Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

- ☐ Coloured covers / Couverture de couleur
- ☐ Covers damaged / Couverture endommagée
- ☐ Covers restored and/or laminated / Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- ☐ Cover title missing / Le titre de couverture manque
- ☐ Coloured maps / Cartes géographiques en couleur
- ☐ Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) / Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- ☐ Coloured plates and/or illustrations / Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- ☐ Bound with other material / Relié avec d'autres documents
- ☐ Only edition available / Seule édition disponible
- ☐ Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure.

- ☐ Coloured pages / Pages de couleur
- ☐ Pages damaged / Pages endommagées
- ☐ Pages restored and/or laminated / Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- ☑ Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/ Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- ☐ Pages detached / Pages détachées
- ☑ Showthrough / Transparence
- ☑ Quality of print varies / Qualité inégale de l'impression
- ☐ Includes supplementary materials / Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- ☐ Blank leaves added during restorations may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from scanning / Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été numérisées.

☑ Additional comments / Commentaires supplémentaires:

Pagination is as follows: [1], [805]-1778, [i]-xcvi p.

Pages 1026 & 1520 are incorrectly numbered pages 0126 & 150.

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

FOURTH SESSION—FIFTH PARLIAMENT.

49° VICTORIÆ, 1886.

VOL. XXII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTIETH DAY OF APRIL TO THE SECOND DAY OF JUNE, 1886.

OTTAWA:
PRINTED BY MACLEAN, ROGER & CO., WELLINGTON STREET.
1886.

House of Commons Debates

FOURTH SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT.--49 VIC.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 20th April, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 112) to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Western Canada Loan and Savings Company, and to authorise the said company to issue debenture stock.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 113) to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Freehold Loan and Savings Company, and to authorise the said company to issue debenture stock.—(Mr. Beaty.)

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 100) respecting the transfer of the Lighthouse at Cape Race, Newfoundland, and its appurtenances, to the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Foster.)

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS BEFORE JUSTICES.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 84) to make further provisions respecting Summary Proceedings before Justices and other Magistrates (from the Senate).—(Mr. Thompson, Antigonish.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 6,

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). I explained to the committee that the object of this section was to provide by legislation of our own the same enactment as is contained in the Statute of 5 George II., which has been recognised in various decisions as in force in the Province of Ontario, and may, probably, be in force in some of the other Provinces, although its operation may not have been recognised in any other Province. The object is, as I have said, to embody that enactment in this Statute and then declare in section 8 that the English Statute would no longer be in force. It was considered desirable that an enactment of that kind should be declared to be in force all over Canada, and in force by our own statute, rather than to have any doubt as to the operation of the English Act in any part of the country. It was suggested in the committee that the passage of clause 6 as it is would probably have the effect of preventing any motion being made to quash a conviction until a general order in the terms of clause 6 was passed. If that is still the sense of the committee, I propose to amend the clause in such a way as to provide that the enactment which is contained in that section should have force of law when so ordered by the court having authority to entertain the motion and quash the conviction. The section then would read:

> The court having authority to quash any conviction, order or other proceeding by or before a justice or justices, may prescribe by general order that no motion to quash any other conviction, order or other proceeding by or before any justice, or brought before the court by *certiorari*, shall be entertained, unless the defendant is shown to have entered into recognizances, with one or more sufficient sureties, before a justice or justices of the county where such conviction or order has been made, or before a judge or other officer, as may be prescribed by any such general order.

The balance of the section being as printed.

Mr. MILLS. I thought when the committee rose that the fifth clause was under discussion.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). We carried it, but with an amendment confining it to cases where the jurisdiction was in question.

Mr. MILLS. The same question, I think, applies to this—that is, in any proceeding of this kind the party criminally affected must certify that he will not proceed on any civil right of action he may have, before redress will be given.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). That is not the present clause. The present clause is clause 6, which provides that security shall be given before a motion is granted to quash a conviction.

Mr. MILLS. But as the fifth clause now stands, as amended, is it not such that the party must waive his civil right before the order is granted?

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Upon what ground can we insist upon a party waiving his civil right, which is a matter under the jurisdiction of another Legislature. How can he be bound by it?

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). Of course we could not take away—and should not attempt to take away—the civil right of the party, but the effect of the clause is to enable a judge, before making an order to set aside a conviction, to lay down, as a condition of that order, that the party shall waive his right, and I think it is clearly competent for us to do so, as the procedure relative to the setting aside of the conviction is criminal procedure.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think the Minister should consider this matter again. We are doing indirectly what it is admitted we cannot do directly; we are taking away a civil right by giving the judge before whom the application is made power to compel the applicant to forego his civil right, in order that he may get redress for a wrong committed. I do not think Parliament has the right to do so; at all events, it is open to great question. With regard to the sixth clause, as I understand the amendment, I do not think it helps the matter very much. Instead of Parliament prescribing directly that the security for costs shall be given before an application for a *certiorari* is granted, the hon. gentleman proposes that it shall be a matter of discretion with the judge to require security for the costs.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). Not quite so. There is no doubt a judge before whom an application is made for a writ to issue has the authority to prescribe security,

and this enables the court having general authority over such matters, to make a general order, prescribing what amount of security shall be given as a preliminary to a motion to quash the conviction.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does the hon. gentleman know that it is the law now that the court shall have authority to make the rules fixing the amount of security, as one of the conditions upon which the application shall be made? If this is not the law now with regard to cases of *certiorari*, I do not think it would impose any greater hardship upon applicants than is now imposed on them by the law. The effect of it will be that a poor man, however much wronged or injured he may be, cannot get redress unless he enters into security for the payment of costs, and that sometimes may be very difficult. In almost every case of litigation, every subject of Her Majesty has the right to invoke the power of the court for the redress of wrong, without giving security for the costs. Now, why should the man who believes himself to be laboring under an injustice be compelled to give security for the costs any more than the man who sues to recover a debt? It simply places the poor man at a disadvantage as compared with the rich man who is in a better position to get security than the poor man; it is practically discriminating in favor of the rich and against the poor. I do not recollect, though I am under the impression that you require to give security under the present law, in an application for *certiorari*, and if the law is such I do not think the hon. gentleman should impose that burden on the litigants seeking redress.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). It is the law now. The hon. gentleman will find it in 5 George II., chap. 19, section 2, which in two cases has been decided to be in force in Ontario. I stated a few moments ago that it was considered to be more convenient to have that provision embodied in the face of the Act, instead of its having the force of law merely by the circumstance of its being in an English Statute. When we embody it in the Act, modified as I propose to modify it by having it subject to the order-making power of the court, the Act will show the whole law on the subject of *certiorari* and motions to quash convictions. It does not, however, make any radical change in the law.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does that law apply to all classes of cases? The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who is an authority in cases of that kind, intimated to the House the other day that security for the costs was not a condition to the obtaining of a writ of *certiorari*. My impression was the other way, but that hon. gentleman having so stated, I have some doubts on the subject, and especially as to whether it applies to all cases of application for *certiorari*. Take, for instance, the case of an application made under the Scott Act, where an application can be made.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). I think it is of universal application as to convictions under the order of a justice of the peace. While the Act is in force in Ontario, however, under the English law, it has not been recognised as being in force in some, or perhaps any of the other Provinces. I think it is better to have it uniform, especially as we are not imposing any undue stringency, but are simply putting the law on the subject on the face of the Act, so that magistrates may be made aware of their right to take security in such cases. There is, no doubt, a good deal in the observation of the hon. gentleman, that it may seem hard on litigants to require them to give security for costs. Still, we know that a writ of *certiorari* is a writ easily obtained, and it will always be used as a means of defeating an order or conviction, unless we impose some restraint like this, which establishes the good faith, and requires a fair reason for litigating further, which, no doubt, the suitor would be sure to have before he would undertake to give security for costs.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman provides that upon an application to quash a conviction by a writ of *certiorari*, the court shall have power to amend the conviction both in matters of form and substance. It is only in a case where there is a real wrong to be righted that there is much likelihood of an application being made for a writ of *certiorari*. As the law stood before, there was no power to amend; but under this Bill, power to amend is given, and convictions will not be quashed unless they are not sustained by the evidence. That being the case, I do not see the necessity of imposing additional hardship or restrictions upon appellants by compelling them to give security for costs.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). That is quite true; but the argument only reaches this point, that applications to quash convictions under this Bill are much less likely to succeed, but not less likely to be taken; and the fact that we have made it more difficult for them to succeed, is all the more reason why we should require them to give security.

Mr. LISTER. The amount of the security is not fixed by this section. I think under the English Statute the amount of the security is put at £40 sterling. It is possible under this Act that the courts may make an order directing that security shall be given for a greater sum. I think this section should fix a limit of the amount of security required. With regard to the proceedings to quash a conviction by writ of *certiorari*, after a little experience I can say that they are somewhat more complicated, especially in the Province of Ontario, than the hon. gentleman gives us to understand. I think litigants should be protected to that extent, that the maximum amount of the security should be fixed by the Statute.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). I would suggest that it be left to the judges to fix the amount by a general order. It would be difficult for us to fix an amount that would be proper for the different Provinces. There would probably be a difference as to the court in which the motion would be made. The costs incurred would probably be greater in the Province of Ontario than in the Maritime Provinces. My amendment gives power to the court which entertains the motion to quash a conviction, to make a general order prescribing the security, and how the motion shall be made.

Mr. LISTER. I understand that is the intention, but my suggestion is that the courts should not have power to make an order for a greater amount than the law now prescribes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. With regard to the principle of this provision, something may be said both for and against it; but in the practical application of the principle I think it will probably be found to be correct. A case came under my notice this winter of a magistrate having been harassed for having discharged his duty fairly and honestly. An action arose in a town by reason of some boys driving furiously and running against a woman. The husband of the woman brought an action against the boys for furious driving. The magistrate issued a warrant for their arrest. They were arrested and fined, and the father of one of the boys brought an action against the magistrate, as well as the man who had laid the information, and

who did it without malice. He did not know the boys; he was only anxious to prevent a recurrence of the thing; but the jury gave a verdict against this unfortunate man, and he had to pay all the costs, amounting to about $200. Then the father of one of the boys brought an action against the magistrate. He harassed the magistrate for about a year; and when the case was tried he did not succeed, although the magistrate was subjected to costs of about $100, and was unable to recover them from the man because he was worthless. I think this clause will meet cases of that kind. It may be said that it will deter poor men from going to law; but I think there are a number of fair-minded people in any community who will be ready to enable a poor man to provide for the costs. I quite favor this clause.

On section 7,

Mr. LISTER. I do not see why the litigant should not be allowed to drop his appeal and take out a writ of *certiorari*, if he thinks proper, but why should he be debarred from carrying a conviction from the Court of Appeal to a higher court?

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). This is to prevent persons who have been convicted from availing themselves both of the writ of *certiorari* and of the appeal. They should make the option, either of appealing or taking a writ of *certiorari*. In certain Statutes it is so provided, and it is not unreasonable to make it uniform.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). A difficulty will arise sometimes from the fact that it is absolutely necessary to give notice of appeal to prevent goods being seized. A man, for instance, is convicted and ordered to pay a fine of $10, for which, if not paid at once, his goods will be seized. To prevent seizure, it may be necessary to give notice of appeal and the necessary recognisances, because, before he could get out a writ of *certiorari*, especially if the difficulty arose in an outer county, his goods would be seized and sold. A man ought, therefore, to have the option of withdrawing his notice of appeal and getting the judgment of a higher court. But under this clause, the moment he has given notice of appeal he is prohibited from invoking the decision of a higher court, and is bound to go to the Court of Quarter Sessions. It would be fair to prohibit the issue of the writ of *certiorari* after the conviction has been disposed of by the Court of Sessions, but prior to the meeting of the court the applicant should have the right to the writ of *certiorari* on abandoning his notice of appeal.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). We should not at all countenance the practice of allowing appeals to be taken, merely to stay proceedings until the writ of *certiorari* can be used. That would rather be an abuse of the right of the right to appeal. The section will not have the effect of making fatal to the writ of *certiorari* the preliminary steps in appeal; but it would be unwise to provide that a writ of *certiorari* could be gone on with after the appeal was determined, because that would enable the defendants to have two remedies in different courts.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). He should not have the two remedies, but he should not be deprived of the writ of *certiorari*, simply because he has given notice of appeal to the Quarter Sessions, to prevent his goods being seized or himself being incarcerated. He ought to have the right to abandon proceedings and take his remedy *a certiorari*.

On section 8,

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). This is to prevent the English Statute being any longer in force.

On section 9,

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). The object of this is to prevent miscarriage of justice arising from want of proof of the proclamation.

Mr. WELDON. The court should take official notice of the proclamation, and there then need be no proof of a question of fact by affidavit.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and we will let this clause stand for the present.

On section 10,

Mr. WELDON. I think a provision should be added requiring the registrar to make the return.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). We will add: "And which shall forthwith be done."

On section 11,

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). The object of that section is merely to extend the time for appeal in certain cases in which it has been found too short in remote localities. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) suggested the other day that I should have these sections reprinted with the proposed alterations, and I would have had that done had it not been that these sections will take their place in the consolidation of the Statutes, so that no confusion can arise. The sections are very long, and I thought it was well to have them passed in their present form, as they will appear in full in the Bill for the consolidation of the Statutes.

On section 12,

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). This is the section which I have substituted for section 9:

No order, conviction or other proceeding shall be quashed or set aside, and no defendant shall be discharged, by reason of any objection that evidence has not been given of a proclamation or order of the Governor General in Council; but such proclamation or order of the Governor General in Council shall be judicially noticed.

Bill reported.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, for its information, copies of certain despatches from the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and of other papers, with reference to the Aspy Bay affair.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 20th April, 1886.

LETTERS PATENT FOR INDIAN LANDS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 102) to expedite the issue of letters patent for Indian lands.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman give some explanation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I stated the other day that this is, I think, word for word, the provisions that are contained in the Dominion Lands Act, and which are to apply to Indian lands.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would tell us what the present provisions are for which these are to be substituted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position just now to say what it is, but I think it is exactly as before that Lands Act was passed: the certificates are made, and the patent is prepared and then sent to the Minister of Justice, and the certificate being obtained, the patent is engrossed, and so on. But so far as I can recollect, the new mode as adopted for the Dominion Land Act is much shorter, and thus the patents have a better chance of being issued in a very short time. The hon. gentleman will see that by the first clause, the Governor General may appoint a deputy for the purpose of signing these papers, and that signature will have the same force as if the Governor General had signed it himself. For the Department of Indian Affairs, the Superintendent General, or his deputy, or some other person that may be especially appointed for that purpose by an Order in Council, may sign. Then, after that, in his office it goes to the Secretary of State, and the same provision takes place. The Under Secretary of State countersigns the patents after the Great Seal of Canada has been fixed. I think the mode is an improved one, and will expedite business. If the Governor General were absent, of course the patent would have to be delayed, but it is provided that in that case the Deputy Governor may sign them; and the same with the Secretary of State, if he is away, the Under Secretary may sign them, or an official especially appointed for that purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it seems under this arrangement that no one of the officers who are supposed to sign, may sign a patent. It may be signed by a deputy, after having been prepared and signed as prepared by the deputy of the Superintendent, and transmitted under the signature of the Under Secretary of State. You may have no one of the responsible Ministers, nor the head of the Executive, signing the patent at all.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. But it must have passed through the office of the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs, and after that the existence of the patent is merely a consequence of the action taken by the Minister or by the Governor General in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand that it must necessarily come under the supervision of the Superintendent-General.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If it is an ordinary case, no; but if it is a special case it would come before the Minister who presides over the Department.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The delay in issuing patents for public lands does not often lie in obtaining the final signature of the Governor General after the patent has passed through the routine to which it is subjected. The delay is in the routine proceedings, and especially in getting the document through the Department of Justice. Whether an officer who could perform the work done in the Department of Justice might be attached to the Department of the Superintendent-General, I am not able to say; but it is in connection with the legal branch of the routine proceedings that the delay takes place. I presume delay does not often occur in connection with obtaining the signature of the Governor General; but that there is great delay in issuing patents is manifest to any hon. member who has been commissioned with the duty, as I have been, of looking after patents passing through the Department.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Under the old system every draft patent had to be prepared in the Department of Justice, and when that Department had declared that the patent should be issued the draft was returned to the Department of the Superintendent-General, where it was prepared and engrossed. By this Bill the patent would be prepared in the Department of the Superintendent-General and go through as fast as possible, consistent with the requirements of the measure, which provides that certain officers shall sign patents. Under the present system much time is lost that will be saved by the new mode, which is the mode adopted in the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in supposing that the patent is prepared in the Department of Justice. It is prepared in the Department of the Secretary of State. The Department of Justice merely reports as to whether the party making application is entitled to the patent or not, and after the patent has been prepared in the Department of the Secretary of State the Minister of Justice or his deputy may sign the patent; but the Department of Justice certainly has nothing to do with the preparation of the patent under the present law.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The patent would always go to the Department of Justice for examination. This would be avoided by the present Bill. One form of patent would be adopted and followed.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. While I am quite willing that all unnecessary precautions and official delay should be got rid of, I view with some degree of apprehension the proposals of the Bill, of which the first clause is now before us. The Department of Justice is no longer to have any responsibility with regard to patents. There is no reason why the Department of Justice should delay in discharging its functions of supervising and approving legal documents; there is no reason why the business should not be promptly and efficiently performed by the Department of Justice. And, apart from that, under the provision of the first clause, coupled with the provisions of the other clauses, it is now proposed to abrogate the provision for the Department of Justice intervening and to make provision under which the patent may be signed by a deputy Secretary of State, by a deputy Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs, and in the end by a deputy Governor—all three deputies. No responsible Minister has to execute the document. I think there ought to be at least one signature of a responsible Minister to documents of this kind. It is only within a few months that very serious frauds or improprieties have been perpetrated in connection with the issue of patents for lands. We do not know how serious or to what extent those frauds have been, because we were told that a commission of enquiry had been appointed and the evidence would be brought before us at some future time, and in convenient phrase the public interests were said to be served by our not knowing anything about the frauds. In the face of the fact that existing precautions have not prevented certain improprieties in relation to the issue of patents, we are asked to relax the existing precautions, though we do not know in what particular they have failed. I do not want any unnecessary formal routine preserved, but I want precautions to be taken that patents shall be issued in proper form and that they shall not be issued to persons not entitled to them. The adoption of provisions whereby patents can be issued under the signatures of deputy heads are not such as are calculated to remove, but rather to increase, the apprehensions to be drawn from recent events.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If in this case we had only one signature affixed to a document of this kind, I would agree with the remarks of the member for West Durham, because, although we have full confidence in our officers, we should always guard against wrongdoing. It is no insult or injury to an officer to take necessary precautions, because they are not taken against the men individually, but they are taken to minimise the temptations to which any man may be subjected. In this case there is the guarantee of three signatures, the signatures of parties who are not in the same Department, and it can scarcely be supposed that three officers in three different Departments, all of high positions, will combine to issue false patents. The Dominion notes are not signed by the Finance Minister, but by two officers; nevertheless, we do not suppose there is danger, though there might be a combination formed. I repeat that if there was only one signature to a patent it should be that of a responsible Minister; but in this case there are the signatures of three officers—the deputy Governor, appointed by the Governor General, an officer who must occupy a high position, the Under Secretary of State or some other officer appointed by the Governor General in Council; then you have the signature of the Registrar General, or the officer acting as such, who is to register this document, which is another guarantee; then the Great Seal is to be affixed by the officer who has the keeping of that instrument. With these guarantees, I think we can safely allow this new machinery to go into play.

Mr. BLAKE. As to the signature of the Registrar General, that is nothing; it is merely to authenticate the fact that the document has been registered. As to the signature of the deputy Governor General, I have no doubt the hon. gentleman advises the Governor General to appoint respectable civil servants, and I have no doubt they will not advise His Excellency to recommend by a Message that an extra sum be paid for this duty. It will be an extra duty, and we know how extra duties are performed. It will be a purely formal matter; he will not investigate it at all, and, therefore, you may wipe out the signature of the deputy Governor General, so far as that is concerned. Now, since you are abandoning legal departmental supervision altogether, and at the same time making these other provisions, there should be one or other of the two official signatories below the Minister's—the Secretary of State or the Department of Indian Affairs; it should be signed by one responsible Minister. If the Under Secretary of State signs, then the Superintendent General ought to sign; if the deputy Superintendent General signs, then it ought to be the Secretary of State, so that we may have some one to whom to really look, politically, for the proper conduct of the office. The hon. gentleman says another provision takes place with reference to Dominion notes. Well, most of the Dominion notes are for comparatively insignificant amounts; the number of them is very large, and probably the difficulty of the responsible Minister making so many signatures would be very great. Balancing conveniences, it may have been thought wise that no greater precaution should be taken as to them than has been taken, though if the newspapers tell us truly, there are some counterfeit two's out at this moment. However that may be, I think it is a very different thing providing for the issue of patents to Dominion lands, which may be of very great value in one instrument, and of which, after all, not a great many will be signed by the Department of Indian Affairs, in the course of a year, and the issue of Dominion notes.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman knows that the number of patents issued by the Indian Department is small; very few are issued during the year. The area of land at the disposal of the Indian Department is very little, and there is no reason, so far as I can see, why the Superintendent General should not always sign the patent. I venture to say that at no period in the history of this country has there ever been one thousand patents issued from the Indian Department in one year, and that being the case, there is no reason why the signature of the Superintendent General should not be attached. With regard to the Department of Justice, there is certainly as much danger of irregularity in the issue of patents from the Indian Department, as in no other way could the patent come under the supervision of the Department of Justice, and the signature of some official of that Department be attached. I think we ought always to have the signature of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs to patents with reference to Indian lands, and there would be no delay if that provision was required.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY—EXTINGUISHMENT OF THE INDIAN TITLE.

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

Mr. LAURIER. Before you leave the Chair, I desire to call the attention of the House to the neglect by the Government of the grievances of the half-breeds in the North-West Territories. The subject is a vast one; indeed it is so vast that I think it better not to bring under one single heading all the different grievances from which the half-breeds suffered, all the different derelictions of duty of which the Government, in my judgment, have been guilty, but to confine myself to a single one—the extinguishment of the Indian title, in so far as the half-breeds are concerned. And in bringing this matter to the attention of the House I could have wished that the Government had brought down the information which was to be laid before the House, according to promises often made and often repeated, but not yet fulfilled. The Government and their organs have told us time and again that the Government were in possession of information and evidence which, when it was placed before the House, would show them to be perfectly blameless. Yet, strange to say, by a strange contradiction, owing, I suppose, to the modesty or the sense of dignity of the Government, they have so far kept under a bushel the light which would have placed their conduct in a color so different from what it is now. The next time the Government should not stand on their dignity or their modesty to such an extent. If they have any evidence, it is time they brought it to the House; if they have any defence to make, it is time they should make it. But without anticipating at all the other subjects which may come up afterwards for discussion, without anticipating the other grievances from which the half-breeds have suffered, in so far as the grievance of which I now complain is concerned, I venture to say without fear of successful contradiction that the record will show the Government to be guilty, and to be guilty without a single extenuating circumstance, without a single shadow of excuse. It has always been the policy of England, ever since she has had establishments in North America, to compensate the Indians for the dispossession of their lands. England, and all other Christian nations who planted colonies on this continent, always felt that it was not contrary to moral law to take possession, and even forcible possession, of territories which were roamed over rather than possessed by savage nations — territories which in their hands must forever have remained barren and unproductive, but which under civilised rule would afford homes and happiness to teeming millions. It has always been held as a doctrine of international law that when such territories were discovered, the discovering nation had paramount authority therein; at the same time

it is to the credit of England that she is the one of all civilised nations which gave the fullest development to the doctrine that the Indians were not to be ruthlessly thrown back before advancing civilisation without some fair and adequate compensation. That doctrine was based, not so much on principles of abstract justice as on motives of humanity and prudence. I hold in my hand the opinion of eminent counsel, some of whom have a name in English history, by whom this doctrine is compressed into a few short sentences. It is not dated, but the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) informs me that it is about the date of 1685. It is to the following effect:—

"By the law of nations, if any people make discovery of any country of barbarians, the Prince of the people who make the discovery hath the right of soil and government of the place, and no people can plant there without the consent of the Prince, or of such persons to whom his right is devolved and conveyed; the practice of all nations has been according to this, and no people have been suffered to take up land but by the consent and license of the Government or proprietors under the Prince's title, whose people made the first discovery, and upon their submission to the laws of the place, and contribution to the public charge of the place, and the payment of such rent and other value for the soil as the proprietors for the time being require; and though it hath been and still is the usual practice of all proprietors, to give their Indians some recompense for their land, and so seem to purchase it from them, yet it is not done for want of sufficient title from the King or Prince who hath the right of discovery, but out of prudence and Christian charity, lest otherwise the Indians might have destroyed the first planters, who are usually too few to defend themselves, or refuse all commerce and conversation with the planters."

This opinion is signed, amongst others, by William Williams, Joseph Holt and Henry Pollexfeu. The principles here recorded have hitherto been acknowledged and acted upon by all British Governments on this continent; and I may say that they became at an early date standard principles of our policy; and when the North-West Territories were acquired by this Government, these principles were part of the unwritten law of this country. It is not to my knowledge that at the date of that important transaction the future of Indians in the territory was debated at all between the purchaser and the vendor; but if it was not debated, it was not because the Indians were ignored. It was because the principle was admitted without being mentioned, that the Indians should be treated as all Indians under British rule had been treated. But if the Indians were not ignored, there was in the territory another population, the half-breeds, who were totally and completely ignored by the Government of the time. They were sprung from European hunters and the Indians, and their character partook of the character of both nations; but in point of education and experience, though vastly inferior to the whites in point of intelligence and adaptability to civilisation, they were far superior to the Indians. Amongst other advantages which they possessed over the Indians, they had a better conception of their own rights, and greater ability to proclaim and defend them. What their conception of their rights was, is well put by Mr. Tuttle in his history of Manitoba:

"The feeling of the French half-breeds may be briefly expressed as this: that they questioned the right of the Dominion Government to take possession of what they considered their country without their consent."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to set forth here, or to recall, all the different rights claimed at the time by the half-breeds. I confine myself simply to one point, that is to say, the extinguishment of the Indian title in so far as the half-breeds were concerned. They rebelled; they objected to the further progress of the Canadian Government into what they considered their country, until their rights were recognised and guaranteed; and, after the rebellion, the Government had to admit, and did admit, that the same prudent principles that applied to the Indians should apply to the Half-breeds. The Government admitted that as the original possessors of the soil they were entitled to the same compensation as the Indians, and that since they were to be deprived henceforth of the rights of the soil, they should be treated by the Government as the Indians had been treated. Though the principle was the same, its application in the two cases could not be identical, because of the difference in the state of civilisation of the two races. The rule universally applied to the Indians has been to put them upon reserves, and there to protect and defend them against white encroachments, and to assist them by money and otherwise during their advancement from savage to civilised life. In the case of the half-breeds this rule could not be applied, for the simple reason that they were too far advanced towards civilisation to require it. They were more ignorant and less civilised than the whites, but their minds were adapted to civilisation, and the decision arrived at by the Government was to give them a grant of land. This grant of land has been the object of two different Statutes; and it may be well here to recall the terms of those Statutes, in view of the further discussion of this subject. The first was the Act of 1870, which provided as follows:—

"And whereas it is expedient, towards the extinguishment of the Indian title to the lands in the Province, to appropriate a portion of such ungranted lands, to the extent of 1,400,000 acres thereof, for the benefit of the families of the half-breed residents, it is hereby enacted that, under regulations to be from time to time made by the Governor General in Council, the Lieutenant-Governor shall select such lots or tracts in such parts of the Province as he may deem expedient, to the extent aforesaid, and divide the same among the children of the half-breed heads of families residing in the Province at the time of the said transfer to Canada."

In 1874 a similar Statute was passed, extending to the heads of families those provisions which had been previously applied to minors alone. It has often been stated, and perhaps stated with truth, that this settlement had been in some respects injudicious—that it had proved to be of scarcely any benefit to the half-breed population, as they had been almost wholly deprived of the soil by the cunning and dishonesty of white speculators. These reports, as I have said, have not been without foundation; and experience has shown that it would be more conducive to the interest of the half-breeds if some restrictions were provided in our legislation which would secure to them the advantages which it was the intention of the law to give them. But however satisfactory the settlement may have been from the philanthropic point of view, it had this effect, that it gave protection to the half-breeds of Manitoba, and secured the peace of Manitoba, which has been observed since. It does not require argument to prove that the same treatment should be extended to the half-breeds of the North-West Territories as was extended to those of Manitoba—that the half-breeds of the North-West are entitled to the same rights as were acknowledged and granted to the half-breeds of Manitoba; and it is acknowledged as a consequence that long, long ago the claims of the half-breeds of the North-West Territories should have been settled in a manner similar to that in which the claims of the half-breeds of Manitoba were settled. It has been made a reproach against the Mackenzie Administration that during the time they were in power they had not settled that question. Sir, the Mackenzie Administration is not here on trial, and all the reproaches which can be made against them, if proved to be true, would rebound against the present Administration with tenfold increased force. If the Mackenzie Administration was at all deficient in its duty, which I do not admit, the present Government were ten times more guilty of negligence of not having, up to the year 1885, settled that question. But there was a paramount reason, it seems to me, one which must commend itself at once to the attention of the House, why this question was not settled during the Mackenzie Administration. As long as Mr. Laird was not appointed Governor, and up to the time he reached the Province, there was practically nothing in the territories to show the half-breeds there had

been a change of *régime* at all; moreover, the question could not be settled unless there was in the country some administration of some kind, and until Mr. Laird had reached the territories, in the fall of 1877, there was practically nothing whatever to show there had been a change in the condition of the people, as the people were not interfeared with, and remained practically as they were before. But as soon as Mr. Laird reached the territories, in the fall of 1877, he was approached by bands of half breeds, who made to him the very natural prayer that they should be treated in the same manner absolutely as the half breeds of Manitoba. He was met by two different kinds of applications: First, the application of the half-breeds of the North-West Territories, who represented they had absolutely the same rights as the half-breeds of Manitoba, and should receive the same treatment; and second, the application of the half-breeds who had formerly belonged to Manitoba, but had been absent at the time of the enumeration, and had not therefore participated in the grant made to the half-breeds of Manitoba. Certainly, it was manifest that as to this last class they should participate in the grant which was made to the half-breeds of Manitoba, as it was only through an accident they had been prevented participating in it; and as to the others, though they had resided, at the time of the transfer, in the territories, the same justice should be applied to them as was applied to the half-breeds of Manitoba. This question occupied the attention of Mr. Laird and his Council in the session of the North-West Council, which took place in 1878. They passed a resolution to this effect which, though well known, can bear repetition:

"That in view, however, of the fact that grants of land or issues of scrip were made to the half-breeds of Manitoba towards the extinguishment of the Indian title to the lands of that Province, there will undoubtedly be general dissatisfaction among the half-breeds of the said territories unless they receive some like consideration."

In a further resolution the Council sets forth that it would be prepared, in any such grants, to couple them with the reservation, so as to put them out of the reach of white speculators. Those resolutions were passed in August, 1878, and were sent to the Government, but by the time they reached Ottawa there was a change of Government and the present Administration came into office, so that they came into office just as this question was ripe for settlement. In the Session of 1879 the question occupied the attention of this Parliament, and an Act was passed in which power was given the Government to satisfy any claims in connection with the extinguishment of the Indian title, preferred by half-breeds of the North-West Territories, outside the limits of Manitoba, on the 15th July, 1870, by granting land to such persons, to such extent, and terms, and conditions, as may be deemed expedient. These were the terms asked by the Government from this Parliament, and granted by this Parliament. They do not contain mention of any special mode of settlement, but the whole matter is left to the discretion of the Government. The only thing to which the attention of the Government was directed, was that they should take some means of extinguishing the Indian title in the North-West Territory, in so far as the half-breeds are concerned. Why do the terms of the Act differ so widely from those of the Act of Manitoba? Why are the terms of settlement left altogether to the discretion of the Government instead of their being made directory as they are in the Statute of Manitoba? The reason is that the Government, did not then contemplate to settle the half-breed question in the Territories in the same manner as in Manitoba, but contemplated disposing of it in some other way. By the papers which are brought down, we find that, as early as December, 1878, Colonel Dennis, who, at that time, was Deputy Minister of the Interior, had put before the Minister a memorandum in which the whole half-breed question was stated for his consideration. In the opening sentences of the memorandum, Colonel Dennis speaks as follows:—

"He respectfully submits to the Minister that it is expedient, with as little delay as possible, to deal with the claims to consideration preferred by the half-breeds of the North-West Territories."

He then states:

"Some uneasiness is felt by the half-breed element in the Territories in consequence of no steps having yet been taken towards the recognition of the demands put forward on their behalf. It must be freely admitted they have a claim to favorable consideration; and the question is—how is that claim to be satisfied, so as to benefit the half-breeds, and, at the same time, benefit the country? Certainly the experience gained in carrying out the policy adopted in regard to the half-breeds of Manitoba—that is, absolute grants of land to the parents and children, respectively—has not been such as would justify a simular policy with regard to the half-breeds of the North-West Territories. Indeed, it is anything but probable that a proposition of that nature could be again carried in Parliament. What, then, are we to do for them? They have, as natives, as good a right to protection of the Government as the Indians, and, unfortunately, they are very little better able than are the Indians to take care of themselves.

"It is therefore evident that one or other of three courses must be pursued with respect to them:—

"1. To treat them as wards of the Government, in effect make a treaty with them, as with the Indians, and look forward to their remaining for many years in their present semi-barbarous state.

"2. To give an absolute issue of scrip, to a reasonable extent, to each individual, and then let them take their chances of living or starving in the future; or

"3. To offer them certain inducements to settle on land and learn to farm—especially raising cattle."

Then he went on and made this statement, among other very significant statements:

"He is of opinion that further measures should be adopted to cultivate and maintain relation with our Indians and half-breed populations, calculated to attach them to us, and to convince them that the Government is desirous of fulfilling its obligations to them in the utmost good faith."

And he concluded with these pregnant words:

"The undersigned respectfully requests for the whole question discussed in this memorandum, the early consideration of the Minister of the Interior, in order, if thought desirable, that a measure may be prepared, embodying such policy as may be decided upon, in good time, for the ensuing session of Parliament."

That was said in December 1878. This memorandum was sent to different persons in the North-West who were conversant with the condition of affairs of the half-breeds, with the object of having their views on the question. It was sent, amongst others, to Archbishop Taché, and I may say that all the other persons to whom the memorandum was sent, were unanimous in saying that the half-breeds were entitled to some special favor at the hands of the Government. Archbishop Taché, amongst other things, said:

"It must be freely admitted that the half-breeds of the North-West have a claim to favorable consideration. Great uneasiness is felt by them in consequence of no steps having been taken in their behalf. A liberal policy on the part of the Government would attract to its side a moral and physical power, which the present critical relations of the various tribes of Indians towards each other, and towards the Government, would prove of the greatest value to the Dominion. On the other hand, the half-breed element, if dissatisfied, would turn a standing menace to the peace and prosperity of the Territories. There is no doubt that the state of affairs in the Territories in relation to the Indians and half-breeds is calling for the serious consideration of the Government, and measures should be adopted to cultivate and maintain relations with the half-breed population calculated to attach them to us. The result depends, in a great measure, on the way the half-breeds will be treated. Friendly disposed, they will mightily contribute to the maintenance of peace; dissatisfied, they would not only add to the difficulty, but render the establishment of the country the next thing to an impossibility. The half-breeds are a highly sensitive race; they keenly resent injury or insult, and daily complain on that point. In fact, they are daily humiliated with regard to their origin, by the way they are spoken of, not only in newspapers but also in official and semi-official documents. Everyone acknowledges the desirability for the half-breeds to settle definitely on lands to cultivate them. Here is a scheme I take the liberty to propose. I esteem the half-breed population actually in the North-West at about twelve hundred families. Let the Government make twelve reserves for them, in the very places the half-breeds will like to have them. Each reserve should be for one hundred families at least and contain an area of twelve square miles of available land—that is to say, the extent of four townships. All the half-breeds, men, women and children, residing in the North-West on the 1st January, 1879, ought to receive two non-negotiable scrips for eighty acres of land each, to be located by them in any one of the twelve above-mentioned reserves. Said lands could neither be sold,

mortgaged nor taxed before they should have passed through the hands of, at least, the third generation of those who received them, or of their representatives. I say at least, because I am strongly inclined to believe that it is desirable that such lands be entirely unalienable; and such an idea cannot seem unreasonable to those who consider the advantages deriving from a similar policy with regard to real and unalienable estates of noblemen. Raise the half-breeds to the condition of landlords; you will thereby confer a real benefit on them, and we will not see a repetition of the regrettable occurrence which took place in Manitoba. The only traffic of land which I would like to see allowed would be the exchange of a full lot for another full lot between the half-breeds, even it should be in different reserves. That would be no encouragement to speculators, but great facility to the half-breeds, especially when they marry."

And he concluded in this manner, which should have commended itself at once to the consideration of the Government:

"It is desirable that the half-breed question should be settled without any further delay. The required legislation ought to be passed in the coming session of the Legislature. Immediately after, inspectors ought to be appointed, and I would particularly recommend Mr. Angus McKay as one of the inspectors."

Such were the views expressed by Archbishop Taché. It must be admitted that upon anything which affected the condition of the half-breeds no one could speak with greater authority. The plan he proposed was not adopted by the Government. Of this I make no complaint at this time. Upon this it is not my province at this moment to offer any comment. I neither praise nor blame the Government for that now; but the fact for which the Government are blameable and are to be arraigned before the people of the country is that, while their attention was called in 1879 to this matter, for six long years they remained idle and did nothing towards the solution of this question. They asked for the views of others. What in the world did they ask them for, when, having had those views, they put them in the pigeon-holes and did nothing to solve the question upon which they asked for them? The neglect of the Government upon this question is all the more unpardonable, in view of the fact that all the parties whose views they had asked for had told them that it was expedient and necessary to give immediate attention to this matter. Colonel Dennis had begged the early attention of the Minister of the Interior and the Government to that question. Bishop Taché had told them it was of paramount importance to give satisfaction to the half-breeds, to treat them with justice and fairness, to impress them with the view that the Government were to do all they should do; and yet, in the face of all that, the Government for six long years did not act at all. It is obvious, it does not require any argument to establish that it was of paramount necessity not only that the Government should act, but that they should act at once upon this matter; and the necessity was enforced, it was made still more apparent, by the earnestness with which the statement of that question and of all other questions affecting the half-breeds was pressed upon them, not only by the half-breeds themselves, but by the North-West Council, by the settlers, by the missionaries, by the officials, by everybody almost who took an interest at all in the North-West. In the month of May, 1880, Charles McKay and sixteen others petitioned the Government upon this matter. They represented that some of them belonged to Manitoba at the time the census was taken, but that they were absent at the time of the enumeration, and they asked to be placed upon the same footing as the others, and to have scrip issued to them; they pointed out that the North-West half-breeds were entitled to the same treatment as the Manitoba half-breeds, and they asked for the early issue of a commission; they also made some other demands. In the same month Octave Majeau and others from Edmonton petitioned the Government and made the same demands. In September, 1881, Antoine Lapierre, from the Qu'Appelle district, petitioned the Government and demanded the same treatment for the half-breeds of the North-West Territory as had been granted to the half-breeds of Manitoba. In August, 1882, John Simpson and forty-two others petitioned the Government, complaining of the treatment they had received from the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company. On the 4th September, 1882, Gabriel Dumont and others from the Saskatchewan River petitioned the Government, representing that they were newly established on the lands, and asking for a survey and the issue of a commission. On the 9th November, 1883, William Bremner and thirty-two others, also from the Saskatchewan River, petitioned the Government, their chief complaint being about surveys. On the 13th January, 1882, Mr. Richardson, whose name is now well known in connection with the North-West, also gave his advice to the Government and in this manner:

"Dear Colonel DENNIS,—Having passed three years in the North-West, and during that period seen a good deal of the half-breed population, the following, induced by the remarks of the Right Hon. the Premier in my presence, last Saturday, may not be out of place, the subject of dealing with the half-breed element of the North West being, as I then gathered, intended for early discussion. These half-breeds claim and insist that as a distinct class they have a share in the Indian title to the lands outside of Manitoba, which has not been extinguished, and, as such distinct class, entitled equally with the half-breeds of Manitoba, to special consideration. That grounds exist for such contention appears by reference to the Statutes of Canada, 1870, chapter 3, section 31. Admitting these half-breeds might (as some few have, but now regret) joined in the Indian treaties, I am convinced that such a contingency is not probable, but that, if requested, they would reject the offer; besides, I do not think their joining in the Indian treaties would be in the public interest, but decidedly the opposite. How best to deal with the element, has, as you are aware, been considered, and you already hold my views on the subject. I may, however, be permitted to express the opinion, that opportunities now present themselves for removing the dissatisfaction existing among these people, and securing their goodwill towards the Government, because, 1st, their former occupation as hunters is gone; 2nd, they are, as a class, destitute. A further reason for urging, as I respectfully do, early action is that they are scattered among the Indians, and latterly subjected to the evil influences of leading spirits of the Manitoba troubles of 1870, who, during the past season, have been traversing the country, doing at least 'no good.'"

On the 6th June, 1881, Mr. Lawrence Clark, a member of the North-West Council, brought before the Council the question of the non-enumerated Manitoba half-breeds, and he did it in this language:

"The undersigned has the honor to represent, for the consideration of Your Honor, the Lieutenant Governor in Council:

"That there are resident within the North-West Territory, in various settlements, but more particularly, so far as the personal knowledge of the undersigned extends, about Edmondton, Carlton, Duck Lake, St. Laurent, Prince Albert and Qu'Appelle, a number of half-breeds who were residents in what is now a Province of Manitoba, at, and before the 15th day of July, 1870, but who, in the interval between this date and the distribution of scrip and lands especially provided in the terms of transfer, have removed from their residence, and are now living in the North-West Territory.

"That the undersigned, from such information as he has been able to collect, is quite convinced the total number of the above described class of half-breeds is not large, and that proof of their claims has long since, in the majority of cases, been taken by Mr. Ryan, before his commission lapsed, or since by the local land agent and that the proof for some time back has been in the possession of the Department of the Interior at Ottawa.

"That these half-breeds, in many instances were not aware of the sittings of the commissioners in Manitoba, being limited in point of time, and in nearly every instance, even had they been aware of such being the case, were not possessed of means to bear the expense consequent upon attendance thereat.

"That the general feeling of the community is that these half-breeds, possessing even rights with those who have already received scrip for lands in Manitoba, have not had the measure of justice meted out to them to which by the terms of surrender they were entitled.

"The undersigned considers the subject as one of considerable importance, very desirable for the peace, welfare and good government of that territory, and should be taken and adjusted by the Dominion Government with as little further delay as possible."

On the following day the same gentleman brought before the Council the question of the half-breeds resident in the territories, and he did it in this language:

"That the half-breeds have already been recognised as possessing rights in the same soil, subject to which the Dominion accepted the transfer of the territories, and while ample provision has been made

for those resident in Manitoba on the 15th July, 1870, nothing, so far, has been done towards extinguishing that portion of the Indian title to lands in the territories outside of the Province of Manitoba, as originally formed by the Act of 1870.

"The undersigned further draws attention to the fact that, by law, the half-breeds are excluded from the benefits conferred upon Indians.

"The undersigned has been given to understand, several petitions from various quarters have been presented to the Government on the subject of the half-breeds, particularly referred to, but no notice was taken thereof.

"That the undersigned knows that a considerable portion of these half-breeds were and are still residents of the electoral district of Lorne, and feels, as the electoral representative of that district, his duty to bring under notice their grievance in the hope that some action may be taken at an early day towards removing what seems to me to be just cause of complaint.

"The undersigned recommends that, through your Honor in council, the attention of His Excellency be respectfully drawn to the subject and he be memorialised to direct the attention of his Ministers to the position of the half-breeds, who at the transfer of Canada were and still are residents of the North-West Territory, and have not become parties to Indian treaties, and the taking of such steps as may lead to a speedy adjustment of the grievances they labor under."

That petition was forwarded to the Government by Mr. Laird, then Lieutenant-Governor, and in an accompanying letter he specially drew attention to this subject in the following words:—

"These memorials were presented to the Council of the North-West Territories at its recent session, and as they relate to subjects exclusively within the control of the Dominion Government and Parliament, I was requested, by a resolution of Council passed on the 10th instant, to transmit copies thereof to be laid before His Excellency the Governor General, and to express the hope that His Excellency may be pleased to draw the attention of his Ministers to the grievances complained of."

Then, Sir, this subject also attracted the attention of the council. On the 8th October, 1881, there was a meeting of the settlers of Prince Albert in which this very subject was taken into consideration, and at which the following resolution was passed:—

"Whereas the Indian title in this territory has not become extinct, and the old settlers and the half-breed population of Manitoba were granted scrip in commutation of such title, and such allowance has not been made to those resident in the territory.—Resolved, that the Right Honorable the Minister of the Interior be requested to grant such scrip to those settlers, thus placing them on an equal footing with their *confrères* in Manitoba."

Ten days later there was another meeting at the same place, and a similar resolution was passed. Then, as the subject did not receive any consideration from the Government, though their attention had been so often called to it, the North-West Council again took up the matter, and at a session of Council held in the month of October, 1883, the following resolution was passed, addressed to the Government at Ottawa:

"Your memorialists further pray that those half-breeds in the Territories who have not participated in the arrangement to extinguish the half-breed claims in Manitoba, should enjoy the same rights as accorded half-breeds in that Province."

And, Sir, as late as the month of December, 1883, Mr. Jackson, whose name is well known now in this House, and who is a member of the North-West Council, addressed a communication to the Minister of the Interior (Sir David Macpherson), in which he said:

"You will pardon the liberty I now take in addressing you privately, when I tell you that it is at the special request of a large deputation of half-breeds that I do so. They, in common with the country, have heard of the generally satisfactory settlement of the 'mile belt' and reserve question, and urge, perhaps with reason, that if their own grievances, upon which the Government have been repeatedly petitioned and memorialised, were brought personally to your notice, some immediate action would be taken. Under any circumstances there would not be very many to deal with, and the settlement of their claims need not be a troublesome one. But there are half-breeds in the Territories who have never received anything from the Government, and who, it has been admitted, are entitled to some consideration."

Besides all these representations, Father Vegreville, Father André, and several other persons in the North-West, wrote letters of remonstrance to the Government. Besides all these, Father Leduc, Mr. Maloney, Bishop Grandin and several others had interviews with the Government upon this. Besides all these, my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron), in 1884, brought this matter to the consideration of this House. Besides all these, and notwithstanding all these, the Government, though thus pressed, harassed, and besieged, never lifted a finger towards the solution of that question. During all these years, while the Department was thus filled up with letters, petitions, resolutions and representations, the Minister always remained silent, calm, majestic, but as immovable as an Egyptian sphinx while it is covered up by the sand of the desert. Furthermore, at last, in 1884, the half-breeds, despairing that they would ever get redress of their grievances by any petition that they could send to Ottawa, by any delegation which they could send to Ottawa, by any remonstrances and representations which they could make to Ottawa, finally sent for Louis Riel. Still the Government took no notice and took no action. The Government, if they were blamed at all, were blameable then. They knew that Riel had an uncontrollable character, they knew that his presence must prove dangerous to the public peace. They were warned of his doings; they were warned by their own officers of the agitation that was then taking place, but still they never lifted a finger towards solving that question. What is the reason, Sir, of that long persistent inaction? Was it simply apathy? No; if it had been merely apathy, the unceasing torrent of complaints and remonstrance which deluged the Department of the Interior, would at last have moved them to action. It was not apathy. I say that that inaction was wilful and designed; it was because the Government had come to the conclusion that they would not give to the half-breeds of the North-West the same treatment, the same favors, the same rights and privileges which had been granted to the half-breeds of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I arraign the Government for this, I charge this upon the Government, that though they asked advice as to the best manner of dealing with that question, though they had been told by all those whom they had consulted that these half-breeds must have the same privileges as the half-breeds of Manitoba, that such precautions should be taken as would place their grants beyond the reach of the white speculator, the Government had come to the conclusion that they would not follow the advice given to them, that they would not give the half-breeds of the North-West Territories the same privileges which had been given to the half-breeds of Manitoba. The Government had come to the conclusion that the half-breeds should not be treated as a special class, should not be treated as half-breeds, but that they would have to make their choice as to whether they should be treated like Indians or white men. On a former occasion, speaking on this subject, I quoted the language of the Prime Minister, which made that point perfectly clear, and it can bear repetition here. On 26th March, 1885, the Prime Minister, in speaking on this question, expressed his opinion in this way:

"As a whole the half-breeds have been told that if they desire to be considered as Indians, there are most liberal reserves, that they could go with the others; but that if they desired to be considered white men, they would get 160 acres of land, as homesteads. But they are not satisfied with that; they want to get land scrip of equal quantity—I think upwards of 200 acres—and then yet as a matter of course, this homestead as well."

Why they wanted to get as a matter of course their homesteads as well. The half-breeds of Manitoba had been given free grants of land in which they were in possession, and besides that a lot of land had been given to every head of a family amongst them, 160 acres, and the half-breeds of the North-West claimed absolutely the same privileges as had been given to the half-breeds of Manitoba. But on 26th March last the policy of the Dominion Government was that they should not be treated as had been the half-breeds of Manitoba. They should not be treated as half-breeds; they would have to make choice either one way or the other; they would have to be either Indians or

whites. If Indians, let them go to their reserves; if white men let them take their homesteads. That was the policy of the Government, and it was acted upon. A commission was issued. What were the instructions given to the commission? Were they to treat those half-breeds as the half-breeds of Manitoba had been treated? No. The instructions to the commission were simply to give the half-breeds of the North-West a plot of land of 100 acres as a homestead and nothing more. The instructions to the commissioners were to give:

"To each half-breed head of a family resident in the North-West Territories, outside of the limits of Manitoba, previous to the 15th day of July, one thousand eight hundred and seventy, the lot or portion of land of which he is at the present time in *bona fide* and undisputed occupation, by virtue of residence upon and cultivation thereof, to the extent of 160 acres, and if the lot or portion of land of which he is in *bona fide* occupation as aforesaid should be less than 160 acres, the difference to be made up to him by an issue of scrip, redeemable in land, at the rate of one dollar per acre, and in the case of each half-breed head of a family residing in the North-West Territory previous to the 15th day of July, one thousand eight hundred and seventy, who is not at present in *bona fide* occupation of any land, scrip to be issued, redeemable in land, to the extent of one hundred and sixty dollars."

There was the policy of the Government; and, Sir, this policy was elucidated further by the First Minister himself in a speech delivered in this House on 6th July last. There he gave the motives for that policy. He not only gave the policy, but he gave the motives actuating the Government in adopting it. He said:

"Well, Sir, what was the Government to do? We had all our friends; we had the Archbishop; we had even Mr. Jackson, of whom the hon. gentleman has spoken, who now represents the half-breeds in the North-West Council—we had him stating that there should be no grant given to the half-breeds except on condition of five years of continuous occupation. There was a conflict of opinion. I will not trouble the House with showing that there was an infinity of opinions. An infinity of advice was offered to the Government, how best to deal with the half-breeds, and the Government had only one thing to think of—what was the best for the people, what was it best to do for them, to save them even against their own improvidence, and at the same time not to keep back the settlement of the country. This, Mr. Speaker, may account to any reasonable man for what the hon. gentleman talks of as delay. They were not suffering anything. The half-breed had his own lot. He was not cultivating the land that he had. Giving him his land and giving him more land was giving him nothing. The nomadic half-breed, who had been brought up to hunt, having had merely his shanty to repair to in the dead season, when there was no game—what advantage was it to him to give him 160 or 240 acres more? It was of no use to him whatever, but it would have been of great use to the speculators who were working on him and telling him that he was suffering. Oh! how awfully he was suffering—ruined, destroyed, starving, because he did not get 240 acres somewhere else, or the scrip for it, that he might sell it for $50. No, Sir, the whole thing is a farce."

So you see, Mr. Speaker, here is the whole policy and the motives for that policy. Because the half-breed of Manitoba had been injudicious, the half-breed of the North-West was to get nothing; because the half-breed of Manitoba had sold his scrip for $50, the half-breed of the North-West Territories was to get no scrip at all. That was the reason of the Government's policy—that was the cause of the policy. The Government came to this conclusion, that the half breed of the North-West should not get the same treatment as the half-breed of Manitoba, but they did not dare to announce their policy. They wanted to carry it out, but to carry it out on the sly—to carry it out, but not before the eyes of the people of the country. They knew very well that if they were to tell the half-breeds of the North-West Territories that they would not be treated as had been the half-breeds of Manitoba, and would not get as much land as the half-breeds of that Province, this would be objected to, not only by the half-breeds, but by the white settlers, the officials, the missionaries, by all those whose advice the Government had sought. Having come to that conclusion they came to adopt the fatal policy of to-morrow, to-morrow, to-morrow. They trusted that by resorting to that policy of to morrow, by carrying out that policy, but not announcing it, by-and-bye something would arise and the matter would be forgotten. But the matter was not forgotten. Those men rose in rebellion, and then immediately the Government came down on their knees. What they had refused hitherto they telegraphed in haste to their commissioner to grant at once. They telegraphed their commissioner to grant the half-breeds of the North-West Territories what had been claimed for them. Sir, the Prime Minister having spoken the language which I last quoted, went on to say:

"Now, Mr. Speaker, we, at the last moment, made concessions, and we did it for the sake of peace."

At the last moment? Not at the last moment. Not at the eleventh hour but at the fourteenth hour, when blood had been shed, when lives had been lost, when injury had been inflicted which no power under heaven could repair, then the Government yielded to the demands of those people, but not before then. And I call the attention of Parliament to the motives which were assigned by the Government for that fatal and mistaken policy. What were the motives given? The Government would not give the half-breeds of the North-West Territory the same privileges as had been given to the half-breeds of Manitoba. The half-breeds of Manitoba had been improvident in the management of their property, and therefore the Government would not give the half-breeds of the North-West any property at all. The half-breeds in Manitoba had sold their scrip for $50, and therefore the Government would not give the half-breeds of the North-West any scrip whatever. The half-breeds of Manitoba had sold their lands to speculators and had been despoiled by speculators, and therefore the Government would despoil the half-breeds of the North-West of the whole of their lands. Sir, because the half-breeds of Manitoba had been injudicious in the management of their affairs, it was monstrous that the half-breeds of the North-West should not be accorded any rights, and that the Government should break faith with them. If the half-breeds of Manitoba had been injudicious in the management of their property, there was a remedy. The remedy was the one suggested by Archbishop Taché and by all those conversant with the matter. The remedy was to couple with the legislation some safeguard, whereby the grants of land might be kept to the people, and might be put beyond the reach of white speculators. But who has ever heard of such a monstrous policy as the policy which was propounded and carried out by this Government, namely, that because the half-breeds of Manitoba had been injudicious in the management of their property, the half-breeds of the North-West should have no property whatever? It is again worth while to consider the motives of the Government. They say the half-breeds of Manitoba disposed of their lands, And that is the reason why they gave no land to the half-breeds. Sir, is land such a scarce article with us that the Government of a sudden have become so parsimonious? Is the land of such value that the Government should of a sudden be taken with such a fit of economy? Why Sir, did the Government in this matter of the land grant, consider like the French gentleman of whom Balzac says, that "the soil was his mistress"? It is true that the Government have without remorse or compunction given away millions of acres of land to their favorites, that they might indulge in speculation, but the grant to the half-breed is only 160 acres because he, too, forsooth, might speculate. It has been said several times that even if that grant was refused to the half-breeds even if they were entitled to it still it was a very small grievance at best, and was no reason for going into rebellion. Sir, that is not the question. I do not examine here whether this was a cause sufficient for going into rebellion or not, but I ask of this Parliament, was there any excuse for this Government acting as they acted? Was their course calculated to promote harmony and peace rather than to promote discontent and produce all the conse-

quences of discontent? Sir, this was in effect the course of the Government; their course was not calculated to bring harmony and peace into the land, but was eminently calculated to create discontent and all those consequences which have actually taken place, and the consequences of that discontent was rebellion. It is said that this was a small grievance. Sir, this question is irrelevant. What may be of small value to you may be of great value to me; what may be of small value to the rich man in the east may be of great value to the poor man of the west, and moreover, whether it was of great value or small, did the half-breeds claim anything unfair, unjust, or unreasonable? What the half-breeds claimed was so just, so fair and so reasonable, that their claims had actually been guaranteed by a Statute of this Parliament. What the half-breeds claimed was nothing but what the Parliament of this country contemplated giving them. It is a thing of small value, they say. Sir, nothing is of small when it is granted by law. The half-breeds broke the law at last, but I charge against this Government that they themselves broke the law for six long years, when the Government failed to solve this question, when they failed to exercise the power which was vested in them by Parliament, I charge against them that it was an actual breach of the law. But as soon as the half-breeds broke the law the Government then complied with the law. What a sad commentary it is upon their conduct that after having for long years denied what had been claimed by constitutional prayers they should at last give to violence. But the Prime Minister said that at last he yielded for the sake of peace, that he made concessions. I say, on the contrary, that the Government made no concessions whatever. What the Government gave to the half-breeds was not a concession; it was simply the rights which had been guaranteed them by Parliament, and it is manifest—it must be manifest to every one—that any settlement of that question which would not have given to the half-breeds of the North-West the same privileges that had been given to the half-breeds of Manitoba would have been no settlement whatever. As my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Blake) said last Session, it was a matter of justice. He put it in a way which was forcible, and should be recalled to the House. He said:

"Justice is the same everywhere, justice is the same whether it be on the banks of the Saskatchewan, or on the banks of the Red River; justice demands that the same treatment which has been extended to the half-breeds on the banks of the Red River shall also be extended to the half-breeds on the banks of the Saskatchewan."

Certainly no one can take exception to that justice demanded that those people should receive the same treatment as the half-breeds of the Red River. Why was this not done? It was said that it would not be for the benefit of the half-breeds. The point may be well taken, but surely the only solution which could have reached the objection was to do as was suggested by Archbishop Taché—to enable them to legislate in such a way that the benefits given to the half-breeds should remain in their hands. It would have been quite easy to put in the law a small paragraph by which all sales of lands by half-breeds to white speculators should be null, and if that had been done it would have met the requirements of justice. I say that the Government were bound to act by the very letter of the law; and apart from any question of positive law they should have remembered those principles of humanity and prudence which are the basis of English law in this respect, as I have shown already. They should have acted in the spirit which is indicated by the 'expounders of the law; they should have acted in a conciliatory manner, for fear of the Indians—or, in this instance, let us say the half-breeds—should have destroyed the first planters, who are usually too few to defend themselves, or refuse all commerce and conversation with the planters. Those are the reasons which should have induced them to act. There is something more which must have been extremely galling to these people, and that is the contempt with which all their demands were met by the Government. They petitioned time after time, and all their petitions remained unanswered. Archbishop Taché had told the Government that the half-breeds are a highly sensitive race; that they keenly resent injury and insult, and that they make daily complaints on that point. When they had thus been warned by Archbishop Taché, was it not enough to drive them into the unfortunate course which was at last adopted when they were treated in such a manner. I say that there is no race of men under heaven which values its own dignity and suffered the indignities that those people suffered, without resenting them in some manner. Sir, the conduct of the Government is absolutely indefensible. So indefensible is it that the ministerial press, at the outset of the rebellion, more than once admitted that the half-breeds had serious grievances to complain of, and I need not say that the case must be desperate indeed if any organ of the Administration could admit the possibility of wrong on the part of the Government. But the attempt of the Government has been to minimise their own wrong, by saying that in the great majority of individual cases no just demands had been presented to the Government, but that those presenting such demands were not acting *bond fide* but were speculators who having once obtained their rights in Manitoba were attempting to obtain another grant in the North-West Territories. We find the Government presented papers or suppressed papers, accordingly as the presenting or suppressing would lead to the end in view. They refused to bring down papers which were asked for and they brought down papers which were not asked for. They refused to bring down the files of the Department which would have given a consecutive and complete history of the matter, but they bring down reports prepared after the event and prepared to suit the event. There is in connection with this matter a most important report which we should have had on the Table of the House long ago. I refer to the report of the commission appointed during the month of March last year to investigate the claims of the half-breeds of the North-West Territories. This report should have been on the Table of the House upon the very opening day of the Session; and I say this to the majority of this House, that if they had not abdicated their power and right of supervision over this Government, this report would have been upon our Table at that time. Why, Sir, here was a commission appointed to investigate a most important public matter. This commission has sat, and its report has been presented to the Government for more than six or seven months now; and yet the Government still retain the report and refuse to bring it down. At the opening of the Session I myself enquired of the Government whether it would be brought down, and the answer given to me was that I might move for it. I did move for it on the 4th of March; and now we are at the 20th April, in the eighth week of the Session, and that report has not yet been laid up on the Table. This delay is not the result of accident or of circumstances; but it is wilful and deliberate. No man in his senses will pretend that the Government have not had the time or the means, if they had so chosen, to obtain the information contained in that report. Sir, it is no wonder to me that the petitions of the half-breeds should have met with such contempt as they met with at the hands of the Government when the very mandates of this House are thus disregarded. The majority in this House can excuse and tolerate such abuses; but the majority in this House should not forget that such abuses against constitutional Government always rebound in some way or other against the people who are guilty of them. If such abuses are tolerated by an assembly of a

free people, I speak my mind when I say that this assembly is not worthy of the great duties imposed upon it.

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

After Recess.

Mr. LAURIER. I stated to the House this afternoon that on the 4th March I had moved for the Report of the Half-breed Commission, and that up to a recent date the Order of the House which was then issued had not been complied with. The motion which was then granted by the House ordered the Government to bring down all reports made by the commissioners appointed under the royal commission, all proceedings of the said commissioners, all instructions given to them, and all correspondence exchanged between them and the Government. So far this Order has not been complied with. It is true that in the report of the Minister of the Interior, subsequently laid before the House, there is a garbled report of the commission. This report upon its face is garbled; it shows that the most important and material parts have been omitted. Now, Mr. Speaker, upon a question of this importance, it will strike everybody that it is not sufficient to have truth, but we must have the whole truth. It was not sufficient for the Government to communicate to the House only such parts of the report as suited them. It was their duty to bring the whole of it, whether it was to their advantage or their disadvantage. But while the Government chose to bring only such parts as they deem fit, some hon. members of the House on the other side have been more fortunate than we on this side generally are. On the same day on which I moved for the report to which I have just referred, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross), moved for:

"Return showing the number of half-breeds of the North-West Territories who proved their claims before the commission at Fort Qu'Appelle, Touchwood Hills, Qu'Appelle Valley, Regina, Maple Creek, Calgary, Fort Macleod, Pincher Creek, Edmonton, St. Albert, Fort Saskatchewan, Victoria, Fort Pitt, Battleford, Prince Albert, Batoche, Duck Lake, Forks of Saskatchewan, Fort à la Corne, Cumberland House, Moose Jaw and Willow Branch, in North-West Territories; also at Grand Rapids in Keewatin, and Winnipeg and Griswold in Manitoba, giving in each case the number of heads of families and minors; also the number of males and females; also copies of all the petitions filed in the Department of the Interior praying that grievances be redressed, with the names of such petitioners, distinguishing those who had their claims already settled in Manitoba and those who had not; also the number of Manitoba half-breeds who proved their claims prior to the 20th of April last on the supplementary list, and those who have proved their claims since that date."

On the 24th of March, just twenty days after this Order had issued, the return asked for by the hon. member for Lisgar was brought down. It was not voluminous or bulky, but it showed that its preparation had entailed a great deal of labor. It selected ten different petitions, which had been presented by half-breeds at different periods; it went over the names of the petitioners, one by one, and classified them under three different headings—one, the half breeds who had participated in the Manitoba grant; second, the half-breeds who were to receive scrip from the commissioners; and third, the half-breeds who had not proved their claims. This return showed on its face not only that it had entailed a good deal of labor, but that it was manifestly prepared just to suit the event. It was not a copy of existing documents; it was a careful compilation, prepared with an object. What was the object of the compilation? The object was to show that the great majority of those who had signed those petitions had participated in the grant in Manitoba, and that the claims they were now preferring were fraudulent claims. Such was the object contemplated, and such was the result as set forth in the ministerial press. On the day after this return was brought down, the *Mail* newspaper contained the following article:—

"It appears from a return presented by the Minister of the Interior that of thirty-one half-breeds of the Lake Qu'Appelle district who petitioned the Government in 1874 for land, sixteen had received scrip or land in Manitoba, six did not prove their claims, and nine received scrip certificates from the commission appointed last year.

"Of 147 residents of the Prince Albert settlement, thirty-six had obtained their scrip in Manitoba, seventy-one did not prove their claims, and forty received scrip from the commission.

"There were 276 half-breeds living in the vicinity of the Cypress Hills who petitioned, and of these 101 had obtained their scrip in Manitoba, 161 did not prove their claims, and fourteen obtained scrip from the commission.

"Of seventeen settlers at Manitoba village who petitioned, five had obtained their scrip in Manitoba, four did not prove their claims, and eight received their scrip from the commission.

"Of 115 settlers at Fort Qu'Appelle who petitioned, fifty-seven had received scrip in Manitoba, fourteen did not prove their claims and forty-four obtained scrip from the commission.

"In September, 1882, Gabriel Dumont and 45 others, mostly French half-breeds, settled on the west bank of the Saskatchewan, in the Prince Albert district, petitioned the Government, and of those 36 had obtained scrip in Manitoba and 10 did not prove their claims.

"From St. Louis de Langevin a petition was presented, signed by 32 half-breeds, and of these 24 had obtained their scrip in Manitoba and eight did not prove their claims.

"Another petition from Fort Qu'Appelle bore 44 signatures, and of these persons 30 had obtained scrip in Manitoba, three did not prove their claims, and eleven obtained scrip from the commission.

"The rising, it will be remembered, was confined to the half-breeds of St. Laurent and St. Louis de Langevin, of whom 78 had petitioned the Government for scrip under the Act of 1879, and of these no less than 60 had obtained their scrip in Manitoba, and were entitled to nothing, and could legally receive no other treatment than that accorded other settlers in the North-West."

Now, you see the innuendo of this article. It is not set down in so many words, but the inference is that the majority of those who signed the petitions had already received scrip in Manitoba, and were again applying for scrip, and thus trying to obtain an unfair advantage over the Government. This is a most foul slander. I denounce it as a slander on the half-breeds, in trying to convey the impression that they were dishonest in petitioning for rights to which they were not entitled. Unfortunately they had more grievances than one. They had the grievance, not only that they were not fairly treated with regard to the extinguishment of the Indian title, but also the greater grievance in relation to the surveys. Not one of their petitions can bear the purport the *Mail* puts upon in. Take the first statement of the *Mail*. It said that of the thirty-one half-breeds of Qu'Appelle who petitioned, sixteen had received scrip for land in Manitoba, nine had received scrip from the commission, and six had not proved their claims. You would deduct from that statement that the thirty-one half-breeds of Lake Qu'Appelle who had petitioned the Government had been asking again for scrip for the extinguishment of the Indian title, when they had already received scrip for that purpose. Let the House refer to the petition which is to be found at page 7 of the blue book. What do they asked for? They asked to be allowed to keep the lands they were in possession of; they asked for certain rights for fishing and hunting; they asked for the participation of the Roman Catholic mission in all the rights of the half-breeds; they asked for regulations for the hunting of buffalo and for the establishment of some authority to administer the affairs of the country. There is no demand for the extinction of the Indian title, and therefore the impression the *Mail* seeks to convey is a slander on those people. Let us take the other petitions to which the *Mail* referred. There is the petition of George McKay and others, settlers and residents of Prince Albert, numbering 147. What do they ask? They ask first for surveys; next, that the surveys be made according to their present holdings, with narrow frontages; and third, that the half-breeds who have not participated in the Manitoba distributions should receive the same consideration as was granted the half-breeds in Manitoba. Let us take the fourth petition. Of these petitioners, the *Mail* says: Forty received scrip from the commission, thirty-six had received scrip in Manitoba, and seventy-one had not proved their claims. Let us take the fourth petition,

that of half-breeds living in the vicinity of Cypress Mountain. The *Mail* says 101 had received scrip in Manitoba, 14 received scrip from the commission, and 161 had not proved their claims. Let us return to the petition. It is that of David Laverguere, and 277 others, from Cypress Hills; they ask for the privileges of hunting the buffalo at all seasons; they represent that the majority among them had not participated in the scrip distributed at Manitoba, and they make their demand accordingly, fairly and honestly. I turn to the next petition. The *Mail* says 17 petitioned from Manitoba village, of whom 5 had received scrip in Manitoba, 8 had received scrip from the commission, and 4 had not proved their claims. I turn to the petition. It is that of Charles McKay, and 16 others from Manitoba village; they represented that some of them, who belonged to Manitoba, were absent at the enumeration, and did not participate in the grant of scrip; they, therefore, asked that those be allowed to participate in the grant as if they had been present when the enumeration was taken; they represent also that the half-breeds, who do not belong to Manitoba, are entitled to the same treatment, and they ask the same treatment for them. Take the next petition. The *Mail* says, that of the 115 half-breeds at Qu'Appelle who petitioned, 57 had received scrip in Manitoba, 44 had received scrip from the commission, and 14 had not proved their claims. This is the petition of Peter Lapierre, and 114 others, from Fort Qu'Appelle. What do they ask? They ask for the North-West half-breeds the same participation in scrip as was given the half-breeds in Manitoba; they ask, as to the half-breeds of the North-West Territory, that the Government will be pleased to make a survey of their present holdings similar to old settlers' claims on the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. Then, as to the petition of Gabriel Dumont and forty-six others. The *Mail* says that thirty-six of them had received scrip in Manitoba and had not proved their claims. Here, again, you would suppose that Gabriel Dumont and the forty-four others settlers, who petitioned the Government in 1882 from the Prince Albert District, asked also for scrip on the ground that they were entitled to it, whereas the purport of that petition was not to ask for scrip, but to ask that the Government should be pleased to cause surveys to be made of their present holdings, and that they should have free grants of the land of which they were then in possession. The *Mail* says of another petition of half breed settlers near Qu'Appelle, numbering forty-four, that thirty had received scrip in Manitoba, eleven from the commission, and three had not proved their claims. But this is the petition of John Simpson, and others, whose names have become unfortunately too famous in the rebellion. Did they ask for scrip, and try to obtain an unfair advantage, as the *Mail* says? No, Sir, they did not even mention that in the petition. The only things they complain of are the surveys and the patents. They represent that their lands were invaded by the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Company, and prayed for justice. That was the only grievance they set forth. It is therefore manifest that this article in the *Mail* was a most malicious article, one calculated to convey the impression that the half-breeds had really no grievances, but that the most of those who had petitioned, had received from the hands of the Government whatever they were entitled to; and that, therefore, the rebellion was not the rebellion of people who were seeking the adjustment of grievances, but of men who were trying to take unfair advantage of the Government. I regret that the whole report of the North-West Commission has not been brought down. I have been told on good authority that Mr. Street, the president of the commission, had again and again expressed his admiration of the character of the half-breds, and again and again stated that he had never met with a more truthful people. That, in all these transactions, though some two thousand people had appeared before him, not one had endeavored to misrepresent facts or to try to say anything which was not the truth. Under such circumstances, the bringing down of such a report, with such an object, and commented on as it has been by the press supporting the Government, is another crime for which the Government are liable. Is it not a crime committed by the Government against those people? In the same spirit which called for the preparation of the return I have now discussed, was another report prepared which was recently placed upon the Table of this House. This report was prepared by Mr. Pearce, who is, if I recollect well, inspector of mines of the North-West Territories. This report, as he says himself, was prepared at the request of the Minister of the Interior, who sent him to the theatre of the late insurrection, for the very purpose of bringing down the information which the report contains. This report is dated the 15th December; it was placed on the Table of the House on the 15th April. It is true that certain ministerial newspapers were more favored in this respect than the House, because the report was communicated to certain ministerial newspapers, and perhaps, if we have had it all, it is due to the indiscretion of one of those newspapers, which discussed the report as if it had been already brought down to the House. This report was also prepared with an object, with the object of showing that, in the locality to which the insurrection was confined, the settlers, or the great majority of them, 92 per cent., as the report says, had really no grievances against the Government. The report goes on to say that 92 per cent. of the settlers in that locality had no grievances whatever against the Government, that 92 per cent., and perhaps more of them, had received scrip in Manitoba, that 92 per cent., at least, of them had no grievances against the Government in respect of surveys or of patents. I will not discuss this report to-day at length, the question it deals with is chiefly that of surveys, and, when we come to discuss that question, it will be time to enter into that matter and to show, as I believe, it will be possible to show, how fallacious this report is in that matter. But there is in this report a general purport which may well be discussed here. The general purport which this report tends to establish is that, since in the district to which the insurrection was confined, the majority of the people had no grievances against the Government, there could not be any grievances elsewhere, and that, therefore, the insurrection was absolutely causeless. The object the report has in view is to establish that the rebellion was causeless since in the very place where the people rebelled, they had no grievances whatever. The fact that the rebellion was confined to one particular section of the country is no evidence that there were no grievances in the other parts of the country, even if there had been no grievance in the part to which the insurrection was confined. Look at the insurrection in Lower Canada in 1837, no one will dispute to-day that the Lower Canadians suffered from grievances of a more serious nature. Those grievances were not particular to one section of the country; they affected the whole population of the Province; they extended through the breadth and length of the land; and the insurrection, when it took place, did not spread itself all over the Province, all over the district were these grievances were, for the insurrection was confined to two or three localities. Out of twenty or twenty-five counties which then existed, the insurrection was confined to two or three at most. And, moreover, the very fact that there was a rebellion in the North-West is the best possible evidence that there were grievances which affected the whole of that community. You never find a rebellion anywhere unless those who rebel receive the moral sympathy of their fellow-countrymen. If there is an outbreak anywhere—and this is a daily occurrence—and if those who rise have not the moral support of their fellow-countrymen, you may have a riot, but you will not have a rebellion. You will have a rebellion only when the community is deeply

affected. If only one section of it is affected, you will not have a rebellion. The report goes on further, and tries to show that Gabriel Dumont, Philippe Garneau, Baptiste Boyer, and some sixteen others who are named, of the leaders of the rebellion, had personally no grievances whatever. What is the object of this statement? The object is to show that Gabriel Dumont, Boyer and the other leaders of the rebellion did not act from any noble motive, but simply from the malice of their heart. This is a most unfair statement to make against Gabriel Dumont and his fellow leaders in the rebellion. There is one particular for which I have always admired the British character, it is that British men have never been chary of expressing their admiration for a brave foe. At the ceremony of Her Majesty's coronation, the one person who received the most cheers of the assembled throng was not the young Sovereign herself, popular as she was, but the French Ambassador, old Marshal Soult. As history says, wherever the crowd could get a glimpse of his face, they cheered with increased vigor. And what was the reason? It was that the British public remembered that Marshal Soult had fought their armies with undoubted courage, and had proved himself a worthy foe even of the Duke of Wellington. I am proud to say that it has been admitted that Gabriel Dumont has proved that he has a brave heart in his bosom. His conduct in the field drew from the First Minister himself the statement that he was the hero of that rebellion. If he had no grievance of his own, it only proves not that his follow-countrymen had no grievances, but that he had a greater heart even than we gave him credit for. It would only show that, though he had no personal grievances of his own, he took up arms to defend the rights of others, though his own rights were not imperilled. Would it be the first time in history that men have rebelled though they had no grievances of their own, that men took arms not to remedy their own grievances, but the grievances of others who were suffering? When William of Orange, for instance, with his Dutch companions, placed themselves at the head of the English rebellion, surely he had no grievances against the English Government of that day, he had no personal grievances to avenge against the Government of James. Yet does the fact of his having no grievances alter the fact that at that time the English nation had been tyrannised over by the Government which was ousted on that occasion? And, when the Marquis de Lafayette and his companions forsook the splendor of the court of Versailles to court death on the battlefield in order to aid the American insurgents, it cannot be said that they had any grievances to avenge against the British Government. But does that alter the fact that the American colonies were fighting at that time to uphold the British principle that taxation is not to go without representation? I know the difference that separates these great men from the poor and uneducated half-breeds that live in the North-West, but though the difference is great, it only shows that reason may be found in the breast of all men, without distinction of class; and if these men had no grievance whatever, it is no evidence at all that the nation had no grievances. Have we not the fact that the commission has been dealing with a class of men who had grievances? Have we not the fact that that commission have issued scrip to something like 2,000 applicants? Thereby you have evidence that a great number of half-breeds in the North-West had serious grievances against the Government. Archbishop Taché had estimated the population at 1,200 families, which would probably give a population of 6,000 souls, out of which number one-third actually had their rights acknowledged by the commission. Will any one say, in face of that fact, the people of the North-West had no grievances? Will any one say that Gabriel Dumont and his fellow leaders in the rebellion, even if they had not personal grievances, were not fighting for men who, at that time, did have grievances against this Government? No doubt Gabriel Dumont and his fellow leaders were wrong in taking up arms. Though their complaints had been ignored during so many years, they should still have persisted in their agitation, rather than take the supreme course they adopted. But if they were wrong in taking up arms, still they were excusable. The contempt with which their demands had been received, the fact that their appeals to justice had always met with a refusal, made their action at last excusable. But what excuse can be made for this Government in denying the rights of these people? What excuse can they invoke to shield themselves from the indignation of the people of Canada? What excuse can they offer for having so long refused to act when they had been urged to do so? What excuse can they bring for having so long refused to do justice, when justice simply meant the granting of a few acres of land? What excuse can they offer for having allowed the hearts of these men to swell with bitterness, when a few simple words of right would have softened them into docility? What excuse can they offer for having so long refused legitimate and constitutional demands, which at last they yielded to violence? Sir, excuse there can be none. The Government have forfeited all claim to indulgence. Of all the rights, of all the duties devolving upon the Government, the prime duty is to maintain peace and harmony in the land; and when a section of the population becomes dissatisfied it is the duty of the Government to investigate the causes thereof, and to remedy the complaint as speedily and as fairly as possible, consistent with justice, and if they fail in this, they fail in their most sacred duty. But when the dissatisfaction proceeds from the fact that the Government have ignored their own obligations, then, Sir, I say that the people of the country would be remiss in their own duty if they were to condone such an offence, for by so doing they would strike at the very roots of their own liberty. I think these principles are true, I feel them deeply, and because I feel them deeply, I beg to move:

That all the words after the word "that" be left out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof:—It was the duty of the Government to proceed with diligence under the authority they obtained from Parliament in 1879, to settle the claims arising out of the Indian title of the half-breeds of the North-West Territories, and also to settle the claims of those of the Manitoba half-breeds who were temporarily absent during the enumeration, and that in this respect the Government has been guilty of neglect, delay and mismanagement, prejudicial to the peace, welfare and good government of Canada

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman, in the earlier part of his speech, before dinner, dealt almost exclusively with the fact, as he alleged, that the Government had resisted the petitions made to them for the extinguishment of the Indian title by the half-breeds of the North-West. He pressed upon the House that all these petitions had special reference to the fact that these half-breeds had the same claim as their brothers of Manitoba, and that the Government resisted the extinguishment of their Indian title by refusing to treat them as the half-breeds of Manitoba had been treated. And then, Sir, towards the close of his speech, he apparently, judging from the usual careful and logical manner in which the hon. gentleman deals with public questions, having received new information since he left the Chamber at six o'clock, came back and told us these petitions did not ask for the extinguishment of the Indian title at all, but that they were complaints of the grievances which they had, irrespective of that question altogether. Now, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman should take one ground or the other. If there were petitions coming from the half-breeds of the Saskatchewan district—and with these half-breeds especially we have to deal—which complained that their Indian title had not been extinguished, and that they were entitled to concessions similar to those which the Manitoba half-breeds have received, if he is prepared to take

that ground, then, Sir, I hold that he has no right, as he did at the close of his speech, to claim that these petitions did not at all ask for the extinguishment of that title, but on the contrary, dealt with other grievances, grievances common to all parts of the North-West, so far as complaints are concerned, common, in fact, to new settlements in every country that I have ever heard of. Sir, the hon. gentleman was guilty of what I must regard as great unfairness to the Department over which I have the honor, unworthily, to preside, in saying that the Government had brought down improperly, certain returns which have been laid upon the Table. He referred to one return particularly, in which was stated the number of those whose names were attached to the several petitions who had received their half-breed scrip in Manitoba. Sir, that was the question asked in this House; that was the order given by this House. An hon. member on his own responsibility asked this House to order that the Government would analyse those several petitions and give the House the result of that analysis by stating how many of the petitioners had had their Indian title extinguished in Manitoba. Are we to be told here, especially at a time when so much is being said in relation to the alleged refusal of the Government to bring down returns and information to Parliament, that it was an offence on the part of the Department that it should have done precisely what was ordered to be done; that because the information coming to this House in response to the order does not meet the views of the hon. gentleman, therefore the Department is in the wrong in bringing that information down. Then, the hon. gentleman has referred to the report by Mr. Pearce, which I presented a few evenings ago. I regret very much that the report was not presented some time earlier, as it might have been but for delay in the printing of the schedules by the printers. I can tell the hon. gentleman, so far from the accident, as he calls it, or the indiscretion of a newspaper in publishing in advance certain information contained in that report being the cause of its being brought down, my expectation was that the report would have been brought down at least three days earlier but for the delays in the printing office in connection with the schedules attached to the report. But the hon. gentleman says that was a report prepared expressly, after the event, in order to influence the judgment of Parliament. Whether it was prepared before or after the event, all I have to say is this: It was prepared by the particular officer of the Department who has perhaps had more to do, both under the late Government and under the present Government, with matters in the Saskatchewan district than any other officer in the Department, and therefore the officer who was best qualified to obtain the information which I desired to obtain, and which, in view of all the demands made for information, this House ought to be glad to obtain as well. If that report does not suit the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is certainly not my fault; it is their misfortune. And perhaps the further they probe into the actual facts, however they may get them, whether by sending emissaries into the country to enquire, or in any other way, the less cause they will find for the outbreak of last spring arising out of any improper conduct or neglect on the part of the Government of the day. The hon. gentleman has confined himself in his speech largely to the one question of the half-breed claims, the one question of the extinguishment of the Indian title, and he did that notwithstanding the fact that he cited petition after petition in which he pointed out that the extinguishment of the Indian title was not a chief cause of complaint in those petitions. I propose to deal, if the House will permit me, with the whole question of the grievances of those people in the North-West Territories and to point out, as I think I shall be able to point out, that while in the very nature of things there may have been, and undoubtedly were, some grounds of complaint in the sense in which every settler who goes into a new country, and especially every half-breed, every old settler who finds himself deprived of his usual means of livelihood by the chase, will be almost certain to feel, that so far as the Department was concerned, and so far as regards the treatment of questions connected with the half-breeds, that treatment was one of which no reasonable people could possibly complain, and in relation to which I feel quite satisfied the people of the country will declare the Government are innocent of the charge which has been made against them by hon. gentlemen opposite. This question of the half-breed claims was not altogether a new question. Hon. gentlemen opposite when they sat on this side of the House had to deal with the question. And if I refer to some of their proceedings in connection with it, I desire to say at the very outset that I do not do it for the purpose of justifying or even palliating any neglect of which the Government of the day may have been guilty, but simply for the purpose of showing that the difficulties connected with the subject in the North-West Territories were such as to cause complaint when hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side of the House, and they were such, moreover, as met at their hands certainly not more prompt treatment than has been accorded to them by the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches. In the first place, we know well from what has occurred that the question of the recent troubles in the North-West, which have given rise to these questions in Parliament, was not after all a new question; that Louis Riel did not for the first time last year attempt to raise trouble in connection with the North-West. We know from the statement of Crowfoot given to the *Mail* correspondent, who went through that country during last spring, that long ago, some years ago, Riel attempted to raise the Indians in revolt because, as he declared, the Government had not been treating him properly. And we know after that from a statement made by Mr. Devoy, in an interview with a correspondent of the New York *Sun*, if I mistake not, Riel attempted not only to rouse the Indians into revolt, but also to raise a feeling among the Fenians of the United States with a view, if possible, of enlisting them in his efforts to reconquer the North-West Territories. In that interview Mr. Devoy states that Riel described the frauds and trickery of the land sharks. Recollect this description was given in 1878, certainly not at a time when this Government was in any way responsible for what was going on. The interview reads:

"He described the fraud and trickery of the land sharks, who were protected in their nefarious practices by high officials of the Dominion Government, who were in league with them and profited by their thefts of land belonging to the Metis. The whole administration and system of land management in the North-West he described as rotten to the core. The wrongs of the Metis were intensified by the bitter race hatred of the men who plundered them. Deep-rooted disaffection, he claimed, existed among the whole half-breed population, both in Manitoba and the North-West Territory, and was sustained by strong sympathy on the part of the whole French Canadian population."

And so on with a number of other statements made by Louis Riel at that time to Mr. Devoy, all pointing to the fact that then, in 1878, when this Government was in no way responsible for what had occurred, Riel complained, just as he complained afterwards, of the conduct of the Government in connection with the administration of affairs in the North-West Territories. Now, was there any ground for those complaints at that time? It is well known that petitions and letters were sent to the Government then praying for the settlement of the land claims and for the extinguishment of the Indian title. Mr. Ryan and Mr. Machar had been appointed to settle matters in Manitoba, which would have been settled long before but for the interference of hon. gentlemen opposite with the steps taken by their predecessors, before they went out of office, with a

view to the settlement of those land claims. They had the opportunity of knowing when they came in that these matters were then exciting some interest in the North-West, because in the report of a public meeting, held in 1873, there appears a petition which was transmitted to the Government by Lieutenant-Governor Morris, and in that petition among the claims made was this:

"We also ask of you our Lieutenant-Governor, give us lands in compensation of our rights to the lands of the country as Metis."

That was in 1873, and yet until 1876 not one single step was taken by the hon. gentlemen for the removal of those difficulties and the granting of those claims to those people as half-breeds. It was on the 19th of June, 1876, that the Government took its first action, and at that time they asked Mr. Matthew Ryan, then a stipendiary magistrate, to deal with the question. On the 23rd of October, of the same year, four months afterwards, Mr. Donald Codd, Dominion lands agent, telegraphed to Ottawa as follows:—

"Ryan never received instructions referred to in your letter 12th July. Important that he should be authorised to act by telegram."

So that after, in June of that year, pretending to take that question up, it was not until they were urged to it by their agent in Winnipeg, four months afterwards, that they took the first serious step in connection with it. Two days afterwards Mr. Donald Codd sent a telegram to Ottawa as follows:—

"Ryan anxious to know on what authority he acts. He thinks old commission has expired. Is it intended to keep result of half-breed allotment strictly confidential?"

The answer to that statement was as follows:—

"To MATTHEW RYAN,

"The acting Minister requests you, if willing to take such additional duty, to continue to take evidence of claimants to half-breed lands or to scrip who may come before you in North-West Territories. On reply, forms will be sent."

Now, Sir, Mr. Ryan appears to have accepted the commission entrusted to him. He entered on his duties, but on the 3rd of March, 1877, being then engaged in the performance of his duties as stipendiary magistrate and those supplementary duties connected with the half-breed claims with which he was charged, he wrote rather a remarkable letter, the full text of which I shall read to the House:

"SWAN RIVER, 3rd March, 1877.

"DEAR SIR,—In the matter of my continuing the half-breed lands investigation, as the only official communication I hold on the subject is a telegram authorising me to take the evidence of claimants who may come before me in the North-West Territory, would you kindly inform me, as soon as possible, whether it was the intention of the Department that I should put myself in communication with half-breed claimants by visiting the localities in which they reside, or that I should act in their behalf as they might casually come before me in the course of the discharge of my magisterial duties? If the latter were the intention, I fear that no early practical good can be effected. The greater number of the half-breeds of the different settlements can only be met at certain periods, before their departure to hunt, and after their return, and I am not aware at present at what period or periods I am likely to be engaged as a magistrate at these respective places. My apprehension is, that to trust to the coincidence of our thus meeting would be to defer the investigations indefinitely, and ultimately to cause many of the half-breeds and others in the Territory the loss of the benefits intended for them by law. Would it not be well, therefore, for me to make special endeavors in their behalf during the coming seasons of spring and autumn? I can conveniently go to Lac Qu'Appelle in May, where, as I am advised by Mr. McLean, agent of the Hudson Bay Company, and by the Catholic curé, the bulk of the half-breeds can be met between the middle of that month and the 10th or 15th of the next. And later I may be able to visit the Scotch settlement of Prince Albert, and the French of St. Laurent, and so on. I am not informed, either, as to the matter of expenses, but presume they are to be paid under authority of the Department of the Interior. Would you please instruct me on this head, and generally on the subject of the latter, at your earliest convenience, and believe me to be.

"Very truly yours,
"MATTHEW RYAN.

"D. CODD, Esq., Winnipeg."

That letter was dated on the 3rd of March, 1877, and in a postscript he says:

"P.S —I would require no secretary or assistant, and would otherwise be careful of cost.—M. R."

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Now, there was a pleading letter from the commissioner appointed to enquire into the half-breed claims; there was the deliberate statement on his part with a knowledge of the country, with a knowledge of the habits of the people, with a knowledge of the localities where they might be found most readily, that unless he was permitted to go to particular localities and meet them and give them notice of his being there, the work with which he was entrusted must result in no advantage to the half-breeds, and consequently must result disastrously. And yet, Sir, what was the answer given to that letter by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who at that time was Minister of the Interior. Here it is, written in his own handwriting across Mr. Codd's letter enclosing that of Mr. Ryan:

"It is not necessary to look up parties who have claims. If they care for their interests they will themselves come forward and establish their claims.—D. M."

That, Sir, was the spirit in which the hon. gentleman, who, with his friends, is so solicitous about those half-breeds, who complained that they had not been treated as they should have been treated—that was the spirit in which he dealt with the supplicating letter of his own commissioner, asking that he might be permitted to visit the half-breeds and deal with them as he there found them. But that is not all. Mr. Ryan appears to have been most solicitous in the matter, and he did, at his own expense as it turned out, go to Lake Qu'Appelle with a view of meeting some of the half-breeds there, and when he sent in his bill for $75 to pay his expenses the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), then Minister of the Interior, refused to pay these expenses, and they were only paid after the present Government came in and the present First Minister was Minister of the Interior. That is the way in which hon. gentlemen dealt with those questions. The letter, as I have told you, was submitted to the Minister. Very little appears to have been done in connection with the matter until the 24th of June, 1878, when Mr. David Laird, then Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Territories, a gentleman who was, I believe, not in the best relations possible with the then Minister of the Interior, telegraphed as follows:—

"Observe Mr. Ryan's authority, investigate half-breed claims under order 14th June, 1876, lapsed. Recommend time be extended one year. He is now here. Applicants waiting answer."

On the 28th June, 1878, Mr. Ryan himself telegraphed from Battleford:

"Half-breeds pressing me. Will time of investigation be extended?"

And the answer was as follows:—

"Minister has subject under consideration, and will probably authorise Mr. Duck, who has been appointed Dominion lands agent for Saskatchewan, to investigate such claims."

And that, Sir, was about the last thing the hon. gentleman did in connection with the half-breed claims of the North-West. He appointed a commissioner, and when the commissioner told him what was absolutely necessary to be done, he refused to permit that to be done, and when the commissioner, acting on his own sense of what was right, did it, and incurred a little expense in doing it, he refused to pay that expense; and then, when the Lieutenant-Governor tells him first, and then the commissioner, that the half-breeds were there waiting, but that the authority of the commissioner had lapsed, the answer sent was that the matter was under the consideration of the Government, and that probably Mr. Duck, the newly appointed agent at Prince Albert, would be appointed to investigate those claims. And yet, with that record, these hon. gentlemen move resolutions such as that which has been moved to-day, and ask the condemnation of the Government by Parliament and the country, on the ground that they did not deal fairly, fully, quickly with these half-breed claims in the North-West. During that time it is well known that the importance of this matter was pressed upon the Government by the Hon. Mr. Laird. In

addition, there were several petitions from persons in the North-West; and Mr. Dennis, referring to those petitions, and dealing with the question, wrote as follows:—

"The question raised by His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor as to the manner in which the claims of settlers may be adjusted, who located upon lands in the North-West Territories previous to the transfer, involving, as it does, a question of policy, is for the Minister to consider."

So that it appears that up to that time, although a commissioner had been appointed, the Minister had arrived at no conclusion as to the manner in which he should deal with those claims:

"The undersigned would, however, in reference thereto, venture to express the opinion that land so settled on, without the same may possess exceptional value owing to its situation, and had been taken up with a view to speculation, if the claimant shall have been constantly residing upon and cultivating it to a reasonable extent, should be granted free to the occupant. To give effect to such a policy, however, legislation would be required."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was in March, 1877, and it was a question of simply giving to those people the land upon which they were settled—doing for them, in fact, the very thing the offering to do which afterwards, by this Government, is denounced by the hon. member who has moved this resolution, as a failure of justice to those people—simply the granting of the lands on which they were located, and he is told that legislation will be necessary in order to enable him to do it. And yet, Sir, although another Session of Parliament came and passed afterwards, during which he had the opportunity of getting that legislation, the Session opened and closed without any legislation being attempted, the case of the half-breeds being left precisely as it was, in spite of the recommendation of Mr. Dennis, his own deputy. That, Sir, I think, may fairly illustrate the manner in which the hon. gentleman dealt with those claims. He had claims of a similar kind to deal with in Manitoba. He had to deal with what were usually called the stake claims; and I find that when a schedule was submitted to him of names for his decision as to whether they should have their land or not, nine-tenths of them were bracketed, and the words were written after them, "No —D. M.," to the effect that these people had no claims and should not receive any consideration whatever. What was the condition in which those people were at that time? I have here a letter which, I think, will show the spirit in which these hon. gentlemen dealt with affairs in the North-West. The letter is dated Winnipeg, 29th September, 1877. It is signed by the Rev. Father Lacombe, whose interest in matters in the North-West is well known. It is not addressed to the hon. gentleman for reasons which I suppose the postscript of the letter will sufficiently explain. It is addressed to a gentleman at that time a colleague of the hon. gentleman, the Hon. Mr. Pelletier, then Minister of Agriculture, who had a seat in the other House. The letter was to this effect:

"VERY DEAR SIR,—As you desired me, during your visit to Manitoba, to acquaint you privately with such information as might aid you in the administration of our Province, I now frankly and confidingly communicate the annexed newspaper articles.

"I take the liberty of drawing your attention to those articles, as well as to the remarks which I shall add.

"It must be understood that I am far from approving the violent and unseemly language of the English article. It appears to me that we may protest without being insulting.

"I regret to say that many of the sentiments expressed in those articles are participated in by a great many persons in our Province. Resolutions, coming from Ottawa, threaten to give a fatal blow to our immigration. The Government ask $5 per acre for land on the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. It is too much even for speculation, as speculators sell the same lands for $2 per acre. But above all it is a great deal too much when we consider that those lands are occupied by immigrants who have expended all they had to instal themselves on those lands. If the Government persevere in this determination they will ruin many who accepted the invitation they made them to settle in Manitoba.

"I understand, moreover, that the question of 'stake-claims (Stake-claims) is to be regulated in a manner still more unjust; they wish to draw lots in favor of the Metis children, for lands owned at Rat River and elsewhere anterior to the transfer. For more than seven years those lands, recognised among the population as the property of those who took them, were frequently sold and exchanged. And to-day, on account of these exchanges, there are at Rat River, in the parish of St. Pierre, more than fifty resident families. These families established themselves in good faith, and behold it is now thought to dispossess the greater part of them, of whom many are immigrants, who arrived in spring, bought the land and made outlay for the purpose of establishing themselves. The pretext invoked is, that on certain farms there is little or no cultivation—a pretext which to me seems ill-founded, because those lands were at any rate possessed by those who claim them, before the reserves for Metis children were localised in this place or vicinity. If the lands were possessed then, they are still the property of those who claim them, and consequently an injustice is done in dispossessing them of them. If, on the other hand, these lands were not owned at the time of the localisation of the reserves, how can it be pretended that their cultivation would have ensured their possession? The Government has not yet said anything officially, and secretly they direct the lottery of these lands, so that the odium of dispossessing the occupants may fall on the children of the Metis, to whom these lands shall thus come.

"Evidently the Government are ill-informed, otherwise they would not, for the sake of a few hundred acres of land, consent to draw upon themselves the odium these resolutions would create, to paralyse immigration, and to throw another brand of discord among the population.

"Such are the remarks, which in true friendship, I have thought it my duty to submit for your consideration.

"I remain with much respect, your very humble and obedient servant,
(Signed). ALB. LACOMBE, Ptre., O.M.I."

Then here is a personal postcript:

"Permit me to avail myself of this opportunity to offer you, with all my heart, my best wishes for the New Year."

Here is a second postcript, which is an important one:

"I forgot to tell you that I advised Mgr. Taché to write to the Government. Although he regretted all these misunderstandings, he replied that he would not venture to write to Ottawa, inasmuch as he had never received anything but refusals, and he feared to compromise the case, rather than benefit it, by writing on the subject."

That, Sir, was the opinion of His Grace the Archbishop of the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite treated questions concerning the North-West in which he felt a deep interest, when he ventured to send either petitions or letters to them with regard to those questions. Now, Sir, it is well known that when the change of Government took place, although hon. gentlemen opposite had done nothing to provide by legislation for the settlement of these half-breed claims, the Conservative Government, in its first Session, that of 1879, passed an Act in which they took power to settle these claims. That Act has been referred to by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) on two or three occasions. He has referred to it to-night, and intimated that the first thing done under it was the appointment of the commission last spring. I do not desire, for a single moment, to charge the hon. gentleman with misstating, because I believe him to be incapable of wilfully mis-stating; but I charge him with not having as carefully studied the question as its importance deserves, and as he certainly ought to have studied it. On the 1st June, 1883, an Order in Council was passed, based on a memorandum of the Minister of the Interior, of the 31st May, 1883, separating the offices of Surveyor General and Deputy Head of the Department, creating Mr. Lindsay Russell Surveyor General, with the rank of Deputy Head, and in this memorandum is the following clause:

"The duties of the Surveyor General will necessarily require that he shall spend a considerable part of each season in the North-West, so that he may have the opportunity of directing the operations of the staff in the field; in connection with and in addition to which the opportunity would be afforded him of investigating and finally settling upon the spot, a large class of long-standing and somewhat complicated claims to land, arising at various points in the Territories. Invested as he would be with the rank and authority of a Deputy Head, and bringing to bear on the cases submitted for his adjudication the experience he has acquired in the administration of Dominion lands, his decisions would naturally command the respect and acquiescence of those whom they most directly affect, as well as the confidence of the general public."

Then, by an Order in Council of 7th July, 1883, arrangements were made for dealing with the claims of actual settlers in the Prince Albert and Edmonton districts to obtain titles to the lands they occupied, and it was the intention of Mr. Lindsay Russell to have left at once for the

North-West where he would have been able to deal with the claims question on the spot and settle them on terms reasonable both to the country and the half-breeds and the other settlers chiefly interested. But, as we all know, an accident befell Mr. Russell. He was detained in his room for a long time, and was unable to go to the North-West, as he had intended to do and as the Government desired. The case was not one of such urgency as to require that a substitute, that a less efficient man, should be sent in his place, and so long as there was any hope that Mr. Russell would be able to undertake the important work, the Government, having regard to his great experience and to his familiarity with the English, French and Cree languages, wisely deferred the appointment of any one else until they had to give up the hope of his being able to go at all. Now, there were several classes of claims presented to the Government in relation to the North-West. There were of course a number of other subjects referred to in the petitions. We have heard them read to-night. There was permission asked to hunt the buffalo, but I am not aware that anyone ever prevented a half-breed or Indian from hunting the buffalo; the misfortune was, there were no buffalo to hunt. There was also the question of fishing rights, but I am not aware —although, I am bound to say, I think it would have been wise if it were otherwise—that anyone ever prevented a half-breed, an Indian, or a settler from fishing as he pleased or where he pleased, at his own sweet will. I think the time, however, is rapidly coming when fishery regulations will have to be adopted in the North-West to protect our valuable fisheries there. But, so far as the principal claims are concerned, they may be reduced to two great classes: First, the extinguishment of the Indian title; and, second, the giving of patents for the lands on which the people were settled. As to the extinguishment of the Indian title, it is well to remember that the rebellion occurred on the Saskatchewan, that there was no rebellion anywhere else, and that, therefore, in so far as the rebellion may have been said to have been caused by the non-extinguishment of the Indian title, we have the right to enquire as to whether the persons who petitioned from the Saskatchewan districts were entitled to have any Indian title extinguished, or whether that particular grievance had not in their case been already removed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) has declared that the suggestion that these people had had their Indian title extinguished in the North-West, is an insult to them. He has charged the Toronto *Mail* with having been guilty of the grossest insult towards the half-breeds, by implying that they went into the rebellion for causes which were in fact no causes at all, because the particular grievance in question in their case, had been settled. I have yet to learn that it is an insult to state facts with regard to any people. The particular facts in regard to this case are that the people of the South Saskatchewan, where the troubles arose, had, in the overwhelming majority of cases, their Indian title already extinguished before the rebellion; and that, as to the men engaged as councillors of Louis Riel, a large proportion of them had had their titles extinguished in Manitoba, and, therefore, so far as the extinguishment of the Indian title was concerned, there was no ground whatever for the rebellion which took place on the Saskatchewan, and it took place at that point alone. The place where, perhaps, there had been fewer half-breeds with the Indian title extinguished than in almost any other part of the North-West Territories, was in the Edmonton district at St. Albert; yet, we know that when the rebellion broke out at the Saskatchewan, the young half-breeds of St. Albert enlisted on the side of the Government, and were prepared to do battle for their Queen and their country like the other settlers and volunteers. They did not pretend, that although the Indian title had not been extinguished in their case, they had any ground to rebel, but, on the contrary, recognising that their best interest was to be found in the preservation of the peace and in the prosperity of the country, they enlisted on behalf of their Queen and their country, and aided in preventing the success of the rebellion. So far as the half-breeds in the Saskatchewan district were concerned, the Indian title had in fact been extinguished. Now, Sir, as to this question generally, what are the facts? There is no doubt whatever there were great differences of opinion in the North-West as to the best means of dealing with the Indian title. The hon. gentleman has read from the proceedings of the North-West Council, their proposed method of dealing with this matter. I will repeat the resolution of the council, but first let me look at the recommendation of Archbishop Taché than whom, as the hon. gentleman very properly said, no one is in a position to speak with more authority in relation to the North-West matters. Now, his Grace the Archbishop recommended this:

"I estimate the half-breed population actually in the North-West to number about 1,200 families."

The House will excuse my repeating the quotation made by the hon. gentleman:

"Well, let the Government make twelve reserves for them in the very places the half-breeds themselves would like to have them.

"Each reserve should be for 100 families at least, and contain an area of 12 square miles of available land—that is to say, the extent of four townships. All the half-breeds, men, women and children, residing in North-West on the 1st January, 1879, ought to receive two non-negotiable scrips for 80 acres of land each; to be located by them in anyone of the twelve above-mentioned reserves."

You will notice that the Archbishop's suggestion is that they should have 160 acres of land, precisely the quantity of land which the hon. gentleman says was inferior to that which was given in Manitoba, where the children of half-breeds had 240 acres, and for proposing which he condemned the Government—

"Said lands could neither be sold, mortgaged nor taxed before they should have passed through the hands of at least the third generation of these who received them, or of their representatives. I say, at least, because I am strongly inclined to believe that it is desirable that such land be entirely unalienable; and such idea cannot seem unreasonable to those who consider the advantages deriving from a similar policy with regard to real and inalienable estates of noblemen. Raise the half-breeds to the condition of landlords; you will thereby confer a real benefit on them and we will not see a repetition of the regrettable occurrence which took place in Manitoba."

That was the suggestion of His Grace the Archbishop. Looking at it as a practical man, and not pretending for a moment to have anything like the authority in dealing with the affairs of the half-breeds that His Grace has, I think the people of this country, as a whole, would not have favored the setting apart of twelve reserves, which were to be absolutely inalienable, and were not to be subject to taxation, and to establish, in fact, a system of landlordism in the North-West. But, leaving that aside, what had we from the North-West Council? This is a body representing the people of the North-West, a representative body which is supposed to speak for the people of the North-West, and the very first resolution they presented was a condemnation of the policy of His Grace. In their first resolution they declare:

"That it would be injudicious to set apart reserves of land for the half-breeds of the North-West Territory, or give them negotiable scrip."

So you will see that the first people to object to the policy suggested by His Grace were the representatives of the people of the North-West themselves, in council assembled, in the very petition for not obeying which, for not accepting which, for not dealing in accordance with which, this Government has been attacked both in Parliament and in the country. What did they propose? Here was their proposition:

"That in view, however, of the fact that grants of land or issues of scrip were made to the half-breeds of Manitoba towards the extinguishment of the Indian title to the lands of that Province, there will undoubtedly be general dissatisfaction among the half-breeds of the

said Territories unless they receive some like consideration. That this consideration would most tend to the advantage of the half-breeds were it given in the form of a non-transferable location ticket for, say 160 acres to each half-breed head of a family and each half-breed child of parents resident in the said Territories at the time of the transfer thereof to Canada, the ticket to be issued immediately to any half-breed eighteen years of age or over, on furnishing evidence of claim, and to every child on arriving at that age, and furnishing the necessary evidence."

So you will see that the proposal there was again 160 acres, to be given to the head of a family, and to the child on arriving at the age of eighteen years:

"That each half-breed holding such a location ticket should be allowed to locate it upon any unoccupied Dominion lands, but the title of the land so entered should remain in the Crown for ten years; and if, at the expiration of three years after such entry, the half-breed locatee has made no improvement on the land, his claim thereto shall be subject to forfeiture."

That was the proposal of the North-West Council, a proposal which would have placed every half-breed in an inferior position to any ordinary settler going into the North-West. They were to have 160 acres each; any settler can go into the North-West and get 160 acres. They were to make improvements for three years or were to be deprived of the land; any settler can, on making improvements on his land for three years, get his patent; but they were not to get their patent; the land was to be inalienable for seven years longer, and they were to continue to reside upon it during that time. So that the proposal of the North-West Council was one that would place every half-breed in a position inferior to that of a white settler going in there, and would have left him without any claim, not even the right which is given under the law to any man who chooses to take up a homestead in the North-West. Would anyone pretend to say that the Government would have met the views of the half-breeds if they had accepted that proposition? When the time came to settle these claims with the half-breeds, when they had the opportunity of taking 240 acres for each child of a half-breed born in the Territories before 1870, how many of them took the land? Why, an infinitessimally small number took the land, the great majority taking scrip instead. The papers before the House tell us that a meeting was held at Fort Qu'Appelle at which were adopted resolutions in which the half-breeds declared that they would not take scrip, but would insist upon having land. That was telegraphed down to Ottawa by Mr. Street. Mr. Street was at once instructed to comply with the request of the half-breeds, and give them their settlement in the manner most conducive to their wishes. Yet, when the time came to settle the matter, when the opportunity was given them, I think I am right in saying that but two took land out of all those who put in claims, all the rest taking the half-breed scrip instead. So we have the recommendation of His Grace Archbishop Taché, we have the recommendation of the North-West Council, both of which recommended that land alone should be given, both of which recommended that the half-breeds should remain upon that land on penalty of forfeiture, both of which recommended that land should be inalienable for a certain period, the one for three generations, and the other for ten years; and yet, when the half-breeds came to deal with the matter in their own way, they all took simply scrip, which I am sorry to say most of them sold for a very small sum indeed. They took scrip and thus showed that they did not agree with the suggestion made by those who were perhaps best fitted to advise them, but they took the course which the Government permitted them to take as a last resort rather than allow them to continue to feel that they had any grievances at all. I made this statement in the west a short time ago, and Mr. Jackson, to whom reference has been made, who is a personal friend of my own, with whom I have friendly correspondence all the time, delivered a speech in Fort Qu'Appelle in which he undertook to answer this part of the statement which I made in a speech delivered in Ontario. He said:

"Now, gentlemen, with regard to the question of the issue of scrip or land, just let me say this—and my friend, Mr. Fisher, who was there, will bear me out in it—that, at the first sitting of the commission, I myself and other gentlemen who were presumed to have influence with the half-breeds, urged upon them the almost absolute necessity of taking land. On the first day, about 70 per cent. agreed to take land instead of scrip. In the meantime, and about this time, the fight at Duck Lake had taken place. The Indians felt there that they had whipped the troops. Riel despatched runners and agents all over the country. One was despatched to Fort Qu'Appelle to circulate reports of their success amongst the half-breeds. About this time the rumor reached here from half-breed sources that Riel was to prove victorious, that the half-breeds had better not take land; that they should take scrip, buy what they could, and the land would ultimately belong to them. That is what induced them to take land. (Mr. Fisher. That is so.) These are facts."

Now, Sir, what does that mean? It means that what these people were rebelling for was not the extinguishment of their Indian title but to obtain possession of the country; it was not the permission to hunt for buffalo, nor to fish, but it was simply for the purpose of getting possession of the whole country. As soon as ever, according to the testimony of Mr. Jackson their own friend, there was a prospect of getting the whole country, then they took the scrip. They said: We will take this from the Government in the meantime, it is Government money, and we will have the whole land in the North-West afterwards. Now I should be sorry, for one, to believe so ill of the half-breeds of the Qu'Appelle district, but the testimony comes from two of their friends, from Mr. Jackson, their representative in the North-West Council, and from Mr. Fisher, who was one of their most sincere admirers and trusted leaders, and we cannot do otherwise than to assume that these gentlemen knew what they were talking about when they made such a serious charge against the half-breeds as that they took the scrip because they thought they would get all the land afterwards, and not in any sense in extinguishment of their Indian titles. There were, let me say, other grievances, other complaints, made by the half-breeds. Reference has been made to the letter of Bishop Grandin, and to letters and interviews by father Leduc and Mr. Maloney. Well, Sir, so far as Bishop Grandin is concerned, I am inclined to think that the most important petition presented by him was presented to the late Government, and that as to the principal parts of it, it was dealt with by the late Government. Bishop Grandin said:

"1st. Before all, I ask some encouragement for the settlers. The Catholic missionaries have done almost impossible things in this direction. They have at different places three mills. For the third time we have tried to erect one in the colony of St. Albert—behold more than £900 stg. which we have sacrificed for it; and we are still uncertain whether we shall succeed. That the Government may, on their part, deign to do something to encourage agriculture.

"2nd. Aid for a hospital—at least to construct it, and put it in a condition to receive the sick.

"3rd. Aid for schools. The Government makes large outlay for education in all Canada Is our North-West to be alone withheld assistance? It cannot be said that we required help less than other parts of the country.

"4th. Aid for our orphan asylums, that we may increase these establishments, so as to be able to take in a greater number of little savages.

"5th. Concession of land for each orphan asylum or model farm.

"6th. Reserve of land for the children thus brought up, and aid to help them on to a little farm once they are married.

"7th. And lastly, that the reserves to be made over to the Indians be of arable land, and situated near fishing lakes."

Now, Sir, these claims were dealt with as far back as 1875, in a letter addressed by Lieutenant-Governor Laird to His Lordship, under instructions, of course, from the Government here. This is what he says:

"The Superintendent General cannot but congratulate Your Lordship upon the efforts made by the mission, especially by the establishment of mills to enable the settlers to utilise the grain raised in your diocese."

Well, Sir, there was some taffy in that, but there was not much substance.

"The Superintendent General wishes to remind you that this is a subject which will properly come within the province of the Local Government soon to be inaugurated in the North-West. He thinks, however, that it is obvious that the measures now being taken by the Dominion

Government to carry a railroad and telegraph line through the Territories must have the effect of opening up the country and of facilitating transfer through it, and in this way cannot fail to give an impetus to the agricultural interest of the Territory."

Well, Sir, the hope held out to Bishop Grandin was that this Pacific Railway, built on the line which hon. gentlemen opposite say it should have been built on, gradually, as settlement went on, some day or other would reach them, and that they must keep their courage up until that event occurred, when probably they would have the advantage of the transportation that line could afford then. He goes on:

"The second, third and fourth heads referred to by you, are all matters which come especially within the province of the Local Legislature.

There was not much encouragement in that.

"With regard to the third head, I may remark that the Dominion Lands Act makes provision by a liberal land grant to aid general educational purposes in the Territories, and so far as the Indians are concerned, the Dominion Government will, no doubt, be prepared, when the Territory is surrendered, to make the same provisions there as elsewhere by treaty for Indian schools. In the meantime, I am directed by the Minister to transmit to Your Lordship an official cheque for the sum of $300 in aid of the school at St. Albert, authorised by Order in Council of the 22nd October, 1873. As is assumed from Your Lordship's report, that the average attendance of Indian children at this school is not less than the number required by the Order in Council, viz., twenty-five.

So that $300 seems to have been the whole extent of the answer given to these several propositions of Bishop Grandin:

"Any one of the other schools which Your Lordship may think proper to select will be entitled to a similar one for the current year, provided, of course, the average attendance of Indian children throughout the year is not less than twenty-five.

"As to the fifth head, namely, concessions of lands for orphan asylums and model farms, the Superintendent General is not prepared at present to make any definite pledge on behalf of the Government. On this point, the Superintendent General will be able to speak more definitely after a treaty has been made, and when the question of the extent of land asked for, for the purposes above mentioned, is more accurately known.

"The sixth head refers to large question of public policy, on what it would be manifestly too premature at present to pronounce an opinion. The settlers of the North-West have good grounds for believing that the Dominion Government will deal liberally with them. There is a sufficiency of land in the Territory for all of them and their children, and it is earnestly to be hoped that they will cultivate as much of it as possible, and secure for themselves comfortable homes in the country to which they belong.

"As regards the seventh head, namely, the reserves for the Indians. This matter has hitherto been fully provided for, and all treaties made with the Indians, by which assistance in money and agricultural implements has always been secured to them, and there can be no reason to doubt that these matters will be dealt with in a similar spirit of liberality in future treaties.

"The reservation secured to the Indians will, no doubt, have a fair proportion of arable land, and will include, when it is practicable, any fishing lakes which the Indians may desire to avail themselves of."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was the answer to the petition of Bishop Grandin, and I will ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether it gave much encouragement to his Lordship to hope that his prayers would be acceded to. There was, in addition to this answer by the Lieutenant-Governor, an answer by the hon. Minister of the Interior himself to similar requests, which was dated on the 17th March, 1878, and in that we have this statement of his views of the position of the half-breeds of the North-West, and the manner in which they should be dealt with:

"The application of the petitioners to be aided by the Government with seeds and agricultural implements in their farming operations, I confess I am not disposed to view favorably. I do not see upon what grounds the half-breeds can claim to be treated in this particular differently from the white settlers of the Territories.

"The half-breeds, who have in some respects the advantage over new settlers in the Territories, should be impressed with the necessity of settling down in fixed localities, and direct their energies towards pastoral or agricultural pursuits, in which case lands would be no doubt assigned to them in the same way as the white settlers. But beyond this they must not look to the Government for any special assistance in their farming operations."

So that was the opinion of the late Minister of the Interior, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). He took the ground that the half-breeds, if they consulted their own

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

interests and the interests of the country, would settle down and become ordinary settlers, pointing out to them that in doing so they had large advantages over white settlers, they being old residents of the country and knowing a good deal about it. So much for that matter. Then there was the question of surveys, about which a good deal has been said. I think no one will pretend to say that so far as the question of surveys was concerned this Parliament is not omnipotent. The law was passed in 1871 which fixed the method of survey in the North-West. The law was continued by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the surveys were made on the same principle. As they began, so the present Government continued, and the instructions went to the surveyors that whenever they found settlers upon land, and those settlers desired survey on the river lot principle, the surveys were to be given to them on that principle, and they were as a matter of fact so given to them. The only place where those surveys were not given was in the famous parish of St. Louis de Langevin, and, as we know from the evidence already furnished to the public, at the time the surveys were made, there were but two settlers on the land, and, therefore, it was not a case in which survey by river lots could be adopted. Settlers went in afterwards and took up land, some of them according to the section or block system of survey, and some have made entry in accordance with that survey. They have asked since that the system be changed. They have been informed, and they have always been informed, that if they chose to take their lands in ten chains or twenty chains frontage, they would have the privilege of doing so; but that the principle cannot be recognised, that the Government having once surveyed territory unoccupied at the time of survey, persons going into that territory afterwards cannot demand that a different system of survey be adopted. I think there is nothing unreasonable and nothing improper in that, because, in so far as the surveys are concerned, it cannot be said that the half-breeds should have any more rights than any other class of settlers who might choose to go in, and a farmer from Ontario going into any part of the North-West and preferring the Ontario system of survey, might as well ask to have that plan followed—having gone in there after the surveys had been made—as that the half-breeds, who went in after survey could demand a change in the system. But, as I have said, they have been assured from the first, that if they desire to have the land in ten or twenty chain lots, they can have it on that principle, and that information has been given by the officer of the Government on the spot, so that they can get their lands in that way if they desire. Then there is the question of the lands themselves, of the patents. I venture to make this statement, and no one has hitherto at any rate, that I have heard, ventured to contradict it, that no single half-breed has ever been put off his land by any applicant, that no single half-breed has ever lost an acre of land by any action of the Government. They have, on the contrary, been pressed to make their entries, and, if, to-day, they have not their patents the fact is due, not to the system adopted, but entirely to the fact that they themselves had not taken reasonable steps to get their patents. Let me point out to the House what the Government have done in relation to patents for land; and after all I think it was of the greatest possible importance to them that they should procure the land on which they had settled, which they were tilling and on which they had made their homes. I have here a letter addressed to Mr. William Pearce, a member of the Land Board, by Mr. George Duck, who was agent at Prince Albert, and I will read that letter simply for the purpose of showing what pains the Government took in order that those people might be informed how they could get their patents, in order that they might be induced, if possible, to secure their patents, and in that way remove all possible

doubt as to their legal possession of their property. The letter is as follows:—

"PRINCE ALBERT, 17th December, 1885.

"DEAR SIR,—It having been reported to the Minister of the Interior during his late visit here that there were a large number of claimants to lands within the parishes of St. Laurent, St. Louis de Langevin and in the vicinity of the South Saskatchewan River, more particularly among the French-speaking population, whose claims to the land had not yet been investigated and who therefore could not obtain entry, this statement is based on insufficient data, as the lists of those claimants which I have assisted you in preparing will show."

These lists are attached to the report of Mr. Pearce, which has been submitted to the House.

"Upon receiving your instructions in March, 1884,"—

That was some months before Riel came into the country.—

"to investigate these claims I consulted with the Reverend Père André, the superior of the district, as to the best time to carry out the investigation and obtain the information desired. He told me that as many of the claimants were then away from home engaged in freighting, I had better postpone my visit until after Easter, when they would all be at home putting in their crops. I did so and left here for Batoche early in May. On my way up I called in at Grandin, where I met Père André who told me that he had been waiting for me to tell me that the people had been holding a series of meetings throughout the settlement and they had decided among other things that they would make no applications for entry for their lands in the office here. After consultation with him I thought it advisable to secure his services to explain fully and clearly the nature of my mission and to show to the people the futility of any such resolution on their part. He went with me to Batoche, and at an interview held in the house of Emmanuel Champagne explained fully my object and advised them to fyle affidavits in support of their claims. The investigation was then proceeded with in as careful and thorough a manner as possible, and it will be seen upon reference to the list numbered 2 before referred to that of the 138 claimants 99 were included in the investigation held by me and whose claims were reported upon, 20 had settled upon lands and had not then or afterwards made entry in accordance with the section survey, 2 had settled in 1884 and made no application for entry or filed any evidence of occupation, leaving 17 claimants whose claims were not investigated, which number includes the names of Moïse Ouellette and others who refused to prefer any evidence in regard to their land matters. It was reported to me as long ago as 1882 that these people even those who had settled and claimed their lands in accordance with the existing survey, had been advised by certain interested parties not to make entry for their lands, for what reason I am unaware unless to coerce the Government into another system of survey on the banks of the river. From the schedule prepared you will see how few were then settlers, on the river, some 42 in all, of whom 22 could have obtained entry if they so desired at that time.

"With reference to the list numbered 1, which includes the names of 75 claimants, 55 have made entry, 1 (Cardinal) has settled on a school section subsequent to the plan of the township being received at the office here, leaving 19 who have never applied for entry but who could have made entry if they had so desired. In accordance with your instructions to Mr. Gauvreau, the assistant agent here, in August, 1883, that gentleman visited the different parts of the district in lists numbers 1, 2 and 3, and explained to them fully the Lands' Act as bearing upon their claims. Upon his return he informed me that the chief reply that he had received from the people he visited was that they were poor and had not the money to make entry. There were no other complaints of any nature.

"With reference to list number 3 of the schedule containing the names of 45 claimants, 7 have made homestead entry, 24 filed evidence of claim before me in July last, 9 were filed before you, this month, of whom the majority were absent at the time of my visit, while the remainder failed to represent their claims although requested by me to do so. Of the remainder, 5 have failed to make any application at all before anyone by reason of their absence either as refugees in the United States or as prisoners at Regina, on account of the recent outbreak, this number includes the claim of the Roman Catholic mission, and as so much has been said about this land I might say that no claim has ever been preferred by any of the Oblats for this land.

"I might state that in reference to the question of hay permits representation was made by me to the Department in June, 1884, to the effect that whereas the hay question was not of that character to warrant the imposition of dues for the protection of the small settler as against the stockman, instructions were sent me not to collect any such fees, and no permits have been issued in this district.

"I have the honor to be, Sir, your obedient servant,
"GEO. DUCK.

"WILLIAM PEARCE, Esq.,
"Superintendent, Land Board, Winnipeg."

That is the letter from Mr. George Duck, showing that in 1883 Mr. Gauvreau was sent there to impress on these people the necessity of procuring their patents and to instruct them as to the manner of obtaining them; that in 1884 Mr. Duck procured the assistance of Father André, and again attempted to explain to the people how they could get their lands, and that the difficulty in their obtaining their land was not due to any act of the Government, or anything over which they had control, but was due in the case of some of them to their poverty and in the case of others to their unwillingness to make entry at all. There is no doubt so far as the patents to the land are concerned, that if the half-breeds have not their patents to-day, to them and to them alone is due that fact. Then, Sir, we had the statement made—not to-night, it is true, but we have had it discussed all over the country, we have had it discussed in Parliament, and on the hustings, that the Government had actually driven the people to rebellion, by granting a portion of the lands upon which they were settled to a colonisation company, and that by doing that they had driven the people off the land or, at any rate, had attempted to frighten them off their land. Well, I have here the affidavits of every settler in the parish of St. Louis de Langevin, with one or two exceptions. I shall not trouble the House with reading them. But with these exceptions every one of the settlers on that tract of country, which was supposed to be given to the Prince Albert Colonisation Company, declared either that he did not know of the existence of such a company, and therefore could not know that the land had been awarded to the company, and in the case of one or two who did know it, they had been assured by the agent that they need not be in the slightest degree alarmed, because the company had no power to turn them off the land, being simply the agents of the Government for the settlement of the land, and they were guaranteed by the Government the possession of at least 320 acres like other settlers.

Mr. DAVIES. Will the hon. gentleman lay the affidavits on the Table.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I will put them in *Hansard*, which is better, and will save time.

Mr. DAVIES. Better put them on the Table first.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I am endeavoring to comply with the rule of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), whose resolution I entirely approved of, in relation to short speeches, and will therefore not detain the House by reading all the affidavits. With its permission I will hand them to the reporters. Here is one affidavit which was made by Mr. Norman McKenzie. You heard it read this morning, so I do not think it is worth while reading it again.

An hon. MEMBER. The House was not in Session this morning.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). True; so I will read it.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: I, Norman McKenzie, of Sec. 12, Tp. 45,
To Wit: R. 27, W. 2nd M., make oath and say:—

1st. In the autumn of 1883 I purchased the claim of one Osborne to a portion of sections 12 and 13, in township 45, range 27, west of 2nd, and during the visit of Mr. Pearce to Prince Albert in January and February, 1884, when adjusting the claims of settlers in the Prince Albert district, I spoke to him about that claim, stating I understood that portion of township 45, R. 27, W. 2, lying south of the river, had been handed over to the Prince Albert Colonization Company, and asked if I would be safe in going on and improving the claim. His reply was that I was perfectly safe in going ahead, that so far as settlement in advance of their opening their agency, and even afterwards, when on even sections, was just the same as any other lands in the Prince Albert district. That, so far as the even sections were concerned, the Colonization Company was merely agent for the Minister of the Interior, to grant homestead and pre-emption entries thereon, and any settlers on odd sections, in advance of the Colonization Company establishing their agency, the Minister of the Interior reserving in the agreement with the Colonization Company the right to grant to each and every such settler, land to the extent of 320 acres, and in my case, if I was a *bonâ fide* settler, I would most certainly be protected.

2nd. I never was told by anyone that I would not obtain my entry as desired. In fact, it was always represented to me by the Department

of the Interior land officials, that I would obtain my entry, and have been notified that I can make entry, and purpose doing so shortly.

Sworn before me, in Township 47, Range 26, west of 2nd M., this 11th day of December, 1885. (Signed) WM. PEARCE, Supt. } (Signed) NORMAN McKENZIE.

That is the affidavit of Mr. Norman McKenzie.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the date?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The date is the 11th of December, 1885. I suppose the date does not affect the veracity of the man who swears. I hope the hon. gentleman after his frightful attack upon the Government for having insulted the half-breeds, by bringing down a return, is not going to suggest that all the half-breeds swore falsely, in order to help the Government out of a difficulty.

Mr. LAURIER. My question did not imply that.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If not that, it implies nothing. Here is another affidavit, from one of the two first settlers:

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To wit: } I, Solomon Boucher, of Section 11, Township 45, Range 27, W. 2nd, farmer, make oath and say:

1st. That I am 23 years of age, came with my father, Jean Baptiste Boucher, my sister, Marie Lavillie, a widow, and my brothers, Jean Baptiste Boucher, junior, and Charles Eugène Boucher. The latter attained the age of 18 years on the 1st December, 1882, together with several other younger brothers and sisters, in August, 1882; and have resided in my father's house on the N.W. ¼-sec. 11, in said township, continuously since, up to this date. Came from Baie St. Paul, and participated in the Manitoba half-breed grant.

2nd. That my sister, Marie Lavillie, and my brother, Chas. Eugène Boucher, have also been in my father's house, continuously, since August, 1882, except my sister, who has lived in Prince Albert since last March.

3rd. About 2 weeks after we came here, this township was surveyed. At that time we had about 2 acres of breaking; my brother Charles 2 furrows; my sister Marie had about 1 acre; my brother Jean Baptiste Boucher, junior, not certain whether he had any or not.

4th. My sister, Marie Lavillie, has 1 child, and has done no further improvements on the land.

5th. I have now at least 10 acres of breaking, set of house logs worth about $50, and fencing to the extent of 20 chains, worth $20.

6th. My brother Eugène has 2 acres breaking and a set of house logs which he sold, and also 20 chains of fencing.

7th. At the time of the survey we were told by the surveyor that we were on a school section; but he said he supposed it was all right, and that we would obtain entry. Since then have never been told that we could not obtain entry. Deferred urging to obtain entry, thinking this would be surveyed into river lots, or entry granted so as practically to give that. Heard this land was within a colonisation company's tract, but no official of that company ever said anything to me, nor do I believe, to any of the family, or I should have heard of it. The fact of this land being within a colonisation company's tract never gave my father, brother, sister, or myself any concern whatever, as we always believed we would eventually obtain entry as we desired.

Sworn before me, at Township 45, Range 24, W. 2nd Meridian, this 9th day of December, 1885, having been first read over and explained to him, and he seemed thoroughly to understand the same. (Signed) WM. PEARCE, Superintendent. } (Signed) SOLOMON BOUCHER.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To wit: } I, Jean Baptiste Boucher, junior, of Section 10, Township 45, Range 27, west of the 2nd meridian, farmer, make oath and say:

1st. That I have heard read over to me the foregoing affidavit of Solomon Boucher, my brother, concerning the lands mentioned by him and now claimed by myself, my brothers, a sister and mother (and by my mother on behalf of my father, Jean Baptiste Boucher, senior), and that the same is true and correct in every particular, with the exception that at the date of the survey by Hugh Wilson, D.L.S., in 1882, I had 1½ acres of breaking on the westerly 10 chains of section 11-45-27, W. 2, which land I now claim as a pre-emption, and that I particularly state I never heard, nor do I think my family ever heard that the Government had disposed of the land, and that I could not eventually obtain entry therefor, nor that any of the settlers in Township 45, R. 27, W. 2 M. could not obtain entry for their lands as claimed.

Sworn before me at Township 47, Range 26, West of 2nd Meridian, this 11th day of December, 1885. Having been first read over and explained, and he thoroughly seemed to understand the same. (Signed) WM. PEARCE, Superintendent. } (Signed) J. BAPTISTE BOUCHER.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To wit: } I, William Bremner, of Section 10-45-27, west 2nd M., farmer, make oath and say:

1st. That I came from the parish of St. Charles, in Manitoba, in August, 1882, with my sons Moïse Joseph and Alexander, and my son-in-law J. Baptiste Boucher, to township 45-27, W. 2, and have resided here ever since; lived in St. Charles about 40 years previously.

2nd. That about two weeks after I settled here the survey was made by Hugh Wilson, D.L.S. At the time of survey I had about two acres broken, and the foundation of a house laid. My son Moïse had no improvements and remained with me till the following spring. My son Alexander had the foundation of a house laid on the S.-W. ¼ 10, which he gave to my son William, who arrived the following year, and then began to have building mentioned on E ½ of W. ½ section 5, and completed the house and commenced to reside thereon in the autumn of 1884. My son Joseph had no improvements at time of survey. Commenced to prepare for building in the winter of 1882-83, and commenced residence in the autumn of 1885, but has been farming it for the past two years, living, however, with me. My son William, since the summer of 1883 has been living on the S.-W. ¼ section 10 till the summer of 1885.

3rd. That at the time of survey we had not made up our minds how we would take the land. I came up here on account of my family. They desired the land to be taken up as river lots, and we decided to try and obtain it that way. My son Alexander concluded he would be too much cramped so gave his claim to William Bremner and moved to section 5. We never applied for entry at D. L. office, Prince Albert, waiting to see whether entry would be granted in 10 chain river frontage or not.

4th. That I never was told, nor do I believe, my sons or son-in-law were, or I should have heard of it, that we could not obtain entry for the land as we desired it. Riel once told me, possibly we would not obtain it. Had we believed him we would then have abandoned it, nor continued to make further improvements as we have done.

Sworn before me at Prince Albert, this 9th day of December, 1885, after having been first read over and explained to him thoroughly which he seemed to understand fully. (Signed) WILLIAM PEARCE, Superintendent. } (Sgd.) WILLIAM his + mark BREMNER.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To Wit: } I, Moise Bremner, of Section 10, Tp. 45, Range 27, W. 2nd M., farmer, make oath and say:

1st. That I am the Moise Bremner mentioned in the foregoing affidavit of my father, Wm. Bremner, and that I have heard read over to me the foregoing affidavit of said Wm. Bremner, and that all the statements therein contained are true in substance and in fact, and I particularly declare that I, nor do I believe any of the settlers in Township 45, Range 27, W. 2nd M., were ever told by any one who could speak with any authority or who knew anything reliable about our land claims, that anyone would lose his or her claim.

Sworn before me at Section 10—45—27, W. 2nd, this 9th day of December, 1885, having first been read over and explained to him, who seemed to fully understand the same. (Signed) WM. PEARCE, Superintendent. } (Signed) MOISE BREMNER.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To Wit: } I, Joseph Bremner, of Section 10, Tp. 45, Range 27, W. 2nd M., farmer, make oath and say:

1st. That I am the Joseph Bremner mentioned in the affidavit of Wm. Bremner, my father, corroborated by my brothers Moise and Alexander in an affidavit dated the 9th December, 1885, respecting the land claims of the said William Bremner, Moise Bremner and Alexander Bremner, and my own claim, and those of settlers generally in Township 45, Range 27, West 2nd M., particularly those portions relating to not obtaining our claims, the land covered by them having been handed over or sold by the Government to other individuals, corporation or colonisation company, and declare that the statements contained in the declaration of Wm. Bremner, corroborated by the said Moise and Alexander Bremner, are true and correct in every particular, except regarding the statement of said Wm. Bremner as to date Alexander commenced residence on his claim, it being, as stated by Alexander, in April, 1884, not autumn, 1884, as stated by William Bremner.

Sworn before me at Township 48—27, W. 2nd, this 12th day of December, 1885, it having been first read over and explained thoroughly, and he fully understood what he was subscribing to. (Signed) WM. PEARCE, Superintendent. } (Signed) JOSEPH BREMNER.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To wit: } I, Alexander Bremner, of Section 5-45-27, West 2nd, farmer, make oath and say:

1st. That I am the Alexander Bremner spoken of in the foregoing affidavit of my father, William Bremner, and state that everything men-

tioned therein is true and correct in every particular, except that I began residence on Section 5 in April, 1884, not autumn of 1884, as he states.

2nd. I further state that the foregoing statements of my father, William Bremner, and my brother, Moise Bremner, referring to the land claims of settlers in township 45-27, W. of 2nd, being handed over to any corporation, individual or colonisation company, are true and correct. For my part I always believed I would have to treat with the Government and no one else, and, I believe, all the other settlers thought likewise. The only delay we anticipated being in obtaining entry as we desired in 10 chains, not in quarter sections as surveyed before I took it up.

Sworn before me at Sec. 5-45-27, West 2nd M., this 9th day of Dec, 1885. Having been first read over (3 affidavits) carefully, and seemed fully to understand the same.
(Signed) WM. PEARCE, Superintendent.

(Signed) his ALEXANDER × BREMNER. mark.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To Wit: I, Jonas Laviolette, of Township 45, Range 27, West of 2nd Meridian, farmer, make oath and say:—

1st. That I have lived in this neighborhood ever since the summer of 1882—the greater portion of the time in Township 45, Range 28, West of the 2nd Meridian.

2nd. That when I purchased Wm. Swain's claim, to which I now claim entry, that is, E. ½ of L. S. 4, 5, 12 and 13 of Sec. 3, and E. ½ of L. S. 4 and 5, of Section 10, Tp. 45, R. 27, W. 2nd, supposed I would acquire the right to make homestead entry for said claim; I asked Louis Schmidt, and he told me he thought I could. The neighbors and people generally who live in this vicinity informed me to the same effect. I never heard the Government had sold or given this land, or any land in this township, to any person or corporation. Never heard that any of the settlers in this vicinity had been told by anyone that they would not obtain their claims, and believed that eventually entry would be granted in 10-chain claims, fronting on the river.

Sworn before me at Township 45, Range 27, W. 2nd M., this 9th day of December, 1885, having been read over and interpreted in French to him by Louis Mariot, and he seemed to understand the same.
(Signed) WM PEARCE, Superintendent.

His JONAS × LAVIOLLETTE mark.

I certify I way present and heard the foregoing translated into French to deponent, and he seemed to thoroughly understand the same.
(Signed) GEO. DUCK.

ST. LOUIS DE LANGEVIN, 9th December, 1885.

"At the time I settled upon this land, though it was surveyed, I did not know anything about quarter-sections. Found there was a piece fronting on the river which no one claimed; I took possession of it. Never applied for entry, nor was I told the land belonged to anyone except the Government. Never was told my claim had being sold by the Government to anyone, or corporation, or colonisation company Supposed I would obtain entry whenever I might apply. No one ever told me I would not obtain my land, nor did I ever hear it stated that any of the settlers in township 45, range 27, west of 2nd meridian, or in any other locality along the river, would not obtain their land."

Extracted from a statement made under oath by Elzevir Swain concerning his claim to part of sections 3 and 10, township 45, range 27, west of the second meridian, and sworn to before Mr. Superintendent Pearce, at township 45, range 27, was 2nd meridian, on the 10th day of December, 1885.

"I wished to move to Baie St. Paul, Manitoba, so as to have schooling for the children, and urged my husband to sell out. He offered the place and its improvements for $200 to one McLeod in June last. At the time we settled it was surveyed; desired to settle on the river on account of obtaining fish. We might possibly have obtained a quarter-section, but the settlers generally wished to have 10-chain lots fronting on the river, so we concluded to take it the same way. Never applied at the land office for entry, always thought we would obtain it as desired, but did not expect to obtain entry till we asked for it. Always supposed that the Government would give it us when we applied for it. Never was told by anyone we would not obtain it, nor that it had been sold by the Government to any individual, corporation or colonisation company."

Extracted from a statement made and sworn to by Elizabeth Richard, concerning her husband's, Antoine Richard, claim to portions of section 4 and 9, township 45, range 27, west of the second meridian, before Mr. Superintendent Pearce, at township 45, range 27, west 2nd meridian, on the 10th day of December, 1885, being her answers to questions No. 2, 40 and 42 of said statement.

Her statement is corroborated by an affidavit sworn to by her husband.

"Never was told, nor did I ever hear, that the Government had granted this land to anyone or corporation, nor did I ever believe we would not obtain entry. The only thing that I was afraid of was that entry would be granted by quarter-sections, but held on, hoping to obtain entry as I now apply for it."

The above is an extract from a statement made and sworn to by William Bruce, concerning his claim to portions of sections 4 and 9, township 45, range 27, west of 2nd meridian, being in answer to question No. 42 of said statement before Mr. Superintendent Pearce, at township 45, range 27, west 2nd meridian, on the 9th day of December, 1885.

"Never was told by any one that my husband could not obtain entry—or since his death—myself.

"It was inconvenient for me to go and fyle my application before Mr. Duck here last summer. I wanted my son, Magloire, to enter for it, but he refused, wishing me to have it myself.

"Always supposed we would get this land in 10 chains fronting on the river. If my husband or myself ever imagined we would lose this land we would have abandoned it long ago, and not gone on to make improvements."

The above is an extract from a statement made and sworn to by Marguerite Boyer, concerning her claim to portions of sections 4 and 9, township 45, range 27, W. of the second meridian (being her answer to question 42 of said statement) before Mr. Superintendent Pearce, at township 45, Range 27, W. 2nd meridian, on the 9th day of December, 1885, and corroborated by the following affidavit:

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To wit: I, Jean Baptiste Boyer, of sections 4 and 9, township 45, range 27, west of the 2nd meridian, make oath, and say:—

That I claim homestead entry to E ½ lots 2, 6, 11 and 14 of section 4, and east ½ of lots 3 and 6 (south of river) of section 9, 45—27, W. 2. Have lived in township 45 since 1883, and know whereof I state, and I most emphatically state I never was told by anyone that entry could not be obtained by the settlers in township 45—27, W. 2, for the lands claimed by them.

Sworn before me at Prince Albert, this 11th day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-five, having been read over carefully to him, and he seems perfectly to understand.
(Signed) WM. PEARCE, Superintendent.

(Signed) his J. BAPTISTE × BOYER. mark.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To wit: I, Magloire Boyer, of township 45, range 27, W. of 2nd Meridian, make oath, and say:

That I know Marguerite Boyer who has made oath to the affidavit hereto attached, and so far as her answers to questions numbers 1, 3, 5, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 27, 26, 28, 30, 32, 35, 40, 42 and 45, I know them to be correct in every particular.

That I most emphatically state I never was told by anyone that entry could not be obtained by the settlers in this township, or that the Government had sold the land to any corporation.

Sworn before me at Prince Albert, N.W.T., this 13th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1885.
(Signed) WM. PEARCE, Superintendent.

(Signed) MAGLOIRE BOYER.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To wit: I, Alade Légaré, of Township 45, Range 27, west of 2nd Meridian, farmer, make oath and say:—

1st. That I claim to enter for E½ of E½ 5, and that portion of the SE¼ of section 8, lying south of the river, all in Township 45, Range 27, west of 2nd meridian.

2nd. That I have lived during the past five years in the neighborhood of this land, living nearly the whole time in township 45—28 W. 2nd, and first laid claim to the above lands in 1882; first made improvements on said claim in 1883, have never lived on it.

3rd. Never was told that the Government had granted any portion of township 45-27, W. 2nd meridian, to any person or corporation, and that entry therefor could not be obtained; nor did I ever hear anyone state he or she had been told the same or anything to that effect, and always thought entry would be granted in 10-chain claims. The delay in making entry was to obtain it in such claims fronting on the river, one of which I desired as a homestead, and the other as pre-emption.

Sworn before me at Township 45, Range 27, West of 2nd Meridian, this 9th day of December, 1885. Having been first read over and explained, and he seemed to thoroughly understand the same.
(Signed) WM. PEARCE, Superintendent.

(Signed) ALADE LÉGARÉ.

"Never was told I could not obtain entry for this. Other people wishing to have their claims in 10 chain lots, concluded I would also have one. Never was told the Government had sold or granted this land to any individual, corporation or colonisation company, and always thought that eventually entry would be given as the other settlers in this township desired. Never was told by Riel that I would not obtain entry for this land as claimed."

The above extract is from a statement made under oath by Modeste Laviolette concerning his claim to a portion of Section 5, Township 45, Range 27, West of the 2nd Meridian, being his reply to question No. 42, of this statement. Sworn before Mr. Superintendent Pearce, at Prince Albert, on the 12th day of December, 1885.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To wit: I, Solomon Boucher, of Township 45 Range 27 West 2nd M., Farmer, make oath and say:

1st. That the walls of a building on the North-West quarter of Section 5, Tp. 45, R. 27, W. 2 M., intended for a chapel were erected in the spring of 1884. The building is 21 x 32, the logs in the same are flattened on two sides and as they stand are worth $1.25 each.

2nd. One William Bruce had the contract to put on a shingle roof, but failed to do so. Bruce was paid to some extent on said contract.

Sworn before me at Township 45 R., 27, W. 2 M., this 9th day of December, 1885, having been read over and explained to him and he appeared thoroughly to understand the same.
(Signed) WM. PEARCE, Superintendent.

(Signed) SOLOMON BOUCHER.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To wit: I, Magloire Boyer, of Township 45, Range 27, West of 2nd Meridian, make oath and say:

That I know Marguerite Boyer who has made oath to the affidavit hereto attached and so far as her answers to questions numbered 1, 3, 5, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 27, 21, 26, 28, 30, 32, 35, 40, 42 and 43, I know them to be correct, and believe the remainder are true and correct in every particular.

That I most emphatically state I never was told by anyone that entry could not be obtained by the settlers in this township or that the Government had sold the land to any corporation.

Sworn before me at Prince Albert, N.-W. T., this 13th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1885.
(Signed) WM. PEARCE, Superintendent.

(Signed) MAGLOIRE BOYER.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To Wit: In addition to the above affidavit taken before George Duck on the 23rd day of July last, I further state:

That I claimed this as a 10-chain river lot. My neighbors wishing to have it in 10-chain claims, I supposed I would also obtain a 10-chain lot. Knew it was surveyed into quarter-sections at time I took up claim; never applied for entry and always supposed I would obtain one. Never was told by anyone that this land had been sold or granted in any way by the Government to any corporation, individual, or colonisation company. Never was told by Riel that entry could not be obtained for this land or any of it in township 45, range 27, west 2nd meridian, nor did I hear any of the settlers in said township state they could not obtain entry for these lands,

Sworn before me at township 45, range 27, west of second meridian, this 10th day of December, 1885, having first been read in French by Louis Mariot and he seemed thoroughly to understand to what he was subscribing.
(Signed) WM. PEARCE, Superintendent.

(Signed) ALEX. LAMIRANDE.

Appendix to affidavit taken before Geo. Duck at St. Louis de Langevin, on the 23rd day of July, 1885, and sworn to by the said Alexandre Lamirande.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To Wit: I, Alexander McDougall, of section 13, township 45, range 27, west of 2nd meridian, farmer, make oath and say:

1st. That when I settled on this land in November, 1884, I took up this claim as I did because it was generally considered that entry would be given us by legal sub-divisions or portions thereof so as to give the settlers a river frontage extending back from the river about 1½ to 2 miles.

2nd. That I never was informed that any portion of this township belonged to a colonisation company, and have not been to this day notified to that effect, having always understood that the colonisation company's tract did not extend further north than the southerly limit of township 45, range 27, west of 2nd meridian.

3rd. That I hoped to obtain entry, 20 chains in width, extending back 1 mile from the river.

Sworn before me at township 45, range 27, west of 2nd meridian, this 9th day of December, 1885. Having first been read over to him and thoroughly explained and was understood perfectly by him.
(Signed) WM. PEARCE, Superintendent.

(Signed) his ALEX. × McDOUGALL. mark

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: To Wit: I, Charles Eugène Boucher, of section 1, township 45, range 27, west of 2nd meridian, farmer, make oath and say:

That I am the Charles Eugène Boucher mentioned in the attached affidavit of my brother Solomon Boucher; that I have heard read over to me the said affidavit of my brother concerning the lands mentioned by him, and now claimed by myself, my brothers and sister and by my mother on behalf of my father, Jean Baptiste Boucher, senior, and that the same is true and correct in every particular, and that I particularly state that I never heard nor do I think that any of my father's family ever heard that the Government had disposed of the land, and that we could not eventually obtain entry in the land office therefor, nor that any of the settlers in township 45-27, west of 2nd meridian could not obtain entry for their lands as claimed.

Sworn before me at Prince Albert this 17th day of December, A.D., 1885, having been first read over and he thoroughly seemed to understand the same.
(Signed) WM. PEARCE, Superintendent.

(Signed) CHAS. EUG. BOUCHER.

I believe there were only two who ever heard there was a company, all the others swearing that they did not know there was such a thing. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I may fairly say that under these circumstances the hon. gentleman and those who join with him in attacking the Government can hardly claim that they have succeeded in making out any case against the Government. We have this important fact, that no half-breed has ever been removed from his land by any act of the Government, that no half-breed has ever been disturbed in the possession of his land; and I know of countries where the people would be happy if they could say the same thing. Why, Sir, in the adjoining county of Ottawa, when the hon. gentleman who sits opposite (Mr. Langelier) was Commissioner of Crown Lands for the Province of Quebec, settlers were attempted to be driven off their lands because they had not complied with all the conditions imposed by the Government. Then we have this further fact, in relation to their patents, that the Government, so far from refusing them patents, sent their officers in order that they might personally impress upon the half-breeds the manner in which patents could be obtained, and urge them, if possible, to make the entry necessary to obtain their lands. In the North-West it is absolutely necessary in the obtaining of lands, that there should be general rules which all persons must follow; and it was not too much for this Government, nor is it too much for any Government, to ask that those who have possession of lands in the North-West shall use the reasonable means and conform to the conditions required by the Government in order to get the entry of those lands, and to obtain their patents. The Government not only did this, but they adopted a principle by which the settlement duties performed in advance of survey, and in advance of the entry of lands, even where they were permitted to make their entries long after survey, should all count as if they had been performed after survey. The ordinary white settler going into the North-West and settling on surveyed lands is required at once to make entry. There is no such thing recognised by the law as a squatter upon surveyed lands. But we have dealt in an entirely different manner with those half-breeds. They have been protected against the cancellation which white settlers in similar circumstances are subject to; and they were given, and are still being given, time to make their entry, their

own convenience alone being consulted, and their whole time being counted as if that time had been spent after the entry was made. Then, as to the surveys, the principle has been adopted that wherever a considerable number of settlers were on the land at the time the survey was made, that survey should be made according to the principle required by the settlers; but when the surveyor went into a district where there were no settlers, or where, as in the case of the parish of St. Louis de Langevin, there were but two settlers, the system adopted all over the North-West was followed; but even in such cases, these people were told that they could have their patents upon the principle of the river lot survey if they chose to take their land upon that principle, and to make the necessary sub-division. Then, as to the Indian title, we know that the Government as far back as 1883 passed an Order in Council that Mr. Russell should go to the North-West, and being on the spot, should enquire into and make a report upon all these claims. The difficulties that existed in dealing with that question were difficulties arising out of a conflict of opinion between those parties who were, from their position, supposed to be best able to judge of the necessities of the half-breeds in the North-West, and not from the Government refusing or ignoring their just rights. As to the general treatment of these people by the Government, it has been of the most kindly nature, and for the very best of all reasons, that being the original inhabitants of the country, having been there in advance of our occupation of the country, they were entitled to the greatest possible consideration; and that consideration has been given to them in every respect. I am perfectly satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that the attempt made by hon. gentlemen opposite to make out that the Government were in any way responsible for the outbreak of last spring, or that the refusal of these claims for the extinguishment of the Indian title had anything to do with it, will utterly fail. In fact, the hon. gentleman himself, in his closing remarks, practically admitted as much by pointing out that the people in the district in which the outbreak took place, in their petition did not ask for the extinguishment of the Indian title, but asked for other things, some of which are asked for by white settlers in the North-West as well—all matters of public policy relating to the interests of the whole country, and not to be dealt with exclusively for any one section. Sir, I leave the matter entirely in the hands of the House, and I am perfectly satisfied that the verdict of the House—sustained as I believe that verdict will be by the country—will be that the so-called grievances of the half-breeds of the North West had no basis to justify, or even to palliate the troubles that occurred last spring, still less, Sir, to justify or palliate the language which has been used in this House in relation to those supposed grievances, and in relation to those who took up arms ostensibly to redress them. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for the attention you have given me.

Mr. DAVIES. I very much fear, Sir, that the hon. Minister of the Interior has delivered the wrong speech. The hon. gentleman has the reputation of being somewhat of a skilled debater, and no one knew better than he did that the issue that was tendered for the consideration of the House by my hon. friend from East Quebec was a single issue, clear, definite, and distinct. The hon. gentleman has not attempted to grapple with that issue at all, except in a very limited degree, to which I will refer directly. In fact, in his opening remarks he told the House that it was not his intention to do so, that he intended to deal with the whole question of the North-West grievances. Well, Sir, I for one regret very much that the hon. gentleman took that course. I regret it because the question is so large and intricate that the discussion of one point at a time, such as that tendered by my hon. friend, will vastly facilitate the arrival at just conclusions on the part of members of the House and the country. Hon. members will remember well that last year, when the leader of the Opposition presented a resolution to this House on the general topic of the North-West grievances, and when he delivered a luminous, lengthy and able speech, in which he massed all the evidence together, and submitted a resolution based on his conclusions, he was reprimanded by the leader of the Government, who complained bitterly that all these matters had been mixed together, so that it was impossible to answer them in detail. Why, he asked, does the hon. gentleman mix up the question of civil rights with those of colonisation companies, surveys of land, the Indian title and others? It is impossible for anyone to answer him on all these points in one speech, and the result will be the public mind will be so perplexed as to be unable to draw any fair conclusions from the debate. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) initiated the other night a new policy. He tendered a distinct issue to the House as to the manner in which the Government dealt with the Indians, and that question was discussed separately from other questions. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has tendered a distinct issue to-night, namely:

"That it was the duty of the Government to proceed with diligence, under the authority they obtained from Parliament in 1879, to settle the claims arising out of the Indian title of the half-breed claims of the North-West Territories, and also to settle the claims of those of the Manitoba half-breeds who were temporarily absent during the enumeration."

And concluding that the Government has been guilty of neglect, delay and mismanagement in that regard. Here was a clear, definite issue presented to the House. How has that been met? My hon. friend (Mr. White), in his speech an hour and a half long, treated the House to a dissertation on the claims of the settlers, and the action of colonisation companies, and claims he has proofs that no settlers were dispossessed of their lands,—questions altogether alien to that before the House. But those who have watched the hon. gentleman for some time will understand why he took this course. He did so, evidently, because he was not able to answer the indictment presented upon this issue. The evidence introduced by my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), in support of his resolution, was overwhelming, and the hon. Minister knew that the only course open to him in his defence, was to distract the minds of the members, if possible, from that issue by mixing it up with others. The hon. gentleman brought down a number of affidavits to which I will not refer now. We made a short time ago serious complaints that we were not furnished with proper information, and the hon. gentleman then contended that we had all the information necessary on which to base an opinion; yet we see him here, day after day, as the political exigencies of the case require, bringing down to this House just such papers as suit him. I ask if this is a fair way of dealing with the House? The hon. gentleman referred to the report of Mr. Pierce, a report, I understand, prepared at his instigation, and the instructions for the preparation of which have been withheld, but that report does not deal, directly or indirectly, with the proposition now before the House, nor, if every word of it were true, and if the inferences to be fairly derived from all the facts it states were massed together, would they enable us to form a conclusion bearing on the resolution my hon. friend has submitted. It has nothing to do with the extinction of the Indian title: it has nothing to do with this great grievance which the hon. gentleman knows tended to bring about very largely the insurrection. The hon. gentleman has referred to the Order in Council made in 1883, and the report directing that the office of which he is now the head should be sub-divided in a certain way, so that Mr. Lindsay Russell might be appointed Surveyor-General and proceed to the North-West. Why did the hon. gentleman make that

statement? Did he wish us to conclude from it that the Government or Mr. Russell had done anything? Does he state that in that Order in Council the Government showed any evidence of a disposition to settle the Indian title question? Did Mr. Russell proceed to the west to make an enumeration of the half-breeds? or did he act on the power which, in 1879, the Government took from the House? No; when the hon. gentleman drags this into the debate, he does it for the purpose of inducing those who have not carefully studied the question, to believe that the Government really took some steps to mitigate this great grievance. Why, their action had nothing more to do with the matter than have the affidavits the hon. gentleman referred to. The hon. gentleman stated further that, as regards the point where the rebellion rose, the major part of those who took part in it had their Indian title already extinguished, and that therefore that grievance was not the cause of the rebellion. The hon. gentleman must surely have listened to the argument, he did not attempt to controvert it, presented by the mover of the resolution, in which the latter showed that if it was only the local girevance existing in the minds of the leaders of the rebellion, that they were the main spring of the revolt, it would have been a mere riot and not a rebellion. No; it was the moral effect those insurgents derived from the existence of great grievances throughout the country that gave force to the rebellion, and no man knows better than the hon. gentleman that if it had not been for the existence of those grievances, for the removal of which the half-breeds had petitioned year after year, and to facilitate the removal of which the hon. gentleman and his friends never, until the last moment, raised a finger, the rebellion never would have assumed greater proportions than those of an unlawful assembly or riot. The hon. gentleman went to the North-West last year, as the Minister of the Interior. I think he did right. I think it is a matter for regret that his predecessors had not taken the same course years ago. It was their duty to have informed themselves, personally, with reference to the facts of the grievances stated in the petitions which, year after year, poured into the Department, and which were pigeonholed with that masterly inactivity that characterised the Department in the past five or six years. But when the hon. gentleman returned, after having saturated his mind with the facts, did he arrive at the conclusion that it was because of the settlers' grievances alone the rebellion assumed the important proportions it did? He knows well that the conclusion he formed in his mind was, that had the grievances of the North-West half-breeds, relative to the extinguishment of the Indian title, been removed years ago, there never would have been a rebellion at all. He stated when he returned from his trip, in a speech he delivered on 16th December, at Weston, that the very action taken by the Government, the tardy incomplete action in January, 1885, when the rebellion was almost under way, precipitated the rebellion itself. What action? The action taken to settle the North-West half-breed grievances in relation to the extinguishment of the Indian title alone. That the hon. gentleman said was the backbone of the rebellion, and it was, he said, their efforts to settle that, their tardy efforts to extend the right hand of fellowship to the half-breeds, that precipitated the rebellion; because the leader of the rebellion knew that if we settled that question, we would have removed many grievances and taken from him the support of a large number of his followers. What did the hon. gentleman say?

"Now then, gentlemen, it will be asked, how then did the rebellion occur? How was it that, if these things were settled, this rebellion broke out? I believe it broke out because of the action of the Government, and not because of its inaction. It broke out, as Mr. Astley has stated in his letter, and which information he got from Riel himself, because Riel, seeing that the Government had taken action and that the half-breed claims, such as they were, were about to be settled, believed that his little game will be spoiled."

The hon. gentleman, remark you, had come back from the North-West, he had acquired personal knowledge of the facts, he knew that these grievances had rankled in the breasts of these unfortunate people for years and years, and he knew, when he stated that, that if they had taken time by the forelock, if they had moved a year, or even six months earlier than they did, the cause of the rebellion would have been removed, and we never would have had a rebellion at all. I think I am justified in making the charge, and basing it upon the hon. gentleman's own evidence, that, if it had not been for the delay and inaction of the Government, and for their subsequent ill-advised action at the wrong time, the rebellion would never have taken place. So much for that point. Then the hon. gentleman went on to show that certain Qu'Appelle half-breeds were not influenced by any grievances of their own as to the extinguishment of the Indian title, but that their object was to get possession of the whole of the lands of the North-West. But did the hon. gentleman state when that mind took possession of the half-breeds? Was that their mind before Riel rose and before the Duck Lake tragedy? No, but it was their mind after the success of Riel had induced those unfortunate people to believe that he was going to be successful all around, and so their heads were turned. That was their state of mind after the rebellion broke out, but it was not their state of mind when the rebellion broke out, and it was not that which induced the rebellion. Let us look for a few moments—I promise the House not to be very lengthy upon the subject—at one or two prominent facts in connection with this particular question now before the House, in order that we may judge whether or not this question entered largely into those motives which induced the North-West half-breeds to rebel. How many half-breeds do we find there are in the North-West? I think I am speaking correctly when I say something about 4,800. If I am incorrect, I will thank the hon. gentleman to correct me. Of those 4,800, it appears by the evidence produced by the Government themselves that their own commissioner has reported that 2,000 had just claims which were unredressed. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. I think I am not far astray. I am speaking, of course, with reference to the whole question of the half-breeds of Manitoba and the North-West.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Dead and alive.

Mr. DAVIES. I think Mr. Street reports that he has settled nearly 2,000 claims.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He settled 1,710 claims, and that includes the dead whose heirs were settled with.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman say that these were all that were settled? There were 300 settled besides, making about 2,000. I may be a few astray, but I am approximately near the truth, so near it that I may say there were nearly 2,000 settled with. So that out of 4,800 half-breeds, nearly 2,000 were shown to have real grievances which were acknowledged by the Government commissioner and reported upon. That was an enormous proportion, and I think I shall be able to show that these were not grievances of a day, but, as shown by my hon. friend who moved this resolution, were of long-standing, and had been presented to the Government not once or twice but scores of times, not by the half-breeds alone, but by all those who had knowledge of the matter and who lived in that country, by their priests, by their bishops, by their magistrates, by the only body they had to represent them, the North-West Council, by the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West, by the members of the North-West Council individually and by the council collectively, and by all those whose duty it was to bring this matter to the notice of the Government. Let me for a moment go back to the inception of this matter, and I will rapidly run over the historical points. I wish to call attention to the real ques

tion at issue and to eliminate those side issues which the hon. gentleman (Mr. White), for a purpose of his own, has introduced into this discussion. I wish to do this in order that we may come to a clear and intelligent conclusion upon the clear issue which is presented to us. We know that in 1870, 1,400,000 acres were set apart to settle the Manitoba half breed claims under the Administration of the present leader of the Government. Only the children of the half-breeds of Manitoba were to participate in that grant. From 1870 to 1873, when the hon. gentleman went out of power, nothing whatever was done to carry out the law. We find that, when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) came into power in 1874, he introduced a Bill extending to the heads of families as well as their children the right to participate in these grants; and in April, 1875, the Dominion lands agent at Winnipeg, and Messrs. Ryan & Machar, the commissioners, were appointed to take the census of the unenumerated half breeds. We find that, in 1876, they reported, and reported that their work was still incomplete, and Mr. Ryan was ordered to take evidence anywhere in the Territories within two years. I understand the hon. gentleman to complain that there was inaction on the part of the Government of the hon. member for East York. There may have been inaction; I am not sufficiently well acquainted with the facts to undertake to reply on that point; but, from reading the papers which have been brought down, it appears to me that all that was ever done in the matter was done by those gentlemen before they went out of power. They appointed these commissioners to take evidence in order to carry out the law; they directed them to take the evidence wherever they went, and they did more than that, and that is what the hon. gentleman complains of. At that time remember that the half-breeds had not settled in settlements as they did later. The buffalo were not all gone from the plains then. Many of the half-breeds were engaged in buffalo hunting; and the only complaint the hon. gentleman makes is that the Government did not order these commissioners to follow the buffalo and to follow the half-breeds with the buffalo, and to take their evidence as they roamed about the plains. But they did order them, and it seems to me reasonable, wherever they were, in the discharge of their duties, when a half-breed offered his evidence to take it. And they did take it. In 1877 Newcome and Mills, at Emerson and Portage la Prairie, were ordered to take evidence, and in June, 1878, the then Minister of the Interior announced that he had appointed Duck to make an investigation, and I believe in February, 1878, he reported that he had made that investigation. Hon. gentlemen may ask was this matter of the half-breeds' grievance in relation to the extinguishment of the Indian title brought to the notice of the Government? Was there not neglect on their part in lying by? Did they not, by allowing it to lay in abeyance, almost waive their claim? If you look at this mass of papers, which I say, after a thorough examination of it, is a disgrace to the Department which brought it down——

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Why?

Mr. DAVIES. Because the papers are so inextricably mixed up that it is impossible to find what you require.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). After they had been handled by your leader, and tossed about.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I must not allow that observation to go without an immediate challenge. I answered it before, and I say it is indecent for the hon. gentleman to repeat it. I got those papers as they were sent to me by the directions of the Clerk of this House, and they reached the printers in the precise form and order in which they were brought down to the House. I state that now, Sir, upon my responsibility as a member.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). How does the hon. gentleman know that they reached the printers as he carried them away?

Mr. BLAKE. I know how they were when I handed them back to the Clerk.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). They were handled by him and others, and I know, as former chairman of the Printing Committee, that we used to have the greatest difficulty in getting papers that went into his hands, because they used to be handled by him in such a way and kept back until we had to send for them.

Mr. DAVIES. This insinuation of the hon. member only makes the matter worse, in my opinion. The hon. gentleman knows that these papers are arranged with no order. I looked through them myself. When he was in a calmer mood the other day he distinctly acknowledged in this House that the arrangement of the papers was disgraceful.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I say so now.

Mr. DAVIES. Notwithstanding this disgraceful arrangement, notwithstanding the almost—I was going to say—design apparent on their face, by which they are so arranged that nobody could understand them, I have taken a good deal of trouble in going through them, and I have no hesitation in saying that from 1878 down to 1885, not a year went by without petitions being forwarded from those half-breeds, and those who represent them, to the Department of the Interior, praying that they would take up this question and settle it. We find in June, 1878, a petition from Prince Albert, forwarded through Captain Moore, and signed by 151 of these half-breeds, as I find it upon page 29 of these precious papers. These petitioners represent:

"Your petitioners would humbly represent that their rights in the participation in the issue of half-breed or settlers' scrip are as valid and binding as those of the half-breeds and old settlers of Manitoba, and are expected from them to be regarded by the Canadian Government as scrupulously as in that Province, and with a view to the adjustment of the same, your petitioners would humbly request that a census of said half-breeds and old settlers be taken, at as early a date as may conveniently be determined upon, with a view of apportioning to those of them who have not already been included in the census of Manitoba, their just allotment of land and scrip."

In February, 1878, Gabriel Dumont and John Fisher, chairman and secretary respectively of a public meeting of half-breeds held at St. Laurent, presented another petition to the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West, praying for similar treatment as that accorded to the Manitoba half-breeds. This is found on page 28, and reads as follows:—

"That there be granted to each half-breed head of family, and to their children, who have not participated in the distribution of scrip and lands in the Province of Manitoba, a like amount of scrip and like land grants as in Manitoba."

Then in April, 1878, Lieutenant-Governor Laird forwards a petition of the half-breeds of Prince Albert, praying for similar treatment; to be found on page 25, wherein they pray:

"That all the heads of families of half-breeds and their children who have not participated in the distribution of scrip and lands in the Province of Manitoba, to allow such like scrip and grants of lands to those allowed in the said province, at least that bush land be granted to them."

Then we find in August, 1878, the North-West Council passing a resolution, praying that the half-breed claims be granted—to be found on page 36. I will read that resolution, because I deem it of more than ordinary importance. It is a resolution of the only representative body that these poor people possess; it is a resolution of intelligent, educated men, men who felt their responsibility in making their statements; and we may assume that the North-West Council would not put upon record statements of that kind unless they personally knew them to be true. They say:

"That it would be injudicious to set apart reserves of land for the half-breeds of the North-West Territories, to give them negotiable scrip.

"That in view, however, of the fact that grants of land or issue of scrip were made to the half-breeds of Manitoba towards the extinguishment of the Indian titles to the lands of that Province, there will undoubtedly be general dissatisfaction amongst the half-breeds of said territories, unless they receive some little consideration."

The Government here are informed, on the responsibility and the authority of the only representative body in that country, that there will be general dissatisfaction until they take this matter up and grant some relief to the half breeds. Then they go on to suggest a form in which that grant should be given; but I need not trouble the House with it because the Government were bound to act under the authority they took from Parliament in 1879. They did not suggest a particular plan for settling these grievances; they only asked Parliament to give them power to deal with them. They were then bound, after taking that power, to take proper evidence and to find a proper way to act upon the evidence so as to remove the grievances, but they did not do it. Going on with the record, we find that in August, 1878, a petition from the Cypress Mountain half-breeds was forwarded to the Government, to be found at page 32, in which they also set forth their grievances, and state:

"That the majority of us, upon the cession of the Province to the Canadian Government, were temporarily absent, and were thereby deprived of the benefits of the scrips given to those half-breeds who were at that time present in the Province."

Then we have Mr. Laird's despatch, in which he urges the Government to take action upon it. We have that despatch acknowledged, and on the 28th December, 1878, we have Col. Dennis submitting that celebrated memorandum to the Minister, and asking his immediate attention to it. That memorandum was read by the mover of the resolution, and I need not read it again. The Deputy-Head of the Department was fully apprised of the importance of this question and of the necessity of dealing with it immediately. He was informed, that if they did not deal with it immediately, it would be a cause of general dissatisfaction, natural dissatisfaction, which we would feel ourselves, had we been some of those unfortunate half-breeds. Well, Sir, what was done with that memorandum of the Deputy-Head? It was very properly, I think, submitted to Archbishop Taché, to the Bishop of the Saskatchewan, to Lieut.-Governor Laird and to Mr. Richardson, the magistrate, to obtain their opinions upon it. They made each of them their reports, and the Government are in possession of the suggestions they made with respect to that memorandum. I charge, Mr. Speaker, that although they were in possession of these, although they had got, ostensibly, all the information they asked for, and although they were in a position to deal exhaustively with the question, they followed that policy of masterly inactivity for which they are so much renowned—they did nothing. Now, let us look for a moment at the powers this Government took from Parliament. Section 125 of the Dominion Lands Act, 1879, enacts:

"The following powers are hereby delegated to the Governor in Council:— * * *

"(e) To satisfy any claim existing in connection with the extinguishment of the Indian title, preferred by half-breed residents in the North-West Territories outside of the limits of Manitoba, on the 15th day of July, 1870, by granting lands to such persons, to such extent and on such terms and conditions as may be deemed expedient."

Now, Sir, the Minister of the Interior has criticised at some length the reports made to the Deputy Minister, to whom those suggestions were sent. He has shown that in some particulars the suggestions made by Archbishop Taché and some others were not prudent suggestions. But are we here to discuss at this late day whether the suggestions were prudent or not? Why the Government should have determined in 1879 what portions of these suggestions were prudent, and they should have acted upon them. The petitions should have been taken out of the pigeon-holes, and the Minister instead of hieing away to England and other parts should have hied himself away personally to the North-West and should have enquired into the facts connected with the grievances, and have put forward his hand and dealt with them, remedied them and removed them. But he did not do it, and we have sad results in 1885. But the matter did not end there. In the spring of 1880 the half-breeds in Manitoba village, in the North-West Territory, petitioned Sir John A. Macdonald again. That petition is to be found on page 41. They are getting restless; they are wondering that the petitions forwarded by them and endorsed by their priests, bishops and magistrates, by the North-West Council and all the legally constituted authorities of the country, should have been treated with contempt, and they are forwarding other petitions in which they set forth at still greater length their grievances in this regard. They state:

"And whereas the continued delay in ascertaining and investigating said claims is creating great and general dissatisfaction throughout the Territories, we your petitioners do humbly pray that you will cause a commission to be issued at an early day to enquire into and confirm the said claims, not only with regard to scrip and allotments of land as provided for in Manitoba, but, moreover, to confirm the titles of land occupied by or purchased by parties from occupants of claims taken previously to the transfer of the Territories to the Dominion of Canada."

The Government were not only aware of the existence of those grievances, the fact had been pressed on them time and again, month after month, but there was the further and important fact, which had been pressed on them, that the existence of those grievances and the delay in their removal were causing great and general dissatisfaction from one end of the Territory to the other. What, then, is the use of the hon. gentleman urging to-day, in the face of facts so plain and palpable, that those grievances had nothing to do with the outbreak in 1885. Following in the same string we have the petition of a large number of residents near Edmonton. I am afraid to say how many; I did not count them, but their names covered two columns of a whole page and must number 100. I will not trouble the House by reading them. They repeat the statements in a previous petition respecting delay. I will read some of their own words:

"And whereas the continued delay in ascertaining and investigating said claims is creating great and general dissatisfaction throughout the Territories."

I will not weary the House by reading further from the petition. So the record goes on; month after month, year after year, these poor people petitioning the authorities at Ottawa, praying and begging for some relief in this regard, and receiving in return the stereotyped reply that the Government will take the matter into consideration, or that it will be submitted to the Minister for his consideration. But nothing is done. I say, therefore, the mover of the resolution was right in arraigning the Government and in charging them with neglect, grievous and criminal neglect, towards those poor people, and with having waited, before entertaining their grievances, until those people rose in rebellion when it was too late. The Government thus adopted the vicious system followed by all tyrants throughout the world—refusing to concede what is right at the proper time, and yielding to force when it is too late, and that in the wrong manner. I will not weary the House by going through the events of 1883-84.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not wonder at hon. gentlemen cheering. It is a record of shame and disgrace to hon. gentlemen opposite. But we come down to the action which hon. gentlemen opposite did take. The hon. Minister has said they moved. When was the first record of their motion? In January, 1885, the Minister of the Interior came down with a recommendation of what? That a commission issue

to settle those grievances and entertain the claims of the half-breeds? No. But a recommendation that a commission issue to take evidence of the unenumerated half-breeds of Manitoba and confining it to them alone, repudiating by inference the claims and rejecting by inference the claim of all the half-breeds of the North-West outside of Manitoba to be treated in the same manner as the Manitoba half-breeds were. When hon. gentlemen opposite say they moved before the rebellion, let us understand clearly what they did do. I refer to the report of the Minister, to be found on page 17. I want to place it on record, because I have heard it stated more than once by leading members of the Government that they did not wait till after the rebellion took place to meet the grievances, but they had taken steps months before the rebellion broke out; and I say that statement is not in accordance with the record. The report of the Minister is as follows:—

"Certified copy of a report of a Committee of the honorable the Privy Council, appoved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council on 28th January, 1885.

"On a memorandum, dated 26th January, 1885, from the Minister of the Interior, submitting that it is desirable, with a view to settling equitably the claims of half-breeds in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, who would have been entitled to land had they resided in Manitoba at the time of the transfer and filed their claims in due course under the Manitoba Act, and also of those who, though not residing in Manitoba and equitably entitled to participate in the grant, but did not do so, to ascertain the number of such half-breeds; and recommending that he be authorised to obtain an enumeration of them, and to employ three persons to make such enumeration.

"The committee concur in the foregoing recommendations, and they advise that the requisite authority be granted."

So this recommendation, meagre as it was, short as it was, did not go further than the Manitoba half-breeds. It did not touch the half-breeds of the plains; and it did not say what the policy of the Government was. It held out no promise; it did not point out to what extent the Government would yield, whether it would grant certain parts of the petitions or the whole. It is merely a recommendation of one part of the claim and one part only. Then we find nothing more is done. We find events moving very rapidly, reports tumbling in on the Government that their inaction, their criminal inaction, is bearing its legitimate fruit. We find the Government being told that the half breeds, despairing of redressing by petitions and by legitimate means their grievances, are unfortunately rising in arms. We find a telegram coming in on 11th March, from Superintendent Crozier, stating that the half-breeds are excited, that they are moving about more than usual and are preparing arms. On 11th March there was another despatch from Superintendent Crozier, stating:

"Half-breeds greatly excited; reported they threaten on Carleton before 16th. Half-breeds refuse to take freight or employment for Government; will stop all freight coming into country after 16th of this month; getting arms ready; leader will not allow people to leave home as they may be required."

On 14th March, Lieut.-Colonel Irvine telegraphed:

"Lieutenant-Governor received telegram, dated Carleton, to-day, from Crozier, saying half-breed rebellion may break out any moment, and joined by Indians, and asking that his division be largely increased. Would recommend that at least 100 men be sent at once, before roads break up. Please instruct."

We find a telegram to Colonel Irvine, dated Ottawa, 15th March:

"Start for the north, quickly as possible, with all available men up to 100. Telegraph marching out; state and report when passing telegraph stations."

On 19th March there is a telegram from Superintendent Deane, dated Regina:—

"The following received from Superintendent Crozier: 'Rumor to-night Indians being tampered with; large force should be sent without delay that arrests may be made if necessary to prevent further and continuous trouble from Riel and followers.'"

In a word, we find that the Government policy of masterly inactivity had borne its legitimate fruit, that their policy of criminal inaction had borne the only legitimate fruit that could be expected from it. We find that these people took up arms, and then only action was taken by the Government. On 30th March, after the rebellion had broken out, we find a report of the Committee of the Privy Council acknowledging that their previous report of January, to which I have referred, was altogether incomplete, and reciting that it was necessary to go much further.

"The Minister of Interior, on representations made that it was desirable to have made an enumeration of the half-breeds in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, who would have been entitled to land had they resided in Manitoba at the time of the transfer, was authorised by Your Excellency in Council, under date the 28th of January last, to appoint commissioners and the following gentlemen were accordingly appointed to carry into effect the said order of Your Excellency in Council, namely: William Purvis Rochford Street, of the city of London, in the Province of Ontario, one of Her Majesty counsel learned in the law, who is to be chairman of the commission; Roger Goulet of the town of St. Boniface, in the Province of Manitoba, dominion lands surveyor; and Amedée Edmond Forget, of the town of Regina, in the Provisional District of Assinaboia, clerk of the North-West Council and barrister-at-law.

"The Minister of Interior is of opinion that the scope of the enquiry to be made by the commissioners appointed under the authority of the order of Your Excellency in Council above mentioned should be enlarged."

The rebellion had changed their position. It had enabled them to grasp things which they should have grasped months and years before; it enabled them to see that the policy of inaction and delay would not do any longer, because we find the Minister recommending the enlargement of the scope of the commission, so as to include the half-breeds of the plains outside of Manitoba, as well as the others. That is what we have, on the 30th day of March, after the rebellion is in full force, and, therefore, when the Government claim that they took action which ought to have prevented the rising, we appeal to the record and let it show that their action was taken long after the rebellion broke out. Even on the 4th of April, 1885, the authority which they gave was not complete; they had not fully mastered the subject yet, and the commissioner appointed to take evidence, telegraphed them on the 4th of April, to the following effect:—

"South Centre, Manitoba, 4th April, 1885.

"If desired by half-breeds, would it not be advisable to grant scrip one sixty or two forty dollars, permitting them to acquire title to lands in occupation through possession? Otherwise Government really gives nothing for Indian title."

That telegram is explained by a letter forwarded by the commissioner next day. The Minister and his Deputy evidently did not understand the question. It is true that some years previously, when a petition came from the half-breeds setting forth their grievances, the Deputy Minister said that he could not understand the petition and Mr. Lawrence Clarke came to his rescue, and pointed out what the Minister and his Deputy evidently did not know that an Act of Parliament had provided the means whereby this claim of the half-breeds to the Indian title should be extinguished—pointed out that it was the duty of the Government to act in that way, and if they were ignorant of their own Acts they were to blame and not the half-breeds. There appears to have been a repetition of this state of things in 1885. They did not seem to know then, and Mr. Street follows up the telegram I have already read with the following:

"Commission agree in recommending that power be granted them to deal with occupying half-breeds in the manner summarised in my message of yesterday; also, if possible, to enable commission to settle claims of supplementary Manitoba half-breeds by allowing them the same terms as North-West half-breeds."

That was followed the next day by this letter to the Minister:

"Winnipeg, 5th April, 1885.

"My Dear Sir David,—We arrived here early this morning. I met my fellow-commissioners at the Dominion Land Office at ten o'clock. They introduced the subject as to which I telegraphed you yesterday, and spoke very strongly as to its being one which was likely to be a

serious stumbling-block in our dealings with the half-breeds. Lest you should not fully have understood my telegram, I will shortly state the point. Suppose we find that a half-breed has been, upon and since 5th July, 1870, in occupation of a parcel of, say 160 acres, under circumstances which, if he were a white settler, would entitle him to a grant of the land under the homestead clauses of the Dominion Lands Act: under the authority we now possess we could, if he were the head of a family, allow him nothing more than 160 acres; we could allow him nothing for his claim as a half-breed; and, inasmuch as the Government has all along been purporting to deal with the half-breeds as if they had some general rights beyond those of ordinary incoming settlers, my fellow-commissioners say that great dissatisfaction and disappointment will be created if we give to these occupying half-breeds only that which any ordinary settler can claim, and nothing for the extinguishment of his Indian title."

This shows to me that this matter had never received from the Government of the day and from the Minister in charge, that consideration and examination which it ought to have had, or else we must accept the other proposition which is probably the correct one, that the Government did not desire and never intended to give to these half-breeds any of the concessions which they were authorised and directed to give by Statute, and had taken power to give as far back as 1879. They led these poor people to believe, by passing a Statute enabling them to confer on these half-breeds the same rights as had been conferred on the half-breeds of Manitoba—they led them to believe that these same rights would be granted them; they kept that hope dangling before them for five or six years; they worked them up to a state of dissatisfaction and discontent, and as the mover of the resolution said to-day, even when the rebellion was on the verge of breaking out the real meaning and intention of the Government can be gathered from the speech made by the leader of the Government in this House, on, I think, the 26th day of March, wherein he stated that the half-breeds must make their choice between the rights which the Indians could get and the rights which white men could get, but that they had no other rights. Well, Sir, it is known that they had other rights. Those rights had been conceded to the Manitoba half-breeds; those rights had been ratified by Parliament in 1879, and recognised by the authorities time and again, and on the 26th of March, he comes in and gives you the key to the meaning of the Order in Council of the 26th of January in the following words:—

"As a whole the half-breeds have been told that if they desired to be considered as Indians there are most liberal reserves that they could go with the others; but that if they desired to be considered as white men they would get 160 acres of land as homesteads. But they are not satisfied with that; they want to get land scrip of equal quantity—I think upwards of 200 acres—and then get, as a matter of course, their homesteads as well."

That is the conclusion of the whole matter. After five or six long weary years, after money has been spent by the half-breeds in their efforts to get their rights, after petitions and delegations had been sent to Ottawa in their efforts to get their rights, after memorials from the North-West Council, and from individual members of that Council had been forwarded begging that those rights should be given, when the whole country is in a state of turmoil, and the half-breeds are on the verge of rising to get by force that which is denied to them by peaceable measures, the hon. gentleman rises, and practically he says: You have no rights except as Indians or as white men, and those rights, which as half-breeds, the Parliament of Canada has guaranteed to you time and again, I for one do not recognise. That then is the conclusion of the whole matter, and if it did not bring about the rebellion, it contributed largely to bringing it about, and I say that hon. gentlemen can fairly be arraigned, and I charge them before this Parliament, and before this country, of having, by their inaction, by their cold, cruel and callous neglect, by what they are pleased to term their masterly inactivity, with having contributed to drive those people into a state of desperation, when the only conclusion to their ignorant minds was that redress which they could not get by peaceable measures they could get by a resort to arms. Unfortunately they resorted to arms, and that unfortunate termination resulted, it is true, in their getting their rights; but it resulted, also, in the expenditure of vast millions of money by the taxpayers of this country, and the shedding of the blood of many of our fellow countrymen. I say the Minister of the Interior has evaded the charge made by my hon. friend; that he has not dared to come forward and state that anyone of those petitions were not forwarded; that any one of the facts on which he based his charge were not true, but he evades it, and he talks about settlers' rights and colonisation companies, and affidavits, and other subjects altogether foreign to the one before the House, in the attempt to lead the House and the country to believe that there is nothing in this motion. Believing as I do, that the statements made in that motion are not over-charged, and believing that the Government are directly and criminally responsible for the rebellion—responsible for their neglect, for their indifference, and for the contempt with which they treated all the petitions of these men, I will cordially second the motion and give my vote in favor of it.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend who has just sat down has given a good illustration of how natural it is to magnify the particular topic on which for the time being one chooses to enlarge. I have often remarked, in listening to preachers, that one will take, for instances, in the morning, a particular text; and after reading his text, he will preface his remarks by saying that this is the most important portion of Scripture that there is between the two lids of the Bible. In the afternoon, I have heard the same preacher take another text, and forgetting what he said in the morning, preface his remarks by saying, "there is no more important portion of Scripture in the whole Bible than this of which I am to speak this afternoon." Now, my hon. friend illustrates this. We have found to-night a new emphasised cause for the rebellion. We have heard a great many reasons given why the rebellion took place We have heard that the rebellion took place because of certain colonisation companies' schemes; and for quite a long period, the country resounded from one end to the other, with the allegation that it was these terrible colonisation companies, and the very bad policy of the Government in reference to them, to which was due, and entirely due, this unfortunate and lamentable rebellion that took place in the North-West. That was when they were preaching from the colonisation text. Then, Sir, the papers and the speeches would take a different turn, and it would be: "Oh, this favoritism in the North-West; men are sent from the Eastern Provinces—carpet-baggers with their carpet bags—and it is from the peculations and the favoritism, and the wrong actions of these office-seekers and carpet-baggers that all the troubles have arisen, and that the country was driven to rebellion in order to purify itself from them." And so, text after text, on which for the time being hon. gentlemen were preaching, was stated, to furnish the sole cause of the rebellion. To-night a new cause has sprung up. It is now because the half-breeds, forsooth, did not get—in addition to the 160 acres of land that each one of them could have, more than they ever cultivated, more than they could cultivate, more than they are cultivating to-day—another 160 acres to tack on to that; or, forsooth, a small quantity of scrip which they could sell for ready cash and speedily dissipate. It is because they did not get that that the rebellion sprang up, and that these people ran to arms for their rights. Now, it rests with us to find out whether or not this was the potent cause of the rebellion. My hon. friend said that the issue had been presented to night in a single form, but that the Minister of the Interior had tried to distract the attention of the House by taking up other and different subjects. I will leave the House to judge whether or not my hon. friend from Quebec East did not, before he finished his speech on the

single issue, bring in other issues, to which my hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior, in his speech replied, as well as to the specific issue which was brought. Two or three hon. gentlemen have spoken of Mr. Pearce's report. Mr. Pearce's report seems to bother some hon. gentlemen and the only way that they can get round it is to say that it was instigated, that is to say, that the Minister of the Interior directed Mr. Pearce to get up a certain report for a certain purpose; and thereby they endeavor to discredit the report of Mr. Pearce, which pricks a good many bubbles which have been floating around in sight of the country during the past few months. Now, I prefer to believe that Mr. Pearce made an honest report; and if the report is not honest, it will produce a better effect before the House and the country to take Mr. Pearce's report and show its inaccuracy rather than to throw doubts upon its honesty. My hon. friend said that nothing had been done by this Government from 1879, till after the rebellion broke out, and he stated in the same breath that the extinguishment of the Indian title for the half-breeds was a most important thing, and that because it was not carried out, the Government were thereby guilty of neglect and criminal action. I want to say to hon. gentlemen if, in the now historic language of the leader of the Opposition, "justice is justice, upon the banks of the Red River as well as upon the banks of the Saskatchewan," I want to enlarge that just a little, and ask hon. gentlemen whether justice is not justice between 1873 and 1879 just as much as it is between 1879 and 1885; and if it was criminal, cruel, callous neglect in this Government to keep the half-breeds out of that extinguishment of the Indian title from 1879 to 1885, was it not just as cruel and callous and criminal a neglect on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, who, with that intuitive sense of justice which they possesses in so strong a degree, allowed the years to pass from 1873 to 1879, and had nothing better to say in reference to the extinguishment of the title than to append the cabalistic marks, "No.—D. M." upon their petitions? I say that justice is just as much justice in one year as in another. If hon. gentlemen were so anxious to have justice crowned and elevated, and not simply used as a whip to be used for party purposes, I think they would say that they were guilty when, with their intuitive and strong sense of justice, they allowed all those years to pass by without making a single provision in order that these poor men might have the right which they claimed so strongly ought to have been granted to them. My hon. friend involved himself in a complete circle in his reasoning. He started out to show, and showed to his own satisfaction if not to ours, that the rebellion was caused—and the leader of the Opposition cheered in his most vigorous and trenchant way when that statement was made—by the action of the Government, because the Government took action with the view of having these very claims rectified, and the moment they took that action the flames of rebellion burst forth. Yet about fifteen minutes afterwards, in equally as strong terms, he declared that the Government took no action at all until after the rebellion had been some weeks in progress. I leave my hon. friend to reconcile these two things for himself, and to chase his own argument around the circle and see how long it will take him to catch it. He said nothing was done by this Government from 1879 to 1885. I think that is not quite correct. In the first place, something was done which was not done by hon. gentlemen opposite. Legal enunciation was given to the fact that the half-breeds had rights in the lands of the country. That was given in 1879, and it was more than hon. gentlemen opposite had given. They state in the same breath that it was not the intention of the Government to give these half-breeds any rights with reference to the extinguishment of the Indian claim, and yet that the express intention to extinguish the claim was enunciated in legislation and that the Government are to blame because it did not carry out that intention. Now, I think something was done, and my hon. friend has shown, by the very facts he has adduced, that there were difficulties surrounding the question which could not be settled in an off-hand way. When Archbishop Taché and the North-West Council, which was so good an exponent of the circumstances and wishes of the time, were quoted as far apart as the poles almost with reference to their plans for settlement, I think my hon. friend has shown conclusively that the question is one difficult of solution and not to be settled off-hand. He has stated that the North-West Council knew better than any other body of men what should be done, and they came to the front with a proposition in which they started out by combating the theory and plan of the archbishop, and it is not likely that, if the plan of the council had been carried out, the half-breeds would have been satisfied, because what the half-breed wanted was that they should be able to turn their lands or the worth of their lands into scrip, for which they could get a ready sale and ready cash. That is where the difficulty lay, and where Archbishop Taché saw the difficulty. We had not simply the allaying of bad feelings to take into account, but the difficulty that by giving scrip to the half-breeds which they could sell, we were helping them to their own injury. What we wanted first was to see that the half-breeds retained their heritage and were not put in a position to dissipate it in a moment. The difficulty found in carrying out the Act of 1879 was how to satisfy the half-breeds, as far as sentimental grievances were concerned, and at the same time how to do the best for them in the long run by keeping for them some portion of the heritage which was so justly theirs. It is said that nothing was done. Well, I am not going minutely into this question, but intend merely touching another point before I resume my seat. To hear my hon. friend, in his earnest but very good-natured way, applying his strong, epithets, on the one hand, to the half-breeds, in the way of pity, and on the other hand to the Government, in the way of denunciation, one would suppose that no people under the sun had such terrible grievances to complain of as had the half-breeds with reference to the extinguishment of the Indian title. I may state that their grievances, conceding them the right to complain, because their claims were not immediately settled, were trivial in comparison with the grievances which people in various ages of the world have to struggle against; and when you talk about heroism and justifiable rebellion, you will find no rebellion in the whole course of history which stands upon the elevated plane of heroism and struggle for liberty, which does not appeal to a principle deeper far than the mere sentimental grievance arising out of the non-possession of land, which those who claim it have no intention of cultivating. Has the hon. gentleman proved that one single half-breed was ever dispossessed of the lot of land on which he settled, or the hut in which he lived, or the house that sheltered himself and family? Has he proven that the thongs were ever put about his limbs, that his liberty was ever curtailed, his social freedom interfered with, his religious equality and freedom of worship in any way restricted? If one or all of these things could be shown to have existed, there would be a foundation for grievances which might well have found expression in rising against the authority that exercised the tyranny, but because the half-breed, although he has in his lot more than he ever intends to cultivate, does not get at once 160 acres to tack on that, which he never intends to cultivate, he must, forsooth, rise in bloody rebellion, and imperil the peace and constitution of our country. The pretension is absurd on its face; and what is more absurd still is that eloquent hon. gentlemen should rise in this House to justify the rebellion, and seek to elevate to the plane of heroism, which such men as George Washington and others all the way back through a line of heroes occupy,

such men as Louis Riel, of evil example, and Gabriel Dumont, a man brave but brave in a bad cause, where bravery is but reckless rashness. Though it were proved that the half-breeds had an indefeasible right to the extinguishment of the Indian title, you must prove that the keeping from them of this right infringed upon their essential liberty, that they were maltreated in person, robbed of their liberty, interfered with in their homes. All this was recklessly stated at the outset of the agitation, but these statements have simmered down, until to-night we have got to the bed rock of what hon. gentlemen opposite will rest their case on in future, namely, that the right to the extinguishment of the Indian title of the half-breeds was not granted immediately. I have nothing more to say, except that I have been saddened more than I can express to find in this country, free as it is, with its constitutional methods, men who will take up the time of the country in trying to glorify into a just and laudable rebellion the paltry, miserable rising which has taken place in the North-West, and to dignify into a hero one who lacks all the essential qualities of heroism.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat seems to think that the motion which is placed in your hands is a motion of commendation of the half-breeds of the North-West for having taken up arms. The hon. gentleman surely could not have read the motion. He must be aware that it is quite possible to condemn the rebellion, and, at the same time, not to approve of the course the Government has taken. That motion relates to the conduct of the Government in reference to the extinguishment of the half-breed title in the lands of the North-West. We have before us, so far as that resolution is concerned, no other proposition than that one, but the hon. gentleman who is at the present time the Minister of the Interior has seen proper to go beside that question and refer to the conduct of the Administration which was in office some ten years ago. Supposing the Administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) had been all that the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of the Interior represents it, supposing they were derelict in their duty, supposing their conduct had been such as to have justified the country in expelling them from office, what, I would like to know, would that have to do with the merits of the present Administration, with the efficiency of their conduct, or with their energy in dealing with the important questions that have arisen in the North-West Territories? I think the House will pardon me if I depart from the questions involved in that resolution, and give some little attention to the charges that have been made by the hon. the Minister of the Interior now, and by his leader last year, against the Government which preceded them in office. The hon. gentleman forgets that this half-breed question arose in 1870, that the Government of the Minister who is now at the head of affairs was then in office, and that the rebellion then in a large degree arose from the claims put forward by the half-breeds and the failure of the Government to recognise those claims. The hon. gentleman knows that there were certain parties who were delegated from the people of the North-West Territories to represent their views, and that they entered into an arrangement with the Government, which was given effect to by the Manitoba Act of 1870, one of the provisions of which was the setting apart of 1,400,000 acres in the Province of Manitoba for the purpose of extinguishing the Indian title of the half-breed population. The hon. gentleman also knows that a census was taken in 1870 under the direction of the Lieutenant-Governer of Manitoba, Mr. Archibald; that census included not only the half-breed children who were entitled to share in the 1,400,000 acres, but also the half-breed heads of families and the old settlers of the Province of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman, too, is aware that the people who were enumerated embraced nearly double the population of the Province of Manitoba who were entitled to share in the 1,400,000 acres under the Manitoba Act After that census was taken, the opinion of the law officers of the Crown was had upon the construction of this 31st section of the Manitoba Act. The Prime Minister was at that time Minister of Justice, and he and the Deputy Minister advised that the half-breed heads of families were not entitled to share in this 1,400,000, that it was to be distributed amongst the children of the half-breeds alone. Hon. gentleman no doubt are conversant with the fact that a very considerable number of the half-breeds has been dealt with as Indians. The Indians or the so-called Indians, on the St. Peters' reserves are, or a majority of them are, half-breeds; and these were included in the enumeration made by Mr. Archibald in 1870. It will be seen that the census which was taken by Mr. Archibald did not afford any basis for the distribution of the 1,400,000 acres. I may mention, among other things that were done in regard to the Province of Manitoba at that time, that an Act was introduced by the Government, I think in 1873, providing that 140 acres should be given to each of the original white settlers and the descendants white of settlers, who had come into the Territory between 1813 and 1835. There was no further legislation by the Government of that day either with reference to the half-breeds or with reference to the white settlers of the Territories. There was a law introduced providing for the half-breeds heads of families, but that was introduced in May, 1874, by the Government of the hon. member for East York. I wish to call the attention of the House to this fact—and I am stating these facts with as much briefness as I can—that, during the three years that the Government was in power from 1870 to 1873, no step was taken for the purpose of distributing the 1,400,000 acres among the half-breed children who were entitled to it under the Manitoba Act. Before I proceed further, let me make a quotation from the speech of the First Minister here last year, referring to the census taken by Mr. Archibald. The Prime Minister said:

"If this census had been adhered to there would have been no difficulty. It was accurate, as accurate as a census can be taken in a new country without municipal institutions and means for enumerating the people one by one. But it was a correct census, and for it 1,400,000 acres had been assigned to meet the half-breed claims; and if that census had been adhered to, there never would have been any trouble. But the truth of the matter is, that the moment we went out of power it was necessary that everything we had done should be reversed, and the Government of the day chose to say that there were not 10,000 half-breeds in the Province of Manitoba, and they appointed Mr. Matthew Ryan and Mr. Machar, the latter a gentleman whom the hon. member for South Huron knows something about, for the purpose of undoing—I will not say for the purpose of undoing but of disregarding the census previously taken. That is the fact. If the census that had been taken and returned by Governor Archibald had been accepted there would have been land enough in the appropriation to have settled all trouble as well for the half-breeds who happened to be away on the plains at the time the final adjudication was made. But it did not suit the Government of the day to accept that. Oh, no. The claims of the half-breeds of Manitoba were bought up by speculators. It was an unfortunate thing for those poor people; but it is true that this grant of scrip and land to these poor people was a curse and not a blessing. The scrip was bought up; the lands were bought up by white speculators and the consequences are apparent. I am told that even at this moment, in the vicinity of Winnipeg instead of the surrounding country comprising smiling farms, settled with industrious people, the land is unsettled in consequence of the scrip having been bought up for a song by speculators."

Now, it will be remembered that the Government of the present Prime Minister was in office from 1870, when the enumeration was made by Mr. Archibald, until November, 1873, for a period of three years, and yet no distribution was made, no action was taken, not the first step was made towards the settlement of this half-breed question. The truth was that the census was of no use. No distribution could be had upon it. As I have already stated, a very considerable number of the half-breeds were dealt with as Indians, and a large population were embraced that were

not entitled to any portion of the 1,400,000 acres. There was a report made as late as 1874 by Mr. Provencher, who was at that time Indian Superintendent in Manitoba. He says in reference to these half-breeds:

"Many hundreds were put on the list of Indians, and have been there since 1871. These half-breeds live with the Indians, they have the very same habits, and naturally form part of the tribe in accordance to the Act above mentioned. Their position would be quite regular if they had not afterwards shared in the land specially set apart for half-breeds, and if they did not exact constantly increased payments in a proportion which it is impossible to determine before hand."

Now the report of the Indian Superintendent of Manitoba at that time shows that a very considerable number of those who were embraced in Mr. Archibald's census, had been dealt with as an Indian population, and were not entitled to share in the 1,400,000 acres, although they were enumerated. We find a delay occurred in the distribution of the lands for another reason. In the lands that were reserved for the half-breeds, was embraced what was called the outer two miles, in which the original white settlers along the banks of the Assiniboine and the Red Rivers claimed a hay privilege, which they said they derived from the Hudson Bay Company, and so it was found necessary, when commissioners were appointed by the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite to enquire into the claims of those parties, to alter the limits of the half-breed reservations, and to embrace a considerable portion of the territory that had been reserved for them in the lands that were to be granted to the original settlers along those rivers. I find that at this time Mr. Codd sent a telegram to the Minister of the Interior, then Mr. Campbell, in which he pointed out that the difficulty had been complicated by the Hudson Bay Company claiming one-twentieth of this outer two miles, and he called Mr. Campbell's attention to the fact that the Hudson Bay Company had themselves created the rights of the original settlers, and he did not think were entitled to share in those lands. Mr. Campbell informed him that the two miles were to be taken from the half-breed grant, and were to be given to the original settlers, and the Hudson Bay Company were to be otherwise satisfied. Now this was on the 1st November, 1873, or nearly three years after the census had been taken; so the House will see that if Mr. Archibald's census had been acted upon the right hon. gentleman had three years to make this distribution amongst the half-breeds before he retired, in November, 1873.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Do I understand the hon. gentleman that nothing was done between the enumeration and this particular action in November, 1873?

Mr. MILLS. I say there was no distribution made. There was not a single half-breed who received any allotment. There was no allotment made to any portion of the half-breed population until 1877.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is not quite correct.

Mr. MILLS. I have already pointed out that the Government, in 1874, finding that no provision had been made for the half-breed heads of families, provided that they should receive each 160 acres. In fact they were put in exactly the same position as they had been placed by an amendment to the Act of their predecessors in office.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Is that the Act of 1874?

Mr. MILLS. Yes. There were a considerable number of claims made by white settlers, and in some instances by the half-breeds themselves; there were what was called the stake claims, and there were other claims besides, and until these claims were disposed of in each particular district that had been reserved, no distribution of lands could take place. Well, in May, 1875, the Government of Mr. Mackenzie appointed Mr. Ryan and Mr. Machar as commissioners to enquire into all these claims, and to ascertain the number of the half-breed children, who were entitled to share in the 1,400,000 acres. I find that Mr. Machar, during the following year, reported on 3,180 claims that he had investigated; Mr. Ryan had reported on 4,988, or something over 9,000 claims altogether, in which is included the claims of all parties who were entitled to share under anyone of the particular Statutes to which I have referred. The hon. gentleman referred to a memorandum which I had written across the face of a communication made to me by Mr. Codd:

"It is unnecessary to look up the parties who have claims if they care for their interests they will themselves come forward and established their claims."

Now, was it necessary to look after these claims? I may say, Mr. Speaker, that it had come to my personal knowledge that in many cases, when the commissioners were in the Territories, engaged in investigating the half-breed claims, speculators put in their appearance to whom the half-breeds had disposed of their claims almost immediately for a few dollars, and sometimes for even a less sum of money. If the hon. gentleman will look at Mr. Ryan's letter which has been referred to, he will see that Mr. Ryan puts the two questions; whether it was the intention of the Department that he should put himself in communication with the half-breed claimants by visiting the locality in which they reside, or whether he should act on their behalf as they might casually come before him in the course of the discharge of his magisterial duties. That communication of Mr. Ryan was forwarded to the land agent at Winnipeg, and by Mr. Codd was forwarded to the Department. Mr. Codd accompanied Mr. Ryan's communication with his own opinion upon the subject, which opinion was based upon the experience he had acquired during the twelve months that had already elapsed. We found that the only effect of continuing to keep open the enquiry would be simply to delay the distribution. We felt that it was necessary, as soon as we could, to ascertain approximately the number of half-breed children who were entitled to share in the distribution, we thought it was desirable the distribution should be made, and that if the half-breeds themselves valued the interests which had been created by the Manitoba Act, they would not hesitate to come forward and make their claims. In fact, one of the difficulties that presented itself to the Government was how to make this distribution as valuable to the half-breed population as possible. I may notice here that the correspondence, which the hon. gentleman brought down last year and which is here embraced, is very incomplete. I find that more than one communication is missing. The memorandum to which the hon. gentleman has referred, which was written by me across the face of Mr. Codd's letter, was simply an instruction to the Surveyor General, in order that he might communicate the answer of the Department to Mr. Codd. And yet the answer of the Surveyor General is not included here. I find in the next page a telegram by Mr. Codd, referring to a letter of the 12th of July; and yet the letter of 12th of July is not here. And so we find the hon. gentleman in this correspondence has brought down just what it was thought convenient, and what would suit him, and what is calculated to give the House a very inadequate and, in some instances, a misleading notion as to what was actually done. The memorandum to which the hon. gentleman refers, and which was written by me across the face of Mr. Codd's letter, is a memorandum signed "D. M.", and the reason was that those happen to be my initials; and I know it is the usual practice of Ministers, when making a note approving or disapproving of a recommendation or suggestion, or making a suggestion, to attach their initials thereto. I believe it was done by my predecessor in office, and I suppose it is done by the present Minister; and I subscribed those

initials precisely for the same reason that the Dutchman called his son John. He said he did so because that was his name, and I subscribed "D. M." simply because they happen to be my initials. The First Minister last year, and the hon. the Minister of the Interior has to-night repeated it here, as he has repeated it elsewhere, the statement as to the appointment of Messrs. Ryan and Machar. He said that the enumeration made by them was very incomplete. They reported 5,888 half-breeds entitled to share in the grant made by the Manitoba Act, and 226 others were reported by the land agent at different places. Five hundred others were estimated as being entitled, whose names had not been ascertained and who were not reported to the Department at the time the distribution was made. The First Minister said last year that there were 5,000 others on the plains who were under the Manitoba Act entitled to share in this distribution who were not provided for, as it was intended by Parliament they should be in fact. The hon. gentleman has more than once stated that if we had only taken the census provided by Governor Archibald's enumeration, in 1870, none of the difficulties would have occurred; that the distribution would have taken place very much earlier and the half-breed population would have been satisfied. We have a census of the entire half breed population of the North-West. That census embraces something like 4,800, and we find from what was done by the commissioners appointed by the hon gentlemen that upwards of 1,700 of those were in the North-West Territories at all events before 1870. So that if we take those 1,700 from the 4,800 in the Territories, and if we take also those who shared in the half-breed grants in Manitoba, hon. members will see how very far the Minister was from being accurate in the statement he made. In fact, it seemed to me at the time very much more important that we should be prompt in making a distribution among those people than that we should ascertain the precise number that were entitled to it. Certainly, we are not restricted in the extent of the area of lands at our disposal, and whether they received 240 or 200 acres was a matter of far less consequence to the country than that they should be satisfied with the condition of things that existed. The First Minister stated last year in the same speech that nine-tenths of the half-breeds in the North-West Territories had already shared in the grant; in fact, that enquiry had been made, and in one case fourteen out of seventeen had already received their allotments; and so it was with respect to others whose names he mentioned. The hon. gentleman in making that statement, gave a sufficient answer to the statement made by the Minister of the Interior to-night, and by himself earlier in the debate. If those people had so largely shared in the allotment of 1,400,000 acres to Manitoba, it shows very clearly that the whole population entitled under the Manitoba Act, had been included in the enumeration, and that the Government actually went on distributing the land among the people at as early a period as they could possibly have done. The hon. gentleman has said that we did nothing with respect to the half-breeds in the outlying territories. Well, Sir, the time had not come for dealing with the half-breed population lying beyond the boundaries of Manitoba. We had, first, to extinguish the Indian title; it was not possible to deal with the half-breeds until the Indian population had been dealt with. And it was with a great deal of difficulty, that the Indians were, in some instances, induced to treat with the Government for the surrender of their claims to the North-West. We know that many who were intended to be embraced in Treaty No. 6, did not come in till 1878, and that the whole of the Indians of the south-western country, embracing the Assiniboines, the Blackfeet, the Bloods, and other Indians in that region, were not treated with until 1877; and until those Indians were treated with, it was impossible to undertake to deal with the half-breed population, either by way of allowing them land in any particular district, or by way of extinguishing their title. In 1878 the Government did take steps with a view to ascertaining the wishes of the half-breeds. We withdrew temporarily Major Walsh from the force; we gave him verbal instructions; we asked him to visit the Indians in that section with a view to inducing them to choose their places of settlement, in order that the Government might allot them reservations, and also visit the half-breeds and ascertain what their wishes were, and advise them to choose localities in which to settle, as soon as it was ascertained that they were desirous to have reservations. The hon. gentleman has referred to the Act of 1879 as indicating the intention of the Government to deal with the half-breed population. Now, I might say with regard to that Act of 1879, that it was suggested before the preceding Government had retired from office. If hon. gentlemen will look at the despatch which was addressed by the then Minister of the Interior to the Lieutenant-Government of the North-West Territories, on the 18th of March, 1878, he will see this clause:

"The propriety of passing an Act to secure for the half-breeds some more speedy means of securing a title for Homestead purposes than under the provision of the present homestead and Dominion Lands Act has for some time past engaged my attention."

The fact is that we did propose to deal with the half-breed population and it might not be altogether out of place for me to state what I contemplated submitting to my colleagues for their approval if we had succeeded in the elections of 1878. The hon. gentleman has refered to our neglect to make surveys. Well, that is hardly relevant to the motion.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I did not say anything about surveys.

Mr. MILLS. We sought to satisfy the half-breed population, and to give them the assurance that they would not be disturbed. We informed them that they should have their lands alloted to them at the earliest possible moment. It is true we did not propose to comply with all the requests they made to us. They had asked us for seed grain, for agricultural implements, although some of them had not any particular fixed abode. I might say this, however, with regard to that, that it was a policy which it did not seem unreasonable to me to adopt in the event of a certain place of settlement. The hon. gentleman knows that by the Act of 1870 the children of the half-breeds of Manitoba were to receive 1,400,000 acres of land. He knows that before the distribution took place the majority of those were entitled to have a part of their interest in those lands. He knows that this grant, while it had satisfied them, had conferred on them no permanent advantage. It did seem to me that if we could succeed in securing the settlement and location of the grant to the population, then we might propose to deal with them in some other way than by making immediate grants to their children; and by the Act of 1879 hon. gentlemen took power to deal with the half-breeds of the North-West Territory, to satisfy any clamors in connection with the extinguishment of the Indian title, in reference to the half-breeds of the North-West Territory outside of the limits of Manitoba. Now, hon. gentlemen took that power. It was not necessary that they should adopt precisely the same lines which were adopted in Manitoba. They could have dealt with the half-breeds in another way. They could have dealt with them in a way more advantageous to the half-breed population than that which was adopted; but having taken that power and having in the end dealt with the half-breeds precisely in the same way, there was no reason why that should not have been done at a much earlier period than that at which the distribution ultimately took place. The half-breeds asked that they should not be disturbed in their holdings. We assured them that they would not be disturbed. They asked one of their race should be appointed to the North-

West Council; we complied with their wishes and in so far as it was in the power of the Government to deal with the half-breed population, prior to our retirement from office, it was done. Now, if hon. gentlemen will look at the petitions from those half-breeds, which the Government have brought down to the House, they will get some idea of the maturity of the half-breeds question for settlement outside of Manitoba, by the date of these petitions. The first petition sent in is that from Blackfoot Crossing, 19th September, 1877. It is a petition, not asking for a distribution of lands similar to that in Manitoba, but asking for aid in the way of seed grain and agricultural implements. Then there is a petition from the people of St. Albert, on the 10th of April, 1878. There was a petition of the half-breeds of St. Laurent on the 1st of February, 1878. These petitions were acknowledged immediately after the close of Parliament, on the 17th of May, 1878. Then there was the petition of the half-breeds at Cypress Hills on the 13th of September, 1878, and there was the resolution of the North-West Council of the 2nd of August, 1878. There was a petition of the half-breeds at Edmonton, on the 19th of May, 1880; of the half-breeds of Qu'Appelle, on the 20th of September, 1881; of the half-breeds of St. Antoine de Padoue, on the 4th of September, 1882; and of St. Louis de Langevin, of the 18th of September, 1883. So that hon. gentlemen will see that these people became interested in the question of the distribution of land amongst their children and the security of their homesteads just about the time that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie was retiring from office. The first of these petitions reached us, it will be seen, during the Session of 1878. It was not possible for us to propose legislation at that time. We had not the necessary information. If we had been prepared to deal with the half-breed population upon precisely the same line that they had been dealt with in the Province of Manitoba, we might have done so; but I did not think that the results of the distribution of the land amongst the half-breeds of Manitoba had been so satisfactory that it was desirable to follow exactly the same lines. In my opinion a better course might have been adopted. In my opinion the Government had ample time to adopt that better course, and the fact remains that they adopted no course, that they neither pursued the system which had been followed in Manitoba, nor did they seek a more satisfactory conclusion of the half-breed claims during their Administration. It was not until the rebellion took place that hon. gentlemen took any serious steps to settle this half-breed question. The Minister of the Interior has undertaken to show that the half-breeds and the friends of the half-breeds were dissatisfied with the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, and the hon. gentleman read here a private communication—I do not know how it came into his possession—from Rev. Father Lacombe to the Hon. Mr. Pelletier. Now, I will say with regard to that communication, that I have no recollection of ever having seen it. It may have been sent to the Department, to my secretary, for the purpose of being read by me. It may not have been, by some negligence on my part, returned to Mr. Pelletier. The hon. gentleman did not say how it came into his possession.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Do you deny its existence?

Mr. MILLS. I do not deny its existence. The hon. gentleman may have purloined it for all I know. But I will say this, that I never had any communication with Archbishop Taché, by letter at all events, except one communication that I caused to be addressed to him in regard to the purchase of the rights of the half-breeds to those 1,400,000 acres, shortly after I came into office. I will say further, that I think Father Lacombe was appointed by me one of the commissioners in 1877, for the purpose of dealing with the Indians under Treaty No. 7, and if that reverend gentleman was at all dissatisfied with the course the Government pursued, certainly I did not know it, unless it might be from that communication, if the communication ever came under my notice, unless indeed in the matter of the stake claims, upon which the advice of the law officers of the Crown was altogether against their validity. Now, I think I have shown that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie did deal with the half-breed population of Manitoba. We did make the distribution of the lands of that half-breed population. There are a few parishes in which the lands were not distributed until after we retired from office; but it was because of certain disputes that rendered that impossible. But all that was done was done from 1877 to September or October, 1878, by that Government; and I have pointed out that we were taking the necessary steps for the settlement of the half-breed claims in the North-West Territories. But, Sir, supposing we had been negligent in our duty in dealing with the half-breed population of the North-West Territories, and supposing the question was ripe for settlement in 1878, would not that be all the greater evidence of negligence on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite in not having dealt with the question immediately after their entrance upon office? These hon. gentlemen succeeded us on the Treasury benches, because the public were disposed to trust them rather than us with the administration of public affairs; and if we were negligent in not settling this question between 1874 and 1878, what is to be said of those hon. gentleman, who have been in office for seven years since, and until a rebellion broke out, did not take the first steps for the purpose of securing a settlement of the half-breed question?

Mr. DAWSON. A general impression seems to prevail throughout the country that the half-breeds of the North-West in the locality where the rebellion occurred were the natives of that locality. Now, it has been very clearly explained by the Minister of the Interior that they were not natives of that locality, but that they were mere immigrants who had gone to that section from another part of the country. The number of settlers who were natives there was exceedingly limited, and the great majority of the half-breeds on the South Saskatchewan at the time of the rebellion were immigrants from other sections. Some of them were 800 miles westward from the place of their birth, they were seeking new lands, and there they settled; they were almost as far west of their native place as the country they originally came from is west from this place. This fact is not kept prominently enough in view. Sir, a great many causes have been assigned for the rebellion; but there is one which I think has been very little dwelt upon, and which would have caused trouble under any circumstances; that is, that two different races of people, utterly unacquainted with each other's habits of living, were brought into contact. When the white settlers went into that country first they were not acquainted with the habits of the Indians of the plains or the half-breeds; neither were the Mounted Police when they first went into the country. These half-breeds had been for many generations accustomed to hunt over the plains wherever they chose; they were frequently at war with their neighbors, the Sioux Indians, and they led an unrestrained life which generated a spirit of freedom among them; so that, when the white men came there, after this country acquired possession of the North-West, they felt that a certain restraint was to be put upon them. They saw that they could not spread out their herds of cattle wherever they chose, and hunt the buffalo at will over the plains as they formerly did, and a spirit of discontent naturally arose among them, which under the most careful administration might have resulted in trouble. This view of the matter has been very little taken into account. One side of this House throwing blame on the other, and neither

party placing sufficient importance on the elements which had to be dealt with and the difficulty of dealing with those elements with any material which any Government could have at its disposal. When the first Riel rebellion broke out, I had the honor of being consulted in every step that was taken. The troops were carried through without the loss of a single man, and the rebellion was put down without a shot being fired. Success on that occasion was due to the extreme good management of the Government under the same distinguished gentleman who is at the head of the Government to-day. I had the honor of recommending at the time, when it was proposed to send an armed force into the North-West Territories to maintain order among the Indians, that the true Mounted Police to send among those Indians were these very half-breeds of whom we are talking to-night. These men had been accustomed to lead the life of soldiers. They were accustomed to ride on horseback over the plains, and they were inured to hardship and fighting. I believe if a police force had been organised out of these half-breeds, there would have been no outbreak. It may be asked: Why trust the maintenance of peace to the men who had been in arms against the Government? I say, if you had shown confidence in those men, if the Mackenzie Government at the outset had shown confidence in them and enrolled such of them as were fit for the duty as policemen, we would never have had a rebellion in the North-West. They would have been proud of the confidence reposed in them, and their knowledge of the Indian character would have enabled them to maintain peace among the Indians. When speaking of those rebellions which have occurred among the Indians, we must not think they are the very quiet innocent people they are represented to be, and that the faults are all on the side of the white man, for the first Riel rebellion and this last Riel rebellion were by no means the only ones that occurred among the Indians They had often been at war with the fur traders, and on two occasions troops were sent out by the Imperial Government to keep order. We must not suppose, therefore, that we were dealing with people living quietly in their native land, and that the fault of inciting them lay entirely with the whites, for these half-breeds were a people who had been constantly at war and were very jealous of their position and independence in the new land to which they had gone. Perhaps there is one thing not to be regretted in this trouble, and that is it has taught the white men a little respect for the Indian. Formerly these people were spoken of with the utmost contempt, looked upon as spiritless and cowardly, but the white man has found that they are not naturally cowards. The half-breeds fought bravely though in a mistaken cause, but we found at least that they were not to be despised. The Indian Poundmaker and his band, when attacked unexpectedly on their reserve and while imperfectly armed, did not run away, and Poundmaker, when the retreat of a troop of volunteers commenced, showed a great deal of magnanimity in preventing his people from following them. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), in his very eloquent speech, remarked, very truly, that the Indians are a highly sensitive people. The half-breeds specially are sensitive, and I may add they are exceedingly vain, which quality no doubt they derive from their ancestry—I speak of their Indian and not of their French ancestry, for of course they derive no bad quality from the French—and they are apt to take offence sometimes without sufficient cause. But whence comes this new-born admiration of the Indians? Last year, during the franchise debate, we heard them described as the most degraded people on the face of the earth. We were asked, are you going to give the franchise to people so degraded as Strike-him-on-the-Back and others, but to-night nothing can be found too good to describe their high qualities. Their heroes are equal to Soult and Wellington. How circumstances alter cases. I have always been a friend to the Indians, and am very glad to see this change coming over hon. gentlemen opposite, but I find it rather extraordinary that they should limit their sympathy to this small body of Indians in the North-West, who were up in arms against the Government. Why should they not have a little feeling for the Indians in other parts of the Dominion? In Algoma, we have 12,000 Indians, who, at times, suffer a great deal. I have brought their grievances before the House; I have told the House that the white people were going in and destroying the fish on which the Indians relied for subsistance. But there was no sympathy shown for them. It appears it was all reserved to the small band in the North-West who took up arms against the Government. No doubt they may have grievances, and a great deal has been said with the view of making the Government responsible, but there is no doubt that the Government have done a great deal for the Indians. The Government have been extremely anxious to find out what they had to complain of. Of course, if there were agents sent among the Indians who were not reliable, one side of the House has as much to account for in that respect as the other side. Whose fault was it if incompetent agents were sent out? It certainly was not wholly the fault of the Government. I heard a very true remark made here the other night by an hon. member, who said: Hon. members have themselves to blame a good deal for this. It is generally thought that a man who can do nothing at home need only to be sent abroad to prove himself a very good fellow, and it very often happens that individuals not very well qualified for the duty are forced by members on the Government, I think this is a case in which many excuses may be made for the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not going to inflict a speech upon the House at this late hour of the evening, but I am simply going to give my reasons for voting as I intend to vote on the amendment which is now under consideration. I have listened with considerable attention to the statements made by the mover of the resolution and by the gentlemen who have sustained him, and I have listened to the replies on this side. If we were to believe the statements from the other side of the House, there has been utter neglect on the part of the Government in relation to the treatment of the half breeds. If we believe the statements from this side of the House, and more particularly from the hon. the Minister of the Interior, the complaints should not be confined to the Government of the day, but his answer is: You're another, you did likewise. Now, I am not going to enter into the discussion of the question whether the half-breeds have been or have not been properly used in regard to the particular subject which has been referred to; but, from the conviction that I have had in relation to the general treatment of the North-West on the part of the Government of the day through the two previous Ministers who occupied the position of Minister of the Interior, I have long since come to the conclusion that their administration of the affairs of the North-West was not such as to be for the good of that country or the welfare of Canada, and therefore I am going to vote in favor of the amendment.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier (p. 819).

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Allen,	Fisher,	Livingston,
Amyot,	Fleming,	McCraney,
Armstrong,	Gaudet,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Mills,
Béchard,	Gigault,	Mitchell,
Bergeron,	Gillmor,	Mulock,
Blake,	Glen,	Ouimet,
Bourassa,	Guay,	Paterson (Brant),
Burpee,	Guilbault,	Platt,
Cameron (Huron),	Gunn,	Ray,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Harley,	Rinfret,

Campbell (Renfrew),	Holton,	Scriver,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant)
Casgrain,	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cockburn,	Jackson,	Springer,
Coursol,	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Davies,	Kirk,	Trow,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Landerkin,	Vail,
Desjardins,	Langelier,	Watson,
Dupont,	Laurier,	Weldon,
Edgar,	Lister,	Wilson.—64.
Fairbank,		

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Abbott,	Ferguson (Welland),	Montplaisir,
Allison,	Fortin,	O'Brien,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Orton,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Girouard,	Paint,
Baker (Victoria),	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Beaty,	Grandbois,	Pope,
Bell,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Hackett,	Reid,
Bergin,	Haggart,	Riopel,
Billy,	Hall,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Blondeau,	Hay,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hesson,	Ross,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Royal,
Cameron (Victoria),	Homer,	Shakespeare,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Shanly,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Small,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Chapleau,	Kilvert,	Stairs,
Cimon,	Kinney,	Taschereau,
Cochrane,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Colby,	Landry (Montmagny),	Taylor,
Costigan,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Temple,
Coughlin,	Lesage,	Thompson (Antigonish),
Curran,	Macdonald (King's),	Townshend,
Cuthbert,	Mackintosh,	Tupper,
Daly,	Macmaster,	Tyrwhitt,
Daoust,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Vanasse,
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McCallum,	Ward,
Dickinson,	McCarthy,	White (Cardwell),
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	White (Hastings),
Dugas,	McDougall (C. Breton),	White (Renfrew),
Dundas,	McLelan,	Wood (Brockville),
Everett,	McNeil,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	Massue,	Wright.—106.
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)		

Amendment negatived.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Contingencies, Post Office and Finance Departments.....$2,800

Mr. MULOCK. I made an enquiry a short time ago from the Minister of Finance as to the deposits in the Finance Department and Savings Banks exceeding $1,000. The Minister stated that it would involve so much trouble that he could not furnish the information immediately, but he intimated that, if the question had referred to the end of the financial year instead of the year ending on the 31st December, the information could be furnished. If I put a question in that form, could I get the information desired?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes. I will get the information.

Mr. MULOCK. Will it be necessary for me to put the question on the paper?

Mr. McLELAN. No, I will make a note of it.

Civil Service Board of Examiners, &c.....$7,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is an increase here of about $1,500. What is that for?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Last year we increased the salary of the commissioners $300 a piece, making $900. As to the rest, we have taken the average of the increase of previous years, amounting to about $600 or $700, making the $1,500. However, I think we might reduce the item, as I think $1,000 increase will be sufficient to meet the requirements.

Salaries for Board of Examiners, &c., under the Civil Service Act.....$7,000

Mr. MULOCK. Last year when the House was asked to vote the sum of $6,000, I understood the Secretary of State to assure the House that the item would not require to be increased; and now we are asked to increase it by $1,000. It was pointed out in committee last year that an increase would inevitably follow by adopting what was called on this side of the House a very vicious system. Now, just what was anticipated has happened, and I presume this vote will need to be increased each year. I would ask the Secretary of State what is the cause of this increase? Is it because the work has increased?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. One of the great reasons is this: At the next examination we shall have over 700 candidates instead of the 350 we had last, and it takes, for the stationery alone, the increased sum we have asked for. If we can reduce it we will do so, but I do not think we can. I may add that we expect that this increased sum will be more than half compensated by the fees that will be paid by the candidates. We do not take the fees into the account, because they go into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I may say that this $1,000 is only the larger number calculated for the next examination.

Mr. MULOCK. It increases the salary of each examiner to the extent of $300.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We cannot help that.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand it is expected that there will be 700 candidates examined for this money.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, in the month of May next.

Mr. MULOCK. And if there is the same number in the fall, there will be 1,400 papers to be read by each examiner.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, perhaps so. After the next examination I expect there will have been over 1,500 persons who will have passed the qualifying examination. But I think we may reduce the examinations to one each year, which will reduce the number of applicants.

Mr. BLAKE. The woods are full of them.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad that the Secretary of State has become a convert to that view. Last year he took the opposite ground. Last year there were in all four examinations, two fixed examinations and some supplementary ones for the lame fellows.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have been speaking of promotion examinations.

Mr. MULOCK. There were examinations, too, for persons who failed in the original examinations. It is just what was anticipated. We told the Secretary of State last year that he would be asking for more money this year. I told him he was inducing young men to go into this vicious system of applying for public situations, and he now admits it, but if he is going to reduce the number of examinations to one each year, he will find that the number of candidates will be less; and if we adopt that system it is not necessary to increase the salaries.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We thought we would provide for 350 on the average, but we shall have 700 at the next examination. It is a necessary expense, and I repeat that it will be more than covered by the fees of $2 that each man will pay. The salaries of the examiners were $300 last year, and now they will be $600.

Office of the Que n's Privy Council for Canada.. $20,677 50

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The other evening I explained to the committee the increases, except one. There was $750 for a clerk named Foley, that had been transferred from another Department, to whom we gave an increase of $50. The other increases are all $50, except for the door-keeper, McNaughton, who has been there such a long time that we gave him $100.

Resolutions to be reported, Committee to sit again.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:10 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 21st April, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RULES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. DAWSON moved:

That the 51st rule of the House be amended so as to provide for the publication of notices in the Territories of Canada, pursuant to the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. BLAKE. We cannot amend a rule of the House without notice. The hon. gentleman had better give notice.

Mr. DAWSON. The chairman of the committee will probably explain.

Mr. SPEAKER. Notice must be given.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 111) respecting Insurance (from the Senate).—(Mr. Thompson.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to refer to a personal matter. On 5th April, in the course of a debate with respect to the North-West Territories, the Minister of the Interior, referring to a statement made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), as to the condition of the order of the papers which are printed, and which have been under reference several times, said, in answer to a remark I made, that "they are printed the way they are brought down."

"They were in the hon. gentleman's hands for weeks."

To which I replied:

"They were not; I got them copied."

The hon. member for Queen's said:

"Does the hon. gentleman say my hon. friend altered the date of the papers or the position in which they were? Was it his duty to arrange them?

"Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Not at all.

"Mr. DAVIES. Anybody who takes up that book has to spend hours and hours to get an accurate or clear idea of the papers contained and their relation to each other.

"Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). What I mean is this. When a Department brings down papers to the House, the papers go to the Journals office, and after they pass into the hands of the Journal clerks, who detach them and count them, they go to the printers and appear in the form in which they went to the printers, and the Department cannot be held responsible for that, because the papers have, since they left the Department, passed through a number of hands.

"Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. gentleman has referred to me as having some share in disarranging the papers, I beg to tell him he is not aware of the practice. The first thing done with the returns is to send them to the Clerk's office in order that they may be paged in red, just in the order in which the Government brings them down, and it is under these pages they are arranged and printed.

"Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is not so."

I would not have referred to that matter, having made the statement I have mentioned, except that in the course of the debate last night the Minister of the Interior, in reference to an observation made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) on the same subject, said: "After they had been handled by your leader;" and upon my repeating the same denial of the statement the hon. gentleman declined once again to accept that denial. Under those circumstances I have thought it proper, in vindication of myself, of my statement and of the Orders of the House and the practice of the House, to procure the papers, which are here before me. The papers are numbered in the Sessional Papers 116, 116*a*, 116*e*, 116*f*. They are consecutively printed in the order in which they are brought down. Paper 116 comprises 139 manuscript pages, which are numbered from 1 to 139 consecutively, and they comprise from page 1 to page 18 of print. Paper 116*a* comprises pages 1 to 11 manuscript, and 18 to 20 print; paper 116*e* comprises 1 to 38 MS, 1 to 67 print; paper 116*f* comprises 1 to 119 MS, and 68 to 113 print. I have not, of course, examined every page of these papers since the occasion arose. I was cognisant of the fact that they were numbered, from having looked at them; I have verified that statement, and have looked generally at the papers and compared them in a general sense with the print, and I find by my comparison that they are printed in the order in which they are here numbered. I repeat the statement that the first thing done with the papers, when they come to the House, before they go into the hands of members, is, that the Clerk sends them to an officer of his who is detailed to discharge the duty of affixing the numbers to these pages, with a view that there may be no mistake as to the order of the documents, and that they may be printed in that order. I repeat the statement that I did not disarrange these papers in any shape or way. What I did was this: I found, when they were brought down, that they were so inextricably arranged that it would be difficult in print, and was impossible in MS, to have any clear apprehension of their bearing and effect. I invited the Clerk of the House to be good enough to give directions that the papers should be copied, and they were copied by an officer of the House. Having found that they were in such a condition, if copied in this way—one paper appearing partly on the same page with another—that I could not use them, I asked that another copy might be made and that each of the copied papers might be kept a separate document. I received them in that shape, and I chronologically arranged those copies, having nothing to do then with the originals, and it was from that chronological arrangement that I was able to make the statement I did last Session. This has been done with the copies furnished and not with the originals, which were, however, as I have said in the first instance, and before I saw them, until numbered by the officer of the House, in the number and order in which they are printed in the Department. So far from the insinuation and statement of the Minister of the Interior, repeated, as I said last night and say again—repeated offensively, after my denial the other day—so far from that statement being true, I called the attention of the clerk of the Printing Committee to the fact that those papers would be unintelligible and

useless in that order, and I requested him to see if it would be possible to have them printed in chronological order, and that officer, having made enquiry, informed me that it was deemed impossible to depart from the order in which the papers had been brought down to Parliament, that they must be printed in that order, although he agreed with me as to the results of that order when printed.

SUGAR IN BONDED WAREHOUSE, MONTREAL.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. ROBERTSON, Shelburne) asked, What quantity of sugar was there in bonded warehouse, Montreal, on the 31st March, 1886?

Mr. BOWELL. The quantities of sugar of all kinds and descriptions in warehouse in Montreal, on the 31st March last, was 2,642,467 lbs.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY, FROM STRAIT OF CANSO TO SYDNEY OR LOUISBURG.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) asked, Is it the intention of the Government, during the present Session of Parliament, to provide for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from the Strait of Canso to Sydney or Louisburg?

Mr. POPE. Negotiations are now going on, and I hope we will be able to make provision for that work.

POST OFFICE AT CORINTH.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Is it the intention of the Government at an early day to carry out the promise made by the late Postmaster-General, to open a post office at Corinth, in the township of Bentinck?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Postmaster-General, upon enquiry into this matter, has found that there was a doubt as to the expediency of proceeding with the establishment of this post office. Nevertheless, the matter will be looked into more fully.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL—FEES TO POISETTE & ROGER.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, What amount of fees did the Government pay Poisette & Roger in connection with Trent Valley Canal?

Mr. THOMPSON. The Government paid nothing to that firm.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL—RIGHT OF WAY.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, What amount of money was paid for right of way for Trent Valley Canal through the township of Galway? How much for same through the township of Harvey; also, Burleigh, Smith, Douro and the village of Lakefield?

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman will have to put this in the shape of a notice of motion, because the answer would be long, and I have not the information.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT PETERBORO'.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Why did the Government buy with the Phelan lot, on the corner of George and Charlotte streets, the Sawer's lot, on the corner of Hunter and Water streets, for the post office site in Peterboro'?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government have purchased the Sawer lot in order to build thereon the post office, which will thus be used by the town of Peterboro' and the people of Ashburnham village, the two places being united by a bridge, to which the street on which the Sawer lot is leads. The Phelan lot has been also purchased, so that the Custom house and Inland Revenue office may be erected thereon, that lot being better situated for this purpose. The post office building will be a smaller building than it would have been if the Custom house and Inland Revenue offices had been under the same roof. The two buildings will be equal to the one, had it contained all the offices.

MILITIA ORGANISATION IN NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. WATSON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to extend the Militia organisation to the North-West Territories? If so, to what strength; and the proportion of cavalry and infantry; and whether a Deputy Adjutant-General and Brigade Major, with headquarters in the territories, will be appointed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I beg to state that it is the intention of the Government to extend the militia organisation, existing in the other Provinces, to the North-West Territories. The proposed strength and character of the new force, and the staff that will be required, have not been decided upon, and will depend to a great extent upon the population which goes into those territories.

DRAINAGE AND WATER SUPPLY OF QUEBEC CITADEL.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, 1st. Whether the work of extending to the citadel of Quebec the aqueduct and drainage system of that city, is being done by day's work, or under contract? 2nd. If by the day, who is the superintendent, what are the names of the foremen employed, and what is their pay and that of the workmen? 3rd. If the work is under contract, what are the names of the contractors, the dates of the contracts, the parts of the work undertaken by each, and what amount has been paid to each; were tenders called for the work, and in what manner? 4th. What is the total estimated cost of carrying out the said work?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman I beg to state that the works are being done under contract. The first section of 1,300 feet pipe trench is being done at $1.65 per foot; Mr. J. Power, contractor, Quebec. The second section is composed of 900 feet pipe trench, at $2.00 per foot; Mr. J. Juneau, contractor, Quebec. The third section of 1,500 feet pipe trench was let at $2.00 per foot, and the contractor is Mr. J. Bigaouette, Quebec. The supply of six-inch and four-inch water pipe was made at $29.50 per ton; Mr. J. Robertson, of Montreal, contractor. The date of the acceptance of tender was January 12, 1886, for Mr. John Power; January 16, 1886, for Mr. Joseph Juneau; the same date for Mr. Joseph Bigaouette, and the 15th of February, 1886, for Mr. J. Robertson. The tenders were called for by letter. We estimated the cost of the whole works, when completed, at about $20,750. The supply of valves and hydrants was furnished by the Chapman Valve Company, Indian Orchard, Massachusetts, United States.

WATER SUPPLY TO GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS AT QUEBEC.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, 1st. Whether it is true that in order to avoid paying the water rates demanded by the Corporation of Quebec for supplying, from the aqueduct of the said city, the old Custom house and the Queen's store, the Government have caused apparatus to be set up in order to supply the said buildings with water from the St. Lawrence? 2nd. If so, what is the cost of fitting up the said apparatus and the yearly expense of working the same; what was the price asked by the Corporation for the said service; what is the estimated value of the said properties,

and the price paid by private individuals for water rates on property of the same value? 3rd. Whether, before setting up the said apparatus, the Government enquired as to the hygienic quality of the said water of the St. Lawrence at the said place?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think I must object to the former part of the first question. I do not think the hon. gentleman should have put in the words, "in order to avoid paying the water rates demanded by the Corporation of Quebec." I think that is no portion of the question; it is an argument. The question should be a simple one—whether it is true that the Government have caused apparatus to be set up in order to supply those buildings with water from the St. Lawrence. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether this question should be put in that way.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it is not done in order to avoid paying the water rates, it is not true.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a reflection to ask whether this was done in order to avoid paying the water rates. I will answer the question in this way: Whether it is true that the Government have caused apparatus to be set up in order to supply the old Custom house and Queen's store with water from the St. Lawrence; to that I say no. I understand that the corporation asked $500 a year to supply the Custom house with water, and I would not consent to pay that, as I considered it excessive. The estimated value of the properties I do not know; the hon. gentleman as Mayor of Quebec will find that out from his books. The price paid by private individuals for water rates on property of the same value I think will also be found in the books of the corporation. In answer to the third question, as we did not put up the apparatus, I would answer that we did not enquire.

NEGOTIATION OF COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

Mr. EDGAR asked, 1st. What papers has the Government relating to the negotiation of commercial treaties, conventions or arrangements in which Canada is interested, and which are covered by the terms of the Address passed by this House on 28th January, 1884? and when will they be brought down? 2nd. Has the British Government agreed to the proposal made to Lord Kimberley by Sir A. T. Galt on the 11th June, 1880, and sanctioned by the Governor General in Council on 26th March, 1881, to the effect that it was the wish of the Canadian Government to be relieved, as soon as it could conveniently be done, of the obligations connected with any treaties affecting trade and commerce entered into between Great Britain and other nations; and the further proposal, similarly made and sanctioned, that it was the desire of the Canadian Government to be informed of the inception of any new treaty, and that in future no stipulation binding upon the commerce of Canada should be introduced into any treaty without reserving to the Canadian Government the option of acceptance or refusal? If the British Government has agreed to such proposal, when was it done, and will all papers connected therewith be laid before the House at an early day? 3rd. Has the Government of Canada, since 26th March, 1881, been relieved of the obligations connected with any treaties affecting trade and commerce previously entered into between Great Britain and other nations? 4th. Has the British Government, since 26th March, 1881, reserved to the Canadian Government the option of acceptance or refusal of all treaties that would bind the commerce of Canada? And if so, with what nations were such treaties made, and what was the action of the Canadian Government as to such acceptance or refusal?

Mr. McLELAN. A return was presented to the House of Commons in reply to an address of the House dated 23rd February, 1883, giving the correspondence connected with the negotiations for commercial arrangements with Servia and other countries. At the same time a communication from the Colonial Office was submitted, stating that as correspondence is never furnished which has reference to negotiations still under discussion without the consent of the foreign power with whom the treaty is being made, it would be necessary to obtain from the Governments of France and Spain their consent to the publication of any correspondence which had taken place on the subject of treaties, and Lord Derby suggested that the placing of such papers on the Table of the Dominion House of Commons should be delayed until the matters under discussion were brought to a final conclusion. It would, therefore, be necessary to obtain the consent of the Imperial Government before the papers referred to in the Address of the 28th January, 1884, could be submitted to the House. Correspondence on the subject has been had with the Imperial Government, but as yet the consent has not been received, and as the negotiations are not yet concluded, it cannot be stated definitely when the Government will be able to bring down the papers now in their possession. With reference to the Order in Council of the 26th March, 1881, the British Government has, in all cases of treaties negotiated since that date, ascertained and acted upon the wish of the Canadian Government to be included in or exempted from the operation of commercial treaties entered into with other nations. This has been done in the cases of Roumania, Equador, Morocco, Egypt and Montenegro, as will be seen by the correspondence in the return before referred to. In the case of Servia, prior to the 26th March, 1881, the request of the Dominion Government to be exempted from the operation of the treaty with that country was attended to, and representations made to the Servian Government of that wish. The High Comm ssioner has also been in constant communication with the Imperial Government, and has been kept informed as to the progress of all commercial negotiations in which Canada is interested.

THE MINING LAW.

Mr. FAIRBANK (for Mr. KAULBACH), asked: Whether it is the intention of the Government to amend the Mining Law during this Session, and if so, if the sum now required to be expended upon a location will be reduced, or the time for such expenditure increased; and if such reduction of sum or extension of time will apply to claims now filed?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is no intention of bringing down any legislation on the subject of the mining laws this Session. The whole subject is being considered by the Department in the light of investigations being made on the ground.

THE CASE OF LOUIS RIEL.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) moved for:

Copies of correspondence, whether by telegraph or otherwise, between the Government and Drs. Jukes, Valade and Lavell, or any of them, officers of the Government appointed to enquire into the mental condition of Louis Riel.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no objection to the motion. All the papers at our disposal will be brought down.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope, after the statements made by the Minister of Justice, some effort will be made to re-obtain possession of these papers which are not just now, but ought to be, at the disposal of the Government. The Minister has stated that the important, vital telegrams had been returned to the physicians, and I trust, therefore, they will be got back again and be included in this return.

THE *NORTHERN LIGHT.*

Mr. JENKINS moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Marine Department and the captain of the *Northern Light*, relating to the discontinuance of her trips during the month of February.

He said: It will be remembered that Prince Edward Island did not join the Confederation of Provinces which took place in 1867. For six years attempts had been made to induce her to throw in her lot with the Dominion, but those attempts were unsuccessful, until the Dominion Government agreed to provide such efficient steam service as would give Prince Edward Island continual communication with the mainland. Now, thirteen years have elapsed since this promise was made, and we still have not efficient communication. The *Northern Light*, for thirty-two days, in January and February, did not make a trip, although during that time the weather was extremely mild, so much so that there was very little ice in the straits. The people of Prince Edward Island were induced to join Confederation on this ground alone, or chiefly on this ground. They were aware of the advantages which would accrue to them from having continuous commercial intercourse with the mainland, and the promise given them to that effect was sufficient to induce them to join the Confederation. In a recent debate in another place, the leader of the Government, speaking of winter navigation, said: "We believe faith has already been kept with Prince Edward Island, so far as faith could be kept; we have done our utmost in every way to accomplish that object." Now, I maintain that the Government have not done their utmost to give us efficient steam service; I contend that they have never taken up this matter in serious earnest. It is true we have a small steamer that was put on by the late Government, built for the purpose of navigating the river St. Lawrence, a steamer which has no capacity for carrying freight, and is utterly incapable of meeting the difficulties of ice service, even in thin field ice, and therefore altogether inefficient for heavy ice. She is built in a manner that I believe is just the opposite of the model which should have been adopted, and even if able to run constantly is too small to carry any freight worth speaking of. Now, the steamer *Alert*, which has performed several Arctic voyages, and which is lying idle in Halifax, could have been put on by the Government. In October last I made application to the Department that this steamer should be put on to assist the *Northern Light*, and came, at great inconvenience, to Ottawa to lay this matter before the Minister of Marine, but I was unsuccessful. The *Alert* was built originally as a sealer, and purchased by the British Government, who greatly strengthened her and fitted her out for ice service, and I believe she is a very capable boat. If the *Alert* were put on, it would then be seen, by comparison, whether the *Northern Light* was an efficient boat, or whether a boat of a different model would not have been more efficient. The Government refused to put on the *Alert*, and I had to return home unsuccessful. In November, during the shipping season, unfortunately, small pox ravaged the island, and prevented produce being shipped until the winter season. I therefore, telegraphed, it was of great importance to the people of the island that the *Alert* should be put on, but I was told the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had been instructed that the *Alert* would not be safe in the straits, and that the lives of its crew should not be risked by the Government. The refusal of the Minister was, I think, unjustifiable, and can only be excused by the fact that he had only just been appointed, and had many matters of importance to look after, so that I suppose he was not able to look into this question. I hope, however, next year the *Alert* will be put on, and I would suggest that more powerful engines be put into her, in which case I believe she would accomplish almost all we want, if she were put on to run between the island and the mainland at such points as may be considered most advantageous. I believe also that by putting her on we would see what sort of a steamer is really required to overcome the difficulties of this winter service. By putting a capable mechanic in her, so that he might see what modifications are required to overcome the difficulty of ice navigation, a boat could be built which would run nearly every day in the year. The voyage is a short one, and there ought to be no difficulty in providing a steamer with abundant fuel for that short passage. It is evident, in the case of a steamer making a long passage, such as a sealing vessel has to make, or a vessel going to the Arctic regions, the engines must be small, as it is impossible to carry enough coal to work large engines, but our voyage is short and coal abundant, and a steamer of that sort, with powerful engines, will be able to overcome all the difficulties.

Mr. McINTYRE. I am not at all surprised that there is a good deal of indignation existing in Prince Edward Island in reference to the manner in which communition has been carried on between the island and the mainland during the season just closed. The winter has been the finest within the recollection of the oldest people living on the island. The frost which we had last winter was late compared with that of former years. I have a distinct recollection of the day the *Northern Light* came into Souris for the purpose of being laid up. There was not a particle of ice to be seen, even by the aid of a powerful glass. There was a quantity of ice in the gulf, as I was informed, but nothing to prevent the trips being made regularly. In connection with this, I might read an extract from a letter addressed to the Halifax *Chronicle*, from Pictou, dated the 17th February last:

"The ice on the harbor, which was not very strong at any time this winter, has been weakened by the recent mild weather so as to be entirely unsafe for horses. Even foot passengers are not to be seen on it to-day. The steamer *Mayflower*, which was frozen up on the 5th, has commenced running again, and makes regular trips without difficulty. The gulf is as clear of ice as in the dog days, and has been so all winter, with the exception of three or four days, and yet there is no steam communication between here and Prince Edward Island, the *Northern Light* having been laid up at Souris by order of the Government at Ottawa. Captain Cheverie, who did such good service last spring with his schooner *Josephine*, will probably commence to run again this week, or the Steam Navigation Company of Prince Edward Island may get the *Princess of Wales* out of Charlottetown and put her on the route. With the exception of two or three days this winter, regular steam communication with Prince Edward Island is a thing which might have been, but which was not."

This, I think, is quite confirmatory of what I have said in regard to the condition of the weather during the months of January and February in the Maritime Provinces. If report be true, I believe the boilers of the *Northern Light* are very unsafe. It has been stated that her boilers were worn out and leaky last fall, and that it was owing to this that the ship was nearly lost in the storm she encountered in a trip from Georgetown to Pictou in the month of November or December, I forget which. She had to go under a shortened rate of speed, and could not make the harbor of Pictou before the snow storm came on, so she had to put back. She was out all night, and she came very near being lost. I am not at all surprised that the captain of the *Northern Light* should lay up his ship year after year, seeing what the instructions are which are issued to him by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. These instructions were brought down to the Senate last winter, and I will read them for the information of the House. The first is dated January 16th, 1883:

"Capt FINLAYSON, steamer *Northern Light*, Georgetown, P.E.I.

"Telegram received urging Department order you run; responsibility is with you; expect you to run no undue risks.

"A. W. McLELAN."

The next is this:

"OTTAWA, 18th January, 1883.

"Capt. FINLAYSON, steamer *Northern Light*, Georgetown, P.E.I.

"With knowledge of ice you must be judge, and held responsible for safety of boat. Incur no undue risks.

"WM. SMITH."

The third is a letter, dated Ottawa, 12th January, 1884:

"SIR,—Referring to my letter to you of the 14th December, 1882, I have again to instruct you to use your own judgment as to when the *Northern Light* should run, and not to be governed by directions from any persons, as the Department will hold you responsible for the safety of the vessel, and you are to incur no risk whereby the safety of the vessel may be endangered by being caught in the ice. No risk, also, is to be incurred for the purpose of carrying over any particular passenger or passengers, and the Department expects that you will use your judgment in all matters affecting the running of the boat, and will hold you responsible for her safety.

"I am, Sir,

"Your most obedient servant,

"WILLIAM SMITH,

"*Deputy Minister of Marine.*"

It is not at all surprising that, under such instructions as these, the captain of the *Northern Light* should, on the appearance of ice in the gulf, take his ship into port and lay her up. In fact, these instructions were tantamount to a command. I do not find fault with Captain Finlayson for obeying his orders. I believe any sensible man would do what he has done. Last year, as we know, the *Northern Light* did not make any trip at all. She was laid up in the harbor of Georgetown in the month of January, and she was unable to get out, and so she did not make a trip at all. A small schooner, about the 15th April, left Port Souris and safely landed her passengers the same day at Pictou, and she continued to make her trips for the rest of the season. The *Northern Light* was specially constructed for winter navigation, and I believe that, if certain improvements were made in her, she would do all that could be required in that way. It is useless for us to get the *Alert* or any other boat if she is not kept going in winter. It is quite as easy to pilot the *Alert* to a wharf as the *Northern Light*. The trouble is not with the boat at all, but with the Department, who have absolutely refused to keep the boat on her berth during the winter months. I think it is about time for the Government to take serious steps to carry out our terms of Union. Year after year we are bringing this subject before the House, and it appears to me that we are as far from having these terms carried out as we were years ago.

Mr. DAVIES. Although the subject matter of this motion may not be of very great importance to some hon. gentlemen who live in the upper Provinces of the Dominion, there is a phase of the subject which I think is important to every hon. member of this House. The question has now reached a new stage. For years, the representatives of Prince Edward Island have been complaining that the solemn terms of union have not been kept. Nay, we have gone further, and I think on both sides those representing both political parties have contended that there has not been an honest attempt made to carry out these terms. Public opinion in Prince Edward Island endorses that sentiment. The Legislature of Prince Edward Island, by a unanimous vote, embodied that sentiment in a memorial which they addressed to the present Government some few years ago, and at great length, which I do not intend to repeat here now, pointed out the steps that should be taken, pointed out the promises that the present Government had made, pointed out that they had broken those promises, and pointed out the fact that to-day and for years back the terms of union with Prince Edward Island had not been kept. Now, what is the stage in which the case now is, which I say demands the serious attention of the members of this Parliament. It is that, by unanimous vote, the Legislature of Prince Edward Island have determined that, if they cannot obtain the carrying out of these terms in a fair spirit and a proper manner, they will appeal to Her Majesty the Queen to dissolve the terms of union between Prince Edward Island and this Dominion. They forwarded that memorial to this Government, and they got very little satisfaction from the Government. They notified the Government that if they did not receive satisfaction, they would appeal in person to Her Majesty the Queen; but when the troubles broke out in the North-West last year, they informed this Government that, owing to those troubles, they would not press the matter for immediate attention. But the moment the troubles were over they insisted that the Government should give their attention to this matter. The Government did not give their attention to the matter, the Government did nothing, and, as I will show directly, the solemn promise made by the leader of the Government in the Upper House, in the other branch of this Legislature, was deliberately broken. The delegates went to England. I am not, myself, of the opinion that the Local Government was well advised. Notwithstanding the delay, notwithstanding the inaction, and the persistent determination of the Marine Department of this Dominion, that justice should not be done to Prince Edward Island, I believe there is enough of manly fair play in this House that, when the facts are thoroughly understood, to insist that the Government shall do its duty.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not object to a discussion upon the whole question, if it is proper upon the motion before you. But I think there is another motion on the Order paper which will properly bring up this discussion, whereas this one, I submit, does not do it.

Mr. DAVIES. I am surprised that the Minister of Marine should object to the discussion of this matter. What is the motion? My hon. colleague has asked for all correspondence between the Marine Department and the captain of the *Northern Light*, relating to the discontinuance of her trips during the month of February. Why, that is the very kernel of the complaint we make. The terms of union between the island and the Dominion provided that the Dominion should keep up an efficient steam communication between that Province and the mainland, so as to put the island into continuous communication with the railway system of the mainland. The point of the motion is that that contract has been broken during the past year, and that during the month of February communication was not kept up as it should have been. The Minister must have heard the statement which fell from the lips of my colleague a moment ago, that he applied last autumn, and since the present incumbent took possession of the office, to have the *Alert* put on to assist the *Northern Light*, and this application was refused, and, strong a supporter of th Government as he is, he did not hesitate to say that th refusal to put on the *Alert* was utterly unjustifiable. Why Sir, does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that I am not' to discuss this question at all? Am I to sit silent and listen to these utterances, when all my constituents are so much interested, and when a delegation from the Government of the island is just returning from laying a memorial at the foot of the Imperial Throne, praying that justice may be done? I tell the hon. gentleman that unless I am put down by the authority of the Speaker, I will not remain silent. It is nonsense to talk that way, and the hon. gentleman knows it well. Now, Sir, I was proceeding to say, when I was interrupted, that this delegation went home to England and they presented to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, to be laid at the foot of the Throne, a lengthy memorial reciting all the facts in connection with this contract made between the island and the Dominion, and reciting the alleged breaches of faith on the part of the Dominion. I was repeating that I am not satisfied myself that the Local Legislature took the proper course. I think, myself, and I repeat it again, that there is enough fair play in this

House, when the facts are thoroughly understood, to bring such a pressure upon the Government as will induce them to do justice. I believe the representatives from the island are prepared at all times to press this matter upon the attention of the Government, and the only person to blame is the gentleman who has charge of the Marine and Fisheries Department, and the Government of which he is a member. Why, Sir, I remember a few years ago, before this Government came into power, that not a Session passed in this House but the supporters of the present Government took every occasion to denounce the manner in which that service was then being carried out, to decry and to denounce the *Northern Light*, the boat employed by the Mackenzie Government to perform the service, and promised that if they came into power they would remedy these grievances and put on a better and a stronger boat. Sir, they came into power in the year 1878, and that boat that they then denounced has remained in the service from that day to this. Hon. members will understand that beating, as she has, against icebergs and cakes of ice, year in and year out, she is not improved at the end of eight years; and those gentlemen, after all the promises they made before coming into power, stand to-day convicted of the fact that the state of things which they denounced and decried in 1876-77-78 has been getting every year worse and worse, and still they have taken no steps to better it, so far as the *Northern Light* is concerned. But, Sir, those gentlemen from Prince Edward Island went to England, and they laid this matter at the foot of the Throne, and we had a return brought down yesterday, in answer to an Address moved for by the hon. member for King's. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that this return contained a despatch from Lord Granville to His Excellency the Governor General, and it contains a memorial submitted by the delegates who went to England to see Lord Granville in support to the petition of the Prince Edward Island Legislature. It is a very lengthy document, and the return contains a rejoinder from Sir Charles Tupper to that memorial, but it does not contain the document which was referred to throughout the return, and that is, the minute of Council presented by this Government in answer to the petition of the Prince Edward Island Legislature. I call the attention of my hon. friend to that, and I ask him, without a formal notice being given—because it would be impossible to reach it for some time—that he bring down that memorial, and I hope he will see his way clear to do it. Well, Sir, what does Lord Granville say in reply to their appplication:

"I duly received your Lordship'sdespatch of the 19th November last, enclosing an approved report of a committee of the Privy Council for Canada, forwarding, with other papers, a joint address to the Queen from the Legislative Council and House of Assembly of Prince Edward Island. This address prays that Her Majesty will require that justice be done by the Government of Canada to Her Majesty's loyal subjects of that Province, by the immediate establishment and maintenance of efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers between this island and the mainland of the Dominion, both winter and summer, so as to place the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion; and further, that Her Majesty would be pleased to require that the Government of Canada should compensate the island for the loss whichit is alleged has resulted to its inhabitants by reason of the non-fulfilment of the terms of Confederation in the particulars complained of in the address. I also received your despatch of the 30th of January with the further report of a committee of the Privy Council on the subject of the delegation appointed to support the prayer of the address."

That is the document that I hope the hon. gentleman will bring down; it is not among these papers.

"Since the receipt of these papers I have had the pleasure of receiving Mr. Sullivan, the Premier and Attorney-General, and Mr. Ferguson, the Provincial Secretary of Prince Edward Island, who had been appointed as delegates to Her Majesty's Government, and on the 24th of last month they attended her by appointment, and favored me with a general statement of the circumstances under which the Legislature of Prince Edward Island had addressed the Queen. I explained to them that the Queen had no power either by Statute or otherwise, under the constitution of Canada, to give any directions in this matter, and that, therefore, I should not be able to advise Her Majesty (who had been pleased to receive the address very graciously) to take any action upon it, but that it would give me much satisfaction if, by the exercise of any friendly offices which I could tender, I should be able to contribute to the settlement of a question in which the Provincial Government were so much interested. I added that I had confidence in the kindly spirit in which the matter at issue would be dealt with on both sides, and this led me to hope that some acceptable arrangement might be come to."

Then he goes on to say:

"I then gave the delegates a copy of the report of the Privy Council of Canada, dated the 7th of November last, which they had not previously received."

Now, from that, it appears that the Prince Edward Island Government need not expect to have much assistance from Her Majesty's Government, because it is stated very clearly by Lord Granville that it does not come within his province to compel the Dominion to carry out the terms of the union. This is the proper place to bring up the grievance. This Government have the power to remedy it, and they have not done so. Now, in the year 1883 a commission was appointed by this House to take evidence upon this matter and make a report. Well, that commission made a report, and among other things they reported in favor of improving the service at the Capes by building better boats, stations for observation, a signal service, and boathouses on both sides. Notwithstanding that, and notwithstanding the carrying out of those recommendations, would cost only a few thousand dollars, and notwithstanding the promise made by the Ministry of the day that those recommendations would be carried, 1883, 1884 and 1885 went by, and it was not until members of Parliament were on their way to Ottawa in the middle of winter, with the thermometer nearly 25 degrees below zero, that we found men digging through the ice, trying to make foundations for the boathouses. It was ridiculous, and it was an insult to members that the foundation should be attempted to be laid in the middle of winter and that men should be digging through ice three or four feet deep. The boat-houses are, however, done at last, and some small measure of justice has at length been done to our people. So far as regards that recommendation in regard to boat-houses it is now complied with, and I may say personally that I think they are very nice houses. I crossed this winter much better than for years in this respect; the boats were clean and nice, and so far as I was concerned I had nothing of which to complain in the arrangement. I am aware that some of the members and passengers contend that the charges are too high. I think they are too high. It is well known that some members of Parliament have to carry a large quantity of baggage, for which they are called upon to pay. But that is a small matter, and it can, no doubt, be rectified by the Department without bringing it before the House. Another and the most important recommendation made was that in regard to the steam service to be performed. The House is aware, from the repeated statements made here, that during three or four weeks of every year it is found impossible to carry on steam service. For those three or four weeks we must always, until we build the tunnel or subway, be obliged to cross by open boat service. I am not complaining of the existing service; I am complaining of the improper delay, the inexcusable delay, which has taken place in putting the service in anything like proper order. What has been done in regard to the steam service? Our harbors freeze up some time before Christmas, and just at the very time when our people are anxious to export their produce and take advantage, perhaps, of a rise in the market, the steamboats are stopped, and our people cannot export anything. My colleague has called attention to the condition of the *Northern Light*—it was not intended for a freight boat—and we hoped, and we had a right to indulge in the hope, from the expressions of Ministers, that the Government would put an improved boat on that ser-

vice. What did the committee recommend? It recommended:

"That the service between Georgetown and Pictou, at present performed by the *Northern Light*, be continued, and as the evidence before your committee goes to show that the *Northern Light* is fast becoming unfit for service, we therefore recommend that another suitable steamer be provided to take her place."

Such was the recommendation of the committee,a majority of whom were supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, and it was made after hearing witnesses give their testimony. What have the Government done? They have done nothing. They were aware that the terms of union between Prince Edward Island and Canada have not been kept; that serious grievances were suffered by the people of Prince Edward Island because of the Government's inaction and broken faith; they were aware that public meetings were being held condemning that inaction on the part of the Government; they were aware that the Legislature had petitioned the Queen for redress, that delegates were going home; and still the Government did nothing. When I say they have done nothing, I mean they have done nothing except make promises which they have afterwards broken. When I allege they have made promises which they have afterwards broken, I wish to prove that charge by reference to the records. In 1884 this matter was brought to the attention of the Senate by Hon. Mr. Haythorne in a lengthy and able speech, in which he pressed upon the Government the expediency of making preparations to replace the steamship *Northern Light*. I will not trouble the House with the hon. Senator's remarks, but I will give a quotation from the reply of the leader of the Government in the Senate—the official reply, the reply that was at once telegraphed to Prince Edward Island and published in all the newspapers, the reply that was quoted everywhere as evidence of the Government's intention to do something like justice at last to the island. This is what Hon. Sir Alexander Campbell said:

"The notice that the hon. gentleman from Charlottetown has given is that he will 'call the attention of the Government to the expediency of making timely preparation for replacing the steamship *Northern Light* by a new vessel combining such improvements in design and construction as modern experience dictates.' In reply to the enquiry I may say that the Marine Department has entered into a contract for the building of a wooden screw steamer for lighthouse service in the Maritime Provinces, and it is intended to build this vessel with extra strong timbers, sheath her with green heart, and plate her bows with steel or iron, so as to fit her for ice navigation and assist the *Northern Light* when necessary. She will be ready for service in October next. It is also intended to repair the *Northern Light* thoroughly next season, replacing all defective timbers and plank, and otherwise strengthening the vessel and fitting her thoroughly for winter navigation. There would then be, therefore, for the service of the Government in or near these straits the *Northern Light*, thoroughly restored and strengthened, and this new vessel which is now being constructed, and which is to be finished in October, so that the valuable suggestion of my hon. friend would be acted upon and there would be another vessel there in the event of an accident happening to one of them."

There was the acknowledgment on the part of the leader of the Government in the Upper House that those grievances were well founded, and a solemn promise on his part that they would be removed, for the statement was made by him that a vessel was then in course of building which would be sheathed and prepared in such a way as to be able to assist the *Northern Light* in this winter work, and the expression of the Minister's opinion that the vessel would be ready for service on the following October. We have never heard of this vessel in Prince Edward Island; she has never made or attempted to make a trip in winter; she has never attempted to assist the *Northern Light*. If the Minister of Marine, listened to the telegrams which the hon. member for King's read, he would have found that the necessity of such a vessel being sent to navigate the Straits of Northumberland was acknowledged by the Department of Marine. The Department was telegraphed in January, 1884, that the *Northern Light* was incapable of doing the work, that she was almost worn out; and the fact of the matter was that in the opinion of many skilful men the vessel was so unfit as to be dangerous for the work. What did the Government do? They simply telegraphed to the captain that they would hold him responsible for the safety of the vessel, and they warned him not to run any risk in the matter. The construction put upon that telegram by the captain—and he was correct in drawing that conclusion—was that he must lay up the vessel and not attempt to perform the service. And he did so. On 16th January a telegram was received by the captain as follows:—

"Telegram received urging Department order you run; responsibility is with you; expect you to run no undue risk."

This was from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. What construction could the captain of the *Northern Light* put upon it? He could not avoid running risks when he took his vessel out into the Straits of Northumberland, and forced her through the ice. On 18th January Captain Finlayson received a telegram from the Department of Marine as follows:—

"With knowledge of ice you must be judge, and held responsible for safety of boat; incur no undue risk."

In a letter dated Ottawa, 12th January, 1884, the Deputy Minister of Marine writes Captain Finlayson:

"Referring to my letter to you of the 14th December, 1883, I have again to instruct you to use your own judgment as to when the *Northern Light* should run,and not to be governed by directions from any persons, as the Department will hold you responsible for the safety of the vessel, and you are to incur no risk whereby the safety of the vessel may be endangered by being caught in the ice."

If the captain is to run no risks of having his vessel caught in the ice, he must not go out at all. For what reason was the boat built except to be caught in the ice? Yet this letter is sent by the Department.

Mr. FOSTER. No such instruction was given. The hon. gentleman says the captain was instructed to run no risk. He will find no such instruction there.

Mr. DAVIES. I was reading the official letter itself containing the instructions. It says:

"The Department will hold you responsible for the safety of the vessel, and you are to incur no risk whereby the safety of the vessel may be endangered by being caught in the ice."

Those are not my words, they are the words of the Department. It continues:

"No risk also is to be incurred for the purpose of carrying over any particular passenger or passengers."

What is he there for? How can she go out in the ice in winter, without running some risk? He says you are not to run any risk by going out into the ice, and his construction of the order was that he was not to go out at all, and those conversant with the matter knew why the instructions were sent from the Department; they were aware that at that time the *Northern Light* was not fit to go out, and they left the people of the Island for that season with hardly any means of access. They suffered all the inconvenience and loss arising from the want of a proper boat. And then we have the promise of Sir Alexander Campbell, that a new boat is to be built and is to be ready in October to take the place of the *Northern Light*. I charge that that solemn promise has been broken and violated, that no attempt has been made to keep it; that the *Lansdowne* was not sent there to assist the *Northern Light*,and that the people of the island have been grossly deceived in the matter. I find that Sir Alexander Campbell apologized because his promise was not kept, and said he had done all he could in the matter. Last Session when the promise which I have just read and the fact that his promise had not been carried out, was brought to his notice, he said:

"My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, who introduced this subject to the notice of the House, has, I think, just ground for complaint—ground for complaint,I am sorry to think perhaps against myself, although really, as he has almost admitted, I am not responsible for the non-execution of the measures which, from time to time, I have been authorised by the Government to promise in this House."

The leader of the Government in the Senate was not responsible, and why? He says:

"I made that promise with the authority of the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and, as is my constant practice, the very day the promise was made, I wrote to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that, pursuant to what he had told me, I made the promise, and that I hoped he would keep it in mind. I afterwards called attention to it, and there were reasons which were more or less sound—I can hardly say sound—which made the delay more or less excusable."

That is the answer—the official answer that at this day is given to the people of the island who have been for so many years complaining, and justly complaining, of the bitter injustice they were suffering under, in the want of attention and care which they were led to expect from this Government in carrying out the terms of union. He had made the promise, the promise was not kept, and he excused himself by saying that he had communicated to the head of the Department, who said there were reasons more or less sound—he would not say they were sound—why the promise was not kept. For my own part I expect in future a repetition of the same state of things; I expect no improvement unless the hon. gentleman is brought to a sense of his duty by language a little stronger than that which has been used to-day by my colleague from Queen's. My colleague to some extent palliated his want of diligence by saying that he was engaged in other matters. Sir, what have we to do with that? Surely his Department, which was subdivided only a year or two ago, which is swarming with employees, could find time enough to attend to a matter of this kind—to attend to the solemn promise made with one of the Provinces of the Dominion, that efficient steam communication would be kept up. That excuse will not be accepted as an excuse by me, and I am sure it will not be accepted by the constituency I represent. I complain that in this matter the present Government are doubly responsible—responsible in the sense that before they came into power they acknowledged that this service was inefficient, and in fact they denounced the *Northern Light*, which was almost a new boat, as being unfit for the service, and promised to put on a better boat. They were aware of the complaints of the manner in which that service was carried out; they promised to do better; they were aware of all the facts; they came in and instead of doing better they did worse. They have kept on the same boat year after year, when it was battered and unfit to do the work, and then they notified the captain of the boat that he was not to incur any risks at all. They have deliberately broken the contract with the island, and although I did not approve of the delegates going at the present stage of the case to lay their complaints before the Queen, still I think the people of Prince Edward Island have good cause for resorting to extreme measures in this regard, when at the end of seven or eight years since the *Northern Light* was there, we find that the promise of the leader of the Government that another boat would be sent there, is broken and no attempt is made to carry it out. My colleague from Queen's asks that the *Alert* should be put on. I say it is time another and a better boat should be built for that service. The other boat has done pretty good work, so far as she was able, but the hon. gentleman must see that a boat carrying out the arduous service in which she is engaged, of ramming against heavy masses of ice for seven or eight seasons, must become unfit for the service. I say that from beginning to end of the time this Government have been in power, they have bungled this service badly, and that there is hardly a gleam of light in the whole story from beginning to end. We have year after year made my complaint in this House; the Senators representing the island have done the same thing in the Senate; we have official answers time and again that the matter will be taken into consideration, and it all comes to nothing, and I suppose our debates here will have no effect until and unless an election comes off, and then any number of promises will be made, and official notices sent, and all kinds of inducements held out to the people of the island to lead them to believe that this work will be done. Well, Sir, we must judge the future by the past, and I say the record of the past has been a record of inaction and delay—inexcusable inaction and delay—from beginning to end since this Government came into power.

Mr. HACKETT. I had not intended—as the motion of the hon. member for Queens had reference simply to the orders sent to the captain of the *Northern Light*—to make any remarks on this subject, but as the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has gone into the whole question of the terms of union between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion of Canada, I feel it to be my duty to make a few observations. This question is one of great importance to the people of Prince Edward Island. It is a question with regard to which all party feeling and all party considerations have been sunk by the people of the island. As the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Jenkins) said in his opening remarks, the principal inducement held out to the people of Prince Edward Island at the time of Confederation, was that the Dominion of Canada would keep up continuous steam communication, winter and summer, between the island and the mainland. I will read once more that paragraph of the contract:

"Efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers to be established and maintained between the island and the Dominion winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion."

You will see by that clause of the agreement that the Dominion Government were to place the Island Railway on, at any rate, the same basis as the Intercolonial Railway and other railways of the Dominion, thus providing continuous communication, winter and summer, between the island and the mainland. This offer was made at the time of the Confederation of the original four Provinces. Prince Edward Island was invited to co-operate, and did participate to a certain extent in the discussion at that time. Delegates from the island attended the convention at Quebec, and laid the claims of the island before that convention. Certain offers were made to those delegates; those offers were laid before the people of the island by the delegates, and rejected. The people of the island were at that time in a very prosperous condition. They had the control of their own revenue, they had no deficit, they were carrying on the affairs of the colony with a very small taxation, and they argued in this way: If we throw in our lot with the Dominion of Canada we shall lose our autonomy, and, being part of the Dominion, we shall not be able to have the same voice in the affairs of our country that we have now, and shall not be able to manage our affairs with the same economy that we do now. They therefore rejected the terms offered in 1867. The Dominion afterwards made an offer of very liberal terms. This very agreement that the Dominion would keep up communication, winter and summer, between the island and the mainland was embraced in those terms. The people of the island, although they considered that this offer was very much more favorable to them than the previous one, still rejected it, and although a number of influential gentlemen on the island were at that time advocating union, still the people rejected the offer. However, the seed had been sown, and those gentlemen in favor of union held up to the people of the Province this inducement: They said, We are isolated from the mainland during six months of the year, and we are offered, in these terms, continuous communication, if we become part of the Dominion. That great country will have the means to carry out this part of the contract, which will render great benefit to the people of this Province. After some years the people of the island came

to look at the matter in that light, and in 1873 they accepted the terms in good faith and became part of this Confederation. From that time until 1876 nothing of any great importance was done to carry out the terms of the Union. Of course, during 1874 not much could be expected, as it was the first year the island was in the Union. But in 1875, the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) placed a boat between Pictou and Georgetown for the purpose of carrying out the terms to some extent. That boat was known as the *Alert*. But she was not built for that service, and she proved a complete failure. The people of the island did not expect much at that time, but they were clamoring; and the Government, no doubt urged by the representatives of the Province, purchased the *Northern Light*, which was then on the stocks at Quebec. This boat was not built for navigating the ice in the gulf, but for navigating the lower St. Lawrence. The builder of the vessel, Mr. Sewell, thought he could keep up the navigation, and the boat was purchased for that purpose. That boat has proved, to a certain extent, a failure. She has done the work, to some extent, as the hon. member for Queen's has said, and as the mover of this motion has admitted; but as for completely fulfilling the terms of union, she has not done so, as she was not intended for that service. Mr. Sewell was here in 1879 or 1880, and I had the pleasure of an interview with him. He said that the boat was too light for that service, and he advocated cutting her in two and adding twenty or thirty feet to her. However, his suggestion was not acted upon, and she was sent down to the island, and I cannot say that there was any jobbery or corruption in connection with that boat. She made the attempt to go into the harbor of Charlottetown and she failed, and was laid up for that year. The next year Mr. Sewell went down, and managed to keep up some communication. Now, the mover of this resolution says the boat is not adapted to that service. I can quote very good authority on that subject—Captain Archibald Finlayson, who had been on that boat, and who was examined before the committee referred to by the hon. member for Queen's, as follows:—

"What is your occupation?—I am a master mariner and pilot on the *Northern Light*.
"How long have you been pilot on the *Northern Light*?—Six winters.
"And are you still?—Yes.
"And pilot on the summer boats, too?—Yes.
"How many years have you been pilot?—Sixteen years.
"Sixteen consecutive years?—Yes."

You will agree with me that this is a gentleman whose opinion upon these matters ought to carry great weight. He was asked what was the best model for establishing communication, and he said a Newfoundland steamer.

"Do you think they could be hurried through the ice the same as the *Northern Light*; do you think they would do better than the *Northern Light*, if in a hurry and on the same route?—Yes, if they had power enough; but these Newfoundland boats have not nearly the same power that we have.
"But you think their model is superior to that of the *Northern Light*?—Yes."

Then he was asked if the boat would not do better if managed in the way Captain Sewell expected her to be managed, that is, when she got on the ice, she was to be rolled, so as to break the ice ahead of her. He was asked:

"When we had an interview with Captain Sewell he spoke of (when the vessel got into the ice) of rolling her; were you on board of her when he was there?—No, I was not on her the first winter.
"He tried that, did he not?—Yes, but it would be impossible to keep rolling her.
"That was the idea he had when he got up the model?—I do not know where the poor man got the model."

This pilot of the *Northern Light* had such a poor opinion of her that he did not know where Capt. Sewell got the model. Now, the mover of this motion made reference to the steamer *Alert*. She is a Newfoundland steamer, and she is no doubt a good model for cutting through the ice, but I understand that she has not sufficient power. She has only an engine of 40 or 50 horse-power, which is not sufficient to keep up navigation between the island and the mainland. If the engine and boiler of the *Northern Light* were in the *Alert* she would be able to keep up the service better than the *Northern Light*, but I do not at all advocate the placing of an old vessel like the *Alert* on the service. The *Northern Light* is very much the worse of wear, and in a year or two more will become a complete wreck. Therefore, I think, it becomes the duty of the Government to construct a boat specially for that service, from the experience they now have of the *Northern Light*. We will know what is required, and make such improvements as are necessary in the building of a good boat for the purpose of keeping up communication between the island and the mainland. The committee to which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) referred, and which sat here, in 1883, for the purpose of investigating this matter, made a report containing certain recommendations. The hon. gentleman said no honest attempts had been made to carry out the terms of Confederation with the island. Well, I do not know what he would call an honest attempt, but I think the expenditure of money by the present Government has been in the direction of making an honest attempt to keep up the communication. Let the hon. gentleman look at the report of the committee, and he will find that, after careful examination of all the evidence that could be obtained from men experienced in steam navigation and as captains of ice boats crossing the Straits, the committee reported:

"The evidence of the officers examined is also to the effect that the steamer is not sufficient to overcome the difficulties of the winter navigation, and although they suggest slight improvements on her model which would better fit her for the purposes for which she was intended, still are unanimously of opinion that no steamship can be built capable of keeping up continuous communication in midwinter between the island and the mainland."

Thus, it was the opinion of that committee that no steamer could be constructed which would continuously keep up communication; and this opinion was reached after mature consideration and the examination of witnesses of great experience in these matters. Now, I say the expenditure of this Government has been in the direction of honestly and faithfully carrying out the terms of the union. The hon. gentleman knows that, in 1883, a sum was voted by this Parliament for the purpose of constructing a branch railway connecting the Island Railway with Cape Traverse; he knows that a subsidy was granted to a company for the construction of a railway on the mainland, between Sackville and Cape Tormentine, thus bringing the railways down to the water's edge, and leaving only the straits, a distance of eight miles, to be overcome, and to overcome which an hon. gentleman in another place has matured a scheme, known as the subway or tunnel scheme, which has for object the laying down of a submarine tunnel between the island and the mainland. That tunnel can all the more readily be constructed, now that the railways are down to the water's edge. It will require, of course, an expenditure of a large amount of money, but the people of Prince Edward Island consider, if the building of the tunnel be feasible and practicable—and we have the authority of an engineer of such high standing as the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) that it is, and will not cost the sum of $5,000,000,—the Government should offer subsidies to a company to build the tunnel, or build the tunnel themselves. I say, therefore, that the building of the railways to the water's edge, leaving only the straits to be crossed, has been an expenditure in the right direction, and has shown an honest attempt on the part of the Government to keep faith with the island. But further expenditure has also taken place. The hon. gentleman is so extremely partisan, that, even in discussing a question of

so vast importance to the island as this, he cannot divest himself of his partisanship. If there is any question on which we ought to get rid of our party feelings it is this, for we cannot expect, while we are divided in this way, to accomplish anything of importance. The hon. gentleman said nothing has been done. Why, $130,000 or $140,000 have been expended in building the Cape Traverse Railway. Boathouses have also been built, of which he admitted the great convenience and accommodation afforded by them. He knows further that this last year the Government, acting on the recommendation of the committee in 1883, took that service over. Instead of letting it by contract as formerly, they organised it as a Government service, at the cost of a large addition of public money, but enhancing the value of the service to the people by securing them their mails with much greater readiness. I am astonished that the hon. gentleman will not give credit to the Government for doing that much. The other recommendations made by the committee have been acted upon. In fact, it was only in 1883, after this committee had reported, that any practical results could be accomplished. Before that the people of the island themselves were divided in their opinion. One section desired communication between Georgetown and Pictou, others desired it to start from the Cape, and others from Charlottetown; and in 1882 the hon. gentleman himself declared he had not made up his mind as to which scheme should be adopted. But after the committee of 1883 had reported, the Government acted upon some of their recommendations; as I have already shown. They took over the service, and made a Government service of it; they increased the number of boats and the number of men employed; they built five new boats and placed them on the route; they built boathouses; they provided also rowboats, but these boats did not come up to the expectation of hon. gentlemen who recommended them. The committee, however, arrived at the conclusion that it was impossible to construct any steamer which could keep up continuous communication, so that the Government cannot literally fulfil the terms of the union unless they adopt the scheme so ably advocated by Senator Howland. I may here refer to a matter, which, though only a local one, is considered of great importance to the island, and is at present the subject of correspondence in the newspapers. The gentleman there, who kept up the service between the island and the mainland for the last 30 years, expected he would be placed in charge of the Government service when the Government took it over. He had carried on the service very efficiently. Of course he was a contractor under the Government, and received a certain amount for each trip, but he kept the service up under great difficulties and danger, to the satisfaction of the people, and he thought, being still in the prime of life, active and having experience which no other man in the country could have, he would be placed in charge of that service. But the Government, acting, no doubt, as they thought, wisely, sent down an officer of their own. Last year, a very serious accident occurred at a crossing there, which became the subject of enquiry by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The Department sent down one of their own officers, Captain McElhinney, to enquire closely into the causes of the accident. He examined the parties and reported to the Minister. I do not know whether his reports were confidential or not, but he made certain recommendations, and the Department considered that, as he was down there enquiring into these charges, he was best qualified to organise a Government service. I do not think it was the intention of the Government that he should remain longer than necessary to organise the service. I fully agree with the hon. Minister that it was a proper and businesslike course to adopt to entrust the captain with the organisation of the service, but after the service had been organised and his recommendations carried into effect, it was only right that the gentleman, who for so many years had kept up communication, should be placed in charge of the service. Owing, however, to some lack of discretion on his part, I understand the Minister could not appoint him, and the matter is at present engaging the attention of the people of the island. This service requires great judgment and great experience. It is not an ordinary service; it is an extraordinary service; and no man can undertake to faithfully and efficiently carry it out without great experience in this matter; and although the service has been very efficiently performed this year, and the mails have been carried with greater regularity, still the season has been a very favorable one, and, if any obstacle had been thrown in the way, the service might not have been so efficiently performed, and if any accident had taken place it would have been felt that the gentleman who kept up the service so many years should have been still in charge of it. I trust Mr. Irvine, to whom I allude, will be placed in charge of the service in a short time. There is not a man in the country, from one end to the other, who is better qualified to carry on that service, and he is one of our own people. The man who was there last season is, no doubt, a very good official and a very good man, and he has enforced very good rules there, and the service has been very faithfully carried out, but he is a permanent official here, and I think he is required in the Department, and that he should be kept here, and should allow the service on the island to be taken charge of by gentlemen of greater experience. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) said the island Legislature had passed a resolution stating that, unless the terms of Union were fulfilled, they would dissolve the Union. That is not the fact. The Legislature passed no such resolution. The people of the island and the Legislature are determined to have the terms of Union fulfilled, but they have no desire to dissolve the Union. They are a loyal people. They entered the Union in good faith, and they intend to remain in the Union if they can get fair play, and no man in the island has yet been bold enough to propose to dissolve the Union. They carried their grievance to the foot of the Throne, and they are anxiously waiting to ascertain the results of the delegation to England. The hon. gentleman says it was an ill-advised move. I say it was not an ill-advised move. I do not see that the Legislature could do anything else. They have memorialised the Dominion Government, they have sent their addresses to the Queen, and they felt it to be their duty to proceed to England and lay their grievance at the foot of the Throne; and our only hope is that the intervention of the Imperial Government will be such that their influence with the present Dominion Government, who, as I said before, have been expending money, to some extent, in the right direction there, will cause the terms of Union to be fulfilled between the island and the mainland. The hon. gentleman has referred to a speech made in another place by the leader of the House there. I do not know that the hon. the leader of that House fully considered his statement on that occasion. When he said that the Government had already, as far as they could, kept faith with the island, he made a great mistake. The Government have not fulfilled the terms as far as they possibly could. A great deal more could be done, and I hope that opinion is not entertained by the majority of the members of the Government; because, if it is, and if they believe that faith has been kept with the island, the people of the island know that faith has not been kept with them, and they are agitating for their rights and privileges guaranteed to them at the time of Confederation. Although the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) speaks very lightly of the present Government, I have the fullest confidence that there is no man in the country who has a better intention or desire to carry out the terms of Union

with Prince Edward Island than the right hon. the leader of the present Government. If we are ever to have the terms carried out and the compact kept, we will have to get it from that high statesman who has shown such progressive ideas and wishes to cement this great Confederation from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. FOSTER. I congratulate the hon. member who has just taken his seat on the temperate and reasonable way in which he has discussed this question, which is one of great moment to the people of Prince Edward Island, and to the people of the Dominion as well. I do not think anything is gained, in questions of this kind, by attempting to place them immediately upon a partisan basis. I think, where a Province is interested, as the Province of Prince Edward Island is, in getting a better and an increasingly better communication between it and the mainland, it is one of the questions which may appeal to all the sections of the people of that island and may be discussed and settled on non-partisan basis. It is in that spirit, I think, that my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Hackett) and my hon. friend from Queen's by his side (Mr. Jenkins) have approached this subject, and I am sure that what they have said will not prejudice their cause with the Government or the House or the people of the island who look to them to further their interest in this matter. I want to disclaim the idea that my hon friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) wished to make prominent, that I desired to prevent him from discussing this question. I did not. I do not think it would be in keeping to restrain this discussion in its breadth, but my impression was that there was a motion on the Order paper which would have brought up the whole question. I find, on looking over the paper, that it is not there, and I suppose it was swept off with other undebated motions a day or two ago. It was in connection with that that I said it would be better to discuss this question by itself, and to take the other discussion when the main motion came up. It was not that I did not wish to have a full and free discussion of the matter. My hon. friend, in the first place, committed himself to a rather untenable position. He condemned this Government for not keeping faith with Prince Edward Island, in not keeping up a continuous communication between the mainland and the island; and a few moments afterwards he said that, in his opinion, it was impossible to keep up that continuous communication, that there must be a period of a number of weeks in the winter season when it would be altogether impossible to keep up an efficient steam communication between the island and the mainland, so that this acknowledged impossibility precludes complaint on the part of the hon. member. I commend that opinion of his to the people of Prince Edward Island, as stating at the outset of this discussion that he believes that the demand the people of the island have sent up that there should be continuous steam communication, is an impossibility. I think he is not quite right in saying that this Government have done nothing, that they have practically, from 1878 to 1886, taken no honest step, made no honest endeavor to bring the people of the island closer to the people of the mainland by greater facility of communication. I do not think the hon. gentleman would say that in private conversation, or in a reasonable discussion between man and man, because it is not true. I ask whether this grievance did not exist from 1873 to 1878, when the hon. gentleman's party was in power, and I ask what steps were taken to mitigate the difficulty of communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland between 1873 and 1878?

Mr. DAVIES. Do you wish me to answer?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not say that no steps were taken, I say, on the contrary, that some steps were taken, but I say that the whole drift of the hon. gentleman's speeches goes to show that no sufficient steps were taken by that Government from 1873 to 1878, for up to to-day he declares that the communication is not at all satisfactory, that faith has not been kept, that promises have been broken, and that the condition of things is not at all what it should be, when it is 50 per cent. better now than it was at any time during the period from 1873 to 1878. It is impossible to forget the geographical difficulties, and with all deference to the opinion of the hon. member for Queen's, in my eye, I believe that the vast majority of those who, in the committee moved by himself, gave their testimony stated that it was impossible to carry on continuous and efficient steam communication for mails, passengers and freight, between the mainland and the island, during the whole of every winter season. I think the committee's report goes to show that, and I think that opinion is based fairly well upon the evidence taken. So that if between 1873 and 1878 so little has been done, and between 1878 and 1886 much more, although as contended not yet enough, has been done to bring this communication to a proper basis, it shows, not that there has been a lack of energy or of honesty on the part of either Government, but it shows that the difficulties to be overcome were very serious, that they called for a great deal of observation, that they called for tentative steps to be taken, which could not be unduly hastened and completed at once, and which, in the very nature of things, could only be gradually accomplished. This gradual accomplishment, I think, this Government has been, and is to-day, performing, and is honestly endeavoring to solve the problem of communication between the island and the mainland. Sir, in the extension of the Prince Edward Island Railway which was built by this Government, and for which a large sum of money was spent to accommodate the Prince Edward Island side, in the subsidy which was given for a railway from the main line of the Intercolonial Railway up to Cape Tormentine, for which a large sum of money was voted, in all these expenditures what has been accomplished? This has been done, that the several and necessary steps to as complete a fulfilment as can be had of satisfactory communication between the island and the mainland, have been accomplished, so that only the final steps remain to be taken towards getting as good a communication in that line as we can possibly have. For when you have a railway running through Prince Edward Island and bringing you down to Cape Tormentine, when you have boathouses built there, when you have the narrowest line of winter communication between that and the mainland, when there you are able immediately to take train on a railway subsidised and built by the Dominion Government, and which puts you into communication with the railway system of the whole continent, I say a great deal has been done to bring affairs to a state and condition where the final step, whatever it may be, can more easily and more satisfactorily be taken. Now, one word with reference to the ice-boat accommodation. The committee, which was formed, I think, in 1883, reported in that year, and said that certain things could be done and certain things could not be done. One thing that could not be done was to keep up efficient and continuous steam communication between the mainland and the island by the way of Pictou and Georgetown or Charlottetown and Souris. That was the conclusion, I think, the committee came to, and it was based upon good evidence. Necessarily, therefore, there must be an interregnum of a greater or lesser extent in the communication on that line in the winter season. The committee also came to the conclusion upon the evidence that a good deal might be done to make better winter communication between the capes, and they recommended that certain things be done, that lighthouses be built, that better boats be made, that this service be taken under charge of the Government. Athough they took time to do it, yet it has been done, and now my hon.

friend grumbles after it is done, while he ought to have done all his grumbling before that was done; but he grumbles every year. He is a most unreasonable man in that respect, because after the thing has been done, and done to his satisfaction, and he pays a tribute to the good way in which it has been done, he still gets up and delivers himself of the chronic grumbling that is pent up in his bosom, and which he seems unhappy not to get rid of.

Mr. DAVIES. There are 100,000 people grumbling.

Mr. FOSTER. But he should now make a very graceful acknowledgment that at last a good thing had been done, and that he was happy to compliment the Government upon it. Now, some of the evidence given in that report goes to show that something more may be done to make communication between the capes more satisfactory and more safe, by putting a steam vessel, of a certain size and power, on the route between the capes. However, that is a debatable point. My hon. friend immediately shakes his head. He does not believe that it can be improved. My hon. friend in another section of this House would say that he thought it could be done, and that this communication might be much improved in that way. When doctors disagree; when men who are nearly interested in the matter disagree; when men coming from the very Province where this is of vital interest disagree, it shows that there is difficulty, and that this difficulty is not, as my hon. friend said, altogether the fault of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and of the Government, as he stated a little while ago. Now, with reference to the *Northern Light* and the *Alert* my hon. friend condemned me for not having listened to the junior member for Queen's and put on the *Alert*, and yet I think the hon. member said that he did not believe the *Alert* was a vessel that could do the work of going through the ice. If he did not, certainly other gentlemen from Prince Edward Island did.

Mr. DAVIES. I did not make a statement on the subject, because I have not a sufficient knowledge of the *Alert* to form an opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. Some other hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island did, which goes again to show there is a difference of opinion about the matter. Now, I did not put on the *Alert*, nor did my predecessor in this office put on the *Alert*, simply because he came to the conclusion that she did not possess the power necessary to make her way through the hard ice during the winter between these two points. The junior member for Queen's has made a suggestion that during this summer the Government should take this whole matter into consideration to see whether the *Alert*, if provided with larger engines and made more powerful, would be able to carry out what he believes is feasible, or, at least, make the attempt to ascertain whether a vessel on her model, but with greater power, could keep up continuous communication between these two points. That suggestion is worthy of consideration, and I shall have great pleasure in giving to it all the consideration it deserves, and if anything can be done to make that communication between Georgetown, Charlottetown and Souris on that side, and Pictou on the mainland, better, and shorten the period of the interregnum, I shall gladly do my best to have that thing done. Whatever is best to be done, and can be done with fair and reasonable cost, in order to put the people of the island more nearly on a footing with the people on the mainland, it is the object of this Government to do, and it is the object of the Department over which I now preside, to try to accomplish. Now, I do not think my hon. friend (Mr Davies) was quite wise in bringing up that old threat of a dissolution, in case such and such a thing were not done. I do not believe that the common sense and honest hearts of the people of Prince Edward Island have ever yet made such a manifesto, or will ever so raise the question of a dissolution.

Mr. DAVIES. I rise to a point of order. I think the hon. gentleman is under a misapprehension as to what I said. I never intimated as my opinion that the people of Prince Edward Island should seek a dissolution of the Union. On the contrary, I said that the Conservative Government had passed a memorial through the Legislature asking that unless the terms of Union were carried out the Union should be dissolved, and they had sent some delegates to England to further the prayer of the memorial, but I thought they had taken an improper course.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman's argument, if it had any point, was intended to raise the threat of dissolving the Union in order to bring greater attention of the Government to this question of better communication between the mainland and the island. I say that I do not think the people of Prince Edward Island believe in that method. I believe they have a fair sense of the difficulties of the position in which, geographically, they are placed, and if they see this Government doing in the future as it has done in the past, its best, within any reasonable expense, to solve that question, the people will remain loyal to the Confederation and will be satisfied with any earnest and honest attempt to solve this important question. I have nothing more to say upon this subject except with regard to the reading by the hon. member for King's of certain paragraphs from newspapers. I did not quite hear what they were; but I think they were criticisms upon the delays which occurred during this winter. Of course, newspapers do much criticism: sometimes they are right and once in a while it does happen they are wrong, and I think it is better to judge by the reports of responsible officers, who are competent to judge of the facts, than by newspaper criticisms. The delay this winter was not due to a defective boiler, it was not due to defective machinery, it was simply due to the geographical position of the island and to the ice which forms there whether we make laws for it or against it. The vessel did the best she could. The hon. gentleman made a point of the instructions which were sent by the Department to the captain of the *Northern Light*. Those instructions were wired; and I call attention to this, that the captain was not instructed to incur no risk, but he was instructed to incur no undue risk, and I hold the Department would not have been justified in ordering an experienced captain, with an experienced engineer, who were on the spot, and who knew the state of the ice and the danger of navigating through it, to make trips one day or the other, or at any time. If a captain is placed in charge of a vessel he is a competent man. If he is a competent man and upon the spot he knows well what the circumstances are, and when he receives orders to make trips on every possible occasion without running undue risk he receives as stringent an order as I think any Department is justified in giving to a captain. I believe the captain and his engineer have this year, as in previous years, taken the same course, made their trips when it was possible to do so with anything like safety, and avoided running risks which would only have made the problem of communication more difficult and not have benefited the people of the island. It must always be borne in mind that the terms of Confederation between the older part of the Dominion and Prince Edward Island did not take in the question of freight. What was covered was simply the question of mail and passenger communication. The hon. gentleman complained that the boat is not sufficiently large for freight. That complaint is one that is made, I know; but when the hon. gentleman rests his case upon the terms of Union that complaint is not admissible, for the terms of Union do not touch the question of freight. I hope this matter will be settled so that more efficient communication, not only for mails and passengers but freight may be secured to the people of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. BLAKE. This discussion is somewhat amusing to hon. members who like myself recollect the denunciations which were poured upon the hon. gentleman with whom I was intimately associated when sitting on the other side of the House, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) and the late member for Westmoreland, formerly Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as to the *Northern Light*. I remember very well the forcible manner in which the late Mr. J. C. Pope, then sitting for one of the island constituencies, inveighed against the Government for their conduct in regard to the construction and working of that vessel. And when I saw him very shortly afterwards, a Session afterwards, accede to the position of Minister of Marine in a powerful Government with ample resources and a great majority, I certainly supposed that before now some steps would have been taken to remove the defects which he declared existed in that vessel. The language which he used was, as we all recollect, strong. He declared in the spring of 1878:

"She was a boat which from her model was never suited at all for such a purpose; he said so last winter and he repeated it now, and the experience they had, he thought, had proved it."

He, however, was frank enough to say that he did not blame the Government because the boat was not a success; but a little afterwards he said:

"While he did not find fault with the Government for the description of boat that was built, there was a great deal of fault to be found with them for accepting a boat in such a condition. She had powerful engines, but so far as the boat herself went, he never saw in all his experience—and he had been shipbuilding for twenty-five or thirty years—so great a fraud imposed upon any people."

She was then, I think, in her second season. That was in 1878. Hon. gentlemen opposite came into power in the fall of 1878. The winter of 1878-79 passed, and that of 1879-80, and so on until now, and it is the same boat with which the Government have been attempting to perform the service. There is one thing very clear, which is, that a boat performing a service so arduous as that the *Northern Light* is called upon to perform was not at all likely to improve by time, and if she was a fraud upon the people when first constructed she was now little likely to be a very satisfactory boat. But somehow or other the groans and maledictions poured out from these benches upon the late Government with respect to the *Northern Light* died out altogether when the utterers of those groans and maledictions, just before the elections of 1878, had succeeded, I daresay by the utterance of those groans and maledictions in part, in obtaining their accession to office and that power which a confiding people supposed they would use in order to remove the causes of those groans and maledictions. We find that, instead of improved steam service, there is the same old boat to-day. I do not think I could have a better proof of one of two propositions: either that the hon. gentlemen who did so villify the late Government, villified it undeservedly; or, if they villified it deservedly, they have themselves been neglectful of their duty. One thing or the other, either this villification was deserved or it was not, either the denunciation of the *Northern Light* was deserved or not. If it was undeserved, it was an unworthy act to so represent the *Northern Light*. If it was deserved, an unworthy course of conduct has been pursued in the Government not having removed the cause during the years they have been in power. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries commenced his observations by paying a high compliment to the hon. gentlemen who think and vote with him, for the mode in which they have conducted the discussion on this question. He said he thought it was a question which ought to be discussed on a non-partisan basis, that all sections of the community were interested in this work. I should like to know whether all sections of the community are not interested in all questions that are discussed here. All sections of the island are interested in all island questions that are discussed here, so far as I can judge. It is seldom you have a question in which only one section of the community is interested, in the sense referred to by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He said it should be discussed in the non-partisan spirit in which the hon. gentlemen have discussed it—in that temperate spirit, that spirit of conciliation, in that spirit which he was kind and condescending enough to assure them, from his long official experience in his present exalted position, would not injure their cause. I am sure they must have been glad to know that they spoke humbly enough, spoke with bated breath enough, not to incur the anger of the hon. gentleman, and thereby injure the cause of the island and the cause of their constituents. I am sure they will be encouraged to pursue the same humble, deferential, and moderate tone in future and will take care to say nothing which will arouse the mighty wrath of the hon. Minister of Marine and thus induce him to say: I refuse justice to your people, because, forsooth, you offend the dignity of a Minister. But while hon. gentlemen had these tones for the hon. gentleman who announced that the Government of the island had done its full duty and taken its proper course in appealing to the Imperial Government for redress in this matter, in giving up the hope that hon. gentlemen on the other side would render justice to the island, in declaring that the time had come when appeals could no longer usefully and profitably be made to them, after the declaration that they could no longer hope to settle within the limits of Canada itself, this contention between one of the Provinces and the Dominion, as to the fulfilment of the fundamental terms upon which that Province became incorporated with the Dominion, after declaring that the hour and the day of petition, of memorial, of remonstrance, of exhortation, had ended at last, and that, sympathisers though they were in politics with hon. gentlemen opposite, supporting and sustaining them, they no longer ought to have delayed to carry across the water the question of the grievance, and it was their duty to do that which they did do—to go abroad. In fact the hon. gentlemen said their only hope was the intervention of the Imperial Government; he—even he, devoted follower as he is of hon. gentlemen opposite—even he, with that unbounded confidence which he to-day declared he had in hon. gentlemen opposite, said—I took down his words—that the only hope they had was the intervention of the Imperial Government, the paramount authority. I say while we see the hon. Minister of Marine had for such language as that, delivered by his follower, nothing but words of commendation, he came down upon my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) with language of severe denunciation because my hon. friend, he said, had talked in a spirit of the dissolution of the Union; my hon. friend from Queen's, who declared that it was premature to have gone to the Imperial Government at all; my hon. friend from Queen's, who declared that the Conservative Government of the island ought not to have taken the step which the hon. gentleman believes is the only hope of redress; my hon. friend from Queen's who did not despair as yet, although he has no confidence in gentlemen opposite, of justice being done within the walls of this Parliament, and even under their auspices, to the island—my hon. friend from Queen's is denounced as proposing a dissolution of the Union, while the hon. gentleman is commended because he said it was the right thing to appeal to England and it was the only hope for them. This is a specimen of the language addressed, a specimen of the equal and even justice which the hon. gentleman, who sometimes appears rather to assume the *rôle* of an expounder of the high moralities, exhibits in his treatment of this question.

Mr. MITCHELL. There has been a good deal of politics imported into this discussion, and as the leader of the Inde-

pendent party in this House, I feel it to be a duty I owe to myself and to the country to make a few observations from a dispassionate standpoint.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! Oh!

Mr. MITCHELL. Hon. gentlemen say "oh," but I am serious about that. There is now great difficulty about this question of winter navigation; everybody who has had anything to do with it—and perhaps I have had as much practical experience, in my own person, of winter navigation as most men here—everybody admits that it is one of the very greatest difficulties that we have not yet been able to solve, in connection with winter communication with the island. Now, Sir, I am not going to attempt to condemn either the past or the present Government for what they have tried to do in connection with carrying out the spirit of the agreement which was made with Prince Edward Island. But, Sir, there is one thing I want to put my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett) right about. When he was recapitulating the circumstances in connection with the admission of Prince Edward Island into the Union, he spoke of the first efforts to bring in the island and he said, mentioning a later period, that again Canada came to woo Prince Edward Island. I wish to tell my hon. friend that Canada did not then come to woo Prince Edward Island, but on that occasion Prince Edward Island came to woo Canada. After the Quebec conference, Prince Edward Island went back and refused to come into the Union; she went her own way. Canada united in the Confederation; she went on and prospered, developing the railways and developing the commerce of that Union, notwithstanding her enormous debts, and notwithstanding the stress of affairs which she experienced, Canada developed her resources, and an amount of prosperity and success after Confederation was carried out, which is a credit to the men who carried it out. Prince Edward Island came and wooed Canada on that occasion; when she became involved in debt, resulting from the construction of the railway, when she saw embarrassment ahead, then she came and wooed Canada for the purpose of getting into the Union. I refer to this matter for the purpose of putting my hon. friend right in relation to an historical fact. That, however, has nothing to do with the matter before us. We agreed and entered into a solemn engagement to place upon that line of communication a steam service, and that has not been done. The first effort that was made to do it was putting on the *Northern Light*. The *Northern Light* was built by a man of one idea, who imagined he could keep open winter communication for commercial purposes down the St. Lawrence. Sir, the thing was practically impossible; it was a commercial impossibility—just as utterly impossible, in my opinion, as the navigation of the Hudson Bay is, which we hear so much talk about. It is impossible to keep up continuous communication with the mainland. We entered into an agreement—and I am thus far in accord with the Minister of Marine—an agreement which it is practically almost impossible to carry out; but, Sir, if we cannot keep to the letter of that agreement, we ought to keep to the spirit of it. Have we done that? Canada has failed in carrying out what she undertook; she has failed in endeavoring to carry it out; she has not made the effort. The *Northern Light* was put on, and she was a failure—she was a make-shift from the start. Every person who had experience in nautical affairs knew that the vessel must prove a failure. If the first year did not satisfy them, the second ought to have convinced them that she was a failure. Did the Government of the hon. member for East York make any further efforts? No, Sir, they were satisfied with what they had done. But some eight years have passed away since that time, and what has this Government done towards remedying the difficulty? I am not going to assert that the Government have done nothing at all. The hon. Minister of Marine says they have done a great deal. He says they have established railway communication with Cape Tormentine. What did they do that for? To give the county of Westmoreland her share in railway expenditure, in order to develop that rich and fertile county. They simply did what they had a right to do, even if no engagement to keep up communication between the island and the mainland had been made. The hon. Minister said the Government had built railways in Prince Edward Island; and I believe they did build a connection from the main line to this point, or at least a vote was taken for it. But is that carrying out the spirit of the agreement? The question is, what was done to carry out the spirit, and if possible, the letter of the engagement made between Canada and Prince Edward Island? I will not say that the Government have done nothing. But I will say they have done next to nothing. They have taken no steps to establish steam communication, except by means of a useless vessel like the *Northern Light*, which has proved a failure from the start. I speak from a non-party standpoint, and I say that Prince Edward Island has claims on the Government of Canada which we are bound to recognise. We entered into an agreement which it is impossible literally to carry out, but I believe partially it is possible to carry it out; and if, during one month of the year, it is impossible to have communication, though it can be had during the other eleven months, it is the duty of the Government of the day, no matter what party is in power, to make an effort to keep up that communication. But we have seen no effort made by the Government in power to carry out the spirit, much less the letter, of the agreement. There are no better means of communication to-day between the island and the mainland than there were 40 years ago; there is a little better accommodation in the boat-houses, perhaps, but Prince Edward Island has a right to expect something more than that. That is not what we agreed to do when they entered into the Union. Something has been said of the *Alert*. I have not seen her, and I do not know whether she is fitted for the special duty there required of her or not; but hon. gentlemen are quite right in saying that with the small steam power she possesses, it would be utterly useless to put on a vessel of that class for the performance of a duty in which she must prove to be a failure. What ought to be done is this: There is a solemn agreement; let the Government take the matter into consideration and get the best opinion they can, not the opinion of a deputy, but the opinion of a scientific man on the subject; let them secure the best advice they can obtain, and make a legitimate effort to carry out the arrangement; let them put a sum of money in the Estimates of this year with the view of carrying it out at once. It is not Prince Edward Island alone that is concerned in this transaction, the honor of Canada is concerned in it. It is a disgrace to Canada, that one Province of this Dominion should be approaching the Throne in order to lay such a paltry matter before it; and the sooner the Government of Canada makes arrangements to carry out its solemn engagment the better. That is all I have to say on that matter. I pass from that to say this. As far as I can judge, the moment any question comes up which has any relation to past years, and it is found that the Government or a Department has neglected some duty, the answer is: Look what you did five or six years ago, and we have not done much worse. If that is to be considered a sufficient answer when any Minister or Department is charged with having neglected public duty, if that is to be considered a logical reason to be presented in Parliament and to be accepted by an intelligent body like this, then all I have to say is that parliamentary represention has deteriorated and is likely to prove a failure. Sir, this brings it home to me that the condition of things in this Parliament is not sound. I cannot but feel that representative institutions in this country are not proving to be the success they ought to be.

We have not in this Parliament that independence on the part of the members that we ought to have—that freedom from party thralls—that determination to vote on questions irrespective of what suits the interests of the particular party that is in or the leaders of the party who are out; and unless we adopt a different course, and hon. gentlemen on either side vote according to their convictions on questions that arise, then I say that Parliamentary Government in a great country like ours will prove in the end a failure, and result as it is to-day in being the Government of one man. I regret to say this, and the only remedy I can see for it is that hon. gentlemen should consider this matter. It is not long before we shall have a general election; some say it will be this year; I do not believe it myself, but it is not an improbable event; and it is time for this House to consider—the followers of the Government on the one hand, and the hon. gentlemen in Opposition on the other—whether, when they go to their constituents, they will come back again hide-bound to vote for the conclusions that their leaders may adopt irrespective of their own convictions. I take this opportunity of stating my views on this point, and I hope they will be considered by the hon. members of this House, as they certainly will be by the country.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman says there has been no improvement made in the means of communication within the last forty years. I admit that looking back fifty years, there was no improvement in crossing from Prince Edward Island to the mainland in winter up to 1873. There was nothing but the boat service. There was no improvement nor hardly any attempt at improvement of that communication for forty or fifty years as I am informed by the records which I have examined. After the union with Prince Edward Island, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), then leading the Government, entered into a contract with a Mr. King for the winter service, in order to carry out the terms of the Union. That lasted for two years, but the means employed by Mr. King proved insufficient, and the hon. member for East York took other steps. He contracted with a Mr. Sewell, of Quebec, for the construction of a winter boat. Mr. Sewell had given a great deal of study to the navigation of the St. Lawrence in winter, and had prepared a model and plan of a winter steamer. He came to the Premier with his model and plan; they were submitted to scientific men acquainted with the service, who approved them, and a contract was entered into with Mr. Sewell for the construction of the *Northern Light*. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), says that great complaints were made by the press of the island when that boat entered on the service, as being a fraud on the Government. If the hon. gentleman will look at the account for repairs and additions to the *Northern Light*, he will see that she was very imperfectly constructed, and cost the late Government, in the first year or two, very large sums to supply what should have been furnished by the contractor. From $5,000 to $7,000 were expended in completing the engines, and very large expenditure was made to render her at all efficient. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says that a year or two ago she was inefficient and unseaworthy, but since then she has been taken out, examined and repaired, at an expense from $20,000 to $30,000, and the inspector declared she was then better than when she first entered the service, having been greatly strengthened in all respects. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), asked what is the difference between the present year and the past forty years. I say that before Confederation the island was shut off for five or six months in the year from all communication with the mainland. The committee in 1883 reported that the average term in which there had not been steam communication had been reduced to forty-eight days. That is, we have brought down the period of interruption from five or six months to fifty days, and the same committee reported, after examining men who had lived all their lives on the shores of the gulf, and had been engaged in crossing in the boat service every year, that the construction of a boat to navigate uninterruptedly the straits the season through was an impossibility, and the hon. member for Northumberland is of the same opinion. Then the attention of the Government was turned to other methods of communication. One of the great complaints of the people of the island was that they had to travel in open sleighs to and from the capes, and that was considered worse than crossing the ice. The Government, on the report of the committee, and from the experience of the *Northern Light*, considering it as impossible to construct a ship to cross the straits at all seasons, turned their attention to improvements in other respects. They expended large sums in constructing a branch line of railway from the mainland to Cape Traverse and in constructing a wharf at Cape Traverse, and asked Parliament last year to appropriate $130,000 to construct a pier at Cape Tormentine, and voted $3,200 per mile to subsidise a railway from the Intercolonial Railway to Cape Tormentine, so that the Government has not been neglectful in improving the means of communication for the people of Prince Edward Island. When all these plans will be carried out, there will be no reasonable ground for complaint on the part of the people.

Motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 68) to incorporate the Brockville and New York Bridge Company.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Bill (No. 2) to amend the Criminal Law, and to declare it a misdemeanor to leave unguarded and exposed holes cut in the ice on any navigable or frequented waters.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 112) to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Western Canada Loan and Savings Company, and to authorise the said company to issue debenture stock.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 113) to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Freehold Loan and Savings Company, and to authorise the said company to issue debenture stock.—(Mr. Beaty.)

THE MONTREAL BOARD OF TRADE.

Mr. CURRAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 90) to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Montreal Board of Trade.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I made a remark to the hon. gentleman about this Bill, and particularly section 15 of it, which, I think, ought to be discussed in committee.

Mr. CURRAN. This Bill is merely a consolidation of the powers now possessed by two different bodies, that is, the Board of Trade and the Corn Exchange of Montreal. They desire to be incorporated together, so far as possible. The clause to which the Minister of Public Works refers, clause 15 of this present Bill, is a *verbatim* transcript of a similar clause to be found in the charter of the Montreal

Corn Exchange. No new powers are asked for by this Bill. I am satisfied that this Parliament will not be disposed to take away powers they have already granted.

Mr. BOWELL. I fancy that the best time to discuss that will be when the Bill comes before the committee. The clause to which the hon. gentleman refers is certainly a most extraordinary one. It gives the Corn Exchange as they exist to-day, full power to control the Customs officials and collectors of some half a dozen different places, not only in Montreal but along the frontier, powers which I think should not be given to anyone outside the Government. I must confess I was surprised in reading that clause. I could not believe that this power was given in any existing law. If it is, it is time, either that the law should be modified, or the power taken away from the Corn Exchange.

Mr. CURRAN. I would refer the Minister of Customs to 26 Victoria, chapter 21, section 8.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not doubt what you say.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT, 1879.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 8) to to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Mr. MULOCK. I would move that the following clause be inserted:—

The Minister of Railways, as regards any Government railway and every railway company subject to the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, or to which "The Consolidated Railway Act, 1879," applies, shall repay to any ticket-holder the cost of his ticket, if unused, in whole or in part, less the ordinary and regular fare for the distance for which such ticket has been used; and such re-payment shall be made at any station or office of the railway or company, between and including the points covered by the ticket; and the sale by any person of the unused portion of any ticket otherwise than by the presentation of the same for redemption as provided for in this section, shall be deemed to be a violation of the provisions of this Act, and shall be punished as hereinbefore provided: Provided always, that the claim for such redemption be made within thirty days from the expiration of the time for which the ticket was issued, in accordance with the conditions thereon.

So far the proposed amendment is simply the section which was adopted in the Act of 1882, and the only change is the following addition:—

And provided further, that any railway company liable to redeem any such ticket and which shall refuse to redeem the same when so presented, shall forfeit to the holder thereof a sum equal to ten times the amount payable for its redemption, and the same shall be recoverable at the suit of the holder against such company in any court of competent jurisdiction.

The committee will remember that the House, I think it was in 1882, but I was not present at the time—had under consideration the question of dealing with what was called ticket-scalping, and there was an arrangement come to here by common consent, I believe, between the railway companies on the one hand and the public on the other, providing for the redemption of unused tickets for through trips or return trips, and that provision was in the words set forth in the section I have read, but it did not provide for any way of compelling the company to repay the money except by the ordinary course of law. Now, the railway companies have not honestly lived up to that section, and instead of redeeming unused tickets they have embarrassed the holders of these tickets in so many ways that that portion of the section which was intended to be a benefit to the public has become a dead letter. You can easily see, Mr. Chairman, that if a small amount only is owing to the passenger, say a dollar, and that dollar is not paid to him in the form and manner required by this section, the party so entitled practically loses that claim. The House in 1882 required the company to repay that amount at any station, either at the beginning or the end of the journey, or any station between those points. Now, the companies evade that law by refusing to redeem the tickets when presented, and in every way endeavor to embarrass the holders of such tickets. I have had personal knowledge of the fact, so I speak of something of which I know. I have also received communications, since I introduced this Bill, from parties referring to the practices on several of the leading railways of Canada, which show the necessity for some provision of this kind. If the railway company is simply liable to pay a few shillings or dollars, as the case may be, which it should pay to redeem the ticket, only after an action at law, you can easily see that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the public would abandon their claim to the unearned money rather than enter into an action with the railway company, and therefore I submit that this section ought to be made part of the railway law.

Mr. POPE. I hope my hon. friend will not push this amendment. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), had two Bills before the House, and he consented to those Bills being withdrawn, for the reason that we promised on the part of the Government that a commission should be appointed to enquire into this whole matter. I would ask my hon. friend to allow this Bill also to go before that commission, and when the whole matter of the Consolidated Railway Act is considered, this amendment will be considered with the others.

Mr. MULOCK. I feel that a request coming from the Minister of Railways is to me, in most cases, a command, and whilst I wish therefore to recognise his authority and display a proper spirit of—shall I say—humility towards him, yet, in this case, I must express my opinion that there is nothing in this little innocent clause to refer to a commission. I admit, with regard to some of the provisions of the Bill I have introduced, that it would be a very proper matter to refer them to the commission he refers to; but if he is prepared to meet me in the same spirit in which I am prepared to meet him, I would suggest that the remaining nine clauses of my Bill be referred to the commission, if he will only allow this one clause to be added to the Bill now before the committee. I think that is a fair offer. I am sure the Minister will see that the assistance of a commission is not required to enable the House to decide how to carry out the law which it enacted in 1882. It is not necessary to refer to a commission to decide what the House should do in regard to the redemption of unearned tickets. The House appointed a committee to sit on this matter, and that committee arrived at a conclusion which became the law of the land. That law is now being defeated every day by the action of the railway companies, and this clause simply provides machinery for carrying out that law. I am willing that the rest of the Bill should go to the commission the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. POPE. I do not think my hon. friend is meeting me half way. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) withdrew two Bills with the view of their being sent to the commission, which will consider the whole question. One very objectionable feature of this amendment is this:

And such repayment shall be made at any station or office of the railway or company, between and including the points covered by the ticket.

You would have no means of knowing whether the party got the money or not, or whether the company had paid it or not.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the present law. I am not changing the present law. The clause only says that in case the company does not comply with the law of 1882, it shall forfeit more than the mere unearned money.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the hon. Minister of Railways has misunderstood the object of my hon. friend's clause. It is a repetition of a clause in our present law, with this addition, which I think we all accede to, that if the railway companies do not redeem the ticket there will be a penalty imposed on them, which will make it in the interest of the railway company to obey the law. There is no object in postponing the enactment of this amendment, therefore, I hope the Minister of Railways will consent to its being made a part of the Bill I have introduced.

Mr. POPE. If I saw that there was any necessity for it I would consent; but I think the provisions of the present Act are all that are necessary. I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw it.

Mr. MULOCK. I will not withdraw that clause, because I submit, with all respect, that no reason has been assigned why I should do so. The Minister of Railways says he does not know of any reason for this amendment. I do know of such reasons. I have a letter in my desk at the present moment from a prominent gentleman, stating what his experience has been on one of the largest lines of Canada; and if the hon. gentleman was accustomed occasionally to buy tickets and not use them, he would recognise the necessity of such pressure as this being put on the railway companies to compel them to carry out the spirit of the law.

Amendment negatived; Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE LAW OF EVIDENCE.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 3) for the further amendment of the Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I think it is hardly worth while for me to take up the time of the House in explaining the nature of this Bill, which has been before the House this Session. This Bill has been printed since the third or fourth day of the Session, and I am sure every member who takes any interest in the business of the House has made himself perfectly familiar with it. In general, the object of the Bill is to enable persons who have doubts to affirm instead of taking the oath when called on to give evidence. We have in Ontario a law exactly similar to this with respect to civil cases. And in England the law embodied in this Bill has been in force in criminal cases for a number of years, and has been found to work well; and according to the doctorine which was laid down in the House a few evenings ago, that when laws have been adopted in England and have been found to work successfully there, we cannot do better than act on the example of the Mother Country, I cannot understand why there should be any objection to this Bill. I believe that if a man goes into the witness box for the purpose of giving evidence, he will tell the truth; at all events, unless evidence can be brought to show that his reputation for veracity is such that he is not to be believed, his evidence should be taken.

House divided.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fleming,	Orton,
Allison,	Forbes,	Paint,
Armstrong,	Foster,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Pruyn,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Glen,	Ray,
Baker (Victoria),	Guay,	Reid,
Barker,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Barnard,	Harley,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Beaty,	Hay,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bell,	Hickey,	Scriver,
Blake,	Homer,	Shanly,
Burpee,	Innes,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jackson,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kaulbach,	Sproule,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Stairs,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd)	Kirk,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Kranz,	Temple,
Cockburn,	Landerkin,	Thompson,
Colby,	Lister,	Townshend,
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Trow,
Davies,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Tyrwhitt,
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wallace (Albert),
Dundas,	McCarthy,	Weldon,
Edgar,	McCraney,	White (Cardwell),
Fairbank,	McMullen,	White (Hastings),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Mills,	Wilson,
Ferguson (Welland),	Mulock,	Woodworth.—86.
Fisher,	O'Brien,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Cuthbert,	Jamieson,
Auger,	Dawson,	Landry (Kent),
Bain (Soulanges),	Desaulniers (St. Maurice)	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Béchard,	Desjardins,	Lesage,
Benoit,	Dugas,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Bergeron,	Dupont,	McIntyre,
Bergin,	Farrow,	McLelan,
Billy,	Fortin,	Massue,
Blondeau,	Gault,	Mitchell,
Bourassa,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Bowell,	Girouard,	Pinsonneault,
Cameron (Victoria),	Gordon,	Pope,
Carling,	Grandbois,	Riopel,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Guillet,	Shakespeare,
Casgrain,	Hackett,	Tupper,
Cimon,	Hesson,	Vail,
Coursol,	Ives,	Wood (Brockville)—52.
Curran,		

Bill read the second time.

CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT, 1879.

On the order for second reading of Bill (No. 4) to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and the amendments thereto (Mr. Mulock).

Mr. POPE. I would ask my hon. friend to allow these amendments to be referred to the commission and to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. MULOCK. I agree to the request of the hon. gentleman.

Order discharged, and Bill withdrawn.

THE ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT.

Mr. MULOCK moved second reading of Bill (No. 19) to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act. He said: The House will remember that last Session an Act was passed, intituled: The Animal Contagious Diseases Act. That Act was passed rather hastily, after very little discussion, and it is not, therefore, unreasonable to find it is wanting in some respects. Turn to section 13, and you will find there evidences of hasty legislation. It is the only section which provides for compensating the owners of cattle for animals slaughtered in the public interest. This section provides a scheme of compensation, subject to some very onerous conditions, which, if not complied with, may prevent the owners of cattle destroyed under the Act from recovering any compensation whatever. In the interests of cattle owners and of the country generally it is advisable that this class of property should be better protected than it is. It is extremely discouraging to the farming community that we should allow to remain on the Statute-book a moment longer than is necessary, a clause which endangers the right of this kind of property. This section does endanger those rights. My Bill does not in the

slightest degree, by word or inference, seek to vary the Act of 1885 in any respect, except in regard to the system of compensation. It does not seek to limit the powers of the Government to stamp out and destroy disease by the most severe measures when they deem it advisable to do so, but it simply provides for a just scheme of compensation, in case the Government see fit to exercise the powers vested in them by that Act. The section which my Bill seeks to repeal and for which it seeks to substitute another, purports, under certain conditions, to offer compensation to the owners of cattle slaughtered under the direction of the Government, but the rights of those owners are entirely in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture or his servants, and are dependent also upon many matters which should not affect them. Section 13 reads as follows:—"The Governor in Council may, when the owners of cattle are reported by the Minister of Agriculture, not guilty of any negligence or offence against the provisions of the preceding sections of the Act, order compensation"; and then it goes on to give the scale of compensation. It does not appear to me just that the owners of cattle so slaughtered should not have their right to compensation, if they have not been guilty of any offence in respect of the animals slaughtered; and therefore my Bill seeks to place those owners in that regard, in the position I have indicated. In so doing, I have simply followed the language of the Imperial Act on this question. In regard to the scale of compensation, I may say, if we look to the Imperial Act, and it is the custom in this House to look to Imperial Acts for precedents, we find that the Act 41-42 Victoria, chapter 74, being "The Contagious Diseases' Act," which has been in force in England for many years, deals with this question and provides a scheme of compensation. It is the custom in this House to deny legislation at times, unless an English precedent can be found, and I ask hon. gentlemen, therefore, to apply that principle to my Bill, and, if I can show precedents in the English Statutes for this Bill, I ask that it should receive the favorable consideration of the House. In the English Act, to which I have referred, it is provided that the Government may destroy cattle that are suffering from rinderpest, and in that case the owner is entitled to receive one-half of the value of the slaughtered beast before it was affected, provided that the total compensation does not exceed £20. In case the animal was affected with pleuro-pneumonia, the owner is entitled to three-fourths of its value before it was so affected, so that the compensation does not exceed £30. In all other cases where animals have been slaughtered under the Act I have cited, the owners are entitled to compensation to the extent of not more than £40 sterling for each head. Thus you will see that in England the amount of compensation is made to depend upon the nature of the disease which the animal has, whilst, under the Canadian Act which I am seeking to amend, the nature of the disease is not taken into consideration at all, and it is sufficient to justify the Government in slaughtering an animal if it has any kind of infectious or contagious disease, whether of a severe nature, a dangerous character, or otherwise. We all know that there are animal diseases which are both contagious and infectious, and are yet not dangerous. Still, if an animal so affected should be destroyed under the Act of 1885, the owner is only entitled to one-third of the value, not exceeding in the whole $20. The Canadian Act further provides in its 13th section, for which I am seeking to substitute the sections which I propose, that, in all other cases —that means in every case where one of our domestic animals is slaughtered which is not at the time diseased, but which may be in a perfect state of health, but still is destroyed by the Government, purporting to so destroy it under the provisions of the Act in question—the total amount of compensation the owner can recover is two-thirds of the value of the animal, but not exceeding in all $40. I submit that, whatever may be the position of an owner of an animal which is diseased when it is slaughtered, there can be no justification or excuse for the Government to destroy animals which are in a state of health without affording the fullest compensation to the owners of those animals. Perhaps it may be argued that $40 is a full compensation for all possible damage that could occur under this Act. I submit that it is not. It is only necessary for me to point out some of the directions in which our agriculturists are moving now in order to show that $40 is not a reasonable compensation to the owner of these animals. Throughout the whole of Ontario, and I hope in the other Provinces, a large number of farmers are devoting year by year more attention to the breeding of cattle. It has been recognised of late years that it is necessary to go more into the breeding of cattle, and we find farmers every year going more into the business of fattening cattle, apart from breeding thoroughbreds; and, if one could make a visit to the barnyards of the ordinary farmer of Ontario to-day—and I trust it is the same in other Provinces—I am sure thousands of animals would be found tied up that have been stall-fed through the winter, and that are now worth on an average $70 or $80 a head. It is nothing exceptional for an ordinary grade animal to weigh 1,500 lbs. or thereabouts, and we know that, even under the depreciated value of live stock to-day, such an animal would be worth from $75 to $80. The Minister of Agriculture could now, under the existing law, sweep away that property, and the total amount of compensation allowed to the owner would be at the outside $40 a head for the mistake which might be made. There has been presented to the House in support of this Bill a petition from the Agricultural and Arts Association of Ontario, which, as far as I know, was the unanimous petition of the board. There has also been a petition from the Shorthorn Breeders Association of Ontario; and I will read to the House a letter I have received from a firm of shippers dealing with this matter:

"TORONTO, 16th March, 1886.

"DEAR SIR,—We take the liberty of writing you in regard to your Bill to amend the Animal Contagious Disease Act passed last Session, and beg to express our earnest wish that your Bill may become law, as the Bill of last Session is quite inadequate to cover anything like a reasonable compensation to those whose animals might be slaughtered under the said Act, as disease may get into any man's herd of cattle without it being any fault of his, therefore it would be really too bad that his stock would have to be slaughtered for the benefit of the public in general without fairly compensating him for the same. As a man may have all that he is worth invested in cattle and other stock, and by misfortune they may become diseased, and only getting one-third of the value, therefore it would simply mean ruin to him financially.

"Yours, etc.,
"THOMPSON, FLANAGAN, BLONG & AIKINS,
"Live Stock Exporters and Cattle Feeders."

"P.S.—We are feeding at present 2,064 cattle in one place, and shipped last year over $1,000,000 worth of stock to Great Britain.
"T., F., B. & A."

I submit that, if the figures mentioned in my Bill do not meet with the approval of the House, I will at all events be excused for having followed the English precedent in that regard. I intended to follow exactly the scale of compensation set forth in the English Act, leaving it to the House, when in committee, to alter the Bill; but, by some mistake, I find that, in sub section *a*, $50 has been substituted for the Canadian equivalent for £20 sterling. With that exception, and the further exception that I have inserted a compensation clause for thoroughbreds, the scale of compensation is the same as in the Imperial Act. I do not expect, nor will I urge when in committee, if we get that far, the adoption of these figures, but will be quite satisfied to have a committee to consider what would be a reasonable compensation, and I am sure in that case we will have no difficulty in amending the section in the public interests.

Mr. ORTON. I am quite in sympathy with the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in bringing this question

before the House, though I believe that, as an actual fact, the Government have not found it necessary to slaughter any animals yet. But the day may come at any time when contagious diseases may prevail to such an extent in Canada as to render it absolutely necessary for the Government to kill and destroy a large number of animals, many of whom, perhaps, may not be diseased at all. According to the law as it now stands, I think if any farmer or any owner of animals neglects to report even the most trifling contagious disease among them, he could not recover anything, even ten years afterwards, and he would have no claim against the Government for the loss of any animals they might have to destroy. There are to-day in Canada animals of very great value. In my county of Wellington the farmers have paid a great deal of attention to raising first-class stock, which is very valuable indeed, and it certainly would be a great hardship, in case a contagious disease broke out amongst them, and it became necessary to destroy a number of animals, if the Government did not remunerate those farmers who had sustained the loss, where there had been no neglect according to the the spirit of the law, though there might be according to the letter. I think there is no doubt that the law in that case requires amendment, and I trust the House will back up the efforts of the hon. member.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In connection with this Bill I wish to bring a point to the notice of the Minister of Agriculture, so that if the present Act is defective in granting adequate compensation for the destruction of valuable animals, it may be remedied. I may illustrate by stating that in my own county, though not in my own riding, there was a severe outbreak of hog cholera. It came to my notice, and I at once reminded the gentleman that we had passed a very stringent Act requiring that as soon as any infectious disease broke out among animals, the owner should notify the Minister of Agriculture. I asked this gentleman to do so, and he did at once inform the Government. The disease spread very fast among his own herd of hogs, and there was danger of its spreading elsewhere. He took all the steps required under the Act to prevent the spreading of the disease. A local veterinary surgeon was called in—I do not know whether he was a Government official or not—and the disease was clearly manifested. It was known to be contagious and fatal, and seemed to require the slaughter of the hogs. Well, the hogs were slaughtered; I think, speaking from memory, that something like sixty hogs were slaughtered, a very valuable lot; yet this was done without the officer of the Department having ordered the killing of the hogs. If I remember rightly the officer did not reach the scene of the inspection until some weeks, perhaps, certainly some days, after notice had been sent to the Department of Agriculture. But it was clearly evident that it would not do to keep the hogs in that state, and they were slaughtered in the public interest. Now, I want the Minister to consider this fact. I am not blaming the Minister. The question is under adjudication now, and I believe the Minister is desirous of doing what is just in the matter and I trust that, under the Act, even as it stands, he may see his way clear, within the spirit of the Act to grant compensation in that case. But if the Act is deficient in that respect, it seems to me that a person acting in good faith, taking all the steps that are required, giving instant notice, and who is willing to sacrifice his property in that way, as he must do, even under the law of compensation that is provided in the Act, there should be no difficulty about his recovering the compensation that the Act intended he should have. When Parliament agreed to this Act it was considered a very stringent measure, but the House, I think, were unanimously of opinion that it was a wise step on the part of the Minister of Agriculture to introduce a Bill of this kind, because, as he pointed out, and as the House very rightly recognised, our cattle industry is such an important one that anything that would endanger it in the slightest decree would almost be a national calamity. But if we are to have an Act in which the Minister himself will not be able to allow compensation, except in very rare cases, then it seems to me we have frustrated our first intention. I believe the intention of this Act was in good faith, that if a person found a disease breaking out amongst his hogs or cattle, and if he immediately communicated the fact to the Government, not trying to hide it, and if these hogs and cattle were slaughtered for the benefit of the community, then compensation should be given to him, and that should be done without waiting for an order from the Government officer to slaughter them, except he should come upon the scene within a very short time after notice had been given. If the notice is given to the Department, and the officer does not put in an appearance for two or three weeks, then there must be action taken, and if the action is taken in the interests of the community, it seems to me there ought to be power given to the Minister, upon being satisfied that the cattle were not slaughtered by the direct order of the inspector, he not having arrived in time, to give some compensation for the loss of the animals. That is a point I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister. The mover of the Bill does not seem to have recognised that difficulty—perhaps no case has arisen in his own part of the county. His Bill deals more particularly with what he deems fairer and larger compensation for the animals. But I am pointing out a practical difficulty that exists in many cases where animals are slaughtered in the public interests. If it be true that in such a case as I have pointed out there is no power to grant compensation, I think the law should be remedied. I feared from some remarks I heard, that there was a difficulty in that respect, and the Bill being before us now I have taken this opportunity of making these remarks that I would have preferred to defer until the Minister had decided whether he had power in the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. While I think the Bill introduced by the Minister of Agriculture last year hardly went far enough, I think this one goes a little too far, while one did not allow compensation enough for animals killed, I think this allows too much compensation. In this amendment there appears to be only provision made for two classes of disease, rinderpest and pleuro-pneumonia. It provides a specific amount for animals affected by those diseases that are killed. Then it includes all other kinds of diseases in one class, and goes on to say that in every other case compensation shall be made on the value of the animal immediately before it was slaughtered, but the compensation shall not in any case exceed $200. If those were the only prevailing diseases to which animals were liable, then I could understand why they were classed together and the balance of the diseases were put in one class. But there are other diseases equally contagious and infectious and as common and as dangerous and injurious and as likely to spread. In what class would the hon. gentleman put glanders, one of the most dangerous diseases in the country?

Mr. MULOCK. That is not a cattle disease, and this amendment only deals with cattle.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know what the interpretation of the word cattle in this Bill is.

Mr. MULOCK. The amendment is limited to cattle.

Mr. SPROULE. If that is so why should the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) introduce hogs.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Because they come under this class.

Mr. SPROULE. There are many other diseases to which cattle are liable. I believe when animals are killed they are killed for the safety of the community, and in no case should the allowance be made specific in this Bill, notwithstanding the fact that we are following a precedent established in the Mother Country. If an animal is affected it cannot be worth its original value, because even if it should be likely to recover, there are uncertainties about that matter, and there is danger not only in regard to the spreading of the disease but in regard to the death of the animal itself. It is, therefore, unreasonable either to ask or expect that the value of the animals should be paid in the event in question. If the Bill is allowed to pass it should be very much amended and a great reduction in compensation made, because we have not so many valuable animals here as in England. Therefore the argument does not apply with such force as it does in England. Another reason why it is much more important for us to see that diseased cattle are slaughtered, is from the cattle trade we have with the Mother Country. It is the more necessary because England can schedule our cattle, whereas the same principle would not apply in England. Again, in regard to the price of cattle, the price being lower in this country, the average price paid should likewise be lower. For the general good of the community a reasonable sum should be paid, but no more than half the value of the animal, and in special cases where the animals are held at high figures some specific sum should be settled, much lower than what is proposed, which the Department should be compelled to pay.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The interest affected by this Bill is so very large that it becomes a matter of vast interest to all those who represent agricultural constituencies. We have in this country a very large and flourishing interest, a very large number of cattle, sheep and pigs, and since farming has not been paying as well of late years as it formerly did the attention of the farming community has been directed to the improvement of stock and to increasing the number of the animals raised. The idea contained in this Bill is that the public interest is paramount, that when it becomes necessary in the public interest to slaughter cattle to prevent the spread of a contagious disease, compensation should be awarded. We see this principle carried out in various ways. When it became necessary in the public interest to construct railways the right of way is purchased and fair compensation is awarded to the owners of the line through which the road will run. That is the principle which is obvious and admitted. When animals are affected by disease their recovery is not always doubtful, they may recover and be of their full value. But I do not see why only one-third of the value of those animals should be paid by the country. If it is in the public interest that the disease should be stamped out and animals be slaughtered which might probably recover, then there should be full compensation. The Bill of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) provides that the compensation shall be larger. It is but an extension of the principle admitted in the construction of railways, where the people who sell their land to the railway company are entitled to its full value. When we have admitted that principle I do not see how you can apply an opposite principle to the farming community. It is not fair, when a farmer is obliged to slaughter an animal affected with the diseases mentioned in the Bill, that only one-third of the value of such animal should be paid, and that it should not exceed $20. There are many farmers who have cattle worth $50 or $60. If they become affected by any disease mentioned in the Bill they will have to be slaughtered under its provisions, and yet they would only receive $20, and this slaughtering has been done in the public interest. In the other cases two-thirds of the value will be allowed, but in no case shall it exceed $40. The present Bill proposes its extension to the neighborhood of $150. There are many of our farmers who have thoroughbred cattle which they have imported for the purpose of improving the breed, and which had been purchased at very high prices, and if they became affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and it became necessary, in the public interest, that they should be slaughtered, it would be pretty hard towards any of those farmers to inform him that the amount of compensation obtainable was $40. Why should the public be asked to pay less than the value of the animal, if it is slaughtered in the general interest? Why should they be asked to pay less than any individual would be obliged to pay in a like case? The probabilities are that if the animal is diseased it will recover, and the only reason why it is slaughtered, is for the purpose of preventing the extension of the disease. Now, this Bill is evidently a step in the right direction, and conceiving it to be such, I heartily support it. I believe it is but doing justice to the farming community of this country, who are largely interested in stock raising, that they should receive a fairer compensation in such cases than they have under the present law. I think the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), is deserving of the thanks of the farming community in this country, and the thanks of this House, for having brought the matter so prominently before the House, and I hope the Bill will receive favorable consideration at the hands of the House.

Mr. McCARTHY. There are two points in which it seems to me this Bill differs from the law as it stands. One is certainly a most important matter and well deserving of the consideration of the House. As the law stands if any person has the misfortune to have his cattle slaughtered under the provisions of the law, and if at any time he has been an offender against the provisions of the Act, although not in reference to the particular animal slaughtered, he is not entitled to compensation. I certainly quite agree with the principle of this Bill, which applies that restriction to their right to get compensation to the particular transaction in which it arises. The other matter in which I think this proposed measure is an improvement upon the existing law, is this: Where the animal is diseased and on account of that the animal is slaughtered, it is proper to say, I think, that the owners should not get full compensation. But if the animal is not diseased, and if the animal is slaughtered merely by reason of the other provisions of the Act, which entitles the Government to destroy it because it might possibly have been in contact with an animal which is diseased, the destruction of the animal being considered to be in the public interest, the owner should receive compensation. These are two matters in which I shink this Bill differs from the existing law. The other matters are matters of detail which can be dealt with, as I understand the mover asks they should be dealt with, in committee. I have much pleasure in saying that I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). I do not profess to have any practical knowledge of the subject with which the Bill professes to deal, but I think it is worthy the attention of the House to consider, at this stage, whether a change like this should be made in such an Act, involving very considerable additions to the expenditure in carrying out the law, if the Act is to receive any extensive operation at all. I understand that up to the present time, with the exception of some cattle which were killed in the Province of Nova Scotia, no case has occurred in which the Act has had to be put in force. Not a single case has occurred of an animal having been slaughtered under its provisions, and, therefore, I think it is somewhat premature to undertake to amend the provisions of the Act. If, however, the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill, being, of course,

a great deal better informed practically on the subject than I am, anticipates that the Act is likely to receive an extensive operation, then it becomes a matter of considerable importance how we shall increase the expenditure which the Act involves. Now, there is an Act somewhat in the same line in the Province of Ontario—to prevent the spread of contagious diseases amongst animals, and providing for the destruction of diseased animals—and animals suspected of disease. That Statute makes no provision, I understand, for compensation.

Mr. MULOCK. Do you refer to the Act respecting glanders?

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). I refer to the Act of 1884.

Mr. MULOCK. Dealing with glanders, an incurable disease, which is a different matter.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). I would also point out that the English Act does not go as far as this. The hon. gentleman proposes with respect to one class of cattle to allow the compensation to go as high as $300, whilst the highest compensation allowed in England is $200.

Mr. McCARTHY. He says that may be altered in committee, and he does not adhere to that amount.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). I think there is some misapprehension as to another point which has been mentioned by the member for Wellington (Mr. Orton) and the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and that is the apprehension that the right to compensation is forfeited if there has been at any time, and in relation to any other matter, an offence against the provisions of the Act. I do not think that is a reasonable construction of the Act. The provisions with respect to compensation are contained under the heading "Slaughtering diseased cattle." The 12th section makes provision to the effect that the Governor in Council may from time to time cause to be slaughtered animals suffering from infectious or contagious diseases, or animals which have been in contact with, or in close proximity to, a diseased or suspected animal, and the next section, which is the one that the hon. gentleman proposes to amend, is that which provides for compensation for the loss caused by the operation of the 12th section, and makes the compensation, it is true, dependent on the owner not having been guilty of an offence against the preceding sections. I should suppose that a reasonable construction would be that the offence was only to deprive the owner of compensation provided it were in connection with the subject matter with which those two sections are dealing. The hon. gentleman proposes another change which seems to me to involve a principle likewise. Instead of providing "that the Governor in Council may, &c.," when the owners are reported by the Minister of Agriculture not guilty of any negligence or offence, he proposes to reverse that provision by making this proviso:

> Provided always that such compensation may be withheld in whole or in part where the owner or the person having charge of the animal has, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, been guilty.

In other words, instead of requiring that in the first instance, the Minister shall report that the owner has not been guilty, he proposes to constitute the Government in Counil, in point of fact, a court for the purpose of trying the case and deciding that the owner has been guilty before compensation is to be withheld. It is perhaps not a very important distinction, but it is one involving some inconvenience in putting the burden of proof on the other party.

Mr. MULOCK. Where should the burden of proof be?

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). I think it should be on the claimant, for the purpose of satisfying the Minister, if I am right in my idea that the offence is intended to be one in connection with the same transaction out of which the loss arises. It would then be for the owner to convince the Minister or his officer that the offence had not been committed, though that would not be the case it it referred to a previous transaction. It does strike me that so extensive an alteration should be made unless some urgent necessity exists for it, and that necessity does not exist, if I am correctly informed, that the Act is not likely to be used.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot at all agree with the views of the Minister. It is possible that his observations may properly apply to some of the details. For example: There may be a question as to what the precise amount of the compensation should be. But the hon. Minister takes two grounds. He says, first of all, that he thinks the Bill is premature, because no cattle have been slaughtered yet, except in one instance, and that we ought to wait until the injustice is done, and an inadequate compensation is paid, before we pass the Act; and when the grievance is established, this House will legislate for the future, and provide the just compensation. Then, he says, if the law is going to be broken, we must consider a good deal about this, because it will be extremely expensive. It would be premature to act before the Statute comes into operation; and after it does come into operation we had better not act, because it will cost us some money.

Mr. THOMPSON (Antigonish). I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said it was going to be extensively used, and if it is, it is going to be used just where it will be required. The hon. gentleman must remember that this is not an old Statute. It was introduced, I think, last Session or the Session before. We had it under debate last Session, and a great many of us thought the hon. gentleman's provisions for compensation were inadequate. I thought so then, and I think so still. If it is intended to remedy an injustice which is likely to arise, it is better to provide against it than to wait until an injustice has resulted from neglect. If it is going to be an expensive thing in the public interest to give this protection to the cattle owners, we had better know it; but we must not allow an injustice to be done simply because it is going to be expensive to prevent it, which is practically the second argument of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken about this being a new Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I know there is the old law.

Mr. POPE. It is the same law except in one or two particulars. Last year $150 was allowed as compensation for thoroughbred cattle. We raised the amount I think at the suggestion of the hon. member for Huron. I think I remember something of the case mentioned by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). I do not remember what action was taken; but in my opinion it is clearly the intention of the Act that, when a man acts in good faith and does everything he can, and notifies the Department, he ought to come under the law. But with respect to the argument of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), I think it has something to do with this matter whether we have ever been called on to put the law into practice. So far as Ontario is concerned, this law, with very few exceptions, has been on the Statute-book for eight or ten years, and never during that time have we been called on to slaughter one animal. There never has been a complaint made to the Department since that law was enacted that the price paid by the Department was not sufficient. Where we did put the law into operation, and where there was a necessity to do so, was in the Province of Nova Scotia, in Pictou, where we purchased, I think, 300 or 400 head of cattle. There the law was carried out exactly, and no complaint was made by the people affected by it.

In fact, they looked upon it as a God send that we should send there and attempt to mitigate the disease. The Bill in one section provides that where the animal was affected with rinderpest, the compensation shall be $50, and in the very next section we find that in the case of an animal afflicted with pleuro-pneumonia, the compensation shall be $150. Now, I would like to know the reason for this difference.

Mr. MULOCK. I must refer the hon. gentleman to the Imperial House for the information; but I presume the reason is that rinderpest is a more dangerous and incurable disease than pleuro-pneumonia. At all events, the animal is not considered to have the same commercial value in one case as in the other. In the Imperial Statute a similar distinction is made. It is suggested that probably the chances of recovery from rinderpest are less than from pleuro-pneumonia.

Mr. POPE. There is no disease more destructive or supposed to be more incurable in the United States or England than pleuro-pneumonia, and I am sure my hon. friend will find that he has made a mistake in that.

Mr. MULOCK. It is in the English Statute.

Mr. POPE. It may be, but is an animal that dies with one disease worth more than an animal that dies with another? As a general rule, animals are more valuable in England than they are here, and in fixing the amount of compensation last year I took into consideration the difference between the value of an animal in this country and its value in England, and made the price about equal relatively to that in England; and the reason I objected to this Bill was that last year we consolidated and amended the Act. We put this $150 for thoroughbred cattle where it was only $40 or $50 before, and with respect to the other payments they are exactly the same. My object was to bring it all under one Act, because the penalties were not included in that Act in such a way that they could be easily collected. When I found horses should be put very high, I had them struck out of the Act altogether, excepting those brought into the country, that might be quarantined or where disease broke out among them while quarantined; otherwise horses do not come in at all. I have always had a little doubt, and that is the reason why I have been careful in the working of the Act, whether this Act properly belonged to this or the Local Legislature. There is only one reason why it can be introduced here, and that is because it relates to public health. When I found that Ontario and Manitoba had made provisions for cattle disease in their parts of the country, I hoped, and still hope that all the Provinces would do likewise; because an Act can be worked so much easier by the Provinces, except in the case of the importation of animals. Any law affecting that must be passed by this Legislature, or any law affecting the carrying of animals from one Province to another. I believe the provisions under this Act are quite sufficient to meet the exigencies of the case.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When the Bill was before the Houee a year ago, there was a very lengthy debate on the subject, as many of us felt that it did not deal in a fair and proper manner with certain classes of the community. In looking over the Bill before the House, I must say that, so far as subsections *a* and *b* are concerned, I would not mind if they were struck out altogether. As regards the cases affected by these clauses, the Bill of last year is amply sufficient. When an animal is taken with a contagious disease, which, in the end, must prove fatal, that is one of those contingencies which the owners of animals, in common with other classes of the community, are subject to, and it seems to me arbitrary to make the public bear the whole or a large part of the loss. It would be almost as reasonable that the country should be taxed to pay the loss of the farmer from storms and floods, &c. I have no objections to the Act of 1885, so far as that is concerned. It is provided in that Act that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, cause to be slaughtered animals suffering from infectious or contagious diseases, and then it provides compensation, if the owner of the animal was not guilty of any negligence or offence against the provisions of the preceding sections of the Act, to the extent of one-third the value of the animal before it became so affected, but not to exceed $20. That is amply sufficient, unless it should be a contagious disease that in the end is not death—a disease from which the animal would recover without any great loss. Section 12 further provides that the Governor in Council may order the slaughter of any animal that has been in contact with a diseased animal, and not only in contact but in close proximity thereto, or that is suspected of having been in proximity to any animal affected by contagious disease. That is an intolerable hardship. Take the case where one man has a spite against another, and we know very often strong feeling exists between men known as cattle-breeders. If one choose to say: "I know that animal has been in proximity to a suspected animal," he can take steps to have it slaughtered. Again, it is provided that in every other case the compensation shall be two-thirds the value of the animal, but shall not in any case for grade cattle exceed $40, and that as regards highly bred cattle it shall be two-thirds of the value, but not to exceed $150. There is where the hardship comes in. We know that the cattle raising industry of the country is large and is every year growing; we know that the animals exported from this country to Great Britain bring an enormous revenue to the country, and everything that can be done reasonably should be done to foster that industry. I need not tell hon. gentlemen acquainted with the subject that it has been found by experience that the only way in which you can keep up the standard of these animals for exportation, is by using first class thoroughbred male sires. It seems also that to keep up the breed frequent importations are necessary. I think, if you allow the Bill to go before the committee, and amend it, there is no need for throwing it out. Sub-section *c* should be retained.

"In every other case the compensation shall be the value of the animal immediately before it is slaughtered, but so that the compensation shall not, in any case, exceed two hundred dollars, except in the case of thoroughbred pedigree animals, in which case it shall not exceed three hundred dollars."

I think that is reasonable. We have many men in the west who have gone into the business of raising thoroughbred stock, and it is too bad that, because a man may suspect that an animal has been in proximity to a diseased animal, that animal should be slaughtered without adequate compensation, and the sum of $300 is not at all an excessive compensation.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Whatever may be the individual view of members of the House respecting the amount of compensation to be awarded to parties whose stock may be troubled with these infectious diseases, I think it is patent on the face of that, whether this is a matter that belongs to health regulations or not, and whether it should be relegated to the Provinces or not, when we look at the shipping trade of the Dominion, it will strike every member as being one of those questions respecting which it is exceedingly desirable that the Dominion Government should have some regulations. The farmers of Ontario, and in the near future the farmers of our great western prairies, will be very largely interested in the regulations affecting the shipping of cattle at the various points along the seaboard which are in other Provinces and entirely beyond the reach of those Provinces where the greatest values are invested in stock. I think there would be danger if this matter were relegated to the Provinces, that, where the stock business was not

of such importance as in those Provinces to which I refer, but through which the stock finds its way to the ocean, the duty might be neglected of keeping a clear access to the British stock market without the embargoes which have been placed on other countries. For that reason, if for no other, I think it is extremely desirable that legislation of this class should exist on the Dominion Statute-book. If it were considered desirable that the Provinces should take the administration of this matter in their own hands, there should at least be a general supervision on the part of the Minister of Agriculture, to see that these provisions are not neglected at points through which our stock reaches the ocean in order to connect with Great Britain. I think the Minister of Railways said that, under the operation of this Act, the farmers of Ontario had not been called upon to pay anything. That is a fact upon which the Ontario farmers may congratulate themselves, but we are not absolutely free from the risk of these contagious diseases among farm stock, and it will be in the recollection of very many of the western members that last fall we had a very severe attack of hog cholera in two or three townships of the county of Essex, which in some places decimated the hog stock of the farmers to a serious extent. I do not know whether the aid of the Dominion Government was invoked in this matter, but I know, as far as the Provincial Government was concerned, that an expert was sent out to those municipalities to look into the difficulty, and as far as possible restrict it. On that occasion, there was a heavy loss to the farmers throughout those townships, and what was their difficulty last season may before very long apply generally to other farmers in the matter of cattle and other stock. I think it is desirable that our regulations should not in any way be relaxed in reference to the protection of the general farmer from the spread of these diseases. I cannot quite agree with the opinion of the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), when he says that the farmer is not entitled to be paid an appreciable proportion of the value, where an animal is diseased and suffers. I would remind hon. gentlemen that, if you place the compensation too low, there is a tendency on the part of the farmer who may be first visited with the disease to conceal the difficulty, and his neighbors may suffer before they are aware that there is such a disease in the neighborhood. Where hog cholera and pleuro-pneumonia and similar diseases break out, the passage of the animals along the public highway may leave such traces of the disease behind them, that other healthy stock, perhaps drinking from the same water or travelling over the same road, make take the disease, and those innocent farmers in the vicinity are thus led into difficulty and loss through the carelessness of perhaps one farmer who does not appreciate the difficulty he is causing to his neighbors. Farmers in that respect are no better than the rest of the community. There are found among them, I am sorry to say, men who are intensely selfish as far as the public interest is concerned. Though I have no desire to see the compensation fixed so high as to make it an inducement for a man to apply for compensation for the loss of his stock, because I believe a farmer ought to run risks such as merchants and others take in their business, yet when you take into account the danger of spreading the disease in that neighborhood, I think the compensation should not be placed at too low a figure. While we have not had the difficulty in Ontario yet, and while I hope it will be far in the future, and indeed that we may never have to apply to the Dominion Treasury for any compensation for the loss of cattle from contagious diseases, yet it must not be forgotten that there is a fair medium in this as in other things, and, when we are placing a Statute on the Statute-book, it is desirable to get it as just and equitable as possible. I am therefore disposed to support some modifications of the Bill of last Session, especially when they are guarded as they are here by leaving a large discretionary power with the Governor in Council or the Minister of Agriculture, if that is thought more desirable, to refuse compensation where it is clearly traceable to a man's own negligence in this matter. I think it is wise for the House to consider whether the compensation may not be fairly somewhat increased.

Mr. THOMPSON. After consultation with the introducer of the Bill, and finding that he has consented to some modifications of it, I have no objection to the second reading.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think the House should understand whether the Government are going over to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), or the member for North York is going over to the Government, for we have had two occasions on which these two gentlemen have arrived at this sort of agreement.

Mr. BLAKE. A little of both.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. the mover of the Bill will explain in committee what the amendments are.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, or some other legal gentleman, to point out whether the Act, as it stands, is lame in the particular that I have mentioned. If so, it seems to me that it will not be remedied here. I would like to have that point understood.

Mr. THOMPSON. It seems to me that the Act, as it stands, gives ample power to the Governor in Council to provide for the inspection of cattle, and to cover cases like the one the hon. gentleman mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. It is proposed to amend section 1 by making it read as follows: –

Section 13 of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, passed in the Session held in the 48th and 49th years of Her Majesty's reign, is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

The Governor in Council may order a compensation to be paid to the owners of animals slaughtered under the provision of this Act; and whenever the animal slaughtered was affected by infectious or contagious diseases, the compensation shall be one-third of the value of the animal before it became so affected, but shall not in any such case exceed twenty dollars; in every other case the compensation shall be three fourths of the value of the animal, but shall not in any case of grade animals exceed fifty dollars; and in any case of thoroughbred pedigree animals two-thirds of the value of the animal, not to exceed one hundred and fifty dollars; and in all such cases the value of the animal shall be determined by the Minister of Agriculture or by some person appointed by him: Provided always, that such compensation may be withheld, in whole or in part, where the owner or the person having charge of the animal has, in the opinion of the Minister of Agriculture, been guilty, in relation of the animal, of an offence against this Act, or where the animal, being a foreign one, was, in his judgment, diseased at the time of entering Canada.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In the event of the animal slaughtered having been infected with a contagious disease that was probably curable, would the owner then only be entitled to $20 it it was slaughtered in order to prevent the spread of the disease, and done at the outbreak of the epidemic? I think that is not right.

Mr. MULOCK. It is not likely the officer would slaughter an animal unless the disease was incurable, in which case, perhaps, $20 might be all, or more than, it was worth.

Mr. McNEILL. In case of an animal slaughtered because it has, for instance, the mange, the owner ought to receive more compensation than the owner of an animal that is slaughtered because it is infected with rinderpest, which is incurable. I think the Act which was introduced a few minutes ago was very rightly framed in that respect, drawing a distinction between different kinds of infectious

diseases, some of which are much more likely to be cured than others. It seems clear that an animal infected with a curable disease is more valuable than an animal infected with an incurable disease; and if an animal infected with a curable disease is slaughtered, I think the owner ought to have more compensation than the owner of an animal which is infected with an incurable disease.

Mr. POPE. This Act is not supposed to apply to animals except those that are suffering from what are considered incurable diseases.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). An animal may have what is known an incurable disease and yet that disease may be cured; but the animal will transmit that disease to other animals. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has stated that the officers will be careful not to slaughter animals except those suffering from incurable diseases; but an animal may have what is called an incurable disease and may be cured, and yet transmit it to other animals.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to ask the Minister of Railways if the regulations provided in section 27 of the Act have been made?

Mr. POPE. Regulations have been made, but I cannot state whether they apply to this particular case or not. If they do not I will call the attention of the Minister to it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then the Minister thinks it was intended that that case should be covered.

Mr. POPE. Yes; I think the Act was intended to cover any case where the party acted in good faith. It would be a very great hardship if it did not. In this very extensive country, before you could get the authority of the Minister of Agriculture, your animals might die. I see a difficulty on that point. My impression is that it ought to be covered by the present Act. It was not, however, supposed that we were providing for past cases. I will call the Minister's attention to the matter, and if the regulations do not cover such a case as has been mentioned, the Minister's attention will be called to the matter.

Mr. McCARTHY. That point could not be covered by the regulations. I give it as my opinion, for what it is worth, that as the law now stands there is no power by the regulations to fix a matter such as the Minister of Railways seems to think has been or may be fixed. The compensation which the Statute empowering the Governor in Council to pay, is merely for animals slaughtered by order of the Government, and not animals slaughtered by the owner before any authority has been obtained, or direction given by the authorities. I think the Minister should promise to deal with this matter on the third reading.

Mr. POPE. The Minister of Justice says he will deal with it on the third reading.

Bill reported.

THE EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That when the Speaker leaves the Chair to-morrow at 6 o'clock, the House stands adjourned until the following Tuesday at 8 o'clock, p.m.

He said: It has been represented that by adjourning to 8 o'clock on Tuesday, it would give time to members to arrive that day in time for the meeting of the House; and by adjouring to-morrow at 6 o'clock, it will allow members to be at their homes for Good Friday.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 22nd April, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 114) to amend the Act incorporating the British Canadian Bank.—(Mr. Dawson.)

OVERFLOWING OF THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER.

Mr. CURRAN asked, Is it the intention of the Government, in view of the great suffering and loss of property in the city of Montreal and the neighboring districts, from the overflowing of the St. Lawrence River, to cause an investigation to be made by competent engineers, with a view to suggesting such measures as may prevent the recurrence of such disasters?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention of the Government is to cause an investigation to be made; but, of course, the Government will expect the co-operation of the city of Montreal, and most likely also of the Harbor Commissioners of Montreal.

PRINTING OF PAMPHLETS.

Mr. AUGER asked, Has the Government, since the 1st December last, entrusted the printing of pamphlets or other matter to any printing offices at Quebec? If so, to what offices? What is the nature and the number of pages of such pamphlets, the number of copies of each, the price paid for composition, for printing and for binding, and what sums have already been paid on account?

Mr. CARLING. As the hon. gentleman asks for information involving a good many details, I would suggest that he put a notice on the paper, and I will endeavor to have it brought down in time.

EXPLORATION OF HUDSON BAY.

Mr. DAWSON asked, Whether, in the event of the exploration of Hudson Bay and Straits being continued during the coming summer, it is the intention of the Government to order an examination of the channel represented on the early French and English maps as existing to the south of the straits and extending from Ungava Bay to Mosquito Inlet?

Mr. FOSTER. This matter is now engaging the attention of the Government.

COUNTERFEIT DOMINION NOTES.

Mr. TASSÉ asked, Whether the Government are aware that a large number of Dominion notes of the denomination of $2 have been counterfeited and are now in circulation? If so, is it their intention to order a new issue and to take other steps to protect the public against this fraud?

Mr. McLELAN. The Government are aware that counterfeit Dominion $2 notes are in circulation, and steps are being taken to protect the public against fraud.

APPOINTMENT OF A JUDGE.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, Whether Hon. J. S. Wurtele, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Quebec, has been

appointed a Judge of the Superior Court for the Province of Quebec? If so, what is the date of the Order in Council appointing him? If not, has the position been offered to him, and has he declared his intention to accept or to refuse it?

Mr. THOMPSON. An Order in Council was passed appointing this gentleman a judge. He has not yet signified his acceptance of the office.

RELIEF OF THE TOWN OF COBOURG.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, on Tuesday next, to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to relieve the corporation of the town of Cobourg by releasing an amount of their debt to the Government, equal to the sum contributed by the corporation towards defraying the cost of constructing the harbour of refuge at Cobourg.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose this was part of the assets the hon. gentleman brought down the other day in reduction of our gross debt?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

THE CLAIMS OF MANITOBA.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, on Tuesday next, to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to remove doubts under section 6 of the Act 48-49 Victoria, chapter 50, for the final settlement of the claims of Manitoba on the Dominion, by declaring in what manner the rate *per capita* therein mentioned shall be calculated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In what way do you propose to calculate it?

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman will remember that on the formation of Manitoba into a Province, a certain amount per head was given to that Province, based on an estimated population of 17,000. In 1873 a further sum of about $70,000 was added. The terms of the agreement between the Manitoba delegates and the Government should have embraced both of these sums, and it is doubtful whether the Act refers to both or only to the allowance that was made originally. This measure is to remove that doubt.

Motion agreed to.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM STATIONS.

Mr. CARLING moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, on Tuesday next, to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to empower the Governor in Council to establish an experimental farm station, or experimental farm stations, and to acquire a limited extent of land, and set apart a limited extent of the public lands of Canada for that purpose, and for the purpose of tree planting and timber growing; and also to fix the rate of remuneration of persons employed to carry such provisions into effect, such remuneration to be paid out of monies voted by Parliament for that purpose; and further to provide that such reports, samples, plants, and other products as are designated by the Minister of Agriculture, shall be transmitted by mail free of charge, subject to regulations made by the Postmaster-General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture that it would be expedient to give us a little general explanation as to what he proposes to do. Then we shall be in a better position to discuss the matter when we return after the recess.

Mr. CARLING. I should be very glad indeed to give any explanation; but I am suffering from a very severe cold to-day, and hardly feel able to go into it. If the hon. gentleman will allow the matter to stand till Tuesday, I will give the explanation then.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LANGELIER.

REPRESENTATION OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES IN PARLIAMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 115) respecting the representation of the North-West Territories in the Parliament of Canada. He said: The Bill provides that on a day to be fixed by proclamation, the North-West Territories shall be represented. The Territory of Assiniboia will have two members; the Territories of Alberta and Saskatchewan will each have one member. The Territory of Athabasca has no population to speak of, and therefore is not included in the Bill. The Bill provides that for the present the franchise shall be the same as that which now obtains for election to the Territorial Council of the North-West, and the provisions of the Bill are, in fact, taken from the measures which are now law in the Territories respecting representation in the North-West Council.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, representing that for the good government of the several Territories forming part of the Dominion of Canada, and not included within any Province thereof, it is expedient that provision should be made for their representation in the Parliament of Canada, and praying that she may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be laid before the Imperial Parliament to empower the Parliament of Canada from time to time to make provision for such representation.

He said: In 1871, the Imperial Parliament passed an Act to enable the Dominion Parliament to form Provinces out of the Territories which had been acquired by arrangement with the Hudson Bay Company, and when Territories were formed into Provinces to give Parliament the power of giving them the right of representation. The Act was passed in 1871, to remove doubt as to our power to create Manitoba a Province, and our action in that regard was confirmed by Imperial Statute. The first clause says:

"The Parliament of Canada may, from time to time, establish new Provinces in any of the Territories forming, for the time being, part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any Province thereof, and may at the time of such establishment (this was the establishment of a Territory as a Province) make provision for the constitution and administration of any such Province, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such Province, and for its representation in the said Parliament."

Thus, it conferred upon the Administration the power of declaring a Territory to be a Province, and, when so declared, to give the new Province representation in the Dominion Parliament, but it does not provide that a Territory not declared a Province may have representation here. Therefore, to remove any doubt—and I think it is more than a doubt; it is a certainty that we have not the power—it is proposed we should ask the Imperial Parliament to grant that power. No doubt, it will be granted. Hon. gentlemen who were in Parliament in 1871 may remember that the Act of 1871 was passed on the representation of the Government of that day, of which I was a member, and the Opposition took exception to our having, although the Act was right in itself, asked the Imperial Parliament to make any alteration or addition in the charter of our Constitution, without the previous assent of the Dominion Parliament. There was a great deal in that argument, and therefore I have brought down this resolution, to obtain the consent of Parliament to apply to Her Majesty to lay before the Imperial Parliament a measure giving us the power required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose, as a matter of fact, the hon. gentleman will himself prepare this Bill, or cause it to be prepared here, and then transmit it to England. I suppose also, in conformity with the spirit of his present remarks, he will, at any rate, allow us the opportunity of seeing what he proposes to do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection, and have had the Bill printed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I had no doubt the hon. gentleman would have no objection. Of course, I have no objection whatever to the propositions he has made, which have been enforced on this side, as to the extreme desirability of giving representation to these Territories. The only point that strikes me is this: Whether, in adopting a Bill which is not merely operative for the present occasion, but which gives us the power from time to time in all future cases, if I understand the proposal aright,——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—some reasonable provisions should now be introduced into it to prevent an undue representation being given to the very small population in outlying Territories. The basis of our Constitution is that each Province shall be represented according to its population. Although there were good reasons for departing from that in the case of fast-growing Provinces, still care should be taken to prevent any abuse creeping in by giving a great number of representatives to very thinly settled territories. That might be pressed so far as to interfere to some extent with the principle of representation by population, as it exists in the other Provinces.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That will be completely in the power of the Dominion Parliament, from time to time. When the Province of Manitoba was formed, although the population was very small indeed, we gave them four members to the House of Commons. Objection was taken then that we were giving them representation far exceeding their rights according to population, but Parliament held that one member—perhaps all it had a right to have, and perhaps all the whole North West has a right to have, taking population as the basis—was practically of no use, while by giving them four they would be enabled, as a delegation from the Province, to confer together, and press with some energy and hope of success the views of their locality. Parliament took that view of the case, but the objection was taken strongly by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). The hon. gentleman who has just spoken also said it was in excess of the population, but that a generous view should be taken of the case. Parliament here will have the power to give such representation as they think proper.

Mr. EDGAR. Is it the intention of the Government to give full power to representatives from the Territories, or in any way to limit their power, as is done in the United States with territorial representatives?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government, in giving a Territory power to send one delegate only, did it limit his right to that of making speeches only, would be giving it representation of no value whatever, and it is proposed the representative shall have the same power and status in Parliament here as any one of us. I desire to pass this resolution to-day, because it is of some importance that the Address should go home and that the Government in England should take it up immediately after their Easter recess.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not rise for the purpose of opposing the resolution in its true spirit, namely, that steps should be taken with a view of obtaining representation of the North-West Territory. I think that it is a most desirable thing to seek to accomplish; but, looking at the wording of this resolution and considering the use that might be made of such a resolution as a dangerous precedent in the future, it seems to me that we should proceed with very great caution in this matter. The Government ask by this resolution that they may be permitted, without the sanction of Parliament, without further conference with Parliament, to submit a Bill to the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of altering the Imperial Act which binds these various Provinces together. It may be quite right that that Act should be modified from time to time, but the manner in which the opinions of the people of Canada are to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament is the point to which I beg to direct the attention of the House. My own opinion is that whatever request is submitted to the Imperial Parliament as the wish of the people of Canada should first of all be settled in every particular by this House. If it is proposed to submit a Bill to the Imperial Parliament to alter the Confederation Act, I submit that we cannot be too careful in proceeding, and that that Bill should be submitted to this House and discussed as carefully as any matter which is within our jurisdiction, and that, when finally we have approved of every word in that document, then and not till then does it represent the wishes of the people of Canada, and then and not till then should any communication be directed to the Imperial Parliament to give their sanction to that set of words and convert them into law. For that reason, while desiring that representation shall be given to the North-West, and desiring that the object aimed at, according to the words of the First Minister, shall be accomplished at an early date, I think prudence and caution should suggest, and I hope it will suggest to the First Minister, the propriety of putting in some words in this resolution showing that the humble Address which is referred to cannot be forwarded as representing the opinions of the people of Canada until this Parliament has done something further, and that is, to express its opinion upon the provisions of the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD I think the hon. gentleman is a little too late; I think the resolution has been passed.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, it is not. I simply put the question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The resolution is:

That a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, representing that for the good government of the several Territories forming part of the Dominion of Canada, and not included within any Province thereof, it is expedient that provision should be made for their representation in the Parliament of Canada, and praying that she may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be laid before the Imperial Parliament to empower the Parliament of Canada from time to time to make provision for such representation.

The only thing we ask is to have power to pass an Act, that whenever we think it necessary to make a Territory a Province we should have power to give it representation in the Dominion Parliament. That is the whole, and any Bill which would go further than this is not in accordance with the resolution.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MULOCK. Did I understand the First Minister to say that the Bill he proposes will be submitted to this Parliament before it is sent to the Imperial Parliament?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I mean to say that when I move for the Bill to give representation to the North-West Territory, it will be brought down here, and if it is not satisfactory it will not be passed.

Mr. MULOCK. That is not my question. My question is, whether the First Minister proposes to submit to the Parliament of Canada the Bill which he intends to ask the Imperial Parliament to pass in accordance with this resolution?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It would be rather an act of presumption for us to pass an Act here, and send it to England and ask them to pass that Act. That would be rather absurd. We ask that they shall pass an Act containing certain provisions, and they will do it in such apt phrase as the parliamentary draftsmen will settle. The

draft we send is merely a suggestive one, and I shall lay it before the House, and I have no doubt it will receive the sanction of the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I might ask——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman had better wait until the next motion. There is nothing before the Chair.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we might as well finish this point. I did not ask that this House should pass an Act or assume to legislate for the Imperial Parliament, but simply if the full text of the measure to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament would receive the sanction of this House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be submitted, but not to wait for the sanction. I moved:

That the said resolution be referred to a Select Committee composed of Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. McLelan, Mr. Laurier, Mr. Bowell, and the mover, to draft an Address embodying the same.

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel some little interest in the question put by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and I did not quite catch, from the lowness of tone in which the Premier spoke, all his argument or his statements. But, if I understood the question aright, it was to know whether the legislation which it was proposed to ask the Imperial Parliament to carry out, would first be submitted to this Parliament before it was transmitted. If I understood the right hon. gentleman that it was proposed to do so, nothing more is wanted. If that is not the effect of his statement, I should dissent from such a conclusion. I think the House has a right, in a matter affecting the constitution or representation, or anything so vital, to be taken into the counsels of the Government at least, and I think it is the duty of the Government to lay before the House what they propose. We do not propose to the Imperial Parliament the *ipsissima verba* of the Act that they shall pass, but we have a right to know what the Government ask the Imperial Government to lay before the Imperial Parliament which will bind this House; and I think we have a right to an answer on that point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did give an answer to that question. I said the resolution itself contains the Bill that is to be presented to the Imperial Parliament in England. I said further that we will suggest a Bill, a draft of which I will lay before the House when I bring up the second reading of the Bill granting representation to the North-West. Then the House will have full charge of it, and if they do not approve of that draft, they will say so. The Bill cannot become law unless by the consent of Parliament, and if Parliament disapproves of the Bill, which is merely word for word what is in the resolution, neither more nor less, they will say so, and throw out the Bill itself. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is proposed to be a joint Address, for the Senate have a right to be consulted, and with the consent of hon. gentlemen opposite, I will move that the following Address be read the first time:—

To the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty.

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN:

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects the Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty for the purpose of representing that for the good government of the several territories forming part of the Dominion of Canada, and not included within any Province thereof, it is expedient that provision should be made for their representation in the Parliament of Canada, and of praying that Your Majesty may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be laid before the Imperial Parliament to empower the Parliament of Canada from time to time to make provision for such representation.

All which we humbly pray Your Majesty to take into your favorable and gracious consideration.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that the Address be read the second time.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that the said Address be engrossed.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that a Message be sent to the Senate informing their Honors that this House has passed the Address, and requesting their concurrence in the same.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 102) to expedite the issue of Letters Patent for Indian Lands.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

To defray Departmental contingencies $191,750

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For convenience sake, Mr. Chairman, you had better read aloud each separate office and that will save time in the committee, instead of rambling from top to bottom, as we otherwise will do.

Governor General's Secretary's office.... ..... $15,000

Mr. DAVIES. There is an increase of two or three thousand dollars, which wants a short explanation. In 1884-85 this office expended only $13,185.

Mr. McLELAN. Last year it was estimated that the expenses would amount to $16,000, but it seems only $13,185 were expended. A thousand dollars less has been asked for this year than was asked for last. It is possible that the whole sum may be required this year, or that it may not. It is not intended that all should be expended, unless it is required by the office.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman does not quite understand me. The estimate for 1885-86 was $16,000. What proportion of that has been expended we do not know.

Mr. BOWELL. It was found by the amount expended that as large an amount as was estimated last year would not be required. It is necessary always to have a little margin. That is the only explanation that can be given.

Mr. McLELAN. In 1884-85 it was estimated that $16,000 would be required, and only $13,185 was expended. From the expenditure made in the office so far it is estimated that the sum needed for 1886-87 will be $1,000 less.

Mr. WILSON. I understood the Minister of Public Works to state the other night that the allowance for travelling expenses for the Governor General was $5,000. I observe that item has been increased during the year 1884-85.

Mr. McLELAN. $5,000 was, by Order in Council, allowed to the Governor General for himself and suite. The other items are for the travelling expenses of the officers of his Department who are sent on public service, amounting to $929.

Mr. WILSON. Then the $5,000 is not the only amount allowed for the Governor General's travelling expenses?

Mr. McLELAN. $5,000 are allowed for the Governor General himself, and——

Mr. DAVIES. Is the Order in Council of 1879, which appropriated $5,000 for the Governor General's travelling expenses, supposed to cover the expenses of the Governor General and his suite?

Mr. McLELAN—there are many times when the Governor General is not travelling himself, and when it is

necessary for public business that someone of the officers should go to distant points.

Mr. McMULLEN. Under whose directions are these sums paid? Suppose we commence by considering the sum of $806 paid for newspapers to the Governor General's office. Is that sum increasing or decreasing? Are we to go on increasing that amount? Under whose direction are the papers ordered, and under whose order are the amounts paid? It is right that we should criticise those items. A very large amount is paid out under the head of contingencies. Last year the Government exceeded by $22,000 the amount appropriated for contingencies. We should carefully criticise the different items, and see if we can devise some means to cut them down. In what way are the papers subscribed for? Who orders them, and under whose order is the money paid?

Mr McLELAN. They are ordered by the Governor-General's secretary, and in the other Departments by the Deputy Minister. The order is under the control of the Minister.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are we supposed to pay for everything those officers choose to order?

Mr. McLELAN. Every Department and every Minister, and the Governor General as well, must be kept informed as to what is passing in the world, and subscriptions are therefore made to newspapers. The control of the expenditure is first in the appropriations that are voted by Parliament for certain amounts to be paid for newspapers; and next, in the Public Accounts Committee, where all the details and vouchers can be called for at any time. There is that general supervision held by Parliament over this or any other expenditure.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The total expenditure for newspapers in the different Departments was $10,389. While I am disposed to allow every facility to employees of the public Departments to secure all information desirable, yet I think the committee will admit that this is a particularly large sum. If we allow to the Departments an equal amount to that expended for newspapers for the reading-room of the House I am sure everyone will be satisfied that we have been exceedingly liberal. The report of the Auditor General shows that the amount spent for newspapers for the reading room was only $1,498, while that for the Departments was over $10,000. It strikes me that the newspapers taken largely belong to a particular political section of the community. If the Government will allow both sides to be heard inside of the Department, as they are obliged to allow both sides to be heard outside; if the newspapers of both sides secured a share of the assistance which is employed, in the expenditure of some $10,000 for subscriptions alone, the community might think that there was less of an element of unfairness in the matter. I think it is worthy of the attention of the committee that such a large sum is being devoted to that particular purpose, and the committee must recollect that that is exclusively for subscriptions to newspapers in the Departments at the Capital, and that, besides these, there are subscriptions to the different Government offices outside, that might run the total up to a considerably higher sum.

Mr. McCRANEY. In looking over the amount expended for newspapers in the various Departments, I find they will average about $700 for each Department. Now, Sir, that would furnish say fifty dailies and one hundred or 150 weeklies, magazines, and all papers of that character. I think certainly that is a most extraordinary sum of money to be spent for that purpose. The expenditures in some of the Departments, I find, run as high as, in one case $943 and in another $862, which seems to be an enormous sum. I did not look at the amount expended for our reading-room, but I think these sums must be almost equal to the amount we expend for that purpose. I would like to ask why—as there is a sum of $5,000 appropriated for the travelling expenses for the Governor General—the travelling expenses of his staff are not taken out of that vote?

Mr. McLELAN. I explained to the hon. gentleman, a short time ago, that some years ago $5,000 was set apart by Order in Council as the sum to be allowed to the Governor General for the travelling expenses of himself and his suite. It is found occasionally to be in the public interest, and for the public service, that an officer from the Governor General's office should go out to different parts of the Dominion, and that expense is in addition to the $5,000—the latter being exclusively for the Governor General and his suite when he himself is travelling.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think, as regards what, perhaps, appears a somewhat large amount for subscription to newspapers for His Excellency, that no objection can be taken. It is of importance that the Governor General should acquaint himself very fully with the various phases of public opinion, and I believe I am correct in saying that His Excellency, whatever the Departments may do, does look at all sides, and that the Reform newspapers are very fully represented on His Excellency's files. They used to be, and I think they are still. The large amount for subscriptions in the other Departments is quite another thing, and there is a great deal to be said for the view my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Cameron) expressed, as to the large sum collectively paid for newspapers. That can be discussed, however, as we get on. I would ask if it is necessary to have an additional clerk in His Excellency's Department, because I perceive that a gentleman of the name of Stuart has been apparently permanently appointed. He is put down as an extra clerk, but he is paid for the whole 365 days. If a clerk is necessary, I think it would be better to put the amount in the regular Estimates, than as part of the contingencies. I see that the sum of $2 per day has been paid Mr. Stuart each day for the whole year.

Mr. McLELAN. I think there was a vacancy in the staff, and Mr. Stuart was expected to fill the vacancy. He continued as an extra clerk for some time, but he finally declined, or for some reason did not go up for examination. He has therefore left, and a permanent clerk has been appointed at a less salary than was paid Mr. Stuart as an extra clerk.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot fully endorse the remarks of my hon. friend from West Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). I daresay in times past he may have had something to do with these contingencies, and though it may be the duty of the Dominion to supply the Governor General with those papers, still I think it is the duty of the people's representatives here to cut down these items as far as possible. I think they have gone altogether beyond what the people of the Dominion can bear to pay. I think it is quite time, when we notice how our expenditure has run up, to take up every item of this kind and carefully examine it, with a view to cutting it down. We have the right to express our views to the Government of the day, and point out to them what we conceive to be the items they should operate upon in the way of restriction. I think this item of $806 for newspapers alone is utterly absurd. I admit that it is the duty of the Governor General to take the various journals, for the purpose of posting himself on the questions of the day. But is that sum necessary to keep his files full of the different periodicals of the country? I venture to say that there are plenty of papers there which are not published here. No doubt there are London papers; no doubt he takes a lively interest in the politics of Great Britain; and are we to supply them as well as the Canadian

papers? What is this amount for? Is it really for Canadian papers, or for papers from the other side of the water? Do we pay for the London papers and all those kind of things? I do not think it is fair. I do not want to be parsimonious with the Governor General, but when he gets $50,000 a year, and gets in addition every single item of expenditure almost, in and around his Department—his Secretary paid, every little item there paid from top to bottom, at the public expense—I think that the least we can ask is that he should supply himself with those periodicals he requires from the Old Country, and that we should not be asked to pay for them. I see, in addition, that the sum of $5,000 is allowed by Statute for travelling expenses. I am not disposed to quarrel with that just now, as the wisdom of Parliament fixed that sum, but I think the expenses of those who accompany him in his different tours should be deducted from that. I do not think we should be called upon to pay whatever expenses his footmen are disposed to incur, and all charged up to this country, so that the sum is exceeded something like $1,000. The probability is that, if we go on in this way, we will have to provide $7,000 instead of $5,000. I see we even go so far as to pay the cab hire, and the cab hire of his attendants and footmen. I am entirely opposed to this scale of expenditure; I do not think our people can bear it. I notice also that we paid $197 for advertising for the Governor General. I would like to know what that advertising is for, and what is it that requires that expenditure? He does not advertise for wood, because we supply that, or for coal, because we supply that, and we supply his attendants and everything of that kind. I would like to know what the advertisements are for? I think we are entitled to full explanations with regard to these items.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The contingencies for the Privy Council is an item in which, undoubtedly, the increase has been enormous. In 1878 the total for this office amounted to $2,848, and these gentlemen themselves in their first year only required $3,723, while $8,000 is demanded now. Now, I am really not aware of any remarkable additional expense that should be incurred in connection with the Privy Council to warrant it requiring three times as much now as it did in 1878, and considerably more than double what it required in 1879. It seems to me that the Privy Council, which is not a Department having a very great deal of work attached to it, is really spending a great deal more money than it ought to do.

Mr. McLELAN. The work in that Department has, I know, very largely increased since I have had the honor of being a member of the Government. The presidency of the Council was the first position I had, and from my knowledge of what that Department is doing, I know that its work has very largely increased since 1881. The hon. gentleman will see that during the last year there has been a very large amount for telegrams. Of course, the leader of the Government, who now holds the position of President of the Council, is called upon to communicate by telegraph in all directions, and the expense for telegrams has amounted to over $2,000. There have been in the last two or three years a number of extra clerks employed, which caused an increase last year of about $3,000, and I am told by the Clerk of the Privy Council that that is about as low as the work can be managed for at present, without appointing, upon the permanent staff, the four men now employed as extra clerks. It is not proposed at present to do that, but to continue them as extra clerks, and charge their salaries to contingencies.

Mr. DAVIES. I thought when the other item was under discussion that there was a good deal in the argument as to the necessity of His Excellency being provided with the periodicals and papers of the country. But it does appear to me that to supply every Department with newspapers to the extent that is being done, is rather too much. I find that the expenditure for newspaper subscriptions has gone up in every Department except the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The expenditure of the Privy Council for this purpose has gone up from $585, in 1878, to $756. In the Secretary of State's Department it has gone up from $459, in 1878, to $861. Now, it may be absolutely necessary that something like $1,000 should be spent by each of these Departments in subscriptions for newspapers; but this is a large sum, and I think the Ministers should explain it. The expenditure in the Department of the Interior for subscriptions to newspapers was increased from $441, in 1878, to $619. In the Department of Justice there is a reduction from $545 to $518. In the Militia Department it has gone up from $511 to $753. In the Department of Finance it was $771 in 1878, and it has gone up to $942. In the Public Works Department it has gone up from $419, in 1878, to $778. It appears to me that these increases are more than the increased work of these Departments will justify. There is another item with regard to which, I think, the hon. Minister of Customs should give us some explanation, because I remember that in 1878 the whole country was placarded with his denunciations of the previous Government for its expenditure on cab hire. Now, I find that the Government's expenditure for cab hire is becoming very large.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you say I placarded the country?

Mr. DAVIES. I say the statements of the hon. gentleman in this House were placarded throughout the country as an evidence of the extravagance of the Administration, and I find, so far from the Administration remedying the evil, that outside of his own Department the expenditure for cab hire has very largely increased. The expenditure of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, for this purpose, was $694, in connection with the Privy Council. That may be all right, considering his age and other circumstances; but the expenditure for sundry persons besides Sir John Macdonald amounted to $519. That does seem to be a large amount for sundry persons in the Privy Council for cab hire.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Who is sundry persons?

Mr. DAVIES. I do not know who he is, and it is because I do not know that I am asking the hon. Minister of Customs to explain. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman is not so extravagant in his own Department, but he has been a party to the extravagance of all his colleagues.

Mr. BOWELL. How do you know?

Mr. DAVIES. Because he has not protested against it, and he comes down with them and asks for this vote. In the next Department I find that Sir Alexander Campbell is credited with a very small sum for cab hire, only $55; G. W. Burbidge, $7.50, and sundry persons, $30. That is not extravagant. But in the other Departments I do not find the same moderation. Coming to the Department of Militia and Defence, we find the item: "Hon. A. P. Caron, cab hire at Ottawa, $214."

Mr. MITCHELL. We had a war you know.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman did not go to war in a cab. He stayed at home and directed the matter from here. Then, in the next Department you find the Secretary of State, the Hon. J. A. Chapleau, put down for $376, and the amount expended by him and his officials in his Department on cab hire was no less than $460. In the Department of the Interior, we find no less than $451 for cab hire, paid at Ottawa, from the head of the Department

down through a large number of officials. Every one of them appears to have the right to employ cabs as he pleases and charge the expense to the Department, as fifteen different subordinates have employed cabs.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is easily seen you are not a Cabinet Minister or you would not object.

Mr. DAVIES. I am not complaining that cabs should be employed, but I do not think that all the clerks of a Department should have the right to employ them. In the Auditor General's Department, the cab hire is $38. In the Finance Department, $171, which is not very extravagant. In the Inland Revenue Department, $291; and in the Customs Department, which my hon friend, the great denouncer of cab hire, manages,——

Mr. BOWELL. There is not much there.

Mr. DAVIES. No, the hon. gentleman only spent $2 himself.

Mr. BOWELL. No, I did not.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, he is charged with spending it.

Mr. BOWELL. It has no business there.

Mr. DAVIES. Then the Public Accounts are wrong.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; and I made special enquiry as to how it appears there.

Mr. MULOCK. The thing was not covered up.

Mr. BOWELL. No; I am not in the habit of doing what you do—covering up your iniquities.

Mr. DAVIES. This fact stands out in bold relief, that the Minister of Customs is either an anchorite in his tastes in regard to cabs, or the other gentlemen are very luxurious and extravagant. If the Minister of Customs can get along with only $16 for cab hire and look so hale and hearty, I think the thousands of dollars spent in other Departments might be cut down a little.

Mr. McMULLEN. We not only pay the cab hire and travelling expenses of hon. gentlemen, but I see that we lunch them also. There is an item, J. H. Spencer, $83.63 for lunching the Cabinet. I cannot understand this. If hon. gentlemen will ride in cabs and railways at the public expense, they ought, when they want an extra lunch, to foot the bill themselves. It is absurd to go on this way increasing the annual amount expended under the head of contingencies. I must give the Minister of Customs credit for his handling of the contingencies in his Department, where he has shown a great deal of care in keeping down cab hire and other things; but as to his colleagues, we have the right to find fault with them for their expenditure. I notice here that Sir John Macdonald's cab hire cost very nearly $700, and sundry other persons—it does not say who, or where they went to, or who ordered them, or under what circumstances—it appears engaged cabs to the extent of $519. This also is an absurd item. In my humble opinion, a Minister of the Crown who draws his salary and his sessional allowance ought to pay his own cab hire. Last year the salary of the First Minister was $8,000 and his sessional allowance $1,500, a total of $9,500; and I contend that a man who is paid that amount of money, and who claims to be so absolutely devoted to the best interests of the country as he does, should show a little liberality for the poor struggling people who have to pay $30,000,000 annually, by paying his own cab hire; and if the hon. gentleman were present I would say the same. I care not who the First Minister be, whether Grit or Tory, he has no right to charge the public account with the incidental expenses made for his own personal comfort. I notice also that in each Department they are in the habit, not only of paying telegrams, but of giving the boys who carry them gifts, and in each Department they are careful to charge the same amount as gifts and donations to the boys, namely, $3.75. That also is wrong. Another man who delivers the night mail gets $60. I think he gets nearly $600 a year for delivering the night mail. I do not know under whose order these things are done, but it appears absurd that things of this kind should go on. Street car hire, $25. Extra clerks—J. Belford gets $1.50 a day for 192 days; J. Foley, engaged at $2 a day in 1885, and so on. We should have some explanation with regard to those items. Then we find washing towels——

Mr. MULOCK. Dirty linen.

Mr. McMULLEN. They paid $68 for washing towels.

Mr. BOWELL. This is something you never use.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many do they use a day? Surely the Privy Council would not use more than half a dozen towels a day.

Mr. MITCHELL. They must have clean hands.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not believe all the water in the Ottawa and all the soap in the county could wash away their political sins. $68 for washing towels. Then there is the item of goods, $65.43. What were the goods? We have no account of them. In some of the contingencies there is put down $1,500 or $1,600 for goods. I have a matter of this kind to refer to, when we come to the Agricultural Department. In that there is a large item for goods. We want some explanation of these things. Then there is the ice, $80.60. No doubt, they want ice, but I think they should supply their own ice. I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen can face the people's representatives, and ask them to pass such items as these.

Mr. AUGER. I have compared the expenses of cab hire of this Government with those of the late Government. In the year ending 30th June, 1878, it amounted to $466.55; two years later, in 1880, it amounted to $1,685.16. This last year it amounts to $3,758.29. Now let us take one Department in 1878. In the Department of Agriculture it cost in that year $32.75, as follows: P. Buckley, $16; J. Coursolles, $1.50; L. E. Goulin, $15.25. In the year 1880, in the same Department it cost $115.45. Last year the cab hire for the same Department amounted to $185.40, as follows: Hon. J. H. Pope, $126.75; Mrs. Lyster, $23.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is that?

Mr. AUGER. Well, the Minister will be able to tell us. A. J. Cambie, $11.15; J. E. W. Currier, $9.50; J. Lowe, $5.50; J. F. Dionne, $2.50; W. F. Boardman, $2; J. A. Lyster—I suppose the husband of Mrs. Lyster—$2; L. J. Beland, 75 cents; J. Marmette, 75 cents; Messenger, $1.50. This is a great difference from the expenditure under the Mackenzie Administration. I hope the Minister will be able to explain this.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to enter into particulars, as invited to do by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies); but when he makes the comparison between the expenditure for contingencies in the Customs Department in 1878-79, and the expenditure at present, I think he would omit the reference if he looked at the facts. My predecessor spent on that service $15,767.38, and, by the Auditor General's report of this year, including the $2 for cab hire, he will find that the expenditure is only $6,779.51.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What the hon. gentleman says I have no doubt is true, as regards his own Department. I think the hon. gentleman has been a creditable exception, and that his Department, as regards contingencies, has been carefully managed, but I would call his attention to this fact. In his Department, when it was presided over by my lamented friend, Mr. Burpee, out

of the $15,000 which were spent in 1878, $7,269 was expended for advertising and subscriptions in newspapers, which I think the hon. gentleman now charges in a different place, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. BOWELL. You are mistaken; I do not charge them in the manner suggested.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that it was necessary at that time to make very numerous advertisements; and I think the hon. gentleman, in some other branch connected with his Department, finds it necessary to spend a great deal more than the $5,000 or $6,000 which is put down in last year's account.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in error. There is no place in the Public Accounts where he will find such an expenditure, nor has any such expenditure been made.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman say that he has discontinued the subscription to newspapers?

Mr. BOWELL. No; I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. MITCHELL. He does not take the *Herald?*

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, I do, and two copies of the *Globe*, and I read them, too.

Mr. MULOCK. I think no answer has been given to the statement of my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Auger), who has stated that nearly $4,000 was spent for cab hire last year in this city. It appears to me that that is a most unreasonably large sum. The departmental buildings here are all together, and I think that item is one that cannot be fully justified. I understand that not only the heads of Departments, but the deputy heads and others are allowed a great deal of latitude in that regard, and, if that is the case, if any number of persons are drawing on the petty cash of the Dominion in this way, the grand total will be something very undesirable. I find in the Auditor-General's report, page 35, part 2, an item of Montreal *Minerve*—I do not know whether there is any person in this Chamber, or in the Government, particularly interested in that newspaper, but we find that the *Minerve* is doing printing that could be done in Ottawa, and perhaps ought to be done in Ottawa—Montreal *Minerve*, printing 25 copies Manitoba terms, $47.62; printing 3,120 copies report on Printing Bureau, $112.85; total, $160.47. How does it come to pass that that bit of patronage is given away from the city of Ottawa, and is given to a paper in Montreal which is generally credited with being an organ of a member of the Government, who may be more intimately connected with it than even as a friend, as far as I know. I make no statement on that point, because I do not know; but this system of the Departments giving out printing in this way to papers which are directly or indirectly under the control of members of the Government, is a vicious system. We have a further illustration of it which is germane to the subject—I refer to the printing of the Geological Survey Report, which I believe is printed at the Montreal *Gazette* office, at a cost of several thousand dollars a year. I understand that that job was placed with that newspaper at a time when the Survey was stationed at Montreal, and the reason assigned was that it was convenient to have the printing done there. Subsequently, the Department was transferred to Ottawa, but the work was left there still. That work, I am told, is given to that paper without competition, without tender. Some imaginary, or some alleged, measurement of work is undergone, but I am told that that work could be done at a far less cost to this country if it were honestly open to competition. We know that printers can say: Here are our fixed rates; and it can be offered as an excuse that the payment is not in excess of the ordinary fixed rates. The work is in excess of the ordinary fixed rates. That is a very good statement to make, of course, but fixed rates mean just such rates as you can get when there is competition. It has been argued, but without any real justification, that that paper was especially qualified to do the work. But is this matter to go on forever? Are we to give that paper patronage for several thousands a year forever, without competition and at great inconvenience to the Department, when it could be done, and ought to be done, by the Queen's Printer under the regular contract we give out for printing? I find an item on the same page of the Auditor General's report: "J. J. McGee, travelling expenses, $122.81; Hon. J. A. Chapleau, $16.40." In every form we find moneys being disbursed in the public service, in various ways connected with individual members of the House and members of the Government. With regard to these items for travelling expenses, they may be all right; but with regard to the total amount incurred from year to year for travelling expenses, both in Canada and in Europe, trips made to the Old Country, jaunts through the Empire, I think there has developed a system of extravagance and a feeling that Ministers are not expected to be economical of the people's money in regard to their own personal habits, when they are discharging public duties. I am not disposed to be over particular with regard to the personal expenses of members of the Government engaged in the public service, but no one of them can look through the Public Accounts for the last four or five years without being struck with a vast sum that is being charged annually for travelling expenses by various members of the Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend has already referred to the item of Mr. McGee, for travelling expenses, and I see charged immediately afterwards: "Joseph Pope, travelling expenses, $329.42." Now, I notice in the Auditor General's report that he finds fault in several cases with parties not furnishing a detailed statement of these travelling expenses, by railway or otherwise. He draws attention to the fact in his report that in many of those cases there is no statement given, and only a lump sum is handed in as travelling expenses. I notice in the Secretary of State's Department, there is one person, whose name was mentioned a moment ago, who had received $100 for travelling expenses, which sum has never been properly accounted for, and the Auditor General said so in his report last year. It appears to me that this is a very loose way of doing things. Men are permitted to go on a journey, they are sent to perform certain duties, I presume in connection with their office, they are furnished with the means, and when they return they say, our expenses are so many dollars and so many cents, and that is the end of it. There does not appear to be any detailed statement. Now I hold, with the Auditor General, that such a statement should be given. We have no right to pay out money in lump sums in this way, because, if we continue it, these items will continue to increase. If you take a man who is in the habit of going upon a journey, and when he returns his master treats him generously, not asking any account from him of how he has spent the money that he was given for expenses, but simply takes his word that he has so many dollars left out of so much given to him when he went away, and you will find that he will increase the amount from time to time, and the probabilities are that after a while the sum will run up to double the amount it would be if a careful account was exacted from him on the day that he returns. Now, I hold that it is wrong to put down items in this way, as we find they are put down. For travelling expenses I notice "F. White, $30." He does not appear to have spent more or less than that amount. B. Chilton has got $25, and so on. $681.26 has been paid out for travelling expenses. Now, upon this question of cab hire, I believe it is time that an alteration should be made. If hon.

gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches are not sufficiently remunerated by the respectable sum they draw as their allowance as Ministers of the Crown, and as their sessional allowance and otherwise, then, I say, let us add a sum to that; let us alter the Act at once, and have a distinct understanding that they pay their own cab hire out of the amount that is paid them. That will be the proper way, and I fancy, if that course were adopted, we would find that, if we could have an insight afterwards into the amount actually paid for cab hire, that there would be a considerable falling off. I do not say but that these amounts may have been paid for cab hire. Possibly the Ministers themselves do not look very closely after it. In all probability many of these cabmen are engaged from time to time, and when they come and present their accounts they are paid, and the Ministers, perhaps, do not keep accurate account of the services they perform; so the bill is presented at the end of the year, and the sum is paid and charged to the account of cab hire. I think this thing should be stopped. The idea of spending $4,000 for coaching Ministers around town, I think, is absurd. I am glad that I am able to give the Minister of Customs credit for economy in that particular. I have also looked at the account of the Postmaster General for the last year, and I am glad to say that his account in that respect is very economical. But the other Ministers have spent a great deal, and the First Minister himself a large amount. I cannot extend any credit to the Minister of Public Works for economy in that particular, for I find that he has spent a considerable sum. Now I say we should urge that a change be made in this whole system. We had better do like the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway: we had better buy a dozen of cabs, or a half dozen. I do not believe that it would cost us as much money to get up a cab establishment of our own, and whenever Ministers want a cab, to take one that is owned by the Government themselves. Why, you will be able to keep a livery, we had better start a livery at once. I honestly think that we would save money by starting such an establishment; the idea of spending $4,000 for cab hire alone. Why, it would pay a very respectable return on a respectable number of horses, carriages and men. We might possibly buy each Minister a horse and buggy to drive around with. Perhaps he would not be satisfied with that. I suppose he would want a pair; and if we were to do that it would not cost us any more than it is costing us now. I hope that hon. gentlemen will consider that we are not jesting with this question—we are in earnest. We have got to give an account to our constituents for the way we allow their money to be spent, and it is our duty, when these items are before the House, to point out to the Government the absurdity, and the recklessness of spending such a large amount of money from year to year. If a Reform Government came to occupy the Treasury benches, I should be just as ready as any man in this House to criticise and condemn them if they exhibited as much recklessness in squandering the public money. I believe in the matter of contingencies we have been running mad for years. We have been going on until we have spent $186,000 in contingencies alone, and I suppose the hon. gentlemen will now ask an increased amount this year. These items go to make up the $34,000,000 or $35,000,000 required for the public service; we will get up to $40,000,000 after a while, and then to $50,000,000. Now is the time to cry halt. The people cannot afford it; they are trammeled with difficulties of their own; they are suffering from financial embarrassment, particularly the farming class. We should begin with these small matters and cut them down, so as to make it as easy as possible for the people to live in this country. I am bound to tender my advice in this direction, and to urge on hon. gentlemen opposite and to hon. members on this side of the House the necessity and expediency of taking that course and begin to wipe out cab hire and such items. Hon gentlemen opposite should remember that all our remarks are made because we feel it necessary to make them. I am anxious that expenditures such as cab hire should be cut down, and that there should be an end of the abominable system such as is carried on here. I do not know who inaugurated the system of cab hire; I wish there had never been a cab in Ottawa. If it is necessary for the country to pay for cab hire, let us have a cab establishment for the use of members of the Government, by which means cabs could be supplied at a cheaper rate, and we could make money out of the transaction. I have been told that there is a cabman who waits on a Minister of the Crown, and drives him to-and-fro, and receives $5 a day when the House is in Session. What rate do Ministers pay when they hire a cab? They do not pay the ordinary rate, which would be about 25 cents. No; Ministers must pay $1 or $2. They should endeavor to organise a tariff of rates. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen drive tandem during the recess or not. They appear to act very quietly and becomingly when we are here, and do not keep cabs running round; but when we go away there must be a cab fever, and, perhaps, some of them, like Lords, have 30 or 40 cabs waiting on them.

Mr. WOODWORTH. There is a sanitary element in all this which has not been touched upon. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) was evidently under the impression that Ministers ride a good deal. He asked in a very pertinent way, but he did not push his enquiry in the way he did during the Franchise Bill debate, where the riding was done. But it was driving. I wish it were riding. He wanted to know whether the riding was done round these buildings. The riding could not have been done here. The Ministers were not riding but driving; the hon. gentleman was entirely wrong about it. There is a great deal in what the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has been saying about the sanitary view—he spoke of it only incidentally. I am not going to make an amendment similar to that which was proposed, when it was suggested to vote that five gondoliers be placed in Central Park, which was that instead of five, two gondoliers, a male and a female, should be obtained. I am not going to move such an amendment; but in regard to this cab establishment we might, out of fourteen Ministers, have one as Minister of cabs and horses, with a salary attached. Instead of moving that a female gondolier and a male gondolier be obtained, I suggest that ten horses be bought at $100 a piece—nice saddle horses can be obtained for that sum—and it would cost $200 apiece to keep them a year; that would be $4,000. What shall we have as a result? A lease of life for fourteen Ministers. What a beautiful sight it would be to see the fourteen Ministers capering round the Parliament square between six and seven o'clock in the morning. What a beautiful sight it would be for the Central, the Model and the rest of the Public School children to see fourteen Ministers capering round these grounds on their "Rosinantes." In a franchise debate those fourteen Ministers would outlast any Parliament that ever assembled in Canada as regards physical endurance. Instead of sitting up indolently and effiminately in cabs they would be riding round on their steeds. There is thus a sanitary element which should not be lost sight of. $4,000 would be a mere bagatelle. The Ministers would have health, which they have not got now. The suggestion of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) could, therefore, be improved upon, and to have horses should, of course, be made obligatory on the Ministers. Hon. gentlemen opposite would never come into power, for the Ministers would be rejuvenated and would keep control of the country forever. That would be a bad thing for the Reformers, but for the Ministers themselves

and their families and the country the expenditure of $4,000 would be a good investment; let us make it $8,000 for ten horses and let them go capering round. We might expend, I think, even $10,000 for the first year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would those horses be political hacks?

Mr. WOODWORTH. I do not know; but almost all the members of Parliament would likely try and have some of them. This is the first report of the Auditor General in which items have been given as we have them here. Those expenses have no doubt grown. We have not the items when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. We know, however, that the expenditure then was very large, and it is very large to-day, and perhaps a reduction could be made. Many of the items I do not understand. Two telephone resonanters—or something like that, I think—$6, appears here, and all that kind of thing. Those items have not been dwelt on because hon. gentlemen opposite feel ashamed to dwell on them all. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) held up some of the items to public execration. Other items might be suggested. While both parties have indulged in large expenditures in this direction, the next Parliament that sits here will, no doubt, see that those expenditures shall no longer be made. I do not think they swell up to $35,000,000 as the hon. member for Wellington feared; but every little helps. There is $1.25 for a porter and $3.25 gratuities to messengers, and all these items go to make a muckle. There is no doubt about it. I do not think it gets into the millions, but I think that the Government should not complain if we on this side criticise the allowance. I do not think it should be the duty of the Opposition only to act the part of critics, and that we on this side should say nothing if the accounts are wrong—I do not say the accounts are wrong, but they seem to be very large, and it is no argument to say: Yours were large when you were in. But I believe all this will be swept away in the sweet by-and-bye, when the new party comes in—the angels—when the electorate will send new men here; for I believe that many of us who are here to-day will perhaps not be here next time, and perhaps there will be a better set of men, though I do not know as there could be—but, at any rate, a set of men who will be horrified at these amounts, and will not allow them. But these matters have grown stale with these old parties here. The moment you touch the Governor General's suite, the gallant knight for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) rushes to the front, and like the knight in Ivanhoe, he stops you with his spear. Then the Ministers, the men who have grown grey in the public service, will not allow you to say a word. With the ex-members of the Government on that side and the Ministry on this contending for one another, we, the common members, are like those ancient warriors who had the sea in front of them and the sea drove them back on the barbarians.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think that it was exactly what we might have expected from the Minister of Customs, to make the comparison he did between the expenditure of his Department for contingencies and that made by his hon. predecessor in 1878, and to have left the House under the impression that, whereas he only spends $6,779, the expenditure in 1878 was $16,372.

Mr. BOWELL. No, I said $15,000.

Mr. DAVIES. Very well; the Public Accounts for the year 1878 put it at $16,000. The inference to be drawn from the hon. gentleman's statement is that he was saving about $10,000 a year. Now, is that a fair statement and inference? Did it put the whole truth before the House? What are the facts? The hon. gentleman has come down here asking for two votes for contingencies. He asks for a vote for contingencies in addition to the sum of $7,000 he asks to-day; he asks for an additional sum of $15,000.

Mr. WOODWORTH.

Mr. BOWELL. Where?

Mr. DAVIES. On page 71, to meet the contingencies of the head office, covering printing and stationery, advertising, telegraphing and other items which are contained in the $16,000 expenditure he speaks of in 1878. He shakes his head, but I have them here before me, showing that of that $15,000 in 1878, $7,269 was for advertising in and subscriptions to papers; $592 for stationery, and $1,698 for the Queen's Printer. Now, to make the matter doubly clear I turn back to the items of expenditure in the last completed year in the hon. gentleman's Department, and I find that in that year he spent the sum of $16,216 for contingencies at the head office, in addition to this little vote of $6,000 for contingencies in connection with salaries. I find that amongst that expenditure was $3,870 for the Stationery office, and in the year 1878 the then incumbent of the Department brought down one item covering the whole, so far as I can understand. The hon. gentleman divides the vote, and as a matter of fact, as far as I can see, the total contingencies at the head office was nearly $5,000 more, instead of $7,000 less, than they were in 1878. That was very neatly done, as an aside, but it just drew the committee's attention away from the question of the extravagant expenditure in connection with cabs, which was very fiercely condemned by the Minister of Customs in 1878, though he now asks the committee to endorse it. I said that the expenditure for cab hire was *prima facie* indefensible, and now, as the hon. gentleman has given no defence, I say it is absolutely indefensible; and the only conclusion the country can come to will be that that expenditure is indefensible, and that the money was spent for purposes which the Ministry cannot and dare not defend.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman on this occasion, as upon others waxes very warm. It matters not whether it be the important question of international trade between the United States and Canada or the spending one or two hundred dollars for cab hire, he waxes equally warm. The hon. gentleman is altogether in error with reference to the Department which he has taken the trouble to criticise. The Estimates are made out to-day precisely as they were made out in 1878 and 1879. The contingencies to which I referred, were the expenditures of the office for the inside service. The expenditure for 1877-78 for that service was $13,000, and the estimate for contingencies for the last year and the present year is $7,000. That does not include the printing to which I referred, which is paid through the Stationery Department and which include the blanks and all other forms that are printed and sent all over the Dominion. These items are charged—though I cannot put my hand upon the figures just now—precisely as they were charged in 1878. The additional $15,000 for inside service was to cover the expenditure for the establishment of what is termed a Board of Customs—an item altogether new, one which did not exist in 1877-78. The amount expended during last year for newspapers is about $700 or $800, as will be shown by the Auditor General's report. The item which has been referred to by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) was $5,471.12 for subscriptions to and advertisements in newspapers. That was the expenditure to which the hon. gentleman was referring and which called his attention to the matter, and which covered the ordinary advertising through the Dominion, and the payment for newspapers and other periodicals which are taken in the Department; that is the item to which I referred, and had no reference whatever to the item of the Queen's Printer and other matters to which the hon. gentleman called attention. If he will take the trouble to look at the Estimates of 1877-78, he will find that they are made out to-day precisely as they were then, except that they are made out a little more in detail now. I should not have referred to this matter at all, had

not the comparison been made by others who spoke before I rose.

Mr. DAVIES. I compared the expenditures of the two years.

Mr. BOWELL. You took the ordinary expenditures in this book and compared them with the expenditures as they appear in the Auditor General's report for the two years, the Auditor-General's report being much more full in detail than anything we have had before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The actual point is this. If the hon. gentleman looks at Mr. Burpee's expenditure for 1878, he will see that this large item of nearly $8,000 for advertising in and subscriptions to newspapers was in no respect parallel to any of the items of the hon. gentleman. I recollect, and I remarked to the hon. gentleman, that this matter had been under discussion before between himself and my late lamented friend, Mr. Burpee, and Mr. Burpee pointed out that this large item comprised a considerable number of charges which were afterwards put in a different shape. Now, in 1878 Mr. Burpee's total expenditure for his Department was $714,000, the rest being refunds. The hon. gentleman now asks for $804,000. I dare say they can be reasonably accounted for by the additional increases in business, and so on. According to the Public Accounts, the miscellaneous items of stationery, printing, etc., for which Mr. Burpee, in 1878, spent $9,676.49. The hon. gentleman now requires $16,17[illegible]. I do not say the hon. gentleman requires too much; that is not the matter in question; all I say is that it is perfectly evident that the charge for advertising, printing and stationery, as entered in the Public Accounts for 1885, amounting to $750, is for quite a different service from that for which Mr. Burpee required $7,600 in 1878; so that there is no possible comparison between the hon. gentleman's expenditure and Mr. Burpee's.

Mr. BOWELL. I am exceedingly obliged to the hon gentleman for turning to the Public Accounts and finding the very items referred to. The items making up the $9,600 to which he refers are not included in this contingencies account at all. They are for the service I pointed out, and in addition to the $15,000. The $16,000 that I ask for covers the very expenditure he has referred to; and when he reflects that the extent of the Customs service through the North-West Territories and the whole Dominion is so much greater now than it was then, he will find that the increase has been marvellously small. What I desire to thank the hon. gentleman for is for answering the hon. gentleman on his right. The $16,000 I am asking for is for the outside service, and the items referred to by the ex-Minister of Finance were for the inside service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will see that that does not help him, but it helps my hon. friend. If he chooses to add the $7,000 and the $16,000 together, the result is $23,000 odd, while the same items in his case amount to $24,000

Mr. BOWELL. Is it right for the hon. gentleman to take the actual expenditure of one year against the Estimates of the other?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am comparing the expenditure of 1885 with the expenditure of 1878. But the real point is that there cannot be a comparison between the two accounts, because the very sum Mr. Burpee charged shows conclusively that it was not for the same items that appear in the hon. gentleman's account for the current year.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the dispute; I think they are.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Burpee did not charge $7,500 for the particular service for which he charges that sum.

Mr. BOWELL. No, that is covered by the $9,000 to which the hon. gentleman has referred.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has altered the custom of the Department. He may be quite right in having done that, but it is absurd to say that the charges for newspapers and advertising, which previously amounted to $9,000, are the same items as are now included in advertising and subscriptions for newspapers, amounting to $726. The hon. gentleman is not going to tell the House that the same services for which he charges $726 required $7,500 in Mr. Burpee's time.

Mr. BOWELL. No; but the $750 to which the hon. gentleman has referred covers the expenditure made in 1877-78 for subscriptions to and advertising in newspapers, amounting to $5,471.12.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I understand the contention to be that the general contingencies of the Department of Customs, amounting in 1878 to something like $9,000, were larger than they are at the present time. Now, I have looked through the accounts of 1878, and they show that the contingencies in the Department of Customs amounted to $16,272; and the vote the Government are now asking is something like $7,000. I understood the Minister of Customs to say that the same items precisely were included in the two votes. Now, I find included in the expenditure for 1878, printing, $7,269; stationery supplies, $59[illegible]; and the Queen's Printer, for printing, paper and binding, $1,688, showing to my mind conclusively that the general supplies for the outside service were charged against departmental contingencies at that time, while in the Auditor General's report for 1884-85, I find, in the contingencies at Ottawa for outside service, that there was paid for stationery $3,870, and to the Queen's Printer $9,728, and other items.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is all wrong.

Mr. CAMERON. Does the hon. gentleman say that these contingencies are entirely in connection with the Board of Examiners?

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the Estimates of 1878-79, he will find on page 16, that the Government of that day asked $16,000 for contingencies under the head of Civil Government; that is for the inside service. On page 77 he will find this item: Contingencies of head office, covering printing, stationery, telegraphing, etc., for the several ports of entry, $15,000. If he looks at the Estimates of to-day, he will find that the estimate for the inside service, for which $16,000 was asked then, $7,000 is asked now. If he will turn to page 71, he will also find $15,000 asked for the same service—for the outside service—for which $15,000 was asked in 1878-79.

Mr. DAVIES. But the advertising mentioned in the account of 1878 was not advertising in the city of Ottawa alone.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no advertising at the outside ports now. I have done away altogether with that extravagance.

Mr. DAVIES. The simple difference is that the hon. gentleman pays the Queen's Printer here the $9,000.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will excuse me for saying that he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon gentleman has the blanks sent to the outside ports, and the expenditure for them for the year 1884-85 was $9,728, in addition to $3,070 for the Sta-

tionery Office and $130 for stamps; and the hon. gentleman will find these very items included in the $16,000 for the year 1878.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman does not seem to draw the distinction between the outside service and the inside service. The $16,000 which covers the items he refers to is for the outside service. The $7,000 is simply to cover the contingencies that are incurred here in Ottawa. The $15,000 which I ask, exactly the sum voted and expended by the late Government, is for the outside service. The difference is this: that I spent last year less than $7,000 for the inside service; whereas my predecessor in his last year expended $13,457.46 at headquarters.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That does not alter the fact that the expenditure of Mr. Burpee on these items was within a fraction of the hon. gentleman's expenditure. Mr. Burpee asked $15,000 for these expenditures in 1878, but only spent $9,000, thus saving a large sum. The fact is, that the charges are different. The $750 the hon. gentleman expended for different purposes. He says he has altered the system and abolished the advertising at the outside ports. Mr. Burpee appears to have included that in his headquarters expenditure, and for that reason there is no fair comparison. The hon. gentleman will understand that we are not charging him with any error of judgment or extravagance in his Department. We are simply pointing out that Mr. Burpee's estimates embraced a variety of items which do not occur in the hon. gentleman's, and for that reason the comparison is not quite fair.

Mr. BOWELL. Well, I think I shall be able to convince the hon. gentleman, when the question comes under discussion again, that he is wrong.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I wish to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that the leader of the Opposition made an arrangement with us that the House should adjourn at six o'clock to-day and meet again at eight o'clock on Tuesday, and it was understood that hon. gentlemen opposite would help us to make substantial progress in the Estimates to-day and on Tuesday. Therefore, I would hope that hon. gentlemen would allow this resolution to be carried now, so that we might say we had made some progress, and we will begin again on Tuesday at 8 o'clock. I hope when we do resume that we will be able to make more progress than we have made to-day.

Mr. WILSON. It will be a very unreasonable thing that the whole resolution should be carried. We are as anxious as hon. gentlemen opposite are to expedite business, but a number of questions have been asked, and hon. gentlemen have not given us the information asked for. I think they should explain those items, and account in some way for the expenditure of this money, and until they do so we are certainly not justified in passing an item of this kind. We have the right to have information, and we are not supposed to sit here without getting it, while the Ministers sit in their places and do not give the explanations for which we ask.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course hon. gentlemen have the power to prevent the item passing, as they will have the power on Tuesday to prevent any other motion passing. I only state that an arrangement was so made between the leader of the Opposition and myself, for an adjournment at six o'clock to-day and the reassembling of the House on Tuesday at eight o'clock, and as the hon. leader of the Opposition is not present, I can only state the fact, which I know if he were here he would corroborate. He would say that I am perfectly right in stating that it was understood that hon. gentlemen would help us this evening to make substantial progress in the Estimates. I repeat, those hon. gentlemen may prevent that being done, but I have simply stated the facts to the House.

Mr. DAVIES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would be very sorry indeed that there should be any misunderstanding about the arrangement. I was not present, but I know generally what passed, and what I understood was that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition agreed with the hon. gentleman that no motion would be made to defer, and no discussion would take place on going into committee. But the Minister of Public Works must see that my hon. friend could not positively dictate to the gentlemen behind him that they should not discuss these items; and I am quite sure the hon. gentleman will hardly say that we have been desirous of causing any unnecessary delay. I must recall his attention to this fact, that whenever these particular items were under discussion when we were occupying the Treasury benches, considerable time was always consumed in discussing them. It was one of those points which, for reasons that are rather obvious, gentlemen on both sides took pretty considerably into their own hands. Gentlemen who have been in office, or who are in office, do not usually discuss these very much. That is quite true I admit, but other gentlemen always do discuss them. Now, if hon. gentlemen beside me have had all the information they require——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If not, I do not see what can be done. We might, perhaps, suspend this item, and take the next item or two.

Mr. McCRANEY. I think this is a matter which should be looked into, and we should not proceed without further information.

Committee rose and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 6:05 p.m. until Tuesday, the 27th inst., at 8 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 27th April, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eight o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

FIRST AND SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 116) to incorporate the St. Gabriel and Levee Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

LAND SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 117) to amend an Act to authorise the granting of subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies. He said: The object of this Bill is simply to enable the Government to grant, in a different way from which they have been granted in the past, the land subsidies already granted by Parliament to certain railway companies. We have hitherto been granting them in odd sections. The proposal is to obtain permission to grant them in alternate townships or blocks instead of sections. That has been already done by Order in Council, subject to the approval of Parliament, in the case of the Galt Railway and the Hudson Bay Railway, and the only object of the Bill is to legalise what has been done and to authorise the Government to do that in the future.

Mr. BLAKE. Under these circumstances, I hope the hon. gentleman will at once lay on the Table the Orders in Coun-

oil, and the applications on which they were based in reference to these companies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT, 1874.

On the notice, introduction of Bill to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1874, as respects elections in the Province of Manitoba,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have ascertained, since notice was given of this Bill, that the Committee of last year on the codification of the Statutes has made a suggestion to the same effect, and therefore I will not pursue this Bill.

Motion dropped.

SALARY OF A JUDGE.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Thursday next to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that the salary of the additional Judge of the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice for Ontario, appointed under the Act of the Legislature of that Province, 48 Victoria, chapter 13, shall be $5,000 per annum, to be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and that section 1 of the Dominion Act, 46 Victoria, chapter 9, be repealed.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Departmental Contingencies..... $191,750

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice the contingencies in the Department of Justice is put at $5,000, an increase of $1,500. How is that?

Mr. THOMPSON. The amount asked for is that which was actually expended in 1885. For two or three years past the amount has grown, principally in consequence of the increased service required in connection with the administration of justice in the North-West. In 1883 the amount actually paid was $5,177; in 1884, $5,486.24; in 1885, $4,998.52. We therefore propose to ask $5,000 this year.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice in the contingencies of Militia and Defence the amount charged for newspapers last year is $765.65, and that for travelling expenses, $569.58. There is a charge of $100 for travelling expenses of Lieut. Colonel Panet, for which the Auditor General in his report says there is no account.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I was not aware that the Auditor General had made any such statement. I am perfectly certain whatever amount has been expended in the Department can be accounted for. As to the newspapers being increased, from time to time new newspapers have been published, which, to a certain extent, will account for the increased expense; but the hon. gentleman will see that the contingencies, as a whole, are the same as last year. Of course, as regards travelling expenses, last year was an exceptional year.

Mr. McMULLEN. At the same time, I contend those incidental expenses have been too large for years, and it is about time we should try to reduce them. Undoubtedly, last year there was cause for an increase, but the hon. gentleman does not expect another war next year, and will not therefore require the same amount. With regard to newspapers, is it absolutely necessary that the hon. gentleman should have in his Department $762.65 worth of periodicals hanging around the walls. Are they there to give a means to those waiting on him to pass the time, or to allow the clerks an opportunity of amusing themselves when they are tired of working, by enjoying the privilege and advantage of reading the public news at the public expense?

Mr. WILSON. There is a charge for 483 days, at $2 a day, paid to a Mr. Davidson in 1884-85. How comes it that he should have this number of days credited to him?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That gentleman was transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Militia. He was paid out of contingencies, because he was not a permanent clerk. Since then he has been made permanent, and there was an Order in Council passed and a vote was taken last Session to pay him as an ordinary permanent clerk. The number of days being put in merely shows that he was transferred, and that, although he was employed from the beginning of the year to the end, he could not be paid out of the ordinary vote for clerks because the vote had not been taken in Parliament, and he had to be paid out of contingencies.

Mr. WILSON. Am I to understand that, in order to make the accounts tally correctly, he is credited with a certain number of days in the Militia Department that he really did not serve? He certainly could not have been employed 418 days in the one year. What I desire to know is how the extra number of days is to be accounted for?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman must see that he was not paid except as a clerk. There were a number of days before the year commenced which he was paid for, a number of days which belonged to the year before, and which we had to pay out of contingencies.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps that is very plain to the hon. Minister, but I must confess that I cannot understand it. Was this gentleman paid, or was he not, for what he performed in 1883-84? I want to know how he is paid for an extra number of days in 1884-85 on which he could not have served. If he was employed in the other Department, that Department would have paid him, but he comes into this Department, and for one year he is credited with 418 days, at $2 a day, whereas he could not have been employed that number of days unless, as some members suggest, he was allowed double pay on the Sundays.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This clerk will be paid out of the ordinary vote from the 1st July next.

Mr. WILSON. That does not concern it at all. That is not what I am trying to find out.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The number of days the hon. member refers to comprises a portion of the time before the beginning of the year, and we had to pay out of contingencies previous to the time when the year began, and that makes the difference. He had no extra work and no extra pay. He was paid for the number of days he was employed in my Department after he was transferred.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the Minister will tell me how many days he was employed in the other Department. Then we will be able to see whether it will make 418 or 365.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot exactly tell the hon. gentleman. I did not expect that the hon. gentleman would reduce it to such mathematical exactitude. I tell him the clerk was paid for a certain number of days that he was employed in my Department. He was not paid by any other Department, and he was paid for the number of days he was employed out of the vote for contingencies, and no other vote, because we had not any other vote to take it from. Since then he has been added to the permanent staff of the Department, and he will be paid out of the ordinary vote which has been taken for that purpose.

Mr. VAIL. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this clerk was paid by the Militia Department for working in the Agricultural Department?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No; I never said he was.

Mr. VAIL. It could only be in that way.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I stated—and the hon. gentleman must have understood it—that he was transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Militia; that from the day he was transferred to Militia he was paid out of the contingency vote for the Department of Militia, and was not paid out of any other amount voted to any other Department.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has not touched the point raised by my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Wilson). He did not reduce it to mathematical accuracy; it was the Auditor General who did that. He is paid for 418 days for 1884-85 from the Department of Militia. There are only 313 working days in the financial year. The hon. gentleman says he did not work extra. If he worked in the previous year in the Department of Agriculture he must have been paid in that year. So the hon. gentleman will see that there are 53 days which are clearly unaccounted for.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken when he says they are unaccounted for. I think the Auditor General groups the days during which the clerks have been employed, and there may be a certain number of days taken off the year previous which were paid out of this amount. However, the number of days he was employed he was paid for.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman wish us to understand that he may have worked in the Agricultural Department when he was paid for the Militia Department?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I should be sorry if the hon. gentleman understood that.

Mr. DAVIES. How did you get it in then?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I explained that he was not paid by the Department of Agriculture from the time he was transferred to my Department, but by Militia, out of that vote for contingencies, and I cannot explain anything more. I never contended that he was paid out of Agriculture.

Mr. DAVIES. Was he more than 365 days in the Minister's Department?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I explained that he must have been more, if he was paid for 400.

Mr. DAVIES. Not in the year?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not suppose in the year.

Mr. VAIL. The contingency account in this Department foots up last year to $10,507, while only $8,000 was granted. That is a large sum to overrun.

Mr. McCRANEY. I find, in comparing the cab hire of this Department in 1877-78 with that in 1884-85, that in the former year it was $95.50, and in the latter, $1,244.88. This appears to be a very large increase. Then I find a considerable increase in the subscriptions to newspapers, which amounted to $575 in 1884-85; and I find in almost every other item there is a very large increase. This last year the amount for cab hire for the whole of the Departments was about $4,000; for 1877-78 it was $535, being about eight times less than for last year. Then I find that the whole sum for contingencies in 1877-78 was $170,000, and in 1884-85, $191,000. For travelling expenses in 1877-78 there were paid $4,736, and in 1884-85 about $12,000, or three times as much. The same increase is observable in every Department. I find the subscriptions to newspapers in 1884-85 was $10,300. Then there is a sum paid for goods of $3,000 for the different Departments, of which no details are given. In the Department of Militia and Defence the amount is $15.35; in Public Works, $584; Railways and Canals, $594. It appears to me that these are very large sums to be given without any details. For washing towels there were paid last year $1,030.77; this item does not appear at all in 1877-78. I think, Sir, there might be some way adopted to keep these contingencies in check. Indeed I do not see why they should exist at all. If the salaries of the Ministers are not large enough, by all means let us increase them. I do not see, for instance, as was remarked by an hon. gentleman on a previous day, why the Government should not keep a horse for each of the Ministers, for I do not think that system would cost the country any more than we are paying now. We might just as well pay for their food and clothing as to pay for their cab hire. These expenses are growing larger every year, and something should be done to keep them down.

Mr. MILLS. I think the Minister of Militia must be under some misapprehension with regard to the payment to this clerk, Davidson, last year, for 418 days. If I understand the Minister's explanation, a portion of his time was for service rendered in his Department in the previous year. Now, I do not think that the hon. gentleman could pay out of the appropriation for one year any liability that was incurred at an earlier date. The hon. gentleman must know that he could not make a payment of that sort regularly without calling the attention of the House to it. The hon. gentleman has no power to take out of a sum appropriated as contingencies for a particular year, to pay a liability of a prior year. I assume that was an irregular proceeding, and could not have taken place; that there must be some other explanation than the one the hon. gentleman has given us. It is clear that there could not be 418 days' work performed in the year for which the appropriation was taken. The hon. gentleman says that this man was in the Department the previous year and had performed 53 days' work for which he had not been paid, and for which he was paid out of the appropriation for this year. Certainly it would be most irregular and contrary to law for the hon. gentleman to make a payment in that way.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Davidson was paid $2 per day, and I am certain the payments made were for the time during which he was employed in the Department of Militia. He was transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Militia, and from that day he ceased to be paid by the Department of Agriculture and began to be paid out of the vote for contingencies. I am perfectly certain that the explanation I gave is correct, but I will be able to ascertain if there is any further information that will convince the hon. gentleman that the Department of Militia did not pay anything which should not have been paid, and that we have not gone beyond the law in so doing.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman's explanation is correct, he has gone beyond what the law allows, because, if this Davidson was transferred from some other Department to the Department of Militia before the beginning of this year, then the expenditure that would be incurred for the portion of the prior year should be paid out of the contingencies of that year. It is impossible that he could have performed 418 days' service in one year; therefore 53 days' service were paid out of the appropriation for this year. If the hon. gentleman had done as was done in some other cases, by some other Ministers, and I think by himself in former years—allow this party to do two or three days' work in one, then the matter would be perfectly intelligible, although it would be contrary to the provisions of the law relating to the Civil Service. But the hon. gentleman gives

an explanation which is equally contrary to law. If the payment was, as he says it is, a payment not allowed by law, I do not see myself how the Auditor General passed the account, unless the statement he makes to us is a mis taken one.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am certain that if the Auditor General passed that item it was quite legal, otherwise he would not have allowed the payment to be made. Suppose this clerk had been employed fifty days before the commencement of the fiscal year, and there may not have been an appropriation to pay him therefor. It could have been added to the contingencies, to the vote which appears now as contingencies for the fiscal year, beginning on the 1st July. There is no other way of doing it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will wait until I can refer to it again, and in the meantime rely upon the Auditor General as not having allowed an illegal payment to be made.

Mr. WILSON. We are anxious to have a statement brought down to explain how it is that money has been paid contrary to the rules of Parliament, and contrary to all former usages, and also an explanation furnished as to the number of days certain officers were employed.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will bring it down.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have had no explanation as to the travelling expenses which amount to $1,244.83, in which is included cab hire in Ottawa, $214.25. From observing the hon. Minister, who wears spurs, I imagine he generally rides and does not largely employ cabs. I see, however, no charge entered for spurs. Is there any explanation with respect to this amount of $1,244 for cab hire and travelling expenses?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman has devoted a great deal of his time, and I think properly so from the great interest he seems to take in cabs and cab hire, to this very important question. When the House last met the hon. gentleman took up very nearly a whole evening discussing that matter and repeating time after time that the enormous sum of $4,000 had been expended on cab hire. The hon. gentleman took such a deep interest in the question he suggested that instead of the various Departments expending so much money under this head, there should be a cab stand for Government purposes. I thought probably the hon. gentleman was seeking a position for himself, that there might be a superintendent required to look after that cab stand, and from the knowledge which the hon. gentleman displayed on such matters, possibly he was desiring that position. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there is no sum of $1,200 for cab hire in the Militia Department for last year. The hon. gentleman must know that the vote taken covers all the expenditure required for the travelling expenses of the various officers and heads of the various branches in the Department of Militia. I can tell the hon. gentleman, although he has given so much attention to cabs, that every account sent to the Department of Militia is examined by the Deputy Minister and by myself. Although the other day the hon. gentleman expressed the opinion that the cabmen who drove members of the Government were paid fancy prices, I can inform him that, so far as my Department is concerned, the prices paid are those paid by the public. I can only repeat that all the accounts are looked into and examined by the officers of the Department and by myself, and if the details were examined by the hon. gentleman, the sum would not seem enormous. The hon. gentleman should not consider we would forget our duty to the country for a paltry sum of $100, $150 or $200 paid as expenses in the various Departments. The hon. gentleman will find, in looking into the cab hire, that the expenditure is not frightfully extravagant. As to the statement of the hon. gentleman, that he did not see any entry for spurs, I have to say that his statement is correct. It may be considered in very good taste, and very witty and clever for the hon. gentleman to indulge in a remark of that kind; but the hon. gentleman might possibly find it very inconvenient, even if he were given the cash to pay for the spurs, to make use of them. In justice to the Department of Militia, I must say that what is expended in that way is not paid for out of the public funds.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not intend to stir up the anger of the hon. gentleman. We have a right to criticise these expenditures, and it is our duty to do so. They are increasing year after year. We have drawn attention to the cab hire. The hon. gentleman states that I have devoted considerable time to this question. Yes, I have, as well as to other matters in connection with my duties here. The hon. gentleman says I am probably seeking an office. I will not look to hon. gentlemen opposite for any office. I do not believe, if they established a livery, they would ever think of giving an office of that kind to anyone on this side of politics; and the hon. gentleman, from his personal appearance, is far better fitted to discharge such duties than I am, and they would more become him than me. The hon. Minister says I am probably not capable of using spurs. I do not know that I ever had spurs on, and I never had anything about my house that had spurs, except fighting cocks, and I do not want anything else wearing spurs. The hon. gentleman should not have got out of temper because we have considered it our duty to consider these items. When hon. gentlemen opposite were in Opposition they criticised very severely the expenditure of the then Government both as regards cab hire and other purposes. I intend, when items come up in committee which deserve criticism, to give them criticism, and I caution my friends that if they go upon the Treasury benches and are not content with a smaller amount for incidental expenses, I shall consider it my duty to criticise their expenditure also. On this matter of contingencies we are running wild. Year after year the amount is increasing, until this year it has ran up to $20,000 or $22,000. You take every item and you find the same thing going on. I notice even in the item of ice that they spent last year something like $634.30 for ice. I would like to know what is done in the Departments with so much ice? Do hon. gentlemen regulate the temperature of their offices by keeping ice lying around, or do they use it for drinking? That would pay for, I think, about 327 tons of ice, and I would like to know what is done with all that? It seems to me that some of these items must be for charges which would not look very well in print, and so they are brought down annually as incidental expenses and paid for in that way. I fully endorse the remarks of my hon. friend who said that if Ministers are not paid salary enough to allow them to pay ordinary expenses of this kind, I say let us add to their salaries at once, and let us be done with it, instead of having these constantly increasing incidental expenses. Here is an item of $3,000 last year for goods, and no account is given of what goods they were. Now, any man in business who would present a statement of that kind to his creditors—and the country are the creditors of hon. gentlemen—without telling what those goods were, would be refused an assignment; and if hon. gentlemen cannot bring their accounts down in a better shape than that, then they should allow men who can run their accounts better, to take their places. Here is another large item for telegraphing last year. Hon. gentlemen must have done a tremendous amount of telegraphing, and I would like to know what this item is composed of, where these telegrams went, and what they were. It seems to me that many items which are charged to telegraphing must have been something else. I do not think there was any necessity for the Minister of Militia losing his temper, as I had no intention of stirring him up; but we are entitled to

the information. I asked him about these newspapers and he would not condescend to explain them—why they were kept hanging around the walls of the waiting room. I asked whether they were for his own convenience, for his servants, or for visitors, but he would not condescend to say anything, but began to gibe me about spurs. Well, I do not know very much about spurs, but I think he should not have referred to this matter, because I see no man in the House except himself who wears spurs.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken if he supposes I lost my temper; my temper certainly would not carry me very far if it gave way to what the hon. gentleman said. The hon. gentleman has again come back to the question of spurs, but I notice that on a certain night, when the hon gentleman was called upon to vote, he did not require spurs to carry him away. As to the item for newspapers, I can tell the hon. gentleman that these newspapers are kept there for the purpose of reading; there may be too many newspapers in the country, but, at any rate, they are used for that purpose. I do not know who reads them in the waiting room; I have not the pleasure of seeing the hon. gentleman in my own room very often, but from the information which he seems to be conveying to the House, it may be that he frequents the waiting room. I do not think that this is a very extravagant amount of money to contribute towards the press of the country, who convey the information which is to be found in the columns of these various newspapers that are read by those who come into the waiting room, and sometimes by myself. The hon. gentleman will hardly expect me to read all those papers myself, and he must be liberal enough to allow the papers that are distributed to be utilised by those who come into the waiting room and have to wait there for an opportunity of seeing the Minister.

Mr. McMULLEN. I simply rise to say that I do not think the hon. gentleman should have made any reference to my running away. I do not run away—I never run away from an opponent, anyhow. I never left any place in a hurry, and I do not want a pair of spurs either. Perhaps if we recall the hon. gentleman's visit to the North-West it may be that he left Winnipeg in a hurry, and perhaps he did not need spurs on that occasion. Perhaps I may be able to refer to worse things with regard to him than he has referred to in my case.

Mr. WILSON. I find here another item of a clerk who put in 395 days, at $2 a day. I would like to know whether he is an extra clerk, and also how he managed to get in 395 days when there are only 365 days in a year?

An hon. MEMBER. That has been settled.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps if hon. gentlemen would pay a little more attention to what is going on they would find that this is another item, and it is one of which I think we should have some explanation.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can only repeat the explanation which I gave with reference to the other clerk; but I can tell the hon. gentleman that I will be glad to get all the information before concurrence, so as to be able to satisfy him that the amount paid was proper.

Mr. WILSON. That is all I want.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I find that only $7,000 was demanded for 1886 by the Secretary of State last year, and that the vote now asked is $10,000, an increase of nearly 50 per cent. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will inform us why the increase is demanded.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I am asking a little less than my last appropriation, with the intention of reducing the expenditure. I may say that $13,000 was spent last year, and this year I ask for $10,000, believing that will cover the expenditure, and that it is better that we should have the amount really required rather than that we should exceed the vote. I stated the other day that we certainly will require $2,000 for the extra work rendered necessary in the Department by carrying out the provisions of the Franchise Act. $1,000 has been added on account of the increased work of the Department, and one can understand that the Department of the Secretary of State, which has to deal with every other Department, will have its business increased in a corresponding ratio, and the amount asked for contingencies is the amount which I think will be required, and will be sufficient for the coming year. It is based on an estimate I have made, with the assistance of the officers of my Department, and the other Department which controls our expenditure. To anticipate any remarks that might be made by my hon. friends, I might say that the expenditure might be reduced, and will be reduced. The subscriptions to newspapers might be reduced, and it is our intention to reduce them, as well as the amount expended for cab hire. It has been a pretty large expenditure for last year; but I hope the state of my health next year will enable me to take the healthier exercise of walking instead of driving.

Mr. DAVIES. I see that the hon. gentleman's expenditure last year for extra clerks was $14,000. He is now asking $10,000; although there is an increase of work, owing to the election law. The amount expended for cab hire was only $460, and for newspapers $851; so that if he cuts the newspaper expenditure down one-half, there will be still $3,000 or $4,000 to account for of his contemplated reduction. I would like to have some idea of the items he intends to reduce. Does he intend to do away with the extra clerks altogether, and if only partially, to what extent?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have been asking in the ordinary estimate for two or three extra clerks, and these I want to deduct from our estimates for contingencies. I have here a list of the extra clerks in the Department. In order to fill vacancies that have occurred during the year, some will be taken from the list of extra clerks, and put on the list of regular clerks.

Mr. WILSON. I see an item, advertising in Morgan's *Annual Register*. I would like to ask if it is the intention to continue advertising in this pamphlet?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I admit that fault might be found there, and it has been discontinued.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to ask how it comes that there was so large an amount expended for extra clerks during the year 1885? I see that $4,000 was paid for extra services.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The theoretical organisation of the Department allows only a certain number of regular clerks, and the work of the Department has been such that extra clerks were required. I have tried to reduce the expense, however, and I am not known in the Department for my extravagance. Part of the expenditure for supernumerary clerks was due to the Scott Act. Mr. Harrison is now filling a vacancy among the regular clerks. Mr. Villemure and Mr. Labelle are also on the regular staff. Mr. Wurtele, Mr. Keays, and Mr. Steele are no more in the Department. Mr. Girard is dead. I cannot say more than that the services of these extra clerks were required, and as soon as they were not required they were dismissed; and we will try to reduce the expenditure this year by $3,000 in spite of the increasing work of the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman suppose will be the contingencies of this Department for the current year, 1885-86? The hon. gentleman asked $7,000, and I take it, from his explanations, that a very much larger sum will be required for the present year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. For the year ending the 31st of December, 1885, the expenditure was $10,988, and I think that the estimate for the year ending the 30th June, 1886, will not be much more than $10,000.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the Minister in charge of the Department of the Interior will point out in what respect he intends to reduce the expenditure.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There was a vote of $20,000 taken for 1884-85; the actual amount expended was $17,960. Last year again a vote of $20,000 was taken, and down to the 31st of March last, nine months, the amount expended was $13,919. We assume that we shall get on with within $18,000 for the year, and therefore that is the amount of the vote for the next year, instead of $20,000, as during the past two years.

Mr. MULOCK. The sum of $1,027 was expended last year for petty cash. That seems a large sum to be put under that head, and I would like to ask if it is possible to get further information upon it?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I cannot give the explanation of it; but I will get the particular explanation for concurrence.

Mr. DAVIES. I see that the vicious system of expending money for cab hire, which is confined, in the other Departments, to the heads and the deputy heads, extends, in this Department, to fifteen or sixteen employees. Vicious as it is when confined to the heads of Departments, it is ten times as bad when it extends to all the subordinates.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and every effort will be made to stop it.

Mr. DAVIES. How does the Finance Minister expect to save the difference between the actual expenditure and the estimates of contingencies of his Department?

Mr. McLELAN. It is estimated the expenses of telegraphing will be less and one or two of the extra clerks will be taken on the regular staff. After careful examination, we have put the item at $11,000.

Mr. DAVIES. You reduce contingencies and increase the ordinary expenses of the regular staff.

Mr. McLELAN: There is a decrease proposed in the regular staff as well as in this. Some changes have been made in the staff by which some of the extra clerks will be employed on it.

Mr. McMULLEN. How is it the telegraphing should cost over $3,500? When we have a Minister in London, I do not see how it is the charge should be so heavy. What does he do in London, if we require to do all this cabling?

Mr. McLELAN. Having a Minister in London is one reason for the expense. When called on to do business, it has to be done by cable. During last year we had to negotiate loans on the other side, which involved a great deal of cabling.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that in the contingencies of the Inland Revenue Department there is an apparent reduction of $2,000. Will the Minister explain how that is effected?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In 1884-85, $8,000 were voted for contingencies and $6,651 expended. In 1885-86, $9,000 were voted. For the nine months ending 31st March, contingency account amounted to $5,857, and, counting at the same rate for the remaining three months, the total would be $7,782 for 1885-86. On that ground I ask for a vote of $7,000, believing it will be sufficient.

Mr. DAVIES. I notice that in the travelling expenses, amounting to $763, there is an item of $100 charged against Mr. M. F. Walsh, the details of which the Auditor said have never yet been given.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I was under the impression the Auditor had received the information required, and will enquire into it.

Mr. DAVIES. Is the hon. gentleman going to adopt the plan that the Secretary of State said he would adopt, of discontinuing advertising in Morgan's *Register*?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. McCRANEY. I am glad the Minister of Inland Revenue has reduced his contingencies by $3,000. Has he reduced the number of extra clerks? It is said that last year some of his extra clerks were employed on a certain pamphlet issued by his deputy, Mr. Miall. Mr. Miall handed me a copy and said he was the author. $2,000 would go a long way towards preparing a large number of those pamphlets.

Mr. COSTIGAN. A question was put on the notice paper asking if Mr. Miall was authorised to issue pamphlets on the question of prohibition, and I replied he was not. I had no knowledge of extra clerks being employed on these pamphlets, and if Mr. Miall gave this information to the hon. gentleman he did not give it to me.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. McCraney) is in error in thinking the expenses have been decreased. The actual expenditure of the Department for the last year was $6,583, and the Minister asks now a larger amount. We have not even the promise of a decrease.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a curious little pamphlet. I would commend it to the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carling) who sits beside the hon. Minister, and to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Foster), behind him. Do they think the argument against the Scott Act is a good one? On the whole, I think it would be better for the officers of the Inland Revenue to confine their attention to their own business, instead of discussing in this way the propriety of voting for the Scott Act.

Mr. BLAKE. No doubt the deputy Minister was endeavoring to benefit the Department, since its revenues would be diminished by the operation of the Scott Act.

Mr. McCRANEY. I did not wish to state that the funds of the Government were used in the production of this pamphlet, but the Minister's deputy told me he was the author of it, and I understood that a number of the clerks had stated that they assisted to prepare it. I understand that tens of thousands of these pamphlets have been scattered around the country, and I have seen several in my own place. It is not probable, in my mind, that this was simply a generous act on the part of these parties. I do not wish to insinuate, however, that the Government paid for this pamphlet, but there ought to be some explanation about it.

Mr. DAVIES. I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works, in connection with the amount of $8,000 for the contingencies of his Department, to the item which has been so much discussed, and in which the Minister of Customs is so much interested, cab hire. I observe that the system has crept into his Department also, and that a gentleman named "Sundry Persons" has been spending $152 on cab hire. I think that gentleman had better be checked. In another place, under the head of Privy Council, he appears to have spent $519. I think it is time that Master "Sundry Persons" was called to a stricter account.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose that means the messengers and others who are sent on errands at a distance, going to the railway stations and carrying messages at a distance. Of course, there is a saving in sending them in a cab and not having them three or four hours away. In a large Department, you cannot avoid these things, and the hon. gentleman must see that the amount is very moderate.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would suggest to the Minister that he would save money if he were to buy half-a-dozen velocipedes.

Mr. DAVIES. I see a Mr. Roy has some travelling expenses charged here. I presume that was for the business of the Department, but the public are called upon to pay for his travelling bag. I find "F. E. Roy, travelling bag, $30." If all the public servants are to have these luxuries provided for them, it is as well that the public should know it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Roy is my private secretary, and had to go with me to the North-West last year, and of course I had to provide him with a bag.

Mr. DAVIES. Was that to carry the petitions?

Mr. McMULLEN. I see there is an amount of $584.27 for "goods." Will the hon. gentleman explain what the "goods" are?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That item is in every account before. I have no doubt the Auditor General has received all the information about this; it is in the ordinary accounts of the Department. You require certain things—linen for maps, or anything of that kind—and it is all charged to "goods."

Mr. DAVIES. I do not wish to be at all captious, but I think for a clerk in a Department, even if he be a private secretary, to buy his travelling bag and charge the public $30 for it, is an outrage. We might as well buy his clothes. It is perfectly preposterous that a clerk is to have this sort of thing provided for him out of the public treasury. I wonder where we will draw the line.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the secretary travels with the Minister, he has all the papers of the Minister to put in safety, and of course these cannot be put in paper and carried in the hand; they must be safe and in a proper bag. The bag or the satchel in which the papers are to be must be a good one. It is a proper expenditure.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was it burglar proof?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will enquire about that.

Mr. DAVIES. If that is a proper expenditure, of course every other clerk who goes with his Minister will do the same next year, if Parliament endorses it, and the leader of the House for the time being says it is perfectly proper. We shall have every other clerk going anywhere with a Minister buying a travelling bag at the public expense.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose the Minister knows that the bag was bought for that purpose and was used for that purpose, and of course it is on hand now among the assets of the country.

Mr. WILSON. I think the reduction shown here by the Minister is not sufficient, taking into account the great number of public works which are being done away with or not being carried on so extensively as before. The $500 apparent reduction is not what we might have expected from the Minister if he is in accord with the other members of the Government whose intention is to reduce expenses. I see photographs and frames for pictures charged here. I suppose the Minister will perfectly justify that expenditure. No doubt, he has a right to have photographs taken and framed, and hung in the Department. It is an easy and convenient way of admitting all sorts of wrong-doings in the Department which ought not to be committed. Perhaps my friend will say these are photographs of public buildings. That may be; perhaps the public buildings in St. Thomas are among the number; but the principle is wrong, whether the amount be large or small, and I think we ought to cry a halt here.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The photographs I explained last year. I stated that, when a work is in progress, photographs are taken and sent to the Chief Engineer or the Chief Architect, in order that he may see what progress has been made. Sometimes there is a difficulty about the work, and a photograph is sent, and the Chief Engineer, instead of moving about and going to the place, can see, by the photograph and the explanations which are given, in what state the work is, and can give his decision.

Mr. WILSON. Does the hon. Minister put these photographs in frames?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Sometimes they are framed. If the hon. gentleman will come and see me I will show him the frames.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that $1,074.40 were expended for travelling expenses in the Department of Public Works in 1884-85.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In this sum are comprised the expenses of my trip to the North-West with my private secretary—$300. I think the House will consider that a small sum.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I wish to draw attention to the item paid for books for the different Departments. I find that there is paid annually a large amount in this respect. I assume the books are technical works that are of advantage to the different Departments, but the amount that has been expended in each is so large that I cannot account for it except on the hypothesis that there is a library in every Department. Some of these books, I perceive, from the prices paid, cannot be technical ones.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A number of books are purchased for the Departments that are wanted for use. In other cases, as hon. gentlemen who were in office before us know, books may be purchased in certain Departments under pressure from canvassers. At one time there was an abuse going on, and an Order in Council was passed limiting to four the number of copies that could be taken in each Department, so that no subscriptions beyond that could be given. The hon. gentleman will see that instead of increasing, that item has diminished. In my Department only about $50 altogether were paid.

Mr. DAVIES. $335.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; that was for maps.

Mr. DAVIES. No; maps are put down separately. On page 47 maps are charged $49, and books of reference come to some $335 for the hon. gentleman's Department alone. In nearly all the Departments the expenditure for books of reference has been high.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. However that may be, these books were required in the Department.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Some of these books cannot be of a technical character, I know, because they are purchased from firms who do not publish technical works. I have no doubt that all the Departments are pressed to subscribe for works that are not of a technical character, but at the same time I am decidedly of the opinion that the Departments should purchase no works that are not strictly useful to them. I would like to ask the Minister if these books are detained in the Department for its use, or do they pass out of it surreptitiously, no one knowing what becomes of them eventually?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They must remain in the Department. These are books of reference of course. Sometimes one or more copies are taken of historical books, or books published in the country, and as hon. gentlemen opposite know, there is a good deal of pressure brought to bear to get subscriptions, but the Government have now limited the number of copies to four. I assure the hon. gentleman that we all would be very much pleased if no pressure was brought to bear upon us to take any books

except those that are absolutely required. But this has been done from time immemorial, and we try to limit the number as much as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will take the opportunity of enquiring of the Minister of Public Works on what principle he has of late, in the report of his Department, included a rather lengthy treatise on a purely scientific subject. It is published in his report, occupying, if I remember aright, nearly 100 pages, and from the nature of the case, it can only be of use to a very small number of persons. I also call the attention of whoever overlooks the preparation of these Sessional Papers, to the fact that it appears to me that other and much more important papers are excluded by reason of the large space assigned to these. The hon. gentleman will recollect that a very large part of his report is taken up with this somewhat abstract scientific treatise—I forget exactly what it is about, I did not take the trouble to read it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps I am in the same position as the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But then you are responsible and I am not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This was a hobby, if I may so call it, of a scientific gentleman in my Department, and I consented to have it put in my report, but with the understanding that there should be no such scientific treatise or appendix in future, in the report of the Department. So the hon. gentleman may depend on this, that we shall not have any others of this kind.

Mr. DAVIES. With respect to the item $30,000 for Post Office, I observe an item of $517 for books of reference. This is the banner Department for newspapers, the amount being $1,000 for newspapers supplied.

Mr. MULOCK. There is a large amount taken for extra clerks, nearly $2,000. Is it necessary to have that number of extra clerks continuously? If so, they should be placed on the permament list.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For obvious reasons, I cannot be expected to be as much *au fait* in this Department as in my own Department. The number of clerks has been increasing, and must necessarily increase, as the work of the Department is growing larger each year, and I suppose that when work has become pressing clerks have been taken on for a short time and then discharged. However, I will endeavor to have fuller explanations laid before the committee later on.

Mr. McLELAN. It has been the practice, for eight or ten years past, to keep a very large number of clerks in the Post Office Department, and the contingencies have always ran from $30,000 to $33,000 or $34,000. In 1877 there were two or three dozen extra clerks, and the contingencies amounted to $33,858; in 1878 the extra clerks were about the same number, and the contingencies were $30,700. So it has been the practice to keep a very large number of extra clerks in that Department, and a large sum has always been voted for contingencies.

Mr. MULOCK. That may be. There is a general impression that the Post Office Department is rather overmanned—that there are a great many extra clerks always there. It is stated, I believe, with some truth, that in some of the large cities the expenses of maintaining the post offices are assuming unnecessarily large proportions. It is not only said by the general public, but it is a fact that is admitted by postmasters in charge. It is true we cannot expect the Minister of Public Works to give the explanations, but there is a gentleman in the House who was Postmaster-General, and filled that office when these expenditures were incurred.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman is in error with respect to a large number of extra clerks being employed beyond what are actually required. From my experience as Postmaster General for three or four years, I am aware that very strong pressure has been brought by the postmasters in the different cities for additional help. The extra work has been very great for the last few years. Additional mails have been given: in many cases where there were two a week the accommodation has been increased to three times a week; from three times a week to a daily service; from daily to twice a day, and additional letter carriers have been appointed in Toronto, Montreal and all the larger cities of the Dominion. I can speak from personal knowledge that additional help was not given until heavy pressure was brought by the different postmasters. With respect to the business in the Post Office Department here, I can say that the number of clerks is not more than is actually required. The volume of business has increased very largely, especially in connection with opening up new postal routes in the North-West, new post offices, large increases in the Savings Bank Deposit Department, and from the fact that Post Office Savings Banks are being established in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, also in the North-West and British Columbia. I am quite sure there are no more extra clerks employed than are actually needed. Then I think it is sometimes more economical to have extra clerks than to place them on the permanent list. When there is a rush of business you can hire a clerk for $1 or $1.25 a day and retain him for one, two or three years and then dispense with him when necessary, whereas if you place him on the permanent list he receives a salary of $400 and an increase of $50 a year. From my personal knowledge of the Department I am able to say that there is no Department doing a considerable volume of business, which is worked so carefully and economically as is the Post Office Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be true, and the explanation given may explain a considerable amount of the increase. But when hon. members come to recollect that only ninety-two clerks were employed in 1879 and that 188 clerks, an increase of nearly 100, are added to the permanent staff for the year we are discussing, the hon. gentleman will see that the increase must have been enormous to require an increase from ninety-two to 188.

Mr. CARLING. So it has been.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And I hardly think that either the growth of the business or the growth of the country warrants the whole of that increase, though a considerable part of it may fairly be accounted for. Now, if I understand aright, the estimate submitted by the hon. gentleman's successor, there will be a deficit of nearly $1,000,000 between the expenditure and the receipts of the Post Office Department at present, and that seems to me to be a very undue deficit. I think, in a good many cases, it will be found that accommodation has been granted with very little regard to the increased cost to the country. An expenditure of nearly $2,900,000 is now incurred, and our total receipts will probably be about $1,850,000. That is too much, it appears to me. It may be true that the number of extra clerks was nearly as great in 1877-78 as now, but the hon. gentleman will observe that there is an increase of nearly 100 on the permanent staff at headquarters.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman will admit that the people at Edmonton and Prince Albert and Battleford and Fort Macleod are certainly entitled to mail accommodation. Some three or four years ago the people of those places had a mail once a month; later, once in three weeks; then once in two weeks, and now they are receiving their mails once a week at all those points. In fact almost every

portion of the North-West Territories is now receiving a weekly mail where a few years ago it only received a mail once a month. Of course, that adds considerably to the expense of the Department, involving, as it does, the opening of many miles of new postal routes and new post offices in that portion of the country. In such cases you cannot consider simply whether the expenditure is going to pay for the time being, but if there is a settlement of fifteen, or twenty, or thirty families and they ask for mail accommodation and the settlement is likely to increase, I think that if the hon. gentleman himself were at the head of the Department he would be only too glad to give them that accommodation. As the hon. gentleman has referred to the large increase, I would point out to him that in 1885 the number of post offices throughout the Dominion was 4,518, while last year there were 7,114, or an addition of some 2,600 post offices, and when you consider the enormously increased mileage over which mails have to be carried, it will easily be seen that the expenses must increase to a considerable extent. I have already referred to the vast increase which has taken place in the Post Office Savings Bank business, not merely in the older Provinces, but in the newer Provinces of the west and in the eastern Provinces as well. I am satisfied that the more the expenditure of the Post Office Department is enquired into, the more will it be justified by members of both sides of the House. It is a Department which I believe has been very economically managed, considering the enormons stretch of country over which the mails have to be carried, and the vast amount of business that is done. I think that not only for the last two years, but for a great many years back, the business of that Department has been done in the most satisfactory way.

Mr. GILLMOR. I think in some cases the Department have carried their economy to an extreme. In one community in my own county I find that there is absolutely no post office accommodation at all. For a long time the mail matter has been left in the shire town of St. Andrews and not carried to the Island of Campo Bello at all, because no one could be found who would perform the duties of the office for the amount allowed by the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon gentleman had better confine himself to the item under discussion—the contingencies of the Department.

Mr. GILLMOR. I understood that the Minister referred to the general conduct of the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. He was replying to a remark on the other side, but I do not think we should enter into a general discussion on the subject.

Mr. GILLMOR. I was going to compliment the Department on their economy in this particular case, but I think they have carried their economy to an extreme, as there is a large community there who are not getting mail matter at all. The sum of $40 was all that was allowed for keeping the office. Some years ago it was given to the collector of Customs, but he would not do the work for that sum and nobody else will. I think in such a case they should be a little more considerate of the wants of the community, and increase the pay so that somebody can be found to keep the post office in that place. The communication there is such that a great many of the letters sent go from the community in boats to Eastport more conveniently, so that the letters sent are not numerous, but the letters received are very numerous.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the Postmaster General takes rather an optimistic view of the situation, as I do not think the Post Office Department is as efficient in some respects as it should be. There is one item here which I think requires explanation. We have already called attention to the fact, that in some items of contingencies it is the most extravagant Department of any in the Government, and that is saying a good deal. I would enquire why it is that while some of the Departments spend only $200 and $500 for newspapers, the Post Office Department, in 1884-85, when the hon. gentleman had charge of it, spent some $900, and for books of reference alone, $577. I notice also, that while the expenditure under the item of goods in the other Departments generally amounts to $20, $30 or $40, the expenditure of this Department was $439 in that year. It may be that the item can be explained satisfactorily, but so far no explanation has been given, and I think it requires explanation.

Mr. CARLING. I can hardly explain that particular item at the moment, but I may say that, as the hon. gentleman will understand, the Post Office Department is the largest Department in the service; I believe there is a larger number of clerks employed in it than in any other Department. What the items are I cannot explain, but I should be very glad indeed to give the explanation to the hon. gentleman on concurrence.

Mr. DAVIES. Very well; I shall be satisfied. I wish at the same time he would inform the House whether it is proposed to expend $1,000 this year again on newspapers.

Mr. CARLING. I cannot speak for that Department this year, because I am not in charge of it.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman can tell me whether his official experience enables him to say that it is absolutely essential in the public interest to expend $1,000 for subscriptions to newspapers in that Department.

Mr. CARLING. I do not think the expenditure is a loss to the country. The Department is a very large one, and I think the officers of and visitors to the Department should have an opportunity of reading the newspapers as well as the chiefs.

Mr. DAVIES. Plenty of time, eh?

Mr. CARLING. I do not know about plenty of time, but I do not think an expenditure of $800 or $900 for newspapers for a large Department like that is very great.

Mr. McCRANEY. It does seem to me that this is about the most gay and festive Department we have. For travelling expenses and cab hire it spent $1,966.05. I think we ought to have some explanation of this enormous expenditure. One of two things is true—either the salaries we pay these gentlemen are not large enough, or else they are too penurious to pay their own cab hire. They should either pay their own cab hire, or we should pay them more salary. There were great complaints made of the number of civil servants employed in these Departments under the *régime* of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie); but I find that the number has more than doubled since that time. It does seem to me it is time to call a halt. I see that for washing towels $180 was expended in the Post Office Department. For newspaper subscriptions $916 was expended. It does seem to me this would more than pay for all the newspapers published in the Dominion.

Mr. BOWELL. What was it in the year you referred to a moment ago?

Mr. McCRANEY. I did not look.

Mr. BOWELL. You will find that it was $921.14.

Mr. McCRANEY. All I have to say is that two wrongs do not make a right. I consider it an enormous sum, and it is certainly time such an expenditure should be put a stop to.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman seems to think the charge for washing towels is enormous. I do not think it is, considering that there are nearly 200 officials in that Department. The towels are paid for at the rate of half a dollar a dozen, and there are vouchers for every one washed.

Mr. McLELAN. The sum paid for subscriptions for newspapers in 1877-78 was $921.14, $16 less than was paid last year; and the expense of washing towels, I suppose, was covered by the item of contingent expenses, $869.40. Under the supervision of the Auditor General all the little items included in this charge, now appear in detail; so that hon. gentlemen will find, if they make the comparison, that the contingencies of this Department have not increased.

Mr. MULOCK. I am surprised at the defence the Minister of Finance offers. His Government promised to do better, and he is now citing the practice of the former Government as a justification for the present Government.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman forgets that we have twice as large a staff, and that we are managing with the same contingencies.

Mr. MULOCK. I ask the hon. Minister if he will assert from actual knowledge whether some of the items under the head of contingent expenses, have not been, under his *régime*, transferred to other accounts.

Mr. McLELAN. I think not.

Mr. BOWELL. I say no, so far as they affect my Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The total expenditure for civil government and contingencies was about $823,000 half a dozen years ago, and it is now $1,222,000, so that I do not think we may fear a comparison, particularly when you remember that our superannuation account, which was grievously condemned, only amounted to $100,000, while the hon. gentlemen's is over $200,000. So that where we spent $900,000, the hon. gentlemen will spend $1,400,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see an item, "A. L. Jarvis, travelling expenses, $637.25." I am glad to notice the Postmaster General has been modest in regard to travelling expenses, but this sum should be accounted for.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Jarvis is my private secretary, and he went with me on business in connection with the Post Office Department. I considered I was working in the interests of the country when I attended to all correspondence while absent, the same as when at the office. If the public business was attended efficiently, as it was, I do not think there should be any objection to the charge of the travelling expenses of Mr. Jarvis.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then there is W. D. LeSueur down for $90.60 for travelling expenses, and the Auditor General reports that the details are not given.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. LeSueur is an excellent officer, assistant secretary to the Department, and has often been sent to transact business at Montreal and Quebec and other places. I am quite sure he has returned every item of expenditure, and if not is quite willing to do so.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not challenge the efficiency of the officer, but I complain that a detailed account has not been furnished.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Referring to a little matter in which the honor of the Crown was pledged by letter to establish an office at a place called Corinth, I hope the promise given by the late Postmaster General will be carried out. There is another office required in the township of Egremont; they have none there south of Yeoville. I hope the Postmaster General will not delay establishing offices at those places.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice in the Auditor General's account, there is an item of $222.79 for calculating interest on savings bank accounts. W. J. Barrett, who has $1,700 salary, gets $43 for calculating the interest on these accounts; E. B. Bell, with a salary of $1,000, gets $38.29; another, with a salary of $1,400, gets $60. Those men are paid these salaries for doing their work, and calculating interest on savings bank accounts should be part of that work.

Mr. CARLING. These gentlemen are experts at calculating interest, and they make up the accounts of the savings banks, and also the statements for the fiscal year, and are obliged to work in many cases until one o'clock or two o'clock in the morning. They are therefore paid extra. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. McCraney) was in error in saying the travelling expenses and cab hire amounted to $1,900. That item is only $1,169. I wish also to refer to the statement the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) made the other evening. He called attention to the item of $70 for seventy hours work. I wish to explain this: The Secretary of the Department of Agriculture wrote to the Auditor General the following letter:—

"On page 137 of the report of your appropriation accounts for 1885, there occurs the following item, M. C. Wood, 70 hours, at $1 per hour. In the House of Commons on Wednesday last, the Minister of Agriculture was asked to furnish an explanation of this item, which request he has referred to the Department. It follows, of course, to say that the statement in your report, which I have quoted, is an error, and that no such payment of 70 hours work, at $1 per hour, has been made. It is plain that the word 'hours' has been substituted for days.

"As you will find by reference to the vouchers furnished by the Department.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"JOHN LOWE,
"*Sec. Dept of Agr.*"

This is the reply:

"OTTAWA, 16th April, 1886.

"SIR,—Replying to your letter of yesterday's date, I beg to state that the item 'M. C. Wood, 70 hours at $1 per hour,' should read 'M. C. Wood, 70 days at $1 per day.' The error occurred in the course of transcription.

"I am, Sir, etc.,
"J. L. McDOUGALL,
"*Auditor General.*"

So hon. gentlemen will see that errors of this kind creep into the Auditor General's report. Probably others have crept in in the same way.

Mr. VAIL. I am very glad to hear the explanation, and I have no doubt my hon. friend is very much obliged to me for having given him the opportunity to make it.

Mr. CARLING. Certainly; I am very much obliged indeed.

Mr. VAIL. I was quite sure some such explanation would be made, but I thought it proper to call attention to it.

Mr. DAVIES. I want some little explanation of the sum of $952 for cleaning offices. It seems to be a very large sum of money and no such charge appears in any other Department.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman will understand that it is a pretty large Department, and it is necessary to have the models in the patent branch cleaned. A very large number of persons are coming and going. Visitors from all parts of the country come to see the models in the model room, and it is necessary to employ persons to keep all the different articles clean, and the glass cases in the room are washed, I believe, every day, so that the models can be seen. I think it can be shown that every item has been expended properly and could not be avoided.

Mr. DAVIES. I see that, in that Department, there was an expenditure of $18,236 in the last completed year, and now the Minister is asking for only $15,000. Where does he expect to make the saving?

Mr. CARLING. I believe there is a provision that any over-expenditure is charged to "Departments generally." With regard to the $18,000 for extra service, as I explained in regard to the Post Office Department, so in the Patent Office Branch, we have a large number of extra clerks, and it has been thought by my predecessors, of both parties, that it is more economical to hire clerks at $300, $350 or $400 a

year than to put on permanent clerks at $400, increasing every year. That policy was adopted by my predecessor, and I believe by his predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Letellier. The Patent Branch has been increasing in work very rapidly, and the amount of receipts from that branch was nearly $70,000 last year. It may gradually fall off, and it may not be necessary to keep as many clerks as we have now, and under the present system their services can be dispensed with without any injury to them, because they are only employed by the month.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman misunderstands my enquiry. I find that over $18,000 was spent last year, and now only $15,000 is asked. I imagine that is not done in a haphazard way, or that $3,000 less is proposed without the Minister knowing where he is going to make the saving. The House must vote intelligently and sensibly, and it is doing neither now. The hon. gentleman ought to say where he expects to get the saving. It is no use to vote $15,000 in round figures in a haphazard way.

Mr. CARLING. I understand that we expect we can do with less this year than we did last year.

Mr. DAVIES. You are going to be more economical.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What amount will be required this year for books of reference in that Department?

Mr. CARLING. It is impossible for me to say at present.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Cannot those books of reference be found in the Library?

Mr. CARLING. A number of the works referred to are works on patents, which I believe are not in the Library.

Mr. DAVIES. What is the cause of the increase in the Marine Department?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a sensible estimate. The expenditure for 1884-85 was $7,944, and for 1885-86, to 1st April, there has been spent some $6,000. Arguing from the past, it is supposed that $8,000 will be required for this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister says this is a sensible estimate. Does he mean that the $6,000 provided by his hon. predecessor was not a sensible estimate?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all, but I understood my friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) to say that, if an increase or a decrease were proposed, it should be based on the actual expenditures for past years. This is based upon the actual expenditure for the past year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then his predecessor's estimate was not based on the expenditures of past years.

Mr. VAIL. There is an increase in the amount for fisheries.

Mr. FOSTER. The expenditure last year was $2,399, and the sum estimated for the next year is $3,000, which is a slight increase rendered necessary by the extra work of the Department. This year we have the fisheries protection, which will, no doubt, cause a great deal more work, and an added sum is put in for contingencies. It is a very moderate one.

Mr. DAVIES. How is it that you have in each of the Departments specially charged the item of "goods," sometimes a very large item and sometimes a moderately small one, and yet under the head of "Departments generally" you have $594 for that also. If each Department charges its special expenditure under its own head, how is it that you have another lump sum that you ask the House to vote generally?

Mr. McLELAN. The clerk of contingencies, Mr. Ross, who had charge of this, has not entered this amount to show what the $494 cover. I suppose they are goods purchased, and the invoices are audited by the Auditor General, and distributed among the Departments generally. But if the hon. gentleman desires further information, we can get it on concurrence. Perhaps it would be better to leave it to the Public Accounts Committee, where the vouchers can be examined.

Mr. BOWELL. You will find the whole of these items on page 85 of the Public Accounts.

Mr. DAVIES. What I am asking for is the amount for each Department separately?

Mr. BOWELL. I understand this covers the expenditure by the officer of contingencies, for his own branch of the service and for the Departments generally. For instance, the sum paid for charwomen, I presume, is for all the Departments.

Mr. DAVIES. Take the item of ice. Every Department has a sum voted for that—whatever the Minister asks for. Now you have it here as a general item. What Department is that for? And so with reference to the $594 for goods. What Department is that intended for?

Mr. BOWELL. The $88.70 for ice may be for the corridors over all the buildings.

Mr. DAVIES. We want the explanation at any rate on concurrence. There is $315 for wages to charwomen. Is that in connection with the buildings themselves?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. All the Departments.

Administration of Justice..... ....$48,770

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cause of the great decrease in miscellaneous justice?

Mr. THOMPSON. The larger sum was provided last year in consequence of the additional expenses in connection with the administration of justice in the North-Territories, caused by the rebellion.

Mr. WELDON. There is $1,000 for travelling expenses of the stipendiary magistrates.

Mr. THOMPSON. An additional magistrate, Mr. Travis, was appointed after the estimates of last year were made up. This is for travelling expenses. His salary is provided for in another page.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt that the intention of the Minister was called to the unfortunate altercations that have taken place with respect to that officer's conduct at Calgary. Now, I do not want to prejudice the conduct of any man, particularly of a man in such a position as that; but, perhaps, the hon. gentleman can make some statement as to what is being done. If we are to judge from the reports, the controversy between Mr. Travis and the people of Calgary has assumed very serious dimensions indeed, and I need not say that it is of very great importance to the interests of justice in that country that the officers appointed should not embroil themselves unnecessarily with the people of those distant stations. I am aware that Mr. Travis was not appointed by the hon. gentleman himself—I think by his predecessor; but so much has been said about it that I think it would be as well, if the Minister is in a position to make any explanations as to the position of Mr. Travis, that it should be done now.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is a fact that every step of the controversy has been brought to our knowledge. The litigants on both sides, Mr. Travis for his own vindication, and the persons who had grievances against him, have kept the Department thoroughly posted as to the progress of the conflict from time to time. It was impossible, however, for us to interfere, especially with a person in the position of Mr. Travis, until complaints were formulated. These were formulated two or three months ago by a petition numerously signed, and that petition was answered by another

petition almost as numerously signed, and it was claimed representing in its signatories the more respectable and the more responsible part of the community in which he discharges his duties. However, intimation was conveyed to the petitioners against the judge, that an investigation might be ordered if their charges were made in a more specific manner; and two gentlemen who had complaints of their own to urge, and who represented some of the petitioners, attended at Ottawa and made the complaints in detail, and a person in a judicial position in Manitoba has been commissioned by the Government to investigate the charges made against Mr. Travis. The investigation cannot be commenced for a short time yet, but probably in the course of next month, or the following month at the latest, the investigation will be entered upon.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is the commissioner?

Mr. THOMPSON. Judge Taylor. I understand the selection was satisfactory to both parties; in fact, both parties desired the investigation to take place eventually.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand the Minister intimates that some delay will take place before this investigation can be entered upon or completed. I have received some communications from residents of Calgary, and they all assure me that the administration of justice there is at a standstill. In criminal matters the public decline to have persons brought before the judge to be tried and punished, on account of the unwise exercise of discretion which they say he makes, unduly punishing some and exercising undue clemency in other cases. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice how it came that a Mr. Cayley who, I understand, had been found guilty of contempt of court and sent to gaol for a period of time and also fined, was set at liberty a few days after he had entered upon the period of imprisonment?

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman does not possess accurate information, if his information is that justice is suspended there. Justice Travis had proceeded to a distant portion of his district, within the past few weeks, to hold a court, before the information reached him that an investigation was to be proceeded with. But provision has been made to have the duties discharged, pending the result of the investigation. Justice Richardson will take one district and Justice Rouleau the other. With respect to the case of Mr. Cayley, the relief came not within a few days, but after he had been imprisoned two or three weeks. The release was made by order of Justice Travis himself. I trust the hon. gentleman will excuse me from stating why the release was recommended, because civil proceedings are pending against Justice Travis for the exercise of his authority in that case, and it might to some extent prejudice his case if I entered into further explanations. But the act of release of Mr. Cayley was that of Justice Travis himself.

Mr. MULOCK. I will not press the hon. gentleman on that point. I stated at the time that the Government in sending up Judge Travis to the North-West had made a great mistake. I do not refer to his fitness or want of fitness, but for the Government to appoint to administer affairs in the North-West a gentleman from the Maritime Provinces who had never set foot in the North-West, who was wholly unacquainted with the people there, with their nature, their habits and mode of living, was a mistake, and though I will not refer to what was in my mind—I was going to refer to the *personnel* of the appointment—I will say that all the trouble resulting from this appointment is, in my judgement, clearly attributable to the Government of the day. It was an appointment that under no circumstance should be made. That is the opinion of almost every member of the House, because hon. members have more or less opportunity of judging as to whether he was suitable to the Province or not. He may come out of the investigation well, and he may technically escape condemnation; but if anyone reads the public press of that part of the country he must come to the conclusion that the administration of justice has been degraded, and that, practically, there is no respect for the bench in Calgary to-day.

Mr. WATSON. I desire to say, in endorsing the remarks of the last speaker, that the Government should exercise the greatest possible care in appointing men to administer justice in the North-West. The people are a peculiar people and they have to get accustomed to the laws. It is, no doubt, possible that Judge Travis may escape the sentence that the people would have passed on him, and the fault may not lie with the law he has administered, but with the way in which he has seen fit to administer it. It was pointed out last year that Judge Travis was not a suitable man to hold the position of a judge, that he was looked on by the people of the North-West as a crank, that he was known to the members here as a crank. He came down from the North-West and announced that he had been annoyed because the Government had not appointed him to the bench of Manitoba, and when interviewed by a reporter here, he said he had been up in Manitoba supervising the legislation of the House, as he was going to be appointed a judge there and wished the legislation to be perfect. The Government, knowing he had expressed such views, made a great mistake in appointing him to the bench in the North-West Territories. I hope in the future that the Government will not see proper to send men from the far east to the far west, men who know nothing about the people and are unacquainted with the country and the ways of the people. Due care would cause the laws to be better administered, and I hope in future more suitable men will be appointed.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I have no desire to prejudice the position of Judge Travis; but I desire to enter my most earnest protest against the idea conveyed that the people of the North-West are from their character such that special people have to be sent there, because they, the people of the North-West, are not familiar with the ordinary administration of justice in the older Provinces. I had an opportunity of seeing a good deal of the North-West and of meeting the people of Calgary, and I can only say this: in no part of the Dominion are more intelligent people to be met; they are people from the older Provinces accustomed to the administration of justice in those Provinces. And the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman that special care must be taken in the selection of judges, because they are a peculiar people not used to the method of administering justice in the older Provinces, is simply an insult to the people of the North-West.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of the Interior is very quick to endeavor to put a false construction upon the words that fall from members on this side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. If I am out of order I withdraw that remark. The hon. gentleman has placed a construction on the remarks of an hon. gentleman that is not applicable. I say the Government of the day were, in my opinion, guilty of a mistake in judgment in selecting, as they did, Judge Travis, and they made a mistake for which they are not altogether pardonable. They have had experience before in this matter, and I assert there is no excuse whatever for the Government using the North-West as a preserve whereto to send those having political claims on them, and not in other respects qualified for the discharge of those duties. We have seen the Government of the day so act—I do not know whether the Minister of the Interior is given to it—but if the hon. gentleman is going to continue the policy of his predecessor and send Wilkinson and such men there, what wonder is it that the people become disaffected.

While we are to-day one Confederation, and in some sense one people, there is a public opinion that localities desire, as far as possible, to supply themselves with their own officers. Where the Government can make appointments to commend themselves to public opinion, so that the public are satisfied with the *personnel* of the appointment, there is greater harmony between the people and the Administration. The Minister of Interior says: Just come to the North-West and find out the class of people there. We did not require such information from the Minister of the Interior. They are our own brethren, almost the flower of the people, who have gone to the North-West, but having gone there they lead as in Calgary a somewhat different life from that here, and at all events the people have to be dealt with in a somewhat different way from the people of the older settled communities. There are collected the most active and energetic people of the Dominion, and from the accounts which I have heard from Calgary and vicinity, I again assert that the *personnel* with regard to the appointment of Mr. Travis was a grave mistake, apart altogether from the question of importing a man from the Maritime Provinces to go almost to the Pacific coast to govern the people. The people resented that one circumstance alone, and I hope the Minister of the Interior may not think that he is at liberty to play ducks and drakes with the people, because he is clothed with power, or imagine because he has the power of being able to transfer people from one section of the country to another, that he may experience too great pleasure in exercising that power, like the person of old who fiddled while Rome was burning. He may enjoy that experience of triumph in his temporary power but the country will not flourish while——

Mr. BOWELL. While he is dancing?

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, while he is dancing. I hope the Government will make such arrangements as will be welcomed by the people and will be acceptable to them.

Mr. WATSON. I thank the Minister of the Interior for having complimented the good sense and loyalty of the people of the North-West. I am glad that he for one has paid them that compliment. I believe that the class of people who are in the far west are probably as good a class as you will get anywhere; I know it, and I am glad that he knows it. I only wish that a number of his colleagues would visit that country and see for themselves the class of people that are to be found there. But we have hon. gentlemen on that side of the House claiming that some of those people, whom he is complimenting as law-abiding citizens, are rebels. We have heard them called rebels; but they will not give us the names; they say that the names are held secret by the Government, and yet we find these hon. gentlemen getting up and attempting to make this House believe that these men are not law-abiding people. I believe that they are a law-abiding people, and that they know too much to have the law administered to them by a crank. It is well known that Mr. Travis is a crank, that he has proved himself to be a crank, that he is not acceptable to the people, and the sooner he is removed from Calgary the better for the people there and the better for the people as a whole. I am of opinion that there are men in the North-West Territories who are well fitted to fill all the positions in that country, and yet the Government saw fit to dismiss a man who administered justice to the satisfaction of the people in that country. I refer to ex-Judge Ryan who was wiped out simply because he was a Grit and did not suit them.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He was sent from the east.

Mr. WATSON. He was a good man, and he gave entire satisfaction, and I believe the Government have not shown reasons for dismissing him, or rather for re-arranging the districts so as to leave him out, and appointing one of their own particular friends. That kind of thing has been going on in the North-West; it has been made a dumping ground for political hacks and canvass-baggers from the east, and the quicker the Government stop that kind of thing the better for them, and the better for the people in the west.

Mr. GILLMOR. I feel it to be my duty as one who has been acquainted with Judge Travis for thirty years, to dissent from the character which my hon. friend has thought fit to give that gentleman. I do not know exactly what constitutes a crank, but I have known Judge Travis for a long time, and I believe him to be a man of ability and honor. There is another sentiment which I do not agree with, and that is that nobody from the east should receive these appointments in the west. A man goes there to administer the law as a lawyer, and in order to do that is it necessary that he should be born and brought up in the North-West? I dissent from that sentiment altogether, as I dissent from some of the opinions which have been expressed about Judge Travis. I have read the papers from Calgary, and I find that there are two sides to that question. The Minister of Justice will see that petitions as numerously and as respectably signed have come from one side of that question as from the other, and if there is a fair investigation, as I believe there will be, it will be found that he administered the law correctly. I suppose he got his appointment because he wanted it, and because the Government chose to give it to him. He has had some experience in the North-West; he had practiced his profession in Manitoba, and, professionally, I believe, he was quite as well qualified as many other men who have been appointed to similar positions in that country. As a lawyer, I believe he stands fully up to the average, and his career shows that such is his standing. You may choose to call him a crank, because he is of a nervous temperament, or because he has had the courage to deal with men of high positions on their knowledge of the law; but, so far as I know, Mr. Travis is a man who has taken a high place in his profession; he has taken hold of the most difficult cases successfully; he has had the courage of his convictions, and he is what I call a bold and honorable man. I know nothing against his character, and I believe he is able to take his part anywhere. It may be that he may have shown a little more zeal than was always discreet, but to say that you must not send a man there to administer the law who does not know the habits of the people, seems to me to be absurd. Who are those people there? Some of them are from Mr. Travis' own county. Some of them from the eastern Provinces, and some are from Ontario; and is it to be said that lawyers from Ontario know better how to administer the law of the land in the North-West Territories than lawyers from the eastern Provinces? How are they any better acquainted with the customs of the people than Judge Travis? How is a man from Toronto or from anywhere else in Ontario, who has not been in the North-West, any better fitted to administer the law than a man from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or any other part of the Dominion? I have had some correspondence from the North-West; I have read the papers, and I have seen the correspondence which has appeared in those papers, and I believe if Judge Travis gets a fair trial, as I believe he will, he will come out all right. He has characteristics about him which perhaps might be improved, but who has not? I think that the men who will go there and allow things to run riot, who will allow the people to be lawless and will not enforce the law, are not half as fit for their positions as those who will enforce it fearlessly and firmly, though judiciously.

Mr. IRVINE. This is the first time that I was aware that there was one way of interpreting Statutes and administering laws in the east and another way in the west. I always understood that the Statutes were interpreted by the

judges according to their English interpretation. Allow me to say that I do not believe that there is a judge in the Dominion of Canada to-day who, if he set himself to enforce the law against the liquor traffic as Judge Travis did, but will be put down by a certain class as a crank and be visited with the same odium that has fallen on Judge Travis. If the liquor party are allowed to make such attacks on Judge Travis, then on their shoulders must rest the responsibility, and not on his. Let me say also that I hope he will have a fair trial, for if he is a crank now they have been a long time in discovering it, and he should have a fair trial and not be made a martyr of.

Mr. MILLS. I certainly would not agree to the doctrine that a party residing in Ontario has any better claim to be appointed to a position in the North-West Territories than a party residing in British Columbia or in Halifax. I do not understand that any hon. gentleman has put forward any such ground of objection to Judge Travis. No one has complained that he was appointed because he was a citizen of one of the eastern Provinces; the point was, that he was not a resident of the North-West Territories at the time he was appointed.

Mr. PAINT. He had been.

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. I believe he was a resident of Manitoba, but not of the North-West Territories. One observation made by the hon. Minister of the Interior was, that the people of the North-West Territories are a law-abiding people—that they are from Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, and in no way differ from the people of the other Provinces. I believe that is true; but the hon. gentleman, last Session, supported a measure to put those people on a different footing, for some reason or other, from the people of the other portions of the Dominion. He supported a measure proposing that they should not be allowed to carry or possess arms of a certain kind without a license from the Lieutenant Governor. I am not aware that there was any restriction of that sort placed on the people of the other Provinces. I do not wonder at all that the people of the North-West Territories exhibit a certain amount of sensibility with regard to the action of the Government towards them; and I think that sensibility is something the Government are bound to pay some regard to in their administration of affairs in those Territories, more especially as they are wholly unrepresented in this Parliament. The hon. Minister of the Interior observed that Mr. Mathew Ryan, who was at one time a stipendiary magistrate in the Territories, was a resident of one of the eastern Provinces. Well, he was a resident of the Province of Quebec, and I believe he was at the time he was appointed; but what was the condition of the Territories at that time? There was no population except Indians and half-breeds; but so far were the Government at that time anxious not to offend the sensibilities of the people that when the members of the North-West Council came to be appointed we appointed among them a half-breed. We took from the Territories, as far as possible, the material by which they were to be governed. We also provided in the law, which is on the Statute-book still, that as soon as there was a certain population there they should have the privileges of electing members of the Council, and that at a certain period they should supersede the appointed members altogether. Now, the point of the case is this: I objected to Mr. Travis being appointed a member of that Council last year when the subject was under discussion, not because I had any personal objection to him, or because I thought he was less competent than some others, but because I believed the material existed within the Territories, and that so long as it did the people there would feel towards any person appointed from without, no matter how competent he might be, just the same sensibility as would be felt by the people of New Brunswick if a lawyer from Ontario should be appointed on the bench of the former Province. It is not at all surprising that there should be exhibited by the people of the North-West Territories a certain amount of antagonism towards Mr. Travis, because he was an outside man. The Government themselves are responsible for the condition of things that has arisen. Mr. Travis may or may not be a competent man; I shall not undertake to judge his case; but it is not sufficient that a man should be a good lawyer or have fair ability; he must have a knowledge of human nature, as he is put among a people whose circumstances and conditions are wholly different from those of older populations, and they require more sagacity and more natural ability to govern them and to administer justice successfully among them than the people of older districts, where the restraints are of a wholly different character. The Government not merely appointed Mr. Travis stipendiary magistrate, but increased his difficulties by making him a member of the Council.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He is not a member of the Council.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. He was made a member of the North-West Council *ex officio* as magistrate.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). All I can say is that Judge Travis complained to me bitterly in Calgary that he had not been made a member of the North-West Council.

Mr. MILLS. The Government last year proposed to appoint two additional nominative members for the Council, and Mr. Travis was one of the two who were to be appointed.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He was not appointed, and did not sit in the Council last session.

Mr. THOMPSON. The enactment was not passed. Mr. Travis is not a member of the Council. The number of magistrates was increased, but the amendment, fixing the number of councillors, was not passed.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I may say further that so far from Mr. Travis' unpopularity arising from the fact that he had been from the east, when I was at Calgary he had been there for some time. I had the pleasure of driving around with a number of the citizens of Calgary, Judge Travis being among them, and being in the same carriage as the mayor of Calgary, who was afterwards fined by him, and he was exceedingly popular. It was after that that his unpopularity arose.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose the people were a just people, and did not withdraw their confidence from him until they had occasion to do so. He was popular until they found him out.

Mr. HACKETT. And he was a just man until he gave judgment against the person who was popular.

Mr. THOMPSON. I hope that the House will not interfere with the case of Judge Travis, as it is in the hands of a commissioner from whom we can expect nothing but justice. From what I know of his case, there have been no complaints to justify the strong observations that have been made. The complaints have not been so much as regards incompetence or want of appreciation of justice, as want of discretion and prudence in the statements of his opinions on the bench. I make these explanations, because it may be assumed from what has been said that the complaints are of a very serious nature. As to what the hon. member for Marquette said, it certainly suggested that one great grievance with regard to the appointment was that Mr. Travis came from an eastern Province, but I do not suppose that was intended, though it fell so on the ears of most of us. As the Minister of the Interior has stated, the cause of the agitation against Judge Travis, in the first instance,

was not at all because he was not a resident of the Territories. In point of fact, the ex-mayor of Calgary, who has been the principal complainant against the judge, is himself from the city of St. John, where Judge Travis came from. While it may be correct to urge on the House the propriety of making appointments in the North-West from the residents there, that position is not a strong one, as regards the selection of judges, because the gentlemen practising in the Territories have been until recently practising law simply on their status as barristers from the older Provinces; and unless we appoint gentlemen belonging to the bars of the Provinces, we could not have appointed professional men out there at all. In the selection of gentlemen to fill the position of judges, it would be undesirable to be confined to the members of the profession in the Territories themselves. Most of them are of the junior bar, and it is important that we should select gentlemen of matured experience. Until recently, there has been no bar of the Territories at all, and those who have practised there have practised simply on their standing as practitioners in the other Provinces, so residents would have no additional standing from the fact of residence.

Mr. WELDON. So far as the eastern Provinces are concerned, I see no reason why judges should not be selected from them, if qualified. With reference to Judge Travis, I have received a letter from the mayor of Calgary complaining bitterly of his conduct, but, under the circumstances, knowing the case was under investigation, I thought proper to allow the commissioners to investigate the case before expressing any opinion. Speaking of the appointment of judges, I find in the Auditor General's report that Mr. Hugh Richardson received $300 or $400 for coming to Ottawa under the Torrens Act. As judge in the North-West Territories he receives $1,000 a year with an additional $1,000 for travelling expenses, and then he is employed on this additional work which takes him away from his duties. In a discussion with regard to a recent trial, great objection was made that Mr. Richardson acted as judge, under the control of the Government, since he was employed by them to do work outside of his judicial duties. We find also a judge from British Columbia taken away from his judicial duties and put upon the Chinese Commission, and also that one of the county judges of Ontario has been engaged for several years in matters outside of his judicial district. It is wrong that judges should be taken away from their duties to do other work for which they are paid extra; it has the effect of making judges look forward to remuneration for services outside of their judicial functions.

Mr. WATSON. I had no intention of giving the House to understand that I thought no appointment should be made from the eastern Provinces. We have judges from the eastern Provinces who have given entire satisfaction, and I am glad to see people come to the North-West Territories from all the Provinces. With reference to some remarks of the hon. member for Charlotte in defending Mr. Travis, I have no objection to them at all, they are simply his individual opinions as opposed to mine. I do not think Mr. Travis is a suitable person, and the Government, in this particular case, dispensed with the services of men competent to give entire satisfaction, without any cause except that they differed from hon. gentlemen in their politics. Men who have rendered services to the Government in this House, should not be rewarded by getting appointments in the west which they are not fitted to fill in the east. Judge Travis was not appointed judge in Manitoba because he was not good enough, yet afterwards he was appointed to the Territories, although the Territories people have to come too far to make any appeal, and consequently require careful administration of justice. I do not wish the House to understand that I am opposed to people from the east coming to the Territories.

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know whether the Minister desires it to be understood that he still maintains that appointments to the judiciary in the North-West must be made from persons residing without the Territories. He says that they could not make an appointment from one of the local practitioners, because they had not constituted themselves a local bar. That does not appear to me to be a valid reason for a person properly qualified to practice law, but who happens, for the time being, to be residing in the Territories, being passed over. If a member of the profession, resident in one of the older Provinces, is eligible to be appointed stipendiary magistrate in the North-West, he does not cease to be eligible because he chooses to leave his native Province and go to the North-West. He carries his qualification with him. His eligibility does not depend upon where he is residing, but upon whether he was originally qualified to receive such an appointment. Now the Minister of Justice says that the Government, in making the appointment of Mr. Travis, followed the practice which has prevailed in the Lower Provinces, and did not choose from the junior bar in the Territories. To-day, and at the time Mr. Travis was appointed, there were members of the bar of Ontario resident there who were the seniors of men occupying places on the Ontario bench to-day, so that the Territories possessed at that time the necessary material from which to have made this appointment. I do not know what the Minister's future policy in this regard may be, but I have no hesitation in expressing it as my opinion that the good of the people would be better secured in all cases, where, if possible, appointments to local offices are made from the community in which those offices are to be administered.

Mr. THOMPSON. The principle with which my hon. friend concluded his remarks was one that I admitted at the outset of this discussion. My allusion to the local bar was in answer to one of my hon. friends on the other side who suggested that the case of Judge Travis' appointment was as bad as would be the appointment of a judge from Ontario for Nova Scotia, a thing my hon. friend knows is an impossibility, because the law of each Province regulates the appointment of the judges in such a way that they must be taken from the different bars themselves. That was the way in which I made the allusion to the local bar standing in an entirely different position from the bars of the different Provinces. Now my hon. friend asks me to state whether I am of opinion that we must go outside of the local bar to make these appointments. All I can say upon that subject is that I think still we ought not to be confined to the local bar. I agree that it is desirable to make the appointments from the local bar if the attainments present themselves and other qualifications exist, but I think that, for the present at least, we should not be confined to the local bar in making the appointments. As to what my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) said in reference to Mr. Richardson, I agree with him as to the principle he enunciates as to matters of patronage being conferred upon a judge. That was not exactly the case here, however. It was necessary, in matters connected with the transfer of the land in the North-West, to have for a time, in the Department of Justice, some one who was conversant with legal procedure there, and it was thought desirable to have Mr. Richardson sent for. He was paid nothing for his services, but simply his travelling and living expenses while absent from home. He was given no remuneration whatever, and his withdrawal was detrimental in no way to the discharge of the duties of his office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The appointment of an assistant reporter of the Supreme Court and Exchequer Court at a salary of $1,000 appears to be an entirely new appointment.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is a new appointment. I suppose most of the members of the House connected with my profession know that complaints existed for a considerable time that the reporting was very much in arrear. Steps were taken early in November last to remove the cause of complaint by providing the services of an assistant reporter. There were at that time a great number of decisions unreported, and, as nearly all of us know, the business of the court was then and has since been growing constantly. Representations were made to my predecessor to the effect that to keep up with the current work would be impossible, and much more to overtake the arrears; and, in accordance with strong representations then made to him, both by members of the profession and by members of the judiciary, the services of a very efficient assistant reporter were procured. Up to this time, the expense has been defrayed from another source, and we propose now to estimate permanently for the assistant reporter. The increase in busines and the progress made in overtaking arrears has been such that it will be necessary, for some time to come, at all events, and probably permanently, to publish three volumes a year of the reports, and it is absolutely impossible to do this and keep up with the current work without the services of an assistant reporter. I have here a statement of the progress made since the 1st November in bringing up the arrears, which anyone who chooses may examine; and from which it will be seen that nearly all the arrears, or all that can be overtaken by the reporters—that is all in which the decisions have been given to the reporters—are either in the printer's hands or in such an advanced state of preparation that they will be almost immediately in the printer's hands, and I think the result will be to remove entirely the grievance of which complaint has been made of the reports of the court being in arrear.

Mr. DAVIES. If the appointment of this additional reporter will have the effect which the Minister of Justice anticipates, I do not think anyone will object to it, but I am not quite satisfied that it will have that effect. The grievance of which he speaks was felt all over the Dominion of Canada. The reports of the Supreme Court were very much behind, and everyone complained of the delay. I made it the subject of enquiry a year or two ago, and I found that it was not because the reporter was unable to discharge his duties as reporter. I understood it was from different reasons, and I understood those reasons to be that the work of the Supreme Court had very largely increased and the judges of the court thought they were entitled to have a clerk who would copy their judgments and give them to the reporter. If the additional reporter is supposed to do that work, I daresay his appointment will be found to be very beneficial; but, if he is merely to do the work the present reporter does, or to assist in that, I do not think the publication of the Supreme Court reports will be very much facilitated. I think every hon. gentleman knows that the reporting of the Supreme Court is meagre in one respect. The arguments of counsel are not reported at any length, and in many cases are not reported at all. I am not submitting this so much as a matter of complaint, although as a lawyer I think it is very desirable in many cases that the arguments as well as the judgments should be reported, but in many cases now we find the names of counsel given and then the judgments of the different judges, not taken in shorthand, but as written out and revised by the judges themselves. I understood the difficulty was that the judges thought they were entitled, and I myself agree with them, to the copy of the judgments they had from time to time prepared. If this additional reporter is to do that work I fancy the difficulty will be overcome. If he is not to do that work, but is simply to assist in the work which is now done by the present reporter, I do not think the difficulty will be overcome.

Mr. WELDON. It is very important to have judgments published as soon as possible, and if this appointment will facilitate that, it will be a boon to the public. I would remind the Minister that in the published reports there are a number of cases of past years that have not been included, some of which are very important? I know in one instance a very important judgment was given relating to the powers of the city which I have the honor to represent, but it has never been reported, and we have had some difficulty in knowing exactly what the decision of the court was. My hon. friend from the city of St. John has a notice on the paper to bring up this question and try to get the judgments printed, as well those of past years as more recent ones.

Mr. THOMPSON. The cause of the reports getting into arrears was to some extent that, as suggested by the hon. member from Prince Edward Island, the judges needed assistance, and when their reporter acted as their secretary the reports went into arrears. The reporter could not have prevented the arrears from accumulating. The assistance he now has will enable him, to some extent, to be independent of the written judgments of the judges, and he will be expected to report the decisions that are given from time to time, and to bring the reports up as rapidly as possible; and if the judgments are not furnished to him, owing to the occupations of the judges, he will be expected to report them from his notes. With regard to the earlier decisions which, as the hon. member says, were not reported at all, I can state that the fault will, to some extent, be remedied shortly. Mr. Cassels, the registrar of the court, intends publishing a digest of the reports, and that digest will include, not only the cases that have been reported, but likewise, I think, speaking from memory, about 200 cases which have not been reported at all; and I have his promise, as well as that of the reporter, that after the report is furnished by notes in that digest, an effort will be made to get them published *in extenso* as much as possible, and as soon as possible.

Mr. DAVIES. I hope the Minister will see, when this is being carried out that, as far as possible, all the reports upon points of practice will be published also. Numerous very important points have been determined by the court from time to time, and we never hear of them at all. I may ask the Minister if $2,000 covers the entire cost of printing, binding and distributing the Supreme Court reports?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. How is it, then, that the profession have to pay $4 a volume for the reports? Does that become part of the revenue?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Where is that accounted for?

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot tell what page, but it is in the Auditor General's report. It is in the consolidated fund.

Kingston Penitentiary..... .....$107,935 38

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the increases?

Mr. THOMPSON. The principal increases are: chief keeper, $50; hospital overseer, $50, and $3,000 for guards. The increases are considerable, it is true. The recommendation is under these circumstances: in the time of the late warden, Mr. Creighton, who was not only a very efficient officer, as I believe the present warden is, but an unusually active warden, an attempt was made, especially in the latter part of his term, to conduct the affairs of the prison with a much smaller staff than, in the opinion of everybody connected with the management of penitentiaries, he had a right to expect. His activity was such that he discharged the duties of several officers himself. On his decease a

reconstruction of the staff took place, and it was suggested not only by his successor, but also, I believe, by the inspector, that the staff should be increased in order to bring it up to a state of thorough efficiency by the increase recommended here. At the request of my predecessor the warden was induced to make the attempt for another year to get along with the present staff, and the result of the experiment has not been entirely satisfactory. It has been felt that the staff was not sufficiently large for the prison. But we have this disadvantage to face in the ensuing year, namely, that the contract with the lock company, which furnished employment for about 90 of the male prisoners, is about to be terminated, and it will be necessary to find other employment for those convicts. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House know the difficulty there is in finding labor for convicts which will not come into competition with free larbor, and in this instance it is considered that work can be furnished in the prison grounds. Considerable improvements are expected to be carried on next year, on the prison buildings and surroundings, and most of the prisoners discharged from lock making will have to be employed out of doors. It is quite apparent that an additional number of guards will be required, because the staff of guards must be much larger if convicts are employed out of doors. Considering the whole matter, although I was reluctant to ask for so large an increase in one year, I felt compelled by the statements made by my officers to ask the House to sanction the increased staff, a chief keeper and six additional guards. I may state, however, as one circumstance which will be satisfactory to the committee, that, notwithstanding this large increase, the *per capita* cost of the staff will be less at Kingston than in any other of the penitentiaries. The *per capita* cost of the staff of the several penitentiaries is as follows:—Kingston, $84.57; St. Vincent de Paul, $141.73; Dorchester, $171.03; Manitoba, $107.05; British Columbia, $147.14. The number of inmates at Kingston on 31st December, 1885, was 567; the proportion of officers would give seven prisoners to each officer; while at St. Vincent de Paul the proportion would be $4\frac{59}{100}$; Dorchester, $3\frac{72}{100}$; Manitoba, $6\frac{95}{100}$; British Columbia, $4\frac{2}{4}$. So that in view of the strong statements of the officials, endorsed by the experience of the past year in endeavoring to get along with a small staff, and the very obvious necessity of an increased staff arising from the change in the occupation of the prisoners, and the fact that the *per capita* cost will be still so small—all these facts combined made me agree to the recommendation, and I ask the House to sanction the proposed increase.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does the hon. gentleman propose to employ the prisoners when the lock company's contract terminates.

Mr. THOMPSON. There are some buildings going on this year on which it is intended to employ the prisoners.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Independent of that, what does the hon. gentleman propose to do with them. We have had a great deal of trouble about this matter in past times, and when we discussed the question last year it was then suggested, and partially acquiesced in, that an effort should be made to do as much as possible of the Government work proper. I am not aware that anything has been done in the way of carrying out that understanding. If the Minister has been able to consider that question I should be glad to know at what decision he has arrived in regard to it. Throughout the Dominion there is room for employing a very considerable number of convicts in this way, and whatever may be said about entering into competition with the labor of the general market there can be no objection, I think, to the employment of convicts on Government works in the proper sense of the term.

Mr. THOMPSON. The difficulty of avoiding competition with outside labor is one that has to be faced continually, and changes are made from time to time. Some works have been undertaken in addition to those I have mentioned. One of those which has been suggested as suitable employment for some of the laborers was in connection with smelting iron. With respect to labor up to 7th April, the statistics were these: There were in the penitentiary, males, 533; females, forty-one. The lock contract employs eighty-seven men. The tailor's and shoe shops employ seventy, they making and repairing clothing for the establishment. At that time they were engaged in filling an order for the Indian Department in the North-West. Coopers, paint and tin shops employ twenty-eight men. They were engaged in work required by the institution itself. The blacksmith and machine shops employ twenty-two men. That was for work in connection with the establishment itself. In stone-cutting, thirty-nine men were employed in dressing stone for prison use, and the improvements which are being made at present will increase that number considerably. There are fifteen men employed as masons, and it was intended that as soon as the weather permitted that number would be largely increased in the extension of the building, and pointing the walls. Eleven men are employed on the outside at carpentering and jobing work, and attending to other works and repairs. Fifteen men are engaged in the general jobbing gang; seven men in the wash-house, and twenty-four men in the drying and mending room. In the dining hall and kitchen eighteen men are employed; in the wing-gang seventeen men; in the bakery six men; in the quarry twenty-nine men; in the farm and garden twenty-six men; engineering work and mill fourteen men; and then besides there are, of course, various workmen around the grounds engaged on the wharf frontage, excavation, stable, &c. In the hospital and insane wards there are thirty-eight men, thirty-three of whom are insane. In the female prison there are forty-one women, some of whom are feeble or aged, and scarcely able to work. The women are generally employed in sewing, knitting, and domestic work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that the farm receipts are put down at only $4; a larger amount must be realised than that.

Mr. THOMPSON. That refers merely to the sales; the rest is consumed in the institution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Roughly speaking, how much is produced?

Mr. THOMPSON. About $5,400 worth.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the meaning of this item of capital account, $775?

Mr. THOMPSON. That is put in to cover articles which are not ordinarily chargeable to working expenses.

Mr. DAVIES. I should suppose that the working expenses would be decreased if the hon gentleman proposes to close the lock factory.

Mr. THOMPSON. That depends on the population, and we estimate for an increase.

Mr. WILSON. I see that last year a vote was taken for four teamsters while only three were employed. This year the estimate is for four; will that number be employed?

Mr. THOMPSON. As I stated already, a number of men who have hitherto been employed indoors are to be employed on the grounds, quarrying, &c., and the four teamsters will probably be required.

Mr. DAVIES. I see that the working expenses are $17,166, while those for 1884-86 were $15,300—or an increase of $2,000. I do not see how that increase comes.

Mr. THOMPSON. The maintenance of the building will be increased by $220.24; maintenance of machinery,

caused by the fact that an additional amount of machinery is being put in, for instance, in the gas works, $383.60; kitchen, $32.95, making a total of $636.89, the principal part is in connection with new machinery.

Dorchester Penitentiary $46,993 50

Mr. THOMPSON. For this penitentiary we ask a vote for a baker. The bread hitherto has not been baked in the institution, and it is considered economical and desirable in every way that it should be. We ask also a vote for the salary of a tailor instructor. These are the only increases in salaries. There is an increase of $1,161 for officers' uniforms, which arises from the fact that at certain periods the officers have to be re-uniformed, and this is the period when it is expected this will be required. As a general rule it is required once in two years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The receipts in the Kingston penitentiary amount to $10,000. Here they amount to only $570. The number of convicts, of course, is smaller in Dorchester, but still the discrepancy between the two is very great.

Mr. THOMPSON. The difference, I think, arises principally from the lock contract at Kingston, supplying labor to a considerable number of men, which, of course, we have not at Dorchester.

Mr. DAVIES. I see there is a large increase in the working expenses proposed for the coming year. $4,850 is proposed while the actual expenditure was $3,350. Working expenses consist of such items as coal, light, oil, stationery, &c. There must be some special cause for this great increase.

Mr. THOMPSON. The amount is just the same as was estimated last year, and it is based on the expenditure for the proportion of the year that has expired. I am not able to state exactly what those figures are; but we also estimate for a larger number of convicts.

Mr. DAVIES. These items would not necessarily be increased by an additional number of convicts.

Mr. THOMPSON. There will also be some increase caused by the fact that we are fitting up two new establishments, the bakery and the tailoring department.

Mr. DAVIES. Of course I understand that the amount voted need not necessarily be expended. But we ought to be careful not to vote a sum largely disproportionate to what is required for the service.

Mr. THOMPSON. In the $4,800 is included $2,000 for heating. The heating apparatus was found to be entirely insufficient, and another boiler was added. There is also $450 for light, $200 for repairs, $250 for maintenance of machinery, $250 for the armory, $300 for the farms, $250 for stationery, &c.

Manitoba Penitentiary $52,654 64

Mr. THOMPSON. There are twenty-five more convicts estimated for. A master tailor is required, and two guards at $600 each, in consequence of the large increase of prisoners and the unprotected state of the penitentiary through the want of a wall.

Mr. DAVIES. The officers receiving gratuities are increased $250.

Mr. THOMPSON. This is for no particular officer, but is to make allowance for gratuities to officers who may be retired during the year.

Mr. DAVIES. The expenses last year were $12,378; now they are $14,709. This seems an extravagant increase.

Mr. THOMPSON. The prison has been in a peculiar position as it has no walls, and a large increase has taken place in the number of prisoners. The prison has consequently to be enlarged.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Is the warden of the penitentiary the same individual who had charge of the transport in the North-West?

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Bedson is the warden.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Was he allowed any salary while in charge of the transport service?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No doubt he was allowed his pay like all other officers. Several officers joined the force in Ottawa and received their pay as members of the force, and I believe also their salaries as members of the Civil Service.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It is a decided injustice to the active volunteer force that anyone should be taken out of a position like Mr. Bedson, and given a position on the staff over many experienced officers. Posts of this kind should not be given to civilians, but to men who take an active interest in the volunteer service. Is Mr. Secretan employed in the penitentiary of Manitoba.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, I think not.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It is quite apparent that the management of this penitentiary is not of that economical character which would justify the employment of Mr. Bedson. Looking at the details, I find the cost per convict in the Kingston Penitentiary is 53 cents, while in Manitoba it is $1.31, or two and a-half times that of Kingston. Local differences might justify to some extent this large expenditure, but we find that in British Columbia Penitentiary, where one would expect the expenditure to be at least on a par with that of Manitoba, it is much smaller.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not see what our camps of instruction have to do with the transport which had to be organised in the North-West during the troubles. Mr. Bedson rendered most invaluable services. He was appointed transport officer by the Major General in command. His great knowledge of the country, and his great knowledge of the resources of the country, were brought into play, and contributed possibly more than anything else to the success of the transport service, which was organised at a moment when it was very difficult indeed to find, outside of that country, any man who could have possessed the intimate knowledge which he possessed of the country and its resources. He was employed and paid as a member of the force, and I take this opportunity of saying that the services rendered by Mr. Bedson were considered by the Major General and the other officers in command as being most valuable. The hon. gentleman seems to consider it was overlooking other members of the force in not appointing them to that position which was held by Mr. Bedson. It is quite a different thing from giving a military command or anything in that way to a man who is not a member of the force. It was considered indispensable to have in that country men suitable—and other men were appointed who belonged to the North-West—for that purpose of making use of all the available resources of the country; and none but those who lived there could have possessed that knowledge.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The question I raised was primarily the propriety of engaging a man whose whole time was being paid for by the public in one particular service, to perform the duties of another and a different one for which he was also paid. There will be another opportunity upon which the other question may be more deliberately debated, and we may take issue on that. My own view is that, wherever an opportunity offers, the active militia should have all the positions which they can fill, because their experience so gained will add to their know-

ledge and will be valuable in the future. But here we find a man whose entire service has been paid for by the public, according to the last year's Public Accounts, drawing also possibly a material sum—I am not prepared at the moment to say how much, but I was given to understand it was in the neighborhood of $10 a day—in another service altogether. If we had his services as warden, he was not entitled to get anything extra for the other service, because, according to the Minister of Militia, it was impossible to perform both at the same time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under the head of miscellaneous, I see the Minister demands nearly a double sum, as he raises it from $1,065 to $2,000. Now, looking at the various items under the head of miscellaneous, I find there are some things which seem to deserve explanation, for instance, I see, livery and feed, C. W. Graham, $490; surgeon's livery, 21 trips, at $6, $126. How come such large items as these, amounting to over $600, for livery and feed, to appear under the head of miscellaneous?

Mr. THOMPSON. I am not able to state at the moment the explanation of the item to which the hon. gentleman refers, because I did not anticipate that we would be called upon for an explanation of the expenditure for the year before last, but I shall be glad to get the information for him. All I can say at present is that a service of that kind is more expensive there and more necessary from the fact that the prison is eighteen miles from Winnipeg; and that likewise accounts for the large cost of maintenance which the member for Middlesex referred to, in addition to other reasons having reference to the price of food.

Mr. WILSON. There is another item which requires explanation. Looking at the hospital department, I find there were 100 convicts in this penitentiary last year, and there were the following items charged:—Drugs, $1,071; doctor's fees, $35; provisions, $99; provisions for lunatics, $100; port wine, 8½ gallons, $45; brandy, 6¾ gallons, $39; whiskey, 4½ gallons, $12; and express, $7; in all amounting to $1,402 for the maintenance or doctoring of 100 prisoners. If we turn to the Dorchester Penitentiary, we find under the same heading, hospital, drugs, $326; instruments, $2; provisions, $10; brandy, 1 bottle, $1.25; whiskey, 5 bottles, $5; amounting in all to $346; with a larger number of inmates than the Manitoba hospital. I cannot understand why it should be so expensive in Manitoba as compared with Dorchester. In Kingston also we find a reduction. I should like the Minister to explain to me why the drugs are so expensive, and why so much liquor is required in this penitentiary and not in the others.

Mr. THOMPSON. The proportion of persons in ill-health is much greater in Manitoba than in the other penitentiaries, for the reason that, in the Manitoba penitentiary, we have to take care of the insane of that Province and of the North-West Territories.

Mr. MILLS. A good deal of that medicine is taken for the warden.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think so.

Mr. MILLS. I do.

Mr WILSON. The best physicians now use very little medicine in the treatment of the insane, and I think they do not use spirits or wine at all. At the insane asylum in Toronto they use comparatively little, if any, drugs, and, with three times the number of insane people in the asylums in Ontario, there is not the fourth part of the amount charged for drugs or for liquors in their maintenance, so I think the explanation of the Minister is hardly a satisfactory one in regard to the large expenditure in the Manitoba Penitentiary for drugs and liquors. Perhaps, as was suggested here, several of the officials of the institution may take the drugs in the shape of ale, wine or beer, or something of that kind. I would recommend the Minister to enquire and see whether the sick people get the drugs or those who are well.

Mr. THOMPSON. There can be no continuance of any abuse, because the care of these unfortunate people has been removed from us altogether within the last year.

Mr. DAVIES. The discrepancy is so extraordinary that it really requires some investigation. We find that in Manitoba the drugs alone cost $14 a head, while at St. Vincent de Paul they cost $2 a head, in Kingston $2.50, and in Dorchester $2.20. It is absurd to say that in Manitoba we can expend $14 a head for drugs; the thing is outrageous. The patients could never have been given that amount of medicine.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think the hon. gentleman should ask me to give an explanation now, when I am not asking any estimate for that. But apart from that, it is a mistake to calculate the *per capita* allowance of the sum charged for drugs. It is necessary occasionally to lay in a stock. I take it for granted the stock charged for in that year was not entirely consumed. Besides that, the fact is that it was necessary during that year to furnish the surgery with instruments, and the cost of these, I understand, is included in the item the hon. gentleman mentioned.

Mr. DAVIES. The charge is for drugs $1,071. The hon. gentleman is also asking for an estimate.

Mr. THOMPSON. I say in connection with this.

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, in connection with this very one. I am confining myself to the Manitoba Penitentiary. In 1884-85 the expenditure for the maintenance of the convicts amounted to $15,877, and of that sum $1,402 was for this item of drugs, which my hon. friend complains of. Now, instead of decreasing the expenditure in the matter of working expenses, the hon. gentleman has increased it from $13,402 to $14,709. Therefore he ought to be satisfied that that explanation is a reasonable and *bonâ fide* one. I must say that, comparing it with the expenditure of some other penitentiaries, it seems to be an outrage.

Mr. THOMPSON. In stating I was not asking for an estimate, I meant for the insane patients who have now been removed from our care. Of course, the supply of drugs that is asked for must be for hospital purposes. I will make enquiry about the item he refers to, and I think he will be satisfied, after having the explanation that it is not an outrage at all. Besides, we are not asking to have that estimate made the basis of annual expenditure.

Mr. DAVIES. I used the word "outrage," after comparing that particular item with the expenditure for the same articles in other hospitals. The hon. gentleman will justify me in using strong language, when he finds that $14 per head is paid in Manitoba for drugs, to $2.50 and $2.20 in the other penitentiaries. How many patients have been removed from the Manitoba Penitentiary?

Mr. THOMPSON. Twenty-five insane were removed. Notwithstanding that, we anticipate an increase to 125 inmates. These estimates are not made at random, as to the number of convicts expected. The warden generally makes them up at the beginning of the year, from information as to the number of prisoners held for trial.

Mr. WILSON. The explanation is not satisfactory. The item says for drugs alone, not instruments. In 1884-85, we find the expenditure for drugs alone was $1,071; for provisions, $199, and it only cost $100 to furnish the lunatics with all the food they required during the time they were in the hospital. At the same time, they drank $45 worth of port, $39.50 worth of brandy and $12 worth of whiskey, while the food, all told, only cost $199. In view of these facts, we may justly call on the Minister to examine

into the matter and ascertain why we have presented to us a bill of that kind for the maintenance of the hospital at Winnipeg.

Mr. THOMPSON. On what page does the hon. gentleman find that item of $100 for food?

Mr. WILSON. On page 77.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is special food. That does not include all the food.

Mr. WATSON. From this report it might be supposed that the convicts in the Manitoba Penitentiary were more liable to sickness and disease than those in other penitentiaries. I think that is not the case. The medical officer of the penitentiary at Stoney Mountain, reports:

"I have nothing special to report concerning the sanitary condition of the prison. The watchful care in the prevention of disease has been well repaid by the fact that we have had no epidemic disease during the year, and that the admissions to hospital have been below the average."

While that is the case, the bill for drugs has increased. Now, I might inform some of the hon. gentlemen who are not probably aware of the fact, that in Manitoba we have public officers, and we have also public men coming to that country who have to be entertained. Our Lieutenant Governor in that Province is a strictly temperance man, and it may be necessary for gentlemen visiting that Province to go to Stoney Mountain to be entertained.

Mr. BOWELL. Does he entertain them on drugs?

Mr. WATSON. That may account for so great an expenditure for liquors. There is an item of $1,144 paid to one Whitehead, at Winnipeg, for drugs alone in one year.

Mr. THOMPSON. I considered that the hon. member, in making the statement, would have more respect for the House and for the members sitting on his side of the House, than to have made it in earnest. I have no experience in connection with Stoney Mountain Penitentiary; but I have to say this, that no officer can possibly remain in the employment of the Government if guilty of any such abuse as the hon. gentleman has supposed.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I have called attention to the difference in the cost of maintenance between Manitoba and the other penitentiaries, and some correspondence between the Auditor General and the Deputy Minister of Justice gives an insight into the causes of the difference. At page 80 of the Auditor General's report there is a letter dated 2nd March, 1885, in which attention is called to the matter and the following differences are shown:—

Article.	Contract Price.	Price paid.
50 lbs. pepper	$ 0 30	$ 0 35
41½ gallons syrup	0 90	1 00
20 lbs. coffee	0 40	0 45
12 lbs. lard	0 15	0 20
40 do	0 15	0 17
15 lbs. coffee	0 40	0 45
271 lbs. sugar	0 08½	0 09¾
21 lbs. tea	0 40	0 55
16¾ lbs. bacon	0 15	0 20
20 lbs. tea	0 40	0 60
22 do	0 40	0 60

This I think will account for more of the difference than has been explained by the Minister of Justice. There are other items showing there have been extravagant charges, and hon. members who have drawn attention to these matters are fully justified.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not wish to be understood to charge that the action of hon. members was not quite proper and right in drawing attention to this matter. On the contrary, I said that the *per capita* charge was much in excess of that of other penitentiaries, and I said I could give no other reasons except the local reasons of high prices and distance from market. But the hon. gentleman will see that in coming to my assistance for the purpose of affording an explanation as to why the cost has been so much, he has not done me much service after all, for the whole difference he has pointed out is only $25.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I am prepared to admit that that is all that is shown by this particular statement. But the same discrepancy may arise in regard to other items more under the control of the warden of the penitentiary.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Auditor General would have called our attention to other items if excessive payments had been made. There are no payments made by Mr. Bedson or his officers which do not pass under the scrutiny of the Auditor General. No account whatever has been passed for liquors except for hospital purposes, and that was paid on the responsibility of the surgeon. If the imputation suggested was at all justified, it would simply show that he had failed in his duty and had deceived us in the matter. But I have no reason to suppose that such is the case. The report to which an hon. gentleman briefly alluded called attention to the necessity of surgical instruments being supplied, and the accounts for some of those might explain to some extent the increase in the item.

Mr. DAVIES. It is much to be regretted if the remarks of the Minister of Justice are to be taken as in any way justifying the offence of an officer who is responsible for charges. I hope the Minister did not desire his remarks to be so understood. It is true the sum is only $25, but it is a most serious matter, for the officer is charged by the Auditor General with charging in some cases 50 per cent. higher prices than the contract permitted.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not with having charged them, but with having paid them.

Mr. DAVIES. Then they are charged. When such an over-charge is discovered and exposed, the inference is that there are other items charged in excess, which are not so readily available to the Auditor General.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is not a dollar expended which the Auditor General cannot compare with such charges in other parts of the Dominion. I did not say that the warden was justified in paying excessive prices, but that this amount did not account for the large *per capita* sum for the maintenance of the penitentiary in Manitoba. I am not able to state what excuse the warden gave for the excess in these items, which amount to $25.56.

Mr. MULOCK. Why did the warden purchase outside of the contract? Is it customary to allow officers in the Department to make contracts and agreements with outside parties without the consent of the head of the Department? This is, perhaps, a small item, but it is, perhaps, the commencement of the introduction of a vicious principle. It looks as if there were great laxity in the public service.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think that should be inferred from the fact that I cannot explain an item which is not in the estimates at all, and in connection with which this is not the time when hon. gentleman should expect me to be prepared with an explanation. Nobody in connection with the penitentiaries has any right to ignore the contract at all, and unless there is some good reason for giving the higher prices, the officer would undoubtedly be charged with the difference himself.

Mr. MULOCK. I can understand the Minister of Justice not being prepared to explain the item at the moment, but it is to be borne in mind that as far back as March, 1885, the warden placed his information on this matter in writing, and no doubt since this volume was prepared with the statement of the Auditor General, the matter has been before the members of the Government, including the Minister of

Justice, and it shows on the face of it such an entire departure from all sound principles that although the matter is a trifling thing in itself, I am surprised that the Minister of Justice did not at once observe what a door was being opened to lax administration, and ascertain, at the earliest possible moment, how this transaction occurred.

Mr. LANGELIER. I see that there were 100 convicts in the penitentiary last year, and that 800 pounds of tobacco was consumed, or 8 pounds for each convict, or nearly $4 apiece. If all the other expenditure is on the same footing, I think it is not surprising the expenditure in that place is very high.

Mr. DAVIES. Is tobacco allowed the convicts?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In all the penitentiaries?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. Then according to these figures the country is paying for 50 per cent. more than the amount allowed.

Mr. THOMPSON. No; 800 pounds is the quantity purchased. It does not say used.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the criticisms in the committee are sufficient to justify the Minister of Justice in paying special attention to the expenditure in this Manitoba Penitentiary, because there is an impression among a good many people that the expenditure on this institution is extremely large.

Mr. THOMPSON. The large cost in the penitentiary has not been brought to my attention for the first time this evening.

Mr. WILSON. That may be; but the irregularities existing must have been brought to the hon. gentleman's attention.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have not seen the irregularities, but I know that certain suspicions have been thrown out by hon. gentlemen with regard to certain officers and certain Ministers, and certain public men generally. I am not aware, however, that those suspicions were uttered seriously or on a proper foundation.

Mr. DAVIES. Surely the hon. gentleman takes the letter of the Auditor General as a serious charge by a responsible official.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no serious charge involved in the matter.

Mr. DAVIES. The serious charge is the charging of 50 per cent. more than the contract price justified.

Mr. THOMPSON. Nothing of the kind. The statement of the Auditor General is that the warden buys at a higher price than the contract price, and what the hon. gentleman said was that the warden charged it himself. The bills came in from the traders and were passed, and it may be that those were simply overcharged by the traders, while the suggestion of the hon. gentleman would imply corruption on the part of the warden himself.

Mr. DAVIES. Certain articles for the penitentiary were to be furnished at a contract price, and an officer of the prison went outside and purchased them at a higher figure, sometimes at an advance of 50 per cent. That fact involves a very serious charge, especially when it is backed up by the charge made by my hon. friend that that same officer charges $14 a head for drugs, whereas in the other prisons the charge varies from $1.50 to $2.50. It appears to me these things are sufficient to justify an examination by the Minister of Justice.

British Columbia Penitentiary $46,971 25

Mr. THOMPSON. The increases consist of $600 for a blacksmith, $600 for a keeper, and $600 each for four guards. The warden states the guards are required in consequence of an increased prison population which he anticipates; and the inspector has made a report in which he states that the trade instructors, the keeper and the guards are necessary.

Mr. DAVIES. There are a large number of increases in this penitentiary about which there ought to be some explanations. I trust the Minister will not force us to go into the subject at this late hour.

Mr. MULOCK. I submit it is unreasonable to ask us to carry this item to-night. The expenditure for this service last year was $34,000; for the next year an increase of $12,000 is asked. That means an increase for all time to come; in other words, it means adding to our annual expenditure a sum which represents the interest on a quarter of a million capital. I submit we are not doing our duty to the country in hastily deciding this important matter.

Mr. McLELAN. I think we should finish it, we have gone so far. It was agreed that we might finish the whole of the items for penitentiaries, except St. Vincent de Paul.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know of any such agreement.

Mr. WELDON. The expenditure was only $27,000 last year.

Mr. THOMPSON. During the year the hon. gentleman refers to, the population of the prison was only seventy-five. At the time these estimates were made up there were 115 in the prison, and the warden estimated that he would have to provide for thirty-five more, in consequence of the number of prisoners then held for trial, and likely to be convicted.

Mr. MILLS. If these expenses go on increasing, these convicts will become more formidable to the public, even in the penitentiary than outside.

Mr. DAVIES. What means the increase to capital account of $1,400?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is simply to cover purchases, such as for the blacksmith shop and trade rooms, which are not chargeable to ordinary maintenance, but of a permanent character.

Mr. DAVIES. What are the special purchases to be made?

Mr. THOMPSON. Purchases for implements, such as anvils for the blacksmith's shop, and outfits of that kind.

Mr. MULOCK. We have not sufficient explanation to dispose of this item. On page 30, we find the item of officers' uniforms, 1885-86, $400; this year there is an increase of $600. Are there twice as many guards as last year?

Mr. THOMPSON. There will be five new officers, and the clothes of the old ones wear out sometimes.

Mr. MULOCK. The information the Minister has furnished does not strike one as altogether new.

Mr. McLELAN. They do not get a new outfit each year.

Mr. MULOCK. The $600, in my opinion, is not required merely to supply the uniforms for the new guards.

Mr. DAVIES. The item of industries in 1884-85 was $425; this year it is $3,000.

Mr. THOMPSON. The expenditure for industries is in the material for the convicts to work up. When we have a greater number of convicts learning trades and a new trade instructor, a larger amount is required to buy material.

Mr. MULOCK. I protest against the Minister of Finance forcing this through at this late hour. I find on page 81 an item for convicts' travelling allowances; I would not be surprised to find cab hire included in that.

Mr. BOWELL. Well, they have to travel in vans.

Mr. MULOCK. I move that the committee rise and report progress. The Minister of Finance is endeavoring to force amounts through the House in an unreasonable way.

Mr. THOMPSON. The travelling expenses of convicts is in pursuance of the law which requires us to pay the expenses of convicts going home after their discharge.

Mr. WILSON. The proposition of the hon. member for North York is a reasonable one, as the Minister has not given satisfactory replies. If we fully comprehended what we were voting, we could go on with this item. Why not let the House rise, and give the Minister an opportunity to examine into the items, and then bring down the information to the House so that we may be able to vote on it intelligently.

Mr. BOWELL. That would have very much force if there had not been given explanations to every question asked.

Mr. DAVIES. No, there was not.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in the habit of answering that way, and I do not expect from him anything else. The hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) asked about travelling expenses. What more explanation could be given than the Minister gave? Hon. gentlemen opposite have no right to say we are endeavoring to push these estimates through with haste. The whole of last Thursday was occupied and not a single estimate passed, and I may say I have never, during the seventeen years I have been in Parliament, heard more lucid or plainer explanations given than the Minister of Justice has given to-night on every question put to him. He has not elaborated but stated the facts, and where he had not the facts he would make a note and give a statement at a future stage. If we go on at this rate we will be here until January next.

Mr. DAVIES. Hon. gentlemen are seeking to pass through estimates containing large increases over last year's votes, without giving sufficient explanation. The least hon. gentlemen could do would be to accede to our request and not force this through, but give us time to compare the expenditures. The hon. gentleman has said that explanations were given, and when I rather deprecated that he used language which he should not have used——

Mr. BOWELL. I will in future leave that language to be used by you.

Mr. DAVIES. I was not addressing the hon. gentleman at the time, but when the hon. gentleman says that the Minister of Justice gave all the explanations required, I tell him that the Minister himself reserved explanations until a later stage.

Mr. BOWELL. That is precisely what I said, and I do not desire that the hon. gentleman should leave any false impression on this House. What I said was that my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, had answered promptly the questions put, except in some instances, when he had not possession of the facts, and when he said he would give his explanations later. The hon. gentleman is trying to misrepresent me.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. the Minister of Customs said he had been sitting in the House for the last seventeen years and never heard more complete, lucid and satisfactory explanations than those given by the hon. gentleman. Yet, at the same time, he says distinctly that the information had not been supplied us, and we were to wait until concurrence.

Resolutions ordered to be reported, Committee to sit again.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:40 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 28th April, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that as the time for receiving reports from Committee on Private Bills will expire to-morrow, the same be extended for a further period of fifteen days from that date, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, as contained in their seventh report.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Ontario, Minnesota and Manitoba Railway Company.—(Mr. Royal.)

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the Emerson and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Pruyn.)

RAILWAY WHARF AT ST. JOHN'S, QUEBEC.

Mr. BECHARD asked, Has the Canadian Government ever given to the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company powers to construct the wharf which the said company have built alongside their bridge across the Richelieu River, near the town of St. John?

Mr. POPE. I am not aware, nor can I find any trace, of their ever having given such power.

OIL FOR THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. WELDON asked, Is the oil required for the Intercolonial Railway supplied by contract? If so, were tenders asked for such contract? What is the price paid per gallon for oil supplied?

Mr. POPE. They have all been let by contract. The price is all the way from 7½ cents to 65 cents per gallon.

Mr. BLAKE. Were tenders asked for?

Mr. POPE. Yes, they were all let by contract.

Mr. BLAKE. But they might be let by contract without tender.

Mr. POPE. Yes, tenders were asked.

IMPORTED POWDER FOR CARTRIDGES.

Mr. MULOCK asked, Has the Government within the last six months imported, or does it intend to import from Woolwich, powder to be made into cartridges for use by rifle associations in Canada? If so, in what, if in any way, has such powder been tested for proof, so that it may be relied upon to give satisfaction, or whether it is intended to submit the same to any tests to ascertain that it is of the proper quality and more suitable than the Canadian-made powder?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 7,000 lbs. of rifle fine grain powder, Waltham Abbey, specially manufactured for Snider-Enfield ammunition, have been imported lately from England. This powder has been tested at the cartridge factory with satisfactory results. This course was taken in consequence of objections found to the quality of the powder furnished by the Hamilton Powder Company. Cartridges are now being manufactured with this imported powder for the use of our rifle associations. It is thought that the quality of the powder contracted for this year by the Hamilton Powder Company will give ample satisfaction.

SUGAR DUTIES PAID AT HALIFAX AND MONTREAL.

Mr. DALY (for Mr. STAIRS) asked, What amount of duty was paid on sugar by refiners at the ports of Halifax and Montreal, respectively, from the 1st to the 30th of March, inclusive?

Mr. BOWELL. The amount paid at Halifax was $118,332, and that at Montreal $470,681.80.

VACANCY IN THE ONTARIO HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to propose legislation with reference to the salary of the vacant judgeship in the High Court of Justice of Ontario? Is the Government aware that the late judge was disabled by illness for a long time before his death, and that great inconvenience has been caused by the practical vacancy for over two years in the office? Is it the intention of the Government to make an appointment without delay to the office?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is the intention of the Government to propose legislation with reference to the salary of the vacant judgeship in the High Court of Justice of Ontario. The Government is aware that the late judge was disabled by illness for some time before his death. We have no information that great inconvenience was caused by the practical vacancy in the office. It is not the intention of the Government to make any undue delay in the appointment.

TIMBER SALES ON GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Did the Government sell any of the timber on the following islands in the Georgian Bay, viz.:—Griffith, White Cloud, Hay, Bear's Rump, Flower Pot, and Isle of Coves? If so, when, and to whom, and at what price? Was the said timber sold by private sale or put up at public competition? If sold to a company, who were the members of said company?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government have disposed of the timber on Griffith, White Cloud, Hay, Bear's Rump, Flower Pot and Isle of Coves. A license was issued on the 18th July, 1882, to Mr. Charles Anderson, of Owen Sound, merchant, and Madame Josephine C. Farijana, of Montreal, for the same. The licensees paid a bonus of $1,000, and they also paid dues according to tariff on all timber cut as well as a ground rent of $52 per annum. The timber was sold by private sale.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. COOK moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, departmental orders, engineers' reports, route adopted for the Trent Valley Canal, the estimated cost of construction, amounts already expended on account of the same by contractors or the Government, the names of contractors, the amount paid to officials of the Government, with names and duties of each individual, and all other information bearing on this undertaking.

He said: Sir, this Trent Valley Canal is no new work. It was started a great many years ago before the union of Upper and Lower Canada. Considerable money was expended upon it at that time for the purpose, largely, of bringing timber down the Trent River. That part of the country was covered with timber of large growth, and lumbering operations have been carried on there to a great extent for a great number of years. But this branch of industry has almost wholly disappeared for some years back. The work was discontinued until the present Administration came into power, and it was revived. The object of its revival, I suppose, was to facilitate the getting of grain from the Georgian Bay to the frontier as expeditiously and as cheaply as possible. That was the idea, at all events, of some parties who were interested. There were other motives which, I have no doubt, were known to a good number of members who are sitting on that side of the House, and representing constituencies on this line. This has been a cry for election purposes from the time the first grant was made in 1881 by this Government; but before we come to that part of the subject, I would like to refer to a report, which I do not think a fair one, that was made by William Kingsmill, civil engineer, of Ottawa, I think, at the present time. This report was made some years ago, in which he said:

"Before the union, when Sir John Colborne was Lieut.-Governor, a large amount of money was expended on the River Trent that amounted to, I think, $481,123.61.

"Lock 135 feet long, thirty-three feet wide, and five feet deep, with the accompanying dams, to obtain reaches of navigation, were built between Rice Lake and the Bay of Quinté; also at Peterboro', Bobcaygeon and Lindsay. Until the introduction of railways, small steamers plied between Gore's Landing, on Rice Lake, and Peterboro'. The steamer 'Ogemah' still continues tri-weekly trips between Chemung Lake and Fenelon Falls, connecting with the Port Hope and Lindsay Railway at Lindsay, and by stage a distance of six miles, with Peterboro'.

"Further expenditure on this route was stopped in 1841, on the ground that the line of communication from the Bay of Quinté to Nottawasaga Bay required 820 feet of lockage, and that the depth of five feet of water through a series of lakes and currents, in a route extremely circuitous was unsuited as a line by which the produce of the Western States could be sent down to tidewater. The River Trent, below Peterboro', is now used as the means of conveying rafts of timber from the lakes in the rear of Peterboro' to the Bay of Quinté; and the Board of Works, excepting the locks at Bobcaygeon, maintained only some timber slides and dams on the river for that purpose. In 1863 the member for Peterboro' succeeded in obtaining a select committee to enquire into the advantages of this route, as a means of communication between Lakes Huron and Ontario. The committee did not report during that Session; but, although in 1864 the enquiry was renewed, the result has not been made public. There cannot be any doubt, however, that the decision of 1841 will be affirmed.

"The same objection exists now which were ably urged by Mr. Killaly at that time, and we owe it to him that no more money has been wasted on this ill-advised scheme. There is a schedule in the Public Works report, which, in any other publication, might be ranked among the facetiæ of the hour, but grave documents are not appropriate for the exhibition of humor. It is, however, difficult to consider, in a serious light, a schedule setting forth: 'Public works incomplete and as yet unproductive, but on which tolls are to be levied as soon as they are available.' Under this head the Scugog inland navigation is included at a cost of $481,123.61. It may even be regarded as a matter of good fortune that this sum is not twenty times what it is. It was estimated that in order to complete the works to the extent originally proposed, two millions and a half dollars would be necessary, but it was considered

that the amount was understated, and that at least a million dollars more would be required. It is impossible to explain how such works were originally authorised, for after proceeding upwards of eighty miles through this tortuous and insufficient navigation, the vessel would have been in Rice Lake, just ten miles from Lake Ontario. But the principle on which improvement should be conducted is so little known, and the rapacity of constituencies and politicians so great, that the absurdity of a project is not the least bar to its being entertained."

That was the opinion of that eminent engineer. When they were at Rice Lake they were within ten miles of Lake Ontario, and still they contemplated building the canal through to the mouth of the Trent, which would be something in the neighborhood of 190 miles. Then we heard nothing more of this until the present Government came into power, and in 1881 we find they voted $6,000, I suppose for the purposes of an investigation or survey. In 1882, just before the general election, $5,836.51 of this sum was expended. I know that was a live issue in those constituencies that I have mentioned along this line. At that time it had not reached as far as Simcoe, but I believe, owing to the exertions of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) it has got as far north as even Georgian Bay, and now I am very happy to be able to give it a lift in that direction. Well, I find that North Hastings, East Hastings and West Hastings were very much interested in this subject just about 1882. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that was just before the election, and it was rather doubtful if those constituencies would elect supporters of the present Government. East Northumberland was another one, West Northumberland, East Peterboro', West Peterboro', North Victoria and South Victoria—nine—a pretty good haul, or 18 on a division, if they could have got them all on the other side. In 1882 they succeeded in getting a vote from this House of $290,000. Immediately after that the election took place, and how did we find this money expended? In the very next year after the election was over we find that the Government only expended $40,767.16, leaving $249,.32 84 unexpended. That has a very fishy complexion, and, Sir, from the temper of the delegates that were here a short time ago, they appeared to appreciate pretty well the extent to which they were fooled at that particular time. Well, Sir, in 1884 we had another vote of $185,000, and in that year there were expended $121,382.84, so we have had $481,000 voted by this House and only $288,630 expended. Before a large sum of money is expended in such a manner, it is the duty of the Government to ascertain the utility of the work. The Government should have surveys made, a route adopted, and they should know the cost of the work to the country before expending the money. They should know whether it is practicable, which they do not know even to-day. I have no doubt that if the work is practicable the expenditure is in a good direction; but if the work is so important as it is said to be at election times, then the amount required for its construction should be at once voted by Parliament, and contracts given out for its completion. We had a report in 1884, which, however, only went a short distance and dealt with part of the work; but we cannot make head or tail of it. It does not give the full estimate of the amount required, or what should be done towards the construction of the work. In 1884 a large deputation waited upon the Government; it was said to number something in the neighborhood of 150 of the most influential gentlemen on the line of the Trent Valley Canal. I was invited to attend that gathering, which I did cheerfully, from the fact that I am very much interested in the construction of the work, provided it can be carried to a successful issue. It was stated there by, I think, the member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), that the work could be completed for $3,000,000 and that men could be found who would take the contract for that sum. Sir Charles Tupper, in his reply, stated that if the deputation could point to respectable and competent men who would take the contract, and complete the work for $3,000,000, he would at once invite his colleagues to consider the matter. But at that very time, I am credibly informed from a high authority, the estimate was far more than $3,000,000, was in fact something in the neighborhood of $9,000,000, and when Sir Charles Tupper made that statement to the deputation he knew quite well he was talking nonsense and buncombe to deceive those gentlemen who were present as delegates. If that is the fact, if it is true that the estimated cost was $9,000,000 at that time, I think a Minister of the Crown should not have attempted to trifle with so important a delegation by stating that he would be prepared to give a contract for $3,000,000 when he knew that the estimate for the work was $9,000,000. We heard nothing more about the matter till last year, when we had a report presented, which failed, however, to give us very much more information than we formerly possessed. It gave information with respect to some local works that had been executed since the previous report; but it did not give the cost of the work throughout, and whether, in the opinion of engineers, it was thought to be practicable. One very important change was made, and from my knowledge of that part of the country I am able to state that it was a judicious one. Mr. Rubidge, in his report, stated:

"From Lake Simcoe to Lake Huron the descent is found to be 132 feet, instead of 124 feet, as formerly estimated.

"The circuitous route by the River Severn, which also lies along the southern border of the Laurentian formation, was surveyed, but owing to the rocky nature of its banks and at certain points contracted channel, together with its unfavorable direction, it was ultimately deemed advisable to explore inland for a more feasible route.

"These explorations resulted successfully. A favorable line was discovered between Lake Couchiching and Matchedash Bay, commencing at a point about two miles east of the village of Orillia, and opposite the Narrows of Lake Simcoe; thence it crosses the dividing ridge at what may here be considered the low elevation, in a distance of less than two miles, where, falling into the valley of a branch of the North River, or rather creek, it descends by an easy route, lying in the general direction and east of the Midland Railway to Matchedash Bay, a distance of about sixteen miles.

"By Lake Couchiching and the channel of the River Severn, to its mouth at Port Severn, the distance is forty-four miles. The difference in distance is therefore over twenty-eight miles in favor of the inland route."

This Session another large deputation waited on the Government, and the different delegates expressed their opinion in regard to the work, and urged the Government to place a large sum in the Estimates for its construction. I see by a circular which has been sent to me, and which is, no doubt, in the hands of several other members who reside in the neighborhood of the undertaking, that the executive of the Trent Valley organisation urge upon members to see the Government, and ask them to carry out their pledge by placing $350,000 in the Supplementary Estimates for the work. I observe in the present Estimates a sum of $103,000. I do not think the Government are justified in placing so small a sum in the Supplementary Estimates. If the work is going to cost millions, why not at once face the music? We have been constructing very large works, as was said by members of the Government who replied to the delegation. The Minister of Railways was present, and in his inimitable manner he replied, that when they gave him the money he would build the canal. He said that of course it could not be built without money; that the Government had no money, and when he got the money he would do the work. I thought that was a humiliating statement to be made by the present Administration, which were in the habit of boasting of yearly surpluses, and now that their money has been wasted and thrown away into the four corners of the earth, they say they have nothing with which to build the Trent Valley Canal. The delegation also heard from the Minister of Finance. He said that he received the money in one hand and gave it out with the other, that it came from the people to his Department and that it was expended

as the Government saw fit—that was his duty. The Minister of Customs assured the deputation that he was watching carefully their interests; that it was his duty to watch their interests, as the work would pass through his constituency, and they might rest confident that he would see the work carried out, from the fact that he had married the waters of Lake Ontario with those of the Bay of Quinté by the building of the Murray canal. He rose to the dignity of a poet on the occasion. Then we had the Minister of Interior. He had great respect for that part of the country; he had lived in that section for a long time, and he looked back on his past life in Peterboro' where he was so unsuccessful in obtaining a seat in Parliament, and finally he had to go to Montreal, but still he had a warm corner in his heart for that part of the country and he was bound to stand by it. As long as he was in the Administration he would give it all the assistance he could. These gentlemen led that deputation to believe that the canal would be built out of the revenues of the country. How could it be built out of our revenues if we are going to have a deficit each year? We had a large deficit last year, we will have another this year, and as certain as the sun rises and sets if this Government remain in power for the next five or ten years we will have deficits, and large deficits every year. These hon. gentlemen were dealing in buncombe when they stated that they would build this canal out of revenue; and if they had been honest they would have said: When we find that this work can be constructed then we will construct it, and we will ask for a loan of a million of dollars, or whatever may be necessary for the purpose. That is the only way in which they could properly, fairly and honestly have met this delegation; but here we see the paltry sum of $103,000 in the Estimates for this great undertaking, which is going to do so much good to the carrying trade of the North-West. I would like to know if the Government fear that this canal will come in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, which the Minister of Railways has so much at heart. I say that the people of our North-West country, and even of the Western States, should have an opportunity of making this the highway for their grain to the seaboard, so that it may reach the European market, and I believe that this is one of the routes which should be opened up and adopted for that purpose. I, therefore, move this resolution, and have given my opinions on the subject. I am entirely in favor of the construction of this canal, provided it is found to be practicable.

Mr. BURNHAM. When the hon. gentleman put his motion on the paper I had expected that he would have declared himself in favor of this project, but after listening to his remarks I am unable to say whether he is in favor of it or not. He says if it is a practicable scheme the Government should go on with it. Now, as he represents a constituency in this House which is interested in the matter, I should have thought that he would have made himself better acquainted with the merits of the undertaking and its feasibility. If he had followed the matter as closely as other hon. members whose constituencies are interested in the matter, he would have known that the Government have made very full enquiry into the matter, and that it is not now a question of doubt whether the scheme is practicable or impracticable. In the year 1878 the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, by one of their latest acts, transferred the control of this work to the Local Legislature of Ontario. When this Government came into power the matter was brought to the attention of the House, a committee of the House was appointed, and on the report of that committee the Order in Council transferring the work to the Local Government was cancelled, and the work became again the property of the Dominion. The project is one which has its origin as far back as 1833. The reason the scheme was dropped at the time of the Union of the Provinces was that some doubts existed whether there was a water supply at the height of land sufficient for the purpose of supplying the canal. When Sir Charles Tupper was in the Government he sent an engineer (Mr. Stark) over the route of the canal, and he made an investigation and reported to the Government as to the feasibility of the scheme. The question of water supply was the point to which Mr. Stark's investigation more particularly referred, and he ascertained that such a supply of water existed. Sir Charles Tupper was so much interested in the matter that he went over almost the whole length of the route, including that portion lying within the hon. gentleman's constituency, for the purpose of endeavoring to ascertain its feasibility. Although it is called the Trent Valley Canal, it is not, strictly speaking, a canal, but is rather the adoption of some means of utilising, for the purposes of navigation, the large lakes and other bodies of water already existing, and connecting by locks and short stretches of canal those bodies of water which are already navigable. The length from Georgian Bay to Bay of Quinté is about 206 miles, of which fifty-nine miles will require canalisation. When this route was taken up by the Government some fifty years ago, it was thought to be the natural route for a canal from the waters of Lake Huron to those of Lake Ontario, and the hon. gentleman's own knowledge will inform him that it is the natural water route between those two bodies of water. The hon. gentleman states that the expenditure made by the Government was made for political purposes; that we heard about it in 1882, that a large expenditure was voted, and that the matter is being revived again at the present time for political purposes. Well, Sir, the money that has been expended by the Government has been expended for the purpose of opening up some of these minor stretches of navigation, and the hon. gentleman knows that when the portions for which the money is voted are constructed, there will be a continuous stretch of navigation of about seventy-five miles. The hon. gentleman read the report of Mr. Kingsmill stating the difficulties which existed at that time, and referred to the difficulty of finding employment for one or two single boats on these waters; but I would like to inform the hon. gentleman that there are some fifty or sixty vessels on those waters at the present time, some of them of considerable capacity, and as the hon. gentleman lives in the neighborhood of Lake Simcoe, he should know that there are a number of vessels there of large capacity. So far as the whole scheme is concerned, I do not believe that the members of this House who have been supporting it, have done so for political purposes, but because they believed it to be a project which would be for the benefit of the localities through which it passes and to benefit the country at large. It will not be in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, so far as they have enquired into the work, are in favor of it. The advantage this canal route has over the system of navigation by way of the great lakes and the Welland Canal, is, that it is land-locked all the way from Midland, through Bay of Quinté and the St. Lawrence, to Montreal, saving a distance in navigation between Chicago and Montreal of 400 miles. I am perfectly satisfied that the hon. gentleman, if he is not in favor of this scheme, will wish he had been before the next general election comes round. His constituents have in large numbers waited on the Government to urge this scheme; deputation after deputation has visited Ottawa; the last time I think there were 150 people, a large number of whom were constituents of the hon. gentleman, and I am sure, when they read his remarks, in which he casts doubts on the scheme, on the good faith of the people who are supporting it, and on the good faith of the Government, they will conclude that he is not the proper person to represent them in this House, having

the great interest they have in this scheme. He speaks of the amount placed in the Estimates for the present year for this work, and the statements made to the deputations this year, or in former years, by Sir Charles Tupper and other members of the Government. I am sorry myself there is not a larger amount in the Estimates, and I hope the Minister will be able to explain satisfactorily how there happens to be the difference in the Estimates brought down from the statements which have been made by him to the deputation. I believe the Government, when they have full information before them as to the merits of this scheme and its cost, will feel justified in expending the money necessary to carry it out. If the reports of their own engineers satisfy them that the work is one not only in the interest of the Province of Ontario, but of the Dominion at large, as we believe it is, they should go forward with it. The deputations which have waited on them for several years past have been very large—I think the largest that have waited on the Government on any matter, representing twelve constituencies. I trust the Government will bring down the papers asked for by the hon. member, and will induce their engineers to take active steps to obtain full information as to the nature and cost of the work.

Mr. HILLIARD. I regret that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) should throw any doubts on the Trent Valley scheme. He should certainly have expressed himself on the subject before this late day. He should be prepared to-day to show the advantages of the scheme—to show that though it may accommodate only small vessels, it is a land-locked system of navigation, through which freight can be carried more cheaply from the waters of Lake Superior and Lake Huron to Montreal than it can be by the Welland Canal route. We have in this route almost a perfect canal, and one that is perfectly practicable. There are no great excavations to be made; it runs through a country which is almost a plain from end to end, and the distance is navigable with the exception of about sixty miles, which can be cut through at a nominal cost. I did not understand whether the hon. gentleman said that the work would cost $9,000,000, or whether that was the estimate of the engineer he quoted. But we have the report of Mr. Stark, one of the most practical engineers of the country, based on careful surveys, that the work will cost probably less than $3,500,000, which is a mere nominal sum for such a work. I presume that Mr. Stark did not include the cost of damage to property along the route, which would probably swell the amount to $5,000,000; but if we could get that canal constructed for $5,000,000, or even for $9,000,000, it would be an exceedingly cheap work. I am afraid a large portion of the people of this Dominion do not appreciate the advantages of this inland route of water communication. Take a common point in the west, as Sault Ste. Marie or the Straits of Mackinaw, and another common point in the east, as Kingston, and a saving of 400 or 500 miles of travel will be secured by this canal; and at the western terminus of the canal when it is built, as I hope it will be before many years, we can by means of elevators handle the grain coming from the west and place it on board of vessels which will carry it to the harbor of Montreal at a very nominal cost. I venture to say, on a very careful estimate, that grain can be brought from Duluth or Port Arthur to Montreal at a cost of not more than 5 or 6 cents a bushel. If that can be done, we can bid defiance to the competition of the railways. One of the mistaken ideas of the present day is that the days of water communication have passed by, and that railways are sure in the future to do the forwarding business of the country. But if it can be shown that grain can be brought from Duluth to Montreal at 6 cents a bushel, as I think it can be, that is a good proof that the days of water communication have not passed by. There are people who believe also that freight can be carried cheaply only in large vessels. I admit that the larger the vessel the cheaper the freight can be carried; but when we take into consideration the shortness of this route, its perfect safety, and the absence of risk from storm or tempest, I think its advantages, as compared with the Welland Canal route, will be apparent. The saving of life and of vessels is in itself an object. As I stated on a former occasion, freight is carried on the river Hudson from Albany to New York at the rate of 12½ cents per ton a distance of 160 miles, which is another evidence that water ways have not passed their usefulness; for I do not think it is possible to carry freight by rail 160 miles at 12½ or 15 or 20 cents a ton. This is further evidence that a route of this kind would be decidedly practicable and useful. It has been stated that we lacked water, but people conversant with the country will not dispute the fact that we have abundance of water for the proposed canal. We have sufficient water tributary to this route to supply all the canals not only in the Dominion but on the continent, as we drain the water shed from four large counties. I think it would we wise for hon. gentlemen to post themselves on the practicability and advantages of a scheme of this kind, and if they did I am satisfied we would have much less opposition to the scheme than it meets with to-day. I trust the Minister of Railways will take pains to inform himself thoroughly on this subject. As to the appropriation, a sum of $103,000 has been placed in the Estimates for this work previous to the deputation coming here, but I have every hope that when the Supplementary Estimates come down, we shall find a vote in them equal to the amount promised by the Minister of Railways and Canals. I have every confidence that the hon. Minister will see this work carried through.

Mr. COCKBURN. I think the motion of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) very opportune, and I may say that the promise that an additional vote will appear in the Supplementary Estimates is one that will be hailed with satisfaction by the people of a large section of the country, comprising some 400,000 inhabitants. It is true that railways are looked upon as the modern highways, and that the days of canals are waning; but I have been informed on good authority that canals can not only carry grain cheaper, but even more expeditiously than railways, because they carry a larger quantity. Representing a portion of the country largely interested in the construction of the Trent Valley Canal, I deem it my duty to give my views on this question. I have been over the whole waterway in its present unfinished state, and as to the question of feasibility, I have no doubt whatever that the canal is perfectly feasible, and its construction is only a matter of money. The Government, on meeting the large and influential deputation which waited on it in the Railway Committee room, promised that $350,000 would be expended the coming year on this canal. I had no opportunity of saying a word then, because I was not one of those chosen to make any remarks, but even $350,000 is totally inadequate. The Government ought to spend a million dollars every year on this work, and that would be a very small sum. A few years ago the present Administration committed themselves to the policy of building the canal, but since then they have been very parsimonious in their annual appropriations for the scheme, and in this respect the appropriations are in strong contrast with those for railways, for instance, for the Canadian Pacific Railway. I admit the canal is not so important a matter as the Canadian Pacific Railway, but still it is of great importance along a line of about twenty constituencies interested in its construction. As to the question of the western terminus, some remarks have been made, and although it is not for gentlemen here to state what particular outlet on the Georgian Bay should be selected, I wish to mention a route not yet surveyed, but which is

recommended by practical people. A little south of Washago, on the west shore of Lake Couchiching is a flat running down towards Grass Lake into the Severn River, which would be well worth inspection. I recollect that, on the occasion to which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) alluded, the Minister of Finance spoke of the want of money and the necessity for going slowly, but since then the Canadian Pacific Railway have declared they are going to pay back $20,000,000 of the amount borrowed from the Government, and, as this will furnish means in abundance, I hope that the Minister of Finance will add $750,000 to his proposed $250,000, and make the expenditure this year on the canal $1,000,000. At the present rate of progress the canal will not be finished in this century or in this generation. It will cost, no doubt, a great deal more money than has been estimated by the engineers in the past, as engineers are wont to make estimates as small as possible. The hon. member for Peterboro' (Mr. Hilliard) has spoken of $3,500,000 or $5,000,000 as the cost, but I am sure that amount will be totally inadequate; at any rate, we should have $1,000,000 appropriated this year, at which rate it will still take from five to ten years to complete the work. The present Administration have pledged their faith to the people of those districts that they will build this route, the feasibility and practicability of which are beyond doubt, and as to its utility there can be no question. I was in Peterboro' last night for a short time, and while there I met a Conservative gentleman, who shrugged his shoulders and said he was of opinion that the people of the district were being trifled with, but I told him their representatives were sound on the canal question, and that they would have all the assistance I could give. I hope the several members from that district, who have great influence with the Government, will exert their influence in endeavoring to compel the Government to carry out their promise, and it would not be any great stretch on the part of the Government to give an appropriation of $1,000,000 instead of the amount they appear to have decided on. I think the hon. member for West Peterboro' (Mr. Hilliard) has given valuable information as to what canals are doing. The Erie Canal, for instance, has carried a larger amount of grain than all the railways combined, and as the Dominion of Canada has expended so much on large public works, and is being repaid $20,000,000 of the money advanced the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Government might well spare $1,000,000 of that amount in the appropriation this year for the Trent Valley Canal. I hope and believe that the Government will see it to be their duty, and if they are at all alive to their obligations and to the promises they have made to these different counties, they cannot do otherwise than expend a considerable amount of money there. They appropriated nothing last year, so they should now make up for it by voting this year from $700,000 to $1,000,000.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I desire to say a few words, not so much perhaps in reference to this question as in reference to another canal which I think might be substituted, and to which the Government might direct their attention a little more earnestly than they seem to have devoted it to this particular scheme. From the discussion which has taken place here to-day among the members who represent constituencies which are interested in this scheme, there appears to be a considerable difference of opinion, both as to the feasibility of the scheme itself and the amount of money required to complete it. I do not pretend to offer any opinion either as to the feasibility of the scheme or as to the amount which is required to bring it to a successful completion; but, from all the information we are able to obtain from the reports of engineers, and otherwise, in relation to the navigation of the Trent waters, it appears to me that, as an outlet, or means of communication between the great North-West and the eastern seaboard, the navigation that would be attainable through those waters would be entirely inadequate. I think that, without an enormous expenditure of money, it would be impossible to obtain, by the means of that system of waters in the Trent district, a navigation that would exceed five feet, and it seems to me that such a depth of water as that would be wholly inadequate to divert the traffic from the Erie Canal or to cheapen the cost of transportation of the products of the great North-West to the seaboard. I think the best course for the Minister of Railways to adopt is to expend whatever he may think in the interests of the public it demands, for the purpose of improving the navigation as a local work, and as a local work entirely, and to devote the money which my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Cockburn) alludes to as coming into the exchequer of the country during the present year from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to a scheme of very much greater importance—I speak now of the Ottawa Canal—a scheme which, if the Government would take it up, would enable them to obtain a navigation by means of the Ottawa and Mattawa Rivers which would be infinitely more beneficial for the transportation of grain from the North West to the seaboard than can possibly be obtained by means of the system of navigation which is under discussion to-day. I suggest to the Minister of Railways that he should, at all events, adopt some means of ascertaining what the cost of improving the navigation of the Ottawa would be, because I believe that the future of the great North-West depends upon affording to the people of that section of country a means of communication with the seaboard that would cheapen the cost of transportation. Allusion has been made to the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway in connection with this matter, but in the discussion which took place last year I think it was abundantly proven that, if the development of agriculture in our North-West is at all commensurate with its development in the North-Western States of the Union, under circumstances almost exactly similar to those which exist in the North-West Territory of Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway will, in a few years, be wholly inadequate to move the surplus products of that country. I believe, and I cannot repeat it too forcibly, that it would be in the interests of the country if the Government would adopt the suggestion to improve the navigation of the Ottawa, and thereby afford what I believe to be the shortest and best means of carrying the products of the great North-West to the seaboard. I do not desire, in offering this suggestion to the Government, to prevent or delay in any way the improvement of the navigation in the Trent Valley, but I am firmly of the opinion that that navigation will not be adequate for the purpose of transporting the grains from the North-West, and I would suggest to the Minister of Railways the propriety of considering the question of adopting some means of carrying out the more important scheme to which I have alluded.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings). I look upon the scheme which is under discussion as second in importance only to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The reasons for its construction have already been very clearly laid before the House by the members for Peterboro', and, while I am pleased to know that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) has brought this matter before the House so as to give members an opportunity of giving it their consideration, as well as of urging upon the Government the importance of considering it, yet I believe that the Government are in earnest and are sincere in regard to the construction and ultimate completion of the Trent Valley Canal, and I do not believe, as has been insinuated by that hon. gentleman, that these grants are only given for the purpose of carrying the constituencies through which

the canal is to pass, and more particularly those in the county of Hastings. I think that, without the necessity for any grant in that direction, these ridings can be carried in the interest of the Government. I am glad the matter has been brought before the House, and I hope the Government will see their way clear to supplement the amount which has been placed in the Estimates by putting a larger sum in the Supplementary Estimates, so that the section of the canal may be proceeded with in the riding which I represent, where no money has yet been expended.

Mr. POPE. I am not a little disappointed at the remarks that fell from my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Cook), because I thought we had satisfied the gentlemen who were here on the delegation that we were really in earnest; but we explained then to him, and the gentlemen who were with him, that we had had very heavy works on hand, that we were just completing those heavy works, and that we did not feel at this time that we were in a position to appropriate very large sums of money until we had taken a rest. Such was the style in which I talked to the deputation, without attempting to give them further encouragement than that I stated that we should put a considerable appropriation in the Estimates this year to complete the lock we had begun and to continue the work. I think it came with a very ill grace from the hon. gentleman to say that we were not in earnest in this work. What was the position of this work in 1878, when the present Government came into power? A good deal of it had been handed over to the Provincial Government, a good deal had been already abandoned, and, of course, we had to commence anew, we had to procure some of the works which had been disposed of, and to make a fresh beginning. And, while we have been doing that, everybody in this House and in the country knows very well that we have had to appropriate very large sums of money to carry out public works, to carry out the Pacific Railway and the Welland Canal, and that we could not be expected during this time to go much faster than we have gone. I am very glad to hear hon. gentlemen from the neighborhood of Peterboro' speak as they do, and I believe the country will listen to what they have said, and will believe with them that we are earnestly endeavoring to do what we consistently can to forward this work, as we do with respect to every other work we undertake. With respect to my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White), I am sure he will wait, I shall be very glad to listen to him, to see everything he can show us, and to do everything we can do. But I will ask him to have patience; I will ask him to wait a little until we have made some progress in these great works that we now have on hand, although we have completed that work for which we have expended so much money. I am sure he will not be disappointed in the interest that we shall take in his work, as well as those that have gone before. I have no objection to the motion the hon. gentleman has made, and I will bring down all the papers that I can, that are not confidential reports to the engineer in chief; but all the papers that I can bring down I will bring down.

Mr. BLAKE. May I ask the hon. gentleman whether he has any estimates of the cost of this work?

Mr. POPE. I have two or three estimates. I do not think that I have a complete estimate at present. If it is very recent I will let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman bring down such estimates as he has?

Mr. POPE. I will bring down such estimates.

Motion agreed to.

THE TRAFFIC IN INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. BEATY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to bring in a Bill amending the Act respecting the traffic in intoxicating liquor.

He said: In making this motion I will briefly explain the objects of this Bill. It is not for the purpose of interfering in any way with the Scott Act wherever it is adopted at present. The object is to give an option to any municipality which has not already adopted the Temperance Act called the Scott Act to adopt an Act prohibiting only spirits as a beverage. The clause making that provision reads as follows:—

99*a*. From the day on which this section of this part of this Act comes into force and takes effect in any county or city, and for so long thereafter as the same continues in force therein, no person, unless it be for exclusively medicinal purposes or for *bonâ fide* use in some art, trade or manufacture, under the regulations contained in the 3rd subsection of this section, shall, within such county or city, by himself, his clerk, servant or agent, manufacture, import or bring into such county or city, or expose, or keep for sale, or sell, or barter, or exchange, to or with any other person, or give to any person, or purchase, keep or use, directly or indirectly, on any pretence, or upon any device, any gin, rum, brandy or whiskey, or other distilled liquor, or any porter, beer, ale, wine, or any liquors, or liquids mixed therewith, capable of being used as a beverage: Provided always, that in any county or city where this section comes into and is in force, porter, beer, ale, wine, cider or other vinous or fermented liquor, of the standard acoholic strength required in the Customs or Inland Revenue Department, and not in any instance exceeding such standard, imported or manufactured in such county or city, or elsewhere, may be sold, kept and used as a beverage, as at the time of the passing of this section, but under, and subject to such licenses, restrictions and regulations, as may then or thereafter be enforced in respect thereto, under any Act of Parliament of Canada, or any provincial or other law or regulation.

Now it will be seen that the main point is that counties may have the alternative option of petitioning for this section, which will, if adopted, prohibit the sale of spirits as a beverage in that municipality. It is expressly provided that the Act shall not extend to any community which has already adopted the Scott Act, as it at present exists. The framework of the Act provides a section which is to be called 99*a*, having the language, as far as is practicable, of the present Act, so as to prohibit the sale of spirits in those counties which may adopt this Act. Then there is section 100*a*, providing for penalties for violating this Act. In the first instance the penalty shall be $100, for any infraction of this provision; in the second instance $300; and in the third $500. I do not go as far in this Act as I did in the Act of last Session, and say that property should be confiscated, but I simply provide for a fine, and in case of non-payment of these fines, the offender shall be imprisoned for a certain limited period. We find from the numerous petitions which have been presented to this House during this Session, that there is a great interest taken in a provision of this kind. It may be observed, however, that the petitioners go a little further than I propose in this section. They ask that in Scott Act counties the inhabitants may petition for, and have, a new vote on the exclusion of spirits only, or the adoption of beer and wine. I do not go that far. I think it would be unreasonable, from my standpoint; from my point of view I think it would not be advisable to interfere with those counties which have gone to the trouble and expense of adopting the Scott Act in its present form. They should be allowed to work it out as best they can. Of course, we all know that on the one hand it is said that the Act is a demonstrated failure, and on the other hand it is called a great success. That is, of course, a question of personal judgment on the evidence which is placed before each member. My opinion has never been that the Scott Act was a success, but I am willing that it should be tried to the greatest possible extent so as to ascertain whether it can be made a success. I am willing to adopt any reasonable

measure that can be presented, and allow it to operate fully so as to determine whether it can be made a success. Therefore I do not feel disposed to interfere by any legislation I might propose, or any that this House might adopt, with the operation of the Scott Act as it is at present, but simply to give counties an alternative option of petitioning for this Act, or that Act, as the case may be, and in case there are two petitions presented, the petition having the larger number of signatures shall prevail. Then when the Act comes into force, the provisions of the Temperance Act shall apply to it, with the necessary changes in forms and procedure, and as that Act is fairly well understood now in its provisions and procedure, certainly in its forms for petitions, proclamations and proceedings of that character, I let them stand, to be applied to the present Act, if it should pass. The great evil in connection with liquor drinking arises from the use of spirits, and not from the use of beer and wine—at all events in this country, whatever may be said of other countries. We know that in countries where there is no legislation of this character, but where the people are in the habit of using only the milder drinks, there is not such a large amount of drunkenness as in countries where spirits are readily accessible. The object of this measure will be to prevent the ready access of persons to alcoholic drinks of a strong character, but, of course, enabling them to procure such liquors for medicinal purposes, or for use in the arts, as is provided in the present Scott Act. My view has always been that if the people generally were not permitted to obtain the stronger drinks, drunkenness, with its violence and evil consequences, would be, to a large extent, diminished if not wholly eradicated. It is not possible, probably, to wholly eradicate an evil of this kind. It is not only in the drink itself, but there may be something in human nature which develops results of this character. At all events the object sought to be obtained is to abolish the use of the stronger drinks, and allow, at least, some milder kinds of alcoholic drinks, such as beer and wine, which many persons seem to think are necessary for them. The Canada Temperance Act, as it now stands, is evidently under trial. It has not yet been fully shown to be what its advocates claim for it, a proved success. It is proper, however, to leave it as it is, to leave it on its trial; it is an experiment, and let the experiment be worked out with a view to ascertaining whether it will be a success or not. No doubt a large number of people in all the Provinces are intensely interested in that Act, and I think it would be a most unwise policy for Parliament to interfere with that Act and with the legitimate action of the people in voting for its adoption. I do not in any sense or way propose to interfere with the action or purpose of the measure or detract from it or impair its provisions. The one great point which I have had presented to me—and I have had some representations made to me—is that this Act should not apply to those counties which have already adopted the Canada Temperance Act. I have explained and clearly shown that it will not do so; but where the Canada Temperance Act ceases to have operation after it has been once adopted, then this Act applies to that county as well as to any other. The people may again for the second time apply by petition for the purpose of adopting the Scott Act as it is at the present day, or they may apply to adopt this Act, and in that case it will be a single vote and a distinct vote. I do not design that there should be two votes at the same time, a vote for the Canada Temperance Act as it at present stands and a vote for this Act; but, on the contrary, that the Canada Temperance Act, if petitioned for and if allowed to be voted on, shall be voted on independently and distinctly on its own merits, and so also upon this Act being voted on, if it should come into force. The two votes will be distinct and clear, and votes will not be taken in the same county on both Acts except at considerable intervals. Those are the general ideas pertaining to the Act. I think they are sufficient to commend themselves to this House and country. I have received strong representations from various quarters that some moderate measure of this kind would be acceptable to a great number of people. We find to-day a petition presented for the repeal of the Canada Temperance Act, and we find in some towns where the Scott Act has been adopted, and in some counties also, action has been taken by the councils and other bodies towards repealing the Scott Act, or towards the enactment of an Act allowing the sale of beer and wine. In Halton, which is said to be the banner county in regard to the Canada Temperance Act, the town council of Milton, which is the county town, have, by a vote of seven members against three, asked for the repeal of the Temperance Act, or for the enactment of a law under which wine and beer can be sold in that town at all events, if not in the county. So we find in regard to Collingwood, in regard to Nottawasaga and other places. Petitions are coming in from various quarters with that view. It would therefore, be reasonable to allow another experiment or trial, if you care to call it so, with respect to this liquor question, by allowing the mass of the people to drink alcoholic liquors of moderate strength which would not result in the evils at present attending the liquor traffic, and at the same time would not greatly damage the country in its material and trade interest, and allow those rights and interests at present established to be practically maintained.

Mr. JAMIESON. I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the principle of the resolution submitted by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty). I think it would be unfair at this stage to offer opposition to the measure proposed by the hon. gentleman, as it must be obvious to the House that it is impossible to discuss the principle of a measure intelligently until it is printed, and for my part I feel disposed to postpone the discussion of it until such is done. The hon. gentleman proposed a similar measure last year, and I, from the exigency of the occasion, found it necessary to defeat the measure, for the purpose of bringing forward the measure I had in charge. From the explanation given by the hon. gentleman I am glad to observe that he does not propose to interfere with the Canada Temperance Act, but to make his measure an independent measure. I think in pursuing that course he is acting wisely. Without committing myself—and I only speak for myself in this matter—to the principle of the resolution submitted by the hon. member, I wish to say that when the Bill about to be introduced reaches a subsequent stage I will take the opportunity, as I think other hon. members will take the opportunity, of discussing the measure fairly on the principles which are embodied in it.

Motion agreed to; and resolution considered in Committee and concurred in.

Mr. BEATY introduced Bill (No. 118) to amend the Acts respecting the traffic in intoxicating liquors.

Bill read the first time.

STEAM TUG *SULTAN*.

Mr. MITCHELL moved for:

Copy of the report or award of the Dominion arbitrators, with the evidence and papers connected therewith, in the matter of the claim of the owners of the steam tug *Sultan*.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government have no objection to bring down these papers, but they cannot be brought down immediately. The matter is now in the hands of the Department of Justice, and as soon as the advice which I have asked from that Department is put in

my hands, I will be in a position to submit my report to my colleagues. Until that is done, we will not be able to bring down the papers, but I hope to be able to bring them down in a very short time.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad indeed that the hon. gentleman has made the statement he has made, because I have a good deal of confidence in him, in his integrity and honesty of purpose, and all that. I cannot say the same for all the members of this Government, but I hope I will be able to have the papers at as early a day as possible.

Motion agreed to.

CLAIMS, SECTION 16, INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL moved for:

Copies of the award or report of the Dominion arbitrators, with the evidence and papers connected therewith, in the matter of claims in connection with Section 16 of the Intercolonial Railway, on the part of the estate of the late John Bannon, Esq.; the late William Muirhead, Esq.; William Wilkinson, Esq., and other claims investigated at the same time as those named above, and connected with said report or award.

He said: I shall reserve any remaks I may require to make on this matter until the papers come down. I have faith, however, that in accordance with the pledge of Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways and Canals, two years ago, this matter will be considered, and as I know the claims to be honest and just, that they will be paid. In the meantime I shall be glad to have the papers at as early a date as possible.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATIONS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return showing the names and post-office address of each person on the superannuated list of retired civil servants on the 1st day of January, A.D. 1886.

He said: On previous occasions I have offered some remarks to the House on the question of superannuations. It is a very important question, and I think we should carefully criticise the operation of the Act from year to year. I notice that the number superannuated under the Act, in 1884, was 53, of whom 46 were granted annuities, and 7 gratuities. The number superannuated in the year 1885 was 49. The number on the list on the 30th of June, 1884, was 433, and the number on the list on the 30th of June, 1885, was 446. The average annual amount paid to those on the list in 1884, was $470, and the average annual amount paid to those on the list in 1885, was $434.77. The amount paid in during the year 1883-84, by those on the list, was $51,882.21. The entire Civil Service, during the year 1884, paid in a sum sufficient to pay the 433 on the retired list $120 each, and the Dominion paid them $350 each. The entire sum paid out during the year 1884, was $192,692.70, of which the Civil Service paid $51,882.21, and the net loss to the country, under the operation of the Act in that year, was $140,810.49. The number on the list on the 1st of January, 1886, according to a return presented to the House, was 423. Twelve were granted annuities, which in all amounted to $4,792.47, or an average of $399.37 each. The sum paid in by the Civil Service during the year 1884-85, was $52,701.83, and the sum paid out was $203,636.21; so that the net loss to the country, under the operation of the Act during the year 1884-85, was $150,934.88. The average amount drawn by each person on the superannuated list during the last year was $469. The Civil Service paid in during the year a sum sufficient to pay those on the retired list $121 each, and the country paid them $348. The net loss to the country under the operation of the Act, for 1884-85, was $10,124.39 more than for the year 1883-84. Now, the system of granting a gratuity to those who are retired under the Act before serving ten years has been in my opinion abused, as well as the system of granting annuities. In most cases the sum paid is greatly in excess of the amount the parties have paid into the fund. For instance, R. A. Adair served four and one-quarter years, paid into the fund $25.50, and got a gratuity of $170. R. Biggs served two and three-quarter years, paid in $17.19, and drew $114.58. W. Villeneuve served two and one-sixth years, paid in $6.18, and drew $60. S. Simard served six and one-half years, paid in $41.60, and drew out $276.25. D. R. Bruce served nine and one-half years, paid in $66.97, and drew out as gratuity $446.50. F. Revely served six years, paid in $216, and got a gratuity of $900. J. W. Ryan served eight and seven-twelfths years, paid in $75.10, and drew out $500.70. D. S. Lowry served three years, paid in $15, and when he retired got $100. Now, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the results of the Act for the year 1885. The hon. Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech, stated that during the last year the country had actually made money under the operation of the Act, by the superannuation of some servants and the employment of others in their places, at smaller salaries. Well, let us see what the result to the country of the operation of the Act during the last year has been. There were forty-nine retired, forty-one by annuities and eight by gratuities. The salaries paid to those forty-nine amounted to $42,384.09; salaries paid to the twenty-five new appointees amount to $15,763.75. The places yet vacant the Government intend undoubtedly to fill, because the returns laid before Parliament always, if an office is abolished, state so. Consequently when not abolished, no doubt it is the intention of the Government to fill the office. They have therefore twenty-four offices to fill, the cost of which will be $16,195, but, allowing that they will make a reduction in the matter of salaries for those twenty-four offices, when they will be filled, proportionate with the reduction in the case of the twenty-five officials who have been appointed, and which was 25 per cent. less than those who occupied the offices before—deducting, from the $16,195, 25 per cent., or $4,048.75, those yet to be appointed will draw $12,146.75, making in all $27,910. The yearly allowance to those placed on the superannuation list last year is $18,362.62, the gratuities to those retired by gratuity is $2,568.03 which makes in all $48,838.65. The net loss to the country for the last year is $6,454.56; but hon. gentlemen will perhaps say that the gratuity should not be counted for every year, and I quite admit that, but deducting the gratuity you have a net loss for all time to come, while these men live, of $3,968.54, or nearly $4,000 a year. I notice also that in all the appointments made to fill vacancies out of the twenty-five, only three were filled by officers who had already been in the Department; the remainder were all new appointments. Hon. gentlemen will say, perhaps, that these twenty-four are not now in the employ of the Government and not drawing a salary, so that so much money will be saved. I will refer to some facts connected with the service in 1884. We find, on looking over the returns, that in 1884 there were 140 clerks in or around Ottawa, receiving an average salary of $1,349.66. The amount paid to those clerks for extra work during the year—work, I presume, done after hours, owing to the increased duties devolving upon them, possibly through the fact that some were superannuated—amounted to $57,792, or $412.80 each. This makes the salary of each $1,762.42, averaging $6 a day; and their salaries at the end of ten years, with the statutory increase of $50 per annum, would be $1,850 each, exclusive of payments for extra work. If then superannuated, those clerks, counting they are now ten years in the service, will be entitled to an annuity of $750. Coming down to the present year, we find there have been eighty clerks in the

Departments who have drawn $59,233.85 for extra service, or $731 each, and their ordinary salaries amounted to $1,698.83 each; so that they got $137,605.61 of salary altogether. This makes the amount drawn during the last year, for salary and extra services by those eighty-one clerks, $2,429.83 each. The total sum paid into the superannuation fund, during the time they were in service, by those who were superannuated in 1884, was $10,048.86, or $240 each; just about enough to pay one-half a year's allowance. The total number in the service eligible to be superannuated in 1884, and in a position to claim superannuation, was 1,753, and the total number now eligible to superannuation is about 2,000. The system of adding years to the time of service of those who have been in the service has been followed persistently by hon. gentlemen in a number of cases. I hold it is a most pernicious system, because I believe that the officials in the service, from the salaries they receive, should be able to lay aside something for themselves, instead of depending absolutely upon the country in the case of their becoming sick or retiring. I notice last year, J. B. Cherriman has been superannuated after serving 12 years. He got a salary of $4,000, and under the Act was entitled to a retiring allowance of $960; but instead of that, hon. gentleman added ten years to his time of service, which enables him to draw $800 more, or $1,760 a year. In this case the Minister of Finance certainly cannot show that money has been made. The new appointee to fill the position gets $2,800; so that his salary and the allowance to the one superannuated amount to $4,560 a year. I notice, too, that in 1884, Mr. Russell, Surveyor General, was superannuated, after serving fifteen years. They added ten years to his time, and he is now drawing $1,550 a year, though in all the time he was in office he only paid into the fund $632 33, or not enough to pay one-half year's allowance. Mr. Russell, chief clerk, served twenty years, and had a salary of $2,250; ten years were added to the time when he was superannuated in 1884, and his retiring allowance is $1,671.24, though he paid in nothing to the fund. Mr. J. B. Spencer, who filled the position of collector of Customs, Winnipeg, was superannuated in 1882. His salary was $2,600, and he had paid into the fund in all $388.48, and he now draws an annuity of $1,663.92. I understand he is now engaged in other business, while drawing this handsome allowance from the resources of the Dominion. E. W. Chesnut was also superannuated in 1884. He was drawing $1,100 salary, and was forty-seven years of age at the time of retirement, having served fifteen years. He is now getting an annuity of $330. Mr. N. N. Ross was in the Customs Department getting a salary of $1,600. He has been retired; he was superannuated in 1884. He is now drawing an allowance of $1,120, his successor gets $1,400, so that this office now costs the country $2,520, while before the superanuation of the man who occupied the position it only cost $1,600, so that the increase in that one case is $920 a year as long as that man lives. N. W. McLean, clerk of Private Bills, was superannuated last year. His salary was $1,400. He has a retiring allowance of $616, the new appointee gets the same salary of $1,400, so that this office now costs the country $2,016. We have one man stepping around doing nothing, living comfortably and easily, while another man does the work. Then there was also Mr. Whitcher, the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, he was superannuated with an allowance of $1,008. It is not supposed that he was superannuated because he was inefficient or incapable of doing the work, but I believe there was another gentleman in the office who was anxious to fill the position, and I believe he has got the office. Mr. Whitcher is now receiving his annual allowance of $1,008, and the other man is drawing a salary of $3,200, so that the Deputy Minister of Fisheries is costing the country $4,208 a year. Another case is that of Mr. Macmicken,

Assistant Receiver-General at Winnipeg. He was superannuated and gets $1,579.80 as his superannuation allowance. I understand that the hon. gentleman ran for a constituency in Manitoba and was elected. He was also appointed Speaker of the Manitoba Legislature. He drew his retiring allowance of $1,579.80 from the Dominion Government, he drew his sessional allowance as a member in the Province of Manitoba, and he got his allowance as Speaker, so that he was pretty well remunerated for his services. I believe he is now busily engaged in following other callings, and is still drawing his allowance.

Mr. McLELAN. When was he superannuated?

Mr. McMULLEN. I am unable to give the date of the superannuation.

Mr. McLELAN. You have it before you in the list in your hand.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, I have it here; I think it was in 1878. I daresay he was superannuated then, but I am not certain. I have no doubt the Minister of Finance will say that a good many of these were superannuated in 1878, and the previous year, under the Mackenzie Government. I admit that both parties have superannuated. I am not prepared to say that the Reform Government did not superannuate as well as the others, but, after all, to show gentlemen opposite that they have been the best hands at the business, I will give them a statement showing the amount of increase under the superannuations by the Mackenzie Government, as well as the amount of increase under the superannuations by hon. gentlemen opposite. Under the Mackenzie Government, in 1873-74, the receipts for superannuation were $31,620.18, and the expenditure was $64,442.84. In 1878-79, the year they left office, the receipts were $41,856, and the expenditure, $106,588. So that the increase, in five years, under the Mackenzie Government, was $42,135.16, or an average annual increase of $8,429.03. Now, take the case of the present Government. When they came into power, as I stated, the receipts were $41,856, and the expenditure was $106,588. In 1883-84, at the end of the first five years of their term of office, the receipts were $51,882.21, and the expenditure was $192,692.70, an increase in five years of $86,104.70, or an average annual increase of $17,220.94. The present Government increased the annual expenditure in the first five years of their term $43,969.54 more than the previous Government did in the same time. Now, to give an idea of the operations of the Act, and to bring it fully before the mind of hon. gentlemen opposite and members of this House, we will take the case of the clerk of the House. The clerk's salary is $3,400. We have a superannuated clerk drawing an allowance of $2,379.96. Then for the position of clerk in this House we are paying $5,779.96. We have a deputy clerk whose salary is $2,400. We have a superannuated deputy—yes, we have two of them—one drawing an allowance of $1,543.92, and another drawing $400, so that these three deputies, one doing the work and two stepping round doing nothing, and costing the country $4,343.92. Then for the clerk and deputy clerk of this House, under the operations of this pernicious system, the country is now paying $10,123.88 a year, and every one of those gentlemen was superannuated by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, it will be said that the Bill is ours, that it was introduced by the Reform party, and that consequently we have got to bear the responsibility of its bad effects. I would remind hon. gentlemen opposite that in 1882, when we drew the attention of the House to the operations of this system before, an hon. gentleman who then held a seat in this House moved a resolution, which I will read:

"Mr. Ross (Middlesex) moved, in amendment thereto, that the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, to amend the same so to pro-

vide (with due regard to the rights of those who have been already admitted to the superannuation list) for the abolition of the present system, and the substitution of a plan whereby a percentage of the salary of each civil servant shall be retained, and placed to his credit; and shall be payable to him, with interest, on his quitting the service, or to his family in case of his death in the service."

Every single gentleman on this side of the House voted for that measure, and everyone on the other side of the House voted against it. Consequently, the Bill, from the proposal of that resolution to the present time, becomes the act of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have declared our willingness and desire that it should be abolished.

Mr. BLAKE. It was passed by the old Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. I believe it was introduced by them, but it was amended afterwards. Now, I contend that there is no class of people in the Dominion which are better paid for the services they perform than the civil servants, and I believe this Act has been grossly abused. Hon. gentlemen opposite have taken advantage of a clause in the Act, whereby they found it convenient to superannuate a number of civil servants who were capable of performing the duties, because there were a number of others who were anxious to get the positions, and, as they could not very well put two in the same place, those who held the positions were superannuated and others were put in their places. I am glad to find that, since we have commenced the criticism of this Act, they have not made the same number of superannuations. They have been gradually dropping down. In 1881 there were eighty-five retired, in 1882 there were seventy-nine, in 1883 the number dropped down to sixty-five, in 1884 to fifty-three, and in 1885 to forty-nine. I have no doubt that they find that the country is becoming aware of the fact that gross abuses have taken place under the Act, and that the people are not prepared to countenance and support hon. gentlemen in its continuation. I believe, when the country people are once made aware of the operations of this system, they will undoubtedly pronounce most pointedly and determinedly in opposition to its continuance. Now, this Act has been abused simply because it provided that after a man had been in the service for ten years, and if, through ill-health, or other reason, he sought to be superannuated, he could be placed on a retiring allowance. In many cases, no doubt, hon. gentlemen have intimated to public servants that they had better apply for superannuation, and in some cases, perhaps, they were removed without knowing anything at all of the cause. I know cases myself where men received notice of the intention of the Government to put them on the superannuation list. They had no bodily ailment, but they were led to understand they had better apply for a superanuation, and so they were placed on the list. We are now paying, as the results of that Act, 433 men a sum of over $203,000. They are going about doing nothing, and we are paying other men salaries for doing the work. I say the country cannot afford it. I hold that at this period of our history, particularly when our annual expenditure is growing so large, it is desirable that we should cut off all items of this kind, and only pay what is absolutely necessary. Why, Sir, this Act has been abused in the same way that the Confederation Act has been abused. The hon. gentleman found that by a clause in that Act they were permitted to re-adjust the constituencies, and in consequence, we have had the pernicious Gerrymander Act perpetrated in 1882, and this Superannuation Act has been abused in the same way. Now, I hold in my hand a return, brought down this Session, showing the number of civil servants on the superannuation list on the 1st January, 1886. It gives the names in full, the dates they were superannuated, the amounts they have paid in, and the amounts they have drawn. I think it will be enough to draw attention to the more glaring cases that we may see how this Act operates. I will read from the list a few names:

	Date of Superannuation.	Amount paid in during the time in Service.	Total Amount drawn out up to Jan. 1, 1886.
Agnew, N	Oct. 1, 1878	$ 141 87	$ 4,263 00
Ashe, E. D	May 1, 1883	458 00	2,613 32
Bell, R	Sept. 1, 1879	343 23	4,215 75
Benoit, W	July 1, 1879	239 14	3,822 00
Birch, C. J., age 56	do 1, 1872	112 00	10,207 26
Bramley, J. C.	Nov. 1, 1878	451 99	8,034 69
Bernard, H., age 51	Sept. 1, 1876	505 00	18,704 37
Briscoe, C., age 57	May 1, 1871	69 33	10,972 92
Brunel, A.	Jan. 1, 1883	1,050 85	7,200 00
Cary, A., age 64	Oct. 1, 1875	255 99	6,405 84
Cooper, P.	Jan 1, 1873	22 89	3,257 34
Dickson, G. P.	Dec. 1, 1880	525 03	6,039 00
Fife, W. G., age 59	do 1, 1872	211 97	10,773 00
Flanigan, Jno.	Sept. 1, 1881	337 85	4,506 66
Futvoye, Geo	Jan. 11, 1875	420 00	24,579 41
Hewett, Thos	April 1, 1872	112 00	10,873 44
Hood, H. A	Aug. 1, 1883	349 29	1,488 65
Howard, C., age 53	May 1, 1875	166 84	8,048 64
Kelly, E. C., age 50	July 1, 1871	36 98	6,393 96
Kimber, R., age 59	May 1, 1875	275 71	11,187 20

In reference to Mr. Kimber, I understand that he performed the duties of Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod for a number of years. It appears that the air of Ottawa did not agree very well with his health. I understand that he is now in Paris. He draws the money from Canada and spends it over there. Then I find:

Kingston, G. J	Feb. 1, 1880	$ 140 00	$10,990 80
Langton, John	Aug. 1, 1878	847 00	20,146 93
Leslie, Joseph	Feb. 13, 1879	584 36	16,858 30
Lindsay, P	Jan. 1, 1876	216 00	7,833 60
Maingay, W. A	Nov. 1, 1874	113 00	4,308 33
Meredith, E. A	do 1, 1878	639 25	18,060 00
McKay, H. B	Dec. 15, 1881	223 71	3,687 23
McMicken, G	Feb. 1, 1878	261 13	12,506 75
Passaw, J. M	May 19, 1879	69 33	10,138 33
Patrick, A	Dec. 1, 1880	Nil.	12,098 33
Prieur, T. H	July 1, 1875	240 00	9,975 00
Ramsey, G. W	do 15, 1873	83 56	4,446 13
Ross, J. W	Nov. 1, 1877	294 90	8,318 24
Tasse, F. L	do 15, 1875	136 35	10,018 13

The whole amount drawn out reaches $1,059,093.65, or an average of $2,503.76 for 423 servants, towards which each had paid in on the average only $163.14, or not sufficient to pay a half-year's allowance on the amount drawn. I think this is a very serious matter deserving the attention of the House.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Kingston and Pembroke Mutual Aid and Insurance Company (Limited).—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 83) to amend the Act incorporating the Board of Trade of the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. Mackintosh.)

Bill (No. 61) respecting the Canadian Copper Company.—Mr. White, Hastings.)

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Anglo-American Iron Company.—(Mr. White, Hastings.)

Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the Forbes' Trochilic Steam Engine Central Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 114) to amend the Acts respecting the British Canadian Bank.—(Mr. Dawson.)

INSOLVENT BANKS AND OTHER CORPORATIONS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 15) respecting insolvent banks, insurance companies, loan com-

panies, building societies and trading corporations.—(Mr. Edgar.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. McLELAN. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should explain to the House the alterations which have been made in the Bill.

Mr. EDGAR. The Bill, as it came before the Committee on Banking and Commerce, contained a clause taken from the Insolvent Act of 1875, and made to apply to insolvent companies. But the provision in the latter part of the Bill which provided that the employees of a company should not only be entitled to three months' arrears of wages, but should also be entitled to a salary for two months in the future subject to being employed by the company, was struck out by the committee, and it was made clear, by the addition of one or two words, that clerks or other persons in or having been in the employ of an insolvent company, should be entitled to the privilege. The committee restricted the provisions of the Bill instead of enlarging them.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask the mover of this Bill whether the words, "by special privilege over other creditors," is intended to be applied to hypothecary creditors.

Mr. EDGAR. I think, when read in connection with the meaning of the word "creditor" in the Act, the clause will not be so construed. It is the same as in the Insolvent Act of 1875.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Was not the matter part of this section, which was struck out, considered a repetition of the first portion of the clause, so far as the two months are concerned?

Mr. EDGAR. No. The latter part of the clause, which was struck out, provided for future salary, after the winding-up order was made, to the extent of two months. The committee thought that was too much as it might be embarrassing to a large concern to have to keep on its employees for two months under the original bill also, the employees could get three months arrears, even if discharged some months before the winding up order was made, and the clause has been amended in committee so as to make three months wages the maximum they can get in any case. Suppose, for instance, a winding-up order was made to-day, and the employee had been discharged two months ago, he would have one month's arrears, while under the Bill as originally drawn he would be entitled to the full three months.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. By the Bill as it was originally, it could not have been less than three months; by the Bill as altered, it will not exceed three months, but it may be less.

Mr. IVES. This is a matter of very great importance, not only to the laboring men whose interests have been considerably affected by the report of the committee, but also to the employers of labor. I find it impossible to understand the provisions of the Bill as reported. The report has not been printed, and it does seem to me the changes it makes are sufficiently important to justify the House ordering it to be printed.

Mr. EDGAR. Unless the Bill goes through the committee to-night it will have no earthly chance of getting through this Session. Let it get through the committee and be reprinted as amended, so that we may have it in shape for the third reading. It is an important Bill, as it gives the working man a chance to get a reasonable privilege out of the material in which he has put his labor. If he has increased the value of the assets of the company by his labor, it is not unreasonable that he should have some privilege over the ordinary creditors. It was so considered in all the Insolvent Acts, the Acts of 1864, 1869 and 1875. In 1869 the workmen were given four months' special privilege. In 1875 they were given exactly what this clause, as introduced, gave them. I do not see why the workmen and employees of companies should not stand in the same position as the workmen and employees of private individuals.

Mr. BEATY. In the first line of the section, it was said "the clerk in the employ of the company," and in the committee this was amended by adding the words "or having been in the employ of the company," so that any person not yet paid might receive three months' wages; but the question arose whether clerks, who had been in the employ at the time of the issue of the winding-up order, should continue in it three months after the date of the winding-up order, and it was considered this was too long a term, and therefore the clause compelling the employment of clerks was struck out.

Mr. BOWELL. There is also this point. The section precludes the possibility of paying workmen for any work unless it was done within three months prior to the winding-up order. If this order should not be issued for a month or two or more after the failure, the workmen or clerks would be cut out from that which this Bill is intended to secure to them, unless there be something in the law which compels the issue of the order at once after the failure.

Mr. IVES. In practice the issue of the order is certain to be delayed, as certain proceedings must be taken before it can be issued. I trust the mover of the Bill will not misunderstand what I say. It is because I approve of the principle of the Bill that I wish to see it in such a shape that we can all understand what we are doing. It is only right that a privilege should be given the workingmen, but I think it would be unwise to pass this Bill, without having before us the exact wording of the section as it has been reported by the committee. It would be a misfortune if the Bill properly drawn should not become law, but it would be a greater misfortune if it should become law and then deprive the artisan class of the protection which the law in several of the Provinces gives it. In the Province of Quebec they have a wider privilege than this section gives them. And, if the effect of the law as adopted here will be to over-ride the provisions of the common law in the Province of Quebec, I think it would be a matter of serious importance, and, therefore, I should think that, although it may jeopardise the passage of the Bill, which I should be sorry for, it would be much wiser that the report of the sub-committee should be printed and we should have it before us so that we might study it before the measure passes the House. Although it is a small Bill, containing only one section, it affects the interest of a very large class of the people in this country, and we are bound to consider carefully what we are doing before we adopt it.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The principle of the Bill commended itself to the committee, as I have no doubt it will commend itself to this committee to-night. The general opinion of the lawyers, I think, was that it would not affect prejudicially the interests of the clerks or workingmen to put the clause in the shape in which it now appears. I am not prepared to offer any legal opinion, but I, like the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), should be very sorry if the effect of the amendment made by the Committee on Banking and Commerce should be to restrict the privileges of those persons whose interests it is intended to promote by the passage of this Bill.

Mr. WELDON. The principle of the Bill was accepted by Parliament and by the Committee. It was, however, questioned whether persons who were not in the employ-

ment of the company at the time of the insolvency would be entitled to a lien, and my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Beaty) suggested an amendment which has been put in. The principle of the Bill remains as it was when it was introduced, and the only alteration is to allow persons who had been previously in the employment of the company to have the lien limited to the same extent as those who were in the employment of the company at the time of winding-up. The latter portion of the amendment is unnecessary, because a person employed by the liquidators would of course be paid out of the estate, but the intention was to protect the employees of an insolvent corporation, not only at the time of the insolvency but within three months before it. I should be sorry to see any obstacles thrown in the way of the passage of the Bill, as I think it is only an act of justice to those persons, and I think it would be sufficient, as has been suggested, if the Bill were reprinted before the third reading.

Mr. BOWELL. Would it not have the effect without the addition at all?

Mr. WELDON. No. For instance, if a company got into difficulties and discharged their servants, and a week or two afterwards were put into insolvency, a question would arise whether those employees could get their wages. The object of the amendment was to protect these individuals, as it would be hard for a person employed up to within a week of the insolvency to be deprived of his wages in that way.

Mr. BOWELL. Is not that covered by the words "is or has been"?

Mr. WELDON. Yes, that is the amendment.

Mr. BOWELL. You might strike out the rest.

Mr. EDGAR. I am perfectly in accord with the Minister of Customs on that point, and the members for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) and North Renfrew (Mr. White), appear to be of the same opinion. The committee thought it would be going too far to give the three months' arrears, as provided by the Bill when introduced, unless they were limited to the three months previous to the insolvency. To meet the views of the Minister of Customs, with which I accord, I beg to move that all the words after the words "exceeding" in the Bill as amended be struck out, and the words "three months of such arrears" be inserted in the place thereof. That leaves the Bill as it was before the last amendment was put in.

Mr. IVES. This is amending an amendment which we have not now before us.

Mr. MACMASTER. It is very difficult to understand what is being done, and I think these amendments should be printed in order that the House may understand what it is doing. It was difficult to come to an understanding in the quiet deliberation of the committee; and it is much more difficult here.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that that would bring up the original difficulty in the Bill, and I agree with the suggestion of the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) that it would be much better if the Bill was reprinted as amended and laid before the House, so that it might be understood.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Bill, as introduced, gave to these "clerks and other persons in the employ of the company in or about its business or trade" the privilege of being "collocated in the dividend sheet for any arrears of salary or wages due and unpaid to them at the time of the making of the winding-up order, not exceeding three months of such arrears." The committee, after examining the matter, thought that, instead of saying that, it should be "not exceeding the arrears which have accrued to them during the three months next previous to the date of such order." The hon. gentleman wants now to put aside the amendment of the committee, which was no doubt well weighed and considered, and to reinstate the clause, so far as it goes, as it was before. Well the committee thought that the arrears should be limited to the three months next previous to the date in such order, that is to say, that if previous to the date of the order the arrears amount only to two months, the clerk, or other person, would be paid for those two months, or if the period was only one month, he would be paid for only one month. But by this, the hon. gentleman wishes that the clerk or other person should be paid for three months, whether those three months have accrued at the time of the date of the order, or whether they extend beyond it.

Mr. EDGAR. At any time previous to it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think this is a very important amendment, and it comes into antagonism with a very important committee, one of the standing committees of the House, and I would suggest that the hon. gentleman move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again, and let the Bill be reprinted. In making this suggestion, the Government have no intention to let the Bill be lost. We will take care that the Bill comes back to the House, and has a chance to be discussed, and passed, if the House wishes. I think the Bill should be reprinted, and then when the hon. gentleman brings up his amendment, the committee will know exactly what is intended to be done, because we cannot at present understand the Bill we have in our hands. Not only have these words, "three months of such arrears," been amended by the committee, but eight or nine lines of the clause have disappeared. Unless we go to the Table and look at the Bill, which all the members of the committee cannot do, we cannot understand it. Therefore I make this suggestion to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. EDGAR. I am glad the leader of the House sees the importance of this Bill; and after his assurance that the Government will give the House full opportunity to consider the Bill, of course I adopt his suggestion. I suppose the Government will either put it on their Orders or——

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will see that it comes up.

Mr. EDGAR. I beg leave to withdraw the amendment, and move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS.

Mr. MULOCK moved the consideration of Bill (No. 19) to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have had a conference with the Minister of Justice in reference to the point that I had mentioned, and he seems to think that it would be difficult to frame a clause that would meet the difficulty I pointed out; and that, perhaps, it can be accomplished better through the regulations that the Bill empowers the Governor in Council to make.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not propose to discuss the amendment that I intend to offer when this Bill comes up for its third reading, but I think it is well that I should indicate to the Minister of Agriculture now what the amendment is. It may be remembered that when this Bill was under discussion last Session the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Harley), moved an amendment which excluded horses from the operations of the Bill. I objected to the passage of that amendment at the time, and gave my

reasons. I pointed out that in my own county a great many instances had occurred of the spread of the disease known as glanders, from horses affected being put into stables without the proprietors of the stables knowing that the horses were thus affected. It is a fact, I believe, that in two cases, at all events, in my county, not only has this disease been productive of great loss in causing the death of animals, but it was strongly suspected that deaths of human beings also occurred through the same cause. I find in a local paper published in my county only a few days ago, this paragraph:

"A sad case is reported from Admaston, a few miles below Douglas. Robert Ross, jun., a young man, was driving up to the shanty with produce, shortly before Christmas. In the party was a team that had the glanders. Ross had a cut on the cheek into which some virus of the diseased animal seems to have become deposited. The disease has thus been communicated to the poor fellow, and now he lies at death's door, beyond the help of medical skill, with no hope of more than a few days' existence."

Under these circumstances, I conceive it to be my duty, when this Bill comes up for its third reading, to move it back into committee for the purpose of inserting a clause that will restore to its provisions the class of animals to which I refer. It was stated in the discussion which took place last Session, that a Bill passed by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario would provide the remedy which I seek; but so far I have been unable to find a single case where the provisions of that Bill have been put into operation. Certain machinery is required, and certain information must be laid under the provisions of that Bill, to enable it to be put into operation. As I pointed out, it is almost impossible for the Act of the Local Legislature to be put into operation, and for that reason I intend to move the amendment of which I now give notice.

Mr. IVES. I would like to ask some explanation from the hon. gentleman who moved the second reading of this Bill, of the relative value of sub-sections *a*, *b* and *c*. I find that sub-section *a* provides for the case of an animal affected with rinderpest being slaughtered. The Minister of Railways informs me that this clause has been taken out of the Bill. The only ground upon which the country can fairly be asked to pay compensation to farmers, is when the animals have not shown symptoms of disease, but when they are slaughtered for the public good. I never could understand upon what principle an animal which had already contracted disease, should be paid for by the Government. The owners and breeders of live stock have to take their chances like other business men, and it would be rather an unusual thing for a merchant to come to Parliament and ask it to adopt a measure which would grant compensation to merchants for goods burnt by fire, although the fire occurred by the carelessness of a neighbor. The only thing that could possibly justify the principle of having the public contribute to pay the value of animals, is when animals have been killed in order to prevent disease from spreading to neighboring cattle, and more particularly in cases where animals are healthy to all appearances and have not contracted disease, but where possibly they might have been in contact with infected cattle, and were slaughtered for the purpose of destroying all infection that might exist. It might be fairly argued that where cattle are healthy and a neighbor's cattle are sick with contagious disease, and when a Government officer visits the place and from his experience decides that the healthy cattle should be slaughtered in the public interest, the owner should be compensated; but that is the only case in which I would be in favor of giving any compensation, and that should be limited to the value of the cattle. The word thoroughbred pedigree cattle is a very wide term, and pedigree simply means father and mother. The clause does not state that the cattle have to be registered in a herd book, or that they have to have a certain number of registered sires and dams in a herd book, but it simply says that they must be thoroughbred pedigree cattle. The question as to being thoroughbred is a matter of opinion and hearsay; and as to the pedigree, it simply means that they have a sire and dam.

Amendments concurred in.

Mr. MULOCK moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend the Bill by adding the following as the first clause: "Paragraph *b* of section two of the Animals Contagious Diseases Act, forty-eight and forty-nine Victoria, chapter seventy, is hereby amended by striking out the word 'only' where specially mentioned."

Mr. POPE. The reason I was willing and consented to that clause being struck out last year was this: By the operation of this Bill it is intended to preserve the trade of this country so far as sheep and cattle are concerned, and those animals that we export from the country and to keep them from being scheduled if possible. So far as dealing with horses is concerned, that is quite a different matter. I believe that in no country are horses scheduled, and it would not interfere at all with the trade of this country whether they are in or out, as the hon. gentleman proposes to put it. I have always been of the opinion, and I am still of the opinion, that so far as possible matters of this kind relating to the public health, should be left to be dealt with by the Local Legislatures. Where they have exported animals that are not liable to be scheduled, I thought it was a safe thing to accept the proposition of my hon. friend on the other side, and perhaps it could be better done by these Local Governments than by this Government. It is an extremely difficult thing for this Government to deal with matters of this kind in distant places like British Columbia and Manitoba, to say nothing of the question of the expense of doing so. In Manitoba they passed a similar Bill to the one which is now on the Statute-book here, and they also passed one in Ontario, though I am not sure that compensation is allowed for animals killed in either of those Bills.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press his amendment after the explanation of the late Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Pope), and under any circumstances I think it would be better, if he does insist on pressing it, that it should not be disposed of this evening. The subject was discussed on several occasions last Session. It excited a considerable amount of interest, and it was not until after a good deal of deliberation that the solution was reached which the Minister has stated. I think, under these circumstances, when an amendment is moved without notice, the House having had no opportunity of considering it fully, it would not be satisfactory to dispose of it at once. If the hon. gentleman is bound to press the amendment, if the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with the explanation of the Minister, I would suggest that the discussion of the amendment be reserved until the third reading, which should not take place to-night, and that the hon. gentleman should give notice on the paper. My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), I think, led the opposition to the hon. gentleman's clause, but of course he has not had an opportunity of being aware that the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) was proposing to reverse the judgment of the House to-night.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The arguments of the ex-Minister of Agriculture have not convinced me that I am wrong in pressing this matter on the House. I pressed it last Session, on the grounds which I then stated, and the same argument which is now adduced by the Minister of Railways, with reference to the trade of the country, was brought forward last year. I pointed out then that we had a large export trade from Canada in horses, and although those horses have not been scheduled in other countries so far, the time may come when owing to the progress of this disease

through the country they may be scheduled; and if they are so scheduled, I think the Minister of Railways will come to the conclusion that it would have been in the public interest that he should not have excluded this class of animals from the Bill. In addition to the fact that it is possible that our horses may be scheduled in other countries through its becoming known that this disease is prevalent in this country, I think the Minister of Agriculture should take into consideration the question of the health of those animals in this country itself. There is no doubt a great deal of loss has been sustained by owners of horses throughout the country from the prevalence of this disease, and I think it is just as important that the Minister of Agriculture should be in a position to schedule a locality where this disease prevails, as that he should be in a position to schedule the localities in which rinderpest, sheep-rot, or other diseases of that nature prevail.

Mr. HICKEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is scarcely proper that that motion should be pressed at this late stage of the Session. If the hon. member desires to defeat the Bill, it had better be defeated to-night, and if it is only to postpone the third reading for the purpose of considering this point, it will simply involve a delay without our being likely to arrive at a different conclusion than the one we may arrive at to-night.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not press the adjournment.

Mr. MULOCK. Why not take the sense of the House on the amendment to-night. The House is in quite as good a position to decide the matter to-night as it will be when this Bill comes up again, if it does.

Mr. POPE. I may mention another reason why horses were not included, and that is that we followed pretty much the English practice, and there horses are not mentioned at all.

Motion (Mr. Hickey) negatived.

House divided on amendment of Mr. White (Renfrew).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Hay,	Reid,
Baker (Victoria),	Hickey,	Rykert,
Bell,	Hilliard,	Shakespeare,
Bryson,	Jamieson,	Sproule,
Burnham,	Kaulbach,	Taylor,
Cameron (Inverness),	Kirk,	Tyrwhitt,
Cuthbert,	Macmaster,	Wallace (Albert),
Dundas,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wallace (York),
Everett,	McCallum,	White (Hastings),
Ferguson (Leeds&Gren)	McCarthy,	White (Renfrew),
Gordon,	McNeill,	Wigle,
Guillet,	Pruyn,	Wood (Brockville).—36.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Dodd,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Dupont,	Massue,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Edgar,	Mills,
Beaty,	Fairbank,	Mitchell,
Béchard,	Farrow,	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Fortin,	Mulock,
Blake,	Foster,	Orton,
Blondeau,	Gigault,	Paint,
Bossé,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Glen,	Platt,
Bourbeau,	Grandbois,	Pope,
Bowell,	Guay,	Ray,
Burpee,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Harley,	Riopel,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Hesson,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Cameron (Victoria),	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Scriver,
Campbell (Victoria),	Irvine,	Shanly,
Carling,	Ives,	Small,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jackson,	Somerville (Brant),
Chapleau,	Landry (Kent),	Somerville (Bruce),
Charlton,	Landry (Montmagny),	Springer.
Cimon,	Langelier,	Tassé,
Cockburn,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Thompson,
Colby,	Laurier,	Townshend,
Cook,	Lesage,	Trow,
Costigan,	Lister,	Tupper,
Coursol,	Livingston,	Vail,
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Valin,
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Watson,
Desaulniers (Maskn'gé),	McCraney,	Weldon,
Desaulniers(St.Maurice)	McIntyre,	Wilson,
Desjardins,	McLelan,	Wood (Westm'd).—99.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

LAW OF EVIDENCE.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 3) for the further amendment of the Law of Evidence in certain cases.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. THOMPSON. Hon. members who have objected to the preceding clauses could hardly have attended to the reading of this clause, which contains a different principle. It is simply to require that judicial notice be taken of provincial statutes. It applies only, as printed, to criminal proceedings, but I wish to amend it by adding the following words, "or any civil proceeding, in respect of which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction in this behalf," striking out the words, "by Her Majesty or by any of her royal predecessors."

Mr. AMYOT. By the constitution, evidence in civil matters is settled by the Local Governments, and I do not believe this House has any right to interfere.

Mr. THOMPSON. There are certain matters in respect of which we have the right to legislate as to evidence, and the amendment is confined to those cases.

Mr. AMYOT. My contention is that the rules of evidence are settled by the Local Government, and in vain will this Government try to radicalise them. They may pass laws to abolish God if they like, but they will not abolish the power of the Local Legislatures.

Mr. THOMPSON. I should be very sorry to abolish either, but I presume we are not now dealing either with religion or with the powers of the Local Legislatures. The hon. gentleman will remember there are certain proceedings, such as proceedings in insolvency, which are not of a criminal nature, in respect of which this Parliament has a right to prescribe the procedure, and the principle which is consented to as regards criminal proceedings is to be extended to the civil proceedings over which we have control. If we have not control over any civil proceedings the amendment will not do any harm, but if we have it is fair the principle of the Bill should be extended to them.

The committee rose and reported.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I beg to move the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I propose in amendment that the Bill be not now read the third time, but this day six months.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Desjardins.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Desaulniers(St.Maurice)	Macdonald (King's),
Amyot,	Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Béchard,	Dupont,	McCraney,
Benoit,	Everett,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Bergin,	Farrow,	McIntyre,
Blondeau,	Fortin,	McLelan,
Bourassa,	Gigault,	Massue,
Bourbeau,	Grandbois,	Paint,

Bowell,	Guay,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Guillet,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hesson,	Tassé,
Carling,	Hilliard,	Tupper,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Holton,	Vail,
Cimon,	Ives,	Valin,
Coughlin,	Jamieson,	Wallace (Albert)
Coursol,	Kaulbach,	Watson,
Curran,	Kirk,	White (Renfrew),
Cuthbert,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wood (Brockville),
Dawson,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wood (West'land).—59.
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Lesage,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Hay,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bain (Wentworth),	Hickey,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Innes,	Ross,
Baker (Victoria),	Irvine,	Rykert,
Beaty,	Jackson,	Scriver,
Bell,	Langelier,	Shanly,
Blake,	Laurier,	Small,
Burnham,	Lister,	Somerville (Brant),
Burpee,	Mackintosh,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Macmaster,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Sproule,
Chapleau,	McCallum,	Taylor,
Cockburn,	McCarthy,	Thompson,
Cook,	McDougald (Pictou),	Townshend,
Daly,	McMullen,	Trow,
Dodd,	McNeill,	Tyrwhitt,
Dundas,	Mills,	Wallace (York),
Edgar,	Mitchell,	Ward,
Fairbank,	O'Brien,	Weldon,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Orton,	White (Hastings),
Gillmor,	Pruyn,	Wigle,
Gunn,	Ray,	Wilson.—68.
Harley,	Reid,	

Amendment negatived.

Bill read the third time and passed on the same division, reversed.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Statement showing the amount of liquor of all kinds manufactured in Canada during the year 1885; the amount of same exported, and estimated value of same.—(Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.)

Statement showing the amount of liquors of all kinds imported into Canada during the year 1885, and duties collected from same.—(Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.)

A return showing the number of establishments now in operation in Canada in which liquors of all kinds are manufactured; the number of hands employed; the amount of capital invested, and wages paid to employees during the year ending 31st December, 1885.—(Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.)

Return showing:—1. The number of convictions under the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 (known as the Scott Act), in the several counties of the Dominion in which the Act has been in force, up to the 1st of March, 1886, giving the number in each county separately. 2. The amount of fines imposed and the amount paid in each county. 3. The number and date of appeals, if any, and whether confirmed or quashed. 4. The number of appeals in each county not disposed of on the 1st of March, A.D. 1886.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 29th April, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 119) to amend the Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company.—(Mr. Royal.)

Mr. DESJARDINS.

THE VACANT SEAT FOR HALDIMAND.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved:

That Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a writ for the election of a member to serve in this present Parliament for the electoral district of Haldimand, in the room of the late David Thompson, removed by death.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION LANDS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 120) to make further provision respecting the administration of the public lands of Canada in British Columbia. He said: The object of this Act is to bring the lands which belong to us within the railway belt on the mainland within the jurisdiction of the Dominion Lands Board. Up to this time they have been practically administered by Mr. Trutch, the agent of the Government, but, as he will cease to hold that office after the end of this year, and we have now railway communication which will enable us to reach British Columbia easily, the purpose is to put the administration of the lands under the Dominion Lands Board. I have ordered the agents who have hitherto been in Victoria to move at once to the mainland, in order to give greater facility to the people who desire to enter their lands.

Mr. MITCHELL. I heartily congratulate the Government upon taking the step they propose, and so will all who know the circumstances connected with the management of lands in British Columbia and the administration of Mr. Trutch. I am sure the change will be a great improvement, and will give general satisfaction.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SEIZURE OF THE SCHOONER *LYLIAN*.

Mr. VAIL asked, What was the sum collected from the master and owners of the schooner *Lylian*, seized at Halifax in 1885, for a breach of the revenue laws?

Mr. BOWELL. There was no sum collected from the owners of the schooner *Lylian*. Upon investigation, it was found that there was no evidence of her having smuggled, and consequently she was released.

APPOINTMENT OF THE HON. J. S. C. WURTELE AS JUDGE.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, Why the appointment of the Hon. J. S. C. Wurtele as a Judge of the Superior Court for the Province of Quebec was not published in the *Canada Gazette* in like manner as those of the three other judges appointed at the same time as he? 2nd. When the Government propose to publish the said appointment? 3rd. Whether the commission of the said Hon. J. S. C. Wurtele has been despatched; and if not, why, and when will it be despatched? 4th. Whether the said Hon. J. S. C. Wurtele has been informed of his appointment, and when? If he has not been so informed, when he will be so?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The appointment has not been published, because the acceptance of the office has not been received. The Government will publish it as soon as it is received. The answer to the third question is the same as that to the first and second. The Hon. Mr. Wurtele was informed some days ago, and I expect his commission will be sent in a few days.

THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. ORTON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the Government whether, in view of the fact that the Canada Temperance Act will be enforced on the 1st May next in a large number of counties, and that the

operation of said Act will virtually render valueless millions of dollars worth of property, an opportunity will be given during the present Session, to consider the various Acts amending or otherwise affecting the operation of said Canada Temperance Act.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Bills to which the hon. gentleman alludes are on the list of public Orders, and it is not for the Government to state in what order they shall be taken up. There are several other Bills before the Bill of the hon. gentleman, and of course it depends on the disposition of hon. members who have charge of those Bills, whether they will allow the hon. gentleman to take up his Bill first. So far as the Government is concerned, of course we have no objection to his Bill having precedence over the others, but we are not in a position to give this or any other Bill the precedence.

FUTURE GOVERNMENT MEASURES.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to call the attention of the Government to the fact that, in the Speech from the Throne, it was stated that we would be asked to consider the expediency of improving the judiciary system which obtains in the North-West Territories; also, to consider the propriety of amending the law relating to the business of the office of Queen's Printer, and of providing for the more satisfactory working of the present system of Government and parliamentary printing; also, that other measures would be laid before us, among them being a Bill for providing a better mode of trial of claims against the Crown, and some other measures to which I need not refer. We are now in the ninth week of the Session, and none of those measures have yet been proposed to be introduced. I would ask when it is proposed to introduce them?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Bill for the establishment of a public Printing Bureau is now prepared and printed, and will be introduced to-morrow, I hope.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Bill with respect to the Judiciary in the North-West Territories has been prepared, and I am merely waiting for the resolutions to be drafted which require to be moved in Committee of the Whole House. The Bill respecting claims against the Crown, which stands on the Notice paper at present, we are not prepared to go on with this Session.

BONDS OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. McLELAN moved that to-morrow the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that if, after the Canadian Pacific Railway shall have been constructed and duly placed in operation to its terminus on the seaboard in the Province of British Columbia, it shall be established to the satisfaction of the Government that the retention of the amount of $5,000,000 in bonds under the provisions of the construction contract, as security for the operation of the railway, is no longer necessary in the public interest, the Governor in Council may order that the said bonds be released and delivered to the company.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 84) to make further provision respecting Summary Proceedings before Justices and other Magistrates. —(Mr. Thompson.)

THE DOMINION LANDS ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 94) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1883.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CHARLTON. For what sub-sections are those substituted?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The only change is simply adding the words "superintendent of mines" to the Land Board. In the second case it is simply to require that all records and documents shall be attested by the Minister of the Interior or the Secretary of the Department of Interior, and that documents in the Dominion Lands Office in Manitoba shall be attested by the Secretary of the Dominion Land Board or other officer in charge of such office.

On section 5,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The only change is to authorise the entry to be made before the senior clerk, in the absence of the agent. This will be for the convenience of settlers who sometimes come to the office when the agent is absent, and under the present law the entry must be made before the agent.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I see no reason why the entry should not be made before any clerk of the office, all of whom are responsible for the proper discharge of their duties.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It is desirable to have the work by some particular officer who will be at all times in the office, and it is therefore provided that when the Dominion Land Agent is absent, the senior clerk performing his duty shall act.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the change proposed.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The change proposed is a very important one. It is proposed to authorise persons who may be engaged in towns, or on the railways, or any other way, and who desire to secure for themselves a home in the North-West, perhaps in the same neighborhood with their friends, to have two years in which they can reside off the land and make a little money to enable them to go on and work their land afterwards, but they still require to have a period of three years' residence on the land before getting their patents.

Mr. BLAKE. There are cases, with the precise details of which I am not sufficiently acquainted at present, in which persons are complaining that the more rigid provisions which subsist at present as to residence have prevented them from obtaining homesteads, though they have substantially complied with the provisions. I presume from what the hon. gentleman has explained that the rigidity of the regulations as to residents is now to be somewhat relaxed. It would not seem to be unreasonable that persons who have been engaged in acquiring homesteads under the old regulations should be enabled to avail themselves of the greater elasticity which it is proposed to allow, and if their cases fall within the law, the Department should be in a position to give it to them. I doubt, however, that would be the result of the amendment without a special declaration of that kind.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I may say, though I do not know whether we have quite the power to do it, yet it has been the practice of the Dominion Board and the Department as well, to apply the amendment of 1884 to the Act as to residents within two miles, in the case of those persons who are really *bond fide* settlers; that is, if they have resided within the two-mile limit, and are prepared in good faith to comply with the other provisions as to residents, they get their patents. I do not know whether it would be advisable to put in a special provision of that kind or not, but we can understand that if Parliament assents to the proposition it would apply to every one who was prepared to show that he was *bond fide* in occupation of the land.

Mr. BLAKE. The question is whether the course which has been pursued, and is proposed to be pursued, is a lawful course. It is not wise deliberately to break the law, and it

is particularly unwise on the part of those who are responsible for making the law, and who are supposed to be responsible for its administration. I am not prepared to say whether the course is lawful or not,and I think the hon. gentleman had better consult the legal adviser of the Government before the third reading and ascertain whether he is clothed with the proper legal authority. There is another point which has been presented to me, and which, more or less, comes within the provisions of this clause. It has been stated that there are a very large number of persons who find themselves unable to comply with the conditions as to pre-emptions. I am not expressing any opinion as to the merits of the suggestion, but it has been suggested within a day or two that it would be a proper provision to extend, not as to the future, but as to the past, to cases in which there has been a large and meritorious cultivation, the same provisions with reference to pre emptions as those which apply to homesteads.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Some such suggestions have been made, in fact no suggestion was more frequently made than this one with regard to persons who have pre-emptions and who find it difficult to comply with the conditions. The matter is at this moment very seriously engaging the attention of the Government, and would have been settled earlier, but for the unfortunate illness of the First Minister, who has not been able to give his presence at Council as frequently as all of us could desire. Having been connected with the Department before, the hon. gentleman can quite understand that we see the importance of not deciding upon a matter of the kind without his attention having been engaged upon it. I do not think it is necessary, however, that the matter should be done by an Act of Parliament in any way, for the reason that the price of the pre-emption is not fixed by Act of Parliament. We have the authority; all that we are bound by is that we shall not sell the land at less than $1 per acre. That is the only provision by Statute in regard to it, and therefore the matter could be fixed by Order in Council and regulation—at least, I am so advised, and it probably will be fixed in some such way as to give reasonable facilities to persons who are already in the country to meet their pre-emption claims.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know, I am sure, whether the hon. gentleman has, under the power which enables him to sell at not less than $1 per acre, the authority to make rebates of this description, but I should think that on an important matter of that kind Parliament should have an opportunity of pronouncing upon it. I think it is a very important step, which should be explained, and the principles upon which it should be applied, which may be complicated and varying in detail, ought to be given to us. It is important that these matters should be dealt with on a general principle, and not separately by Orders in Council in each particular case. In a word, it is important that we should retain, in some measure, our power over the Government in the administration of these North-West lands.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that Parliament ought to be well informed on these matters, and should have the opportunity, if it desires, of expressing its opinion upon them. I may say that several proposals have been made. One is that the second homestead should be allowed on the pre-emption, thus practically giving 320 acres instead of 160. Another is that the settler who lives three years longer on his land, and performs certain duties, shall receive a rebate of one-half of his pre emption on the performance of those duties; and still another is that there shall be allowed an extension of time of three years, without interest, for the payment of the money. These are some of the proposals which have been made, and they are now engaging the attention of the Government. If a decision is come to within a few days, as I hope there will be, I shall be glad to communicate it to the House before the third reading, as I think it is right that Parliament should be informed of the decision when it is arrived at.

Mr. WATSON. I am glad that the Government have under consideration some change with regard to pre-emptions and their payment. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the settlers throughout a great portion of the North-West do not feel themselves in a fit position to pay the price at $2 or $2.50 per acre for pre emptions. I believe that the most popular movement, and one which would be most in the interest of the country, would be for the Government to allow the homesteader to make a second homestead of his pre-emption, as this would ensure the settlement of the country. As the Minister of the Interior is probably aware, there are numbers who have to borrow money to pay for the pre emption and have no money to improve their farms with. It is almost impossible for many settlers to comply with the conditions at $2 and $2.50 per acre without involving themselves in debt. I should like also to see the Minister go so far as to provide for homesteading on the condition of cultivation alone as well as for a homestead on conditions of settlement. Let the amount of cultivation be large. The only way our country can become wealthy is by raising grain and exporting it; and if you can induce workingmen and others to put their surplus earnings into the cultivation of the soil, I think it would be of advantage to the country. Homesteading by six months' residence in the year has in many cases proven to be a mere farce; I have no doubt the Minister of the Interior found that to be the case when he visited the North-West. I am satisfied that 50 per cent. of the patents granted by the Crown were granted for homesteads on which there were not $150 worth of improvements. I think homesteading on conditions of large cultivation would lead to far better results. The First Minister stated, when this Bill was first under discussion in 1883, that if an Irishman cultivated only half an acre with a spade, he would be as much entitled to a patent as the man who cultivated 160 acres. I think that is a wrong view to take of the matter. I believe the more land that is cultivated the better for the country, and I hope some provision will be made in the Bill for granting homesteads on conditions of cultivation.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I am afraid I cannot concur in the views of the hon. gentleman. I look upon homesteading in its proper sense—residence on the land—as one of the conditions we ought to adhere to very closely. The object is not to place land in the hands of people in the cities and towns, who might send people out to cultivate it, while they held the land for speculative purposes. What is wanted is people living on the land. I think it would be a great misfortune if we relaxed in any degree the conditions of residence for obtaining a patent. With regard to pre-emptions, I may say that there is a good deal of discussion in the North-West to-day as to whether 320 acres are not too much for a man to cultivate, and whether the 160 acres are not quite enough for a homestead. I have had the views of practical farmers from Ontario, who have been in the North-West some years, and who, with their strong common sense, applied to the conditions of a new country, are able to give practical advice on the subject. There are strong opinions on both sides, but I think the general opinion, except as to those who want to get a second homestead, is that 160 acres are sufficient. I know the argument on the other side. It is this: In that country, where mixed farming is necessary, it is somewhat difficult to raise artificial grasses, and there is no doubt that 160 acres kept as prairie, form a capital pasture ground for cattle; and farmers with 160 acres besides for cultivation can successfully follow mixed farming. That is the argument. But I am certainly much opposed to giving a second homestead on a pre-emption, and thus giving 320 acres

instead of 160. If we treat our people liberally otherwise, 160 acres as a free homestead is a very liberal grant. As to the conditions of cultivation, under the law at present they are undefined, and it is left largely for the Dominion Lands Board to determine what extent is sufficient to justify the granting of a patent. Fifteen acres of cultivation is held to be sufficient generally; but the assumption is that if a man goes on a homestead to make it his home, he will cultivate as much as possible, so as to increase the value of his farm, and in a great number of cases more than fifteen acres are cultivated. As the country grows, and as greater prosperity comes to it, I am satisfied that the settlers will cultivate still more.

Mr. WATSON. In 1883 I moved an amendment to the Land Bill embodying provisions like these: that in the first year the settler should break twenty acres; that in the second year he should have twenty acres in crop and thirty additional acres broken; that in the third year he should have fifty acres in crop and thirty acres additional broken; and that in the fourth year he should have buildings erected to the value of $600, and should live at least three months on his homestead previous to completing his entry. That would be more in the interest of the settlement of the country than granting a homestead on merely six months' residence, with nothing more than nominal improvements. The Minister says that he requires fifteen acres to be broken, which is worth about $75. If the improvements required were greater, some person would be obliged to live on the land and cultivate the soil. There is no room for speculation in the proposal I make. If a man puts his earnings into the cultivation of the soil, he should be considered entitled to a quarter-section of land, and if you require him to make improvements on the land he will, as a rule, live on his farm after the fourth year. A great many young men go into the country with little or no means; they have to work in the summer, and in the winter they put up a little house on their homestead to fulfil the conditions of residence, and do nothing more. That is of no benefit to the country, and it is a bad thing to encourage. If there were homesteading on the condition of cultivation, a great many young men without means could take up a quarter-section for themselves and could work on neighboring farms in order to earn money to enable them to make improvements on their own homesteads. I believe a great number would avail themselves of this privilege if it were allowed. With regard to the price of pre-emptions, I believe a great many will forfeit their pre-emptions if the price is not reduced from $2 to $1 an acre, and if there are no means by which they can get a second homestead, it will be a great hardship. If the Minister does not make the reduction general, I hope he will take into consideration the special district where settlers have been induced to settle under promise of railway facilities. They have been expecting railway facilities for the last five or six years, but up to this time they have not got them, and they made nothing out of the land. In the first few years they spent all the means they had, and then merely eked out a sort of miserable existence, making no money, because they are too far from railway communication. Where lands are taken up in such districts the Government ought to make special provisions that they will be received at $1 per acre pre emption. Most of the people who settled in the north-western portion of Manitoba went in expecting to have railway communication, which would enable them to pay $2 or $2.50 pre-emption. They took up pre-emption lands, and have simply been spending since the little money they had trying to hold on to their land, whilst some who went in a few months previous received their pre-emptions at $1 per acre, and others in Hamilton township, around Birtle, who went in at the same time, received land at $1 per acre. I think the Government should make a special case in the interests of those people who resided there so long and are building up the country.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be a great mistake if the Government were to take into consideration any such suggestion. If cases of that kind were considered as special cases, similar exceptions would be presented from all parts of the country. It is no great hardship to a settler, when he gets 160 acres for nothing, to have to pay $2.50 an acre, if he wants 160 more. I believe a smaller homestead and pre-emption would be better than to enlarge it, or to allow any special exceptions. In reference to allowing cultivation homesteads, public opinion is against that, as the tendency would be to induce those living in villages to take up homesteads and pre-emption all over the country, thus rendering it impossible to build roads and keep up schools and churches, etc. Everywhere throughout the country the complaint is made that the settlements are too sparse to enable the settlers to cope successfully with the difficulties of pioneer life, as there are too few settlers in the townships to build the roads and keep up schools. Where there are schools, they are at a great distance from the settlements, so that it is almost impossible for many of the farmers to use them, and this difficulty would increase tenfold were the suggestion of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) to gain footing and cultivation homesteads allowed to be taken up. It would be in the interests of the settlers if the size of homesteads and pre-emptions were reduced instead of being enlarged.

Mr. WATSON. It is true, as the hon. member says, that settlements are sparse, but that is due to the checker-board system, by which every other section in Manitoba is reserved for railway purposes. I notice, however, in some public prints, that the Government intend, in the future, to reserve townships instead of sections, and I believe it is a good move. That is the principal reason why settlement is so sparse. Those lands have been sold to speculators at public competition, when they should have been reserved either in blocks or the land placed in the hands of homesteaders.

On section 6,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The object of this is simply to enable the Homestead Inspector, the moment a notice is given, to examine the improvements and report. In the United States, at least in some parts, they are obliged to give notice in a newspaper by advertisement when they intend to apply for patents, but there is no proposal to do anything of the kind here. This is strongly urged by the Dominion Lands Board, who have the practical working of the matter.

Mr. BLAKE. The practical result of the section will be that it postpones unnecessarily for six months the right to make application for the patent.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is not the intention.

Mr. BLAKE. It says: "Every person who has acquired a right and purposes to apply shall give six months' notice." It is after he has acquired the right he has to give notice.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I see the force of the objection, and as we will have to go into committee on the Bill again, because I want to give notice of one or two other amendments which I propose to make, I would ask that this section be allowed to stand over.

Mr. BLAKE. I would make this suggestion to the hon. gentleman: I am not well aware what the provisions of the law are as to its becoming public, when such a condition of things has been reached with reference to land in the North-West Territory, that they are subject to municipal taxation. But if the provisions of the law do not con-

tain full arrangements for that becoming public, it is clear that the grievances under which the people in many sections of that country are laboring may be continued and even enlarged. If these provisions are not fully satisfactory, there ought to be some public notice to the municipal officers, or some public notice from which they can derive knowledge that a state of things has been reached in which the land has become taxable. It is little likely that the individual settler will escape; as he is there and is known, he will be assessed; but the man who has obtained under former regulations, or some existing regulations, the right to the land without any visible occupation, the speculator or purchaser without conditions of settlement, is the person who has the opportunity for, and interest in the process of escaping municipal taxation as long as he can. Since the period when I addressed an enquiry on this head to the hon. gentleman, I have received from different quarters of the North-West Territory —from points at considerable distances from each other, and from persons who spoke for many more than themselves, without the knowledge that I had made an enquiry—strong expressions of the grievances they labored under with reference to the lands sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the north-western corporation. The hon. gentleman knows that the provision of the bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was that the lands should be free from taxation for twenty years or until sold. It was not intended that the moment the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had acquired from the Government a right to any specific lands and had alienated those lands, that exemption should cease; but if, by the operations of the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company together, there exists no means by which the municipal officers can be made aware of what specific lands have been sold to this corporation or the other, to individuals or to corporations to whom the company may sell, it is clear that practically the exemption is kept up. I may observe that the hon. gentleman will not very much surprise the North-West Land Corporation if he does something or other to facilitate the people of the North-West having justice at their hands. I observe, from the last report of that company, presented only a few days ago at their annual meeting—I have not got it here, but I give the purport—they state that they have not been taxed hitherto, but that it might be expected that they would soon be taxed. I think there would be very considerable difficulty in taxing them, unless the hon. gentleman makes some arrangement—and I observe that he is proposing to make a trifling arrangement or two with the company which may facilitate his making this arrangement—to have some certainty, as to all the lands left to them, that the moment the lands are sold the fact shall be known to the people that they are sold, and the lots so sold shall become subject to taxation if there be a municipal corporation in the neighborhood which has the power of taxation. These people say they feel it doubly because they settled in that part of the country at a time when it was by no means expected by anybody that the odd lots would be sold to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Of course, it was lawful for the Government to sell them under the law, but it was certainly not expected at that time that they would be sold at a period when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had not earned their lands, and were not entitled to the whole extent of the lands along their line. They say they had the right to expect that those lands would not be subject to exemption at all, but they are subject to the exemption, and, having been sold, to a great extent, in a territory in which the sale was not anticipated, I think the least these people are entitled to claim from the Government is that they shall have some special consideration, as far as the power and good will of the Government can give it to them, in order to have it practically known that sales take place by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, so that, at any rate from that time, the lands may be taxed.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The difficulty is in carrying that out; I mean the method of doing it. We give these twenty-five million acres of land, or whatever quantity is given, to the Canadian Pacific Railway. As soon as it is earned by them, it becomes their property. How we are going to control their sales I cannot quite understand. We have no power to demand that they shall give us notice when they make a sale, and that we shall make publication of that. The moment the land is sold and becomes occupied it is open to taxation, and I think the municipal authorities may very well know when land is sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and when, therefore, it becomes subject to taxation. I quite understand that this question of municipal taxation is a very serious one, not only as to these lands, but as to the lands of many of the settlers themselves, who, I am sorry to say, in many cases, appear anxious to escape the payment of taxes. The land, as a general principle, perhaps it may be said, though I speak without legal knowledge, is not liable to taxation, or rather cannot be sold for taxes, until the patent is issued, until it has become the property of some holder other than the Crown. That moment it does become subject to taxation, but up to that time, at all events in the first three years, when the settler is earning his patent, that land is not liable to taxation, in the sense that it cannot be sold for taxes; although I have urged upon settlers who have written to me—and many of them have written to me—that, as they live in a community which depends for support, in regard to its roads and bridges, and education, and other things, upon the taxes, they ought in honor to pay them. Then, the Local Government of Manitoba have unfortunately exempted all the ordinary goods and chattels of the settler from seizure for taxes, so that there is practically nothing to be seized for taxes until the settler receives his patent. I was unconsciously guilty of an expression in conversation with some gentlemen in the North-West, which has been repeated a great deal, and letters have reached me upon the subject nearly a thousand miles from the place where the conversation took place. I happened to say, referring to the municipal law which exists in Manitoba, that a man was almost a fool who paid taxes, that is, as a business proposition, though as a matter of honor he ought to pay them, because the lands were not liable to be sold for taxes and the chattels were exempt from seizure. That conversation, which occurred in a drawing room, and seems to have been talked of outside, was repeated everywhere; and I was reported as having said that the settlers in the North-West were not liable to taxation. As a matter of fact they are, and they ought to pay their taxes. But I quite concur in the opinion that the Canadian Pacific Railway ought not to be permitted to transfer its exemption to parties who purchase from it, and that everything should be done to prevent that. I can only say that, as far as I have any control in the matter, everything will be done to prevent it; because, the moment they sell their lands, the land should be subject to taxation the same as any other land.

Mr. BLAKE. The cases of the settlers whom I have referred to are not the cases of those who are seeking to evade the payment of taxes like those to whom the hon. gentleman unconsciously tendered that piece of advice which he now appears to regret having given, but cases of settlers who are paying taxes and who find that the adjoining land of proprietors who are holding it for speculation is being improved at their expense, and that they cannot get taxes out of that land. The hon. gentleman's promise to do all in his power to alter these results would be more satisfactory if he had not prefaced it by stating that he had nothing in his power.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, he commenced by saying: "The Government cannot do anything, what can we do?" I say that, finding that something ought to be done and being powerless now to do it, he ought to clothe himself with the power necessary to the accomplishment of his good wishes and good intentions; else, as soon as the happy day of prorogation arrives, his good wishes and intentions will be quite useless. The truth is that his land is liable to taxation under the law. The difficulty is that, as long as the law remains so imperfect that the company is not compelled to divulge what lands it has sold and has so rendered liable to taxation, it escapes its liability. The law makes it liable, but the law is imperfect by not providing the machinery by which the circumstances under which it becomes liable shall be known, and what we want is a provision in the law to make it a condition of the company making the sales that they shall publish the sales, so that we shall know when the exemption ceases. Else, for twenty years to come, or until the time when the corporation to which the company sells makes a sale, it will not be known, and the land will be free from taxation.

Mr. WATSON. Not only is the land of the Canadian Pacific Railway in this position but other lands. As the Minister has stated, unless a Crown patent is issued, the land cannot be sold for taxes. There are a great many municipalities in Manitoba to-day in a very awkward position. They have taxed those lands because there were settlers on them, and it has been stated that $500 worth of goods are exempt, and I believe they are trying to pass an Act through the Local House at present which practically exempts from sale all the chattels on lands. A year ago an Act was passed which prevented the sale of chattels except for the lands on which the chattels were found. Previous to that, they could be sold for vacant lands and lands in a similar position; and now they are trying to exempt even the chattels on the land, and that being the case many municipalities are in a very bad position, because they have been assessing those lands and taxing them. They have gone on with improvements, and they found out when the time for the tax sale came round, that no person would buy those lands because the municipality had no right to sell them on account of their not being patented. Now, if there could be some provision made whereby the taxes against those lands with a settler on them would stand against the land when the patents issued, then the municipality would be all right. In some cases parties who had homesteads have left them, and in that case, of course, the municipality is out entirely. Now, it appears to me these Crown lands must be improved by the money that is spent by the municipality in making roads and other improvements of that description, and, therefore, the amount that is against those lands for taxes imposed by the municipality should stand against them even if they are Crown lands. There should be some provisions whereby the municipality might be recouped for the outlay they have made in figuring on collecting so much taxes. There are a great number of instances such as I have described, with respect both to Canadian Pacific Railway lands and Crown lands.

Mr. SPROULE. Could not the Canadian Pacific Railway Company be requested to make out an annual return, something the same as the Canada Company does in Ontario, as to what lands have been sold and what lands are yet unsold? With reference to the taxes standing against the land, I think it is much the same in Manitoba as in Ontario. If you buy unpatented lands to-day in Ontario for taxes, you are still obliged to pay the amounts held against them by the Crown, and I suppose the same provisions exist in Manitoba. I think the company should be requested to make an annual return the same as the land company in Ontario.

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman will require to make further provision in this Bill than he has already done. It will be necessary to amend the law by providing that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall report their sales annually to the Government so as to make those lands taxable, and it will be also necessary that the Government should do what has been done in Ontario, and I suppose in the other Provinces, that is, to make the interest of the settler in the lands liable to sale for the purpose of meeting any taxation that may be imposed by the municipality, otherwise it would be impossible for the municipality to enforce any provision for taxation to meet its liability, and to pay for the improvements that have been made, certainly while the municipality incurs expense by way of improving the municipality generally, the lands, although they may be still lands of the Crown, have, to a certain extent, partaken in the advantages of those improvements, and it is not an unreasonable thing to provide that, in so far as those lands are occupied by the settler, his interest in them shall be liable for the taxation that shall be incurred. But I wished to call the hon. gentleman's attention to section 6. I do not think it meets the object which he has in view. The section provides that the party is to communicate his intention to make such application six months before the application is made. Now, this imposes the duty, first, to give notice that the party intends to apply for a patent, and afterwards to make application for a patent. The hon. gentleman will see that that is wholly unnecessary; it is only necessary that the party in occupation should give notice for a patent —that is all that is required—and then, that notice being given, the commissioner can direct the inspector to examine the lands and to see whether the homestead conditions are complied with. The two applications are altogether unnecessary. The application for a patent is all that is required, and the section should be amended accordingly.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman understands we are leaving this section in the meantime, but I am obliged to him for the suggestion. With regard to taxes, I find that the complaint is with regard to cancelled homesteads, as I found when I was in the west. I accordingly gave instructions that, in case of cancelled homesteads, notice shall be sent to the municipal clerk to obtain from him a statement of the taxes against that land, and the first charge upon the improvement is the municipal taxes that are due; that goes first to the clerk, and then the balance, if any, will go to the original settler or the Government.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that if he takes authority to do that, and it ought to be provided for by law, it would only meet the case of the homesteads; but how about the case of pre-emption? If it is the intention of the Government that these lands shall be charged with the municipal taxes, so that, if the homestead is cancelled, the party acquiring it shall know that there is a lien upon the land to the amount of the taxation, will that apply to the pre-emption law as well as to the homestead?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman will see that so far as pre-emption is concerned, the pre-emption does not belong to the man until six months after getting his patent out, all he does with regard to his pre-emption is to signify his intention of taking it out; but he may not take it out at all, therefore we cannot possibly deal with that.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Why should he not pay his taxes when he has indicated his intention?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I was going to state that the arrangement I made was this: Whatever is due on a pro-

perty, whether it be a homestead or a homestead and pre-emption, whatever appears by the municipal clerk's book to be taxed against that man's property, shall be the first charge upon the improvements he has made, in the case of cancelled homesteads—for that applied equally to pre-emptions and homesteads. That is all the taxes that can be levied.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I would ask the hon. gentleman what provision there is now for taxing the owner of the land before the patent is issued, either the homestead or the pre-emption? What provision is there for assessing the land, and, in the case of non-payment, for disposing of the land in order to cover the taxes?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is a matter that we certainly have nothing to do with. Local taxation is a matter for the municipal authorities to deal with.

Mr. CAMERON. (Huron). True; but they have no power, as I understand, to collect taxes on a homestead or pre-emption; they have no lien upon the land for unpaid taxes, and there ought to be some provision for that. It is perfectly useless, so far as the municipality is concerned, to say that they can assess if there is no power to collect. As I understand it, there is no power to collect now, just as there was not in the old Province of Ontario, until a law was made. At one time they could not collect taxes for unpatented land out of the land, and the law was altered in that respect so as to enable the municipalities to sell the unpatented land for arrears of taxes. The case in the North-West is the same, and unless you enable the municipalities to sell the unpatented lands for taxes, it is useless to give the power to assess the land, for there is no way of collecting. Now, a man is not bound to take his patent out when he has complied with his settlement duties. He may let it stand for years, and during all these years he can hold his lands, and he need not pay taxes, and the municipalities cannot collect the taxes, simply because they cannot sell. As the law is now in Ontario, you can sell a man's interest in it, whatever it is, and it ought to be the same there. The municipalities ought to have the power of disposing of the interest of the locatee in the land for arrears of taxes, and the purchaser, under tax sales, should stand in the position of the original locatee.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It seems to me that the municipal authorities there can do exactly the same as is done in Ontario, where they can sell a man's interest.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No, they could not do it here until they got power by law to do it; and the Local Legislature cannot grant the power to do it because it is Crown property.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is a matter for municipal arrangement altogether, and I do not think we have power to legislate. I have no hesitation in saying that I should regret to see it done, for the reason that no greater evil has occurred in Ontario than the obtainment by speculators of large tracts of land at taxation sales which they hold to-day, and it has been a very serious injury to the country, and it would be precisely the same in the North-West. It is not for me to criticise an act of the Local Legislature, but the matter rests with the people themselves. The real difficulty rests with the people themselves. If the Local Legislature will simply do away with special exemptions from taxation, then they can collect the taxes. The people have power to elect their own representatives, and, if they find this difficulty about collecting taxes to be an injury, all they have to do is to instruct their representatives to vote for the repeal of the exemption clause, and the moment they do so the chattels will be there to pay the taxes year after year, and the taxes will be paid. That is the simple way of dealing with the matter.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Mr. TROW. There is one thing the Government could do and should do. If they have any control over the Canadian Pacific Railway they should see that the company make annual or quarterly returns of all lands sold by them, in order to give the municipalities of Manitoba the right to tax the property of the then holders. It is bad enough that the Syndicate should be exempt from taxation for a long series of years. The very life of a municipality is that all the lands within its boundaries are liable to an equitable rate of taxation. While it is true that the Syndicate have exemption from taxation on their land, I do not know whether municipalities would have the power to sell for taxes the right of the occupant of the land bought from them. I am inclined to think they have that right. It is, however, a matter belonging to themselves, and if they have not the right they should obtain it.

Mr. MILLS. I have no doubt that the Minister of the Interior is correct in saying that if the exemption of personal property were done away with the evil would be to some extent cured. But the evil he mentioned of the lands falling into the hands of speculators could not take place in regard to homesteads, for all who procure the right to homestead were obliged to conform to the provisions of the law with respect to homesteading, and therefore a large number of homesteads could never pass into the hands of an individual.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I think the suggestion thrown out should commend itself to the judgment of the members of the House, namely, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should furnish returns of all lands that they sell. There is what is called the North-West Land Company that bought a very large number of acres from the Canadian Pacific Railway. We do not know how much they bought —we are kept in the dark.

An hon. MEMBER. They are liable to taxation.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The lands are not taxed. That is what we complain of; and there is no return made. Some lands are taxed, but a great deal escapes taxation; and it is not an answer for this Parliament to give the people of Canada to say that we have nothing to do with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and have no power over them. We brought them into being; they live, move and have their being here; and I am quite sure that the created is not greater than the creator, and that we have the power to oblige them — when there is not a Session in which they do not come here for some concessions to be made to them—to do justice and make any returns asked for, especially when the undertaking is so intimately connected with the public affairs of the country. When the taxation of the country has largely gone in keeping the company in existence, to say that we have no power over them, that we must allow them to act according to their own sweet will, and that when any action on their part is required we must go hat in hand and ask them pleasantly if they will be kind enough to make certain returns, is an argument I cannot agree with. This Parliament should have great power over the company, and can compel it to make returns. It is a reasonable request that the Minister of the Interior, and the Government of which he is a member, should see that provisions are placed in the law so as to compel returns to be given.

Mr. TROW. When any patent is given from the Indian Department, the returns are made direct from the Department to the registry officer. It is the same in Ontario with regard to Crown lands. The moment lands vested in the Crown are patented, the returns are made to the registrar of the county where the lands are located; and this plan could easily be applied with respect to the Syndicate lands.

Mr. WATSON. While this matter is being discussed, I desire to mention for the consideration of the Minister of Interior—if the hon. gentleman intends to make a requisition for returns from the Canadian Pacific Railway—that large quantities of lands were sold by the Syndicate to different parties during the "boom" in the North-West, which lands are now again in the hands of the Syndicate. Those lands have been subject to taxation for a year or two by the municipalities, and some improvements were made, but unfortunately the people were unable to comply with the conditions, and the lands have fallen back into the hands of the Syndicate. In case the Government ask the Syndicate to make returns as suggested, there should be some provision by which the amount of money standing against those lands, in the books of the municipalities, should be paid from the sale of the lands, because the Syndicate has benefited by the payments made and forfeited by the purchasers. If the Syndicate has received certain payments on lands which have fallen back into their hands, and are now free from taxation, it certainly ought to pay the taxes of the municipality out of the amount received from the re-sale.

On section 8,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). This clause is one of considerable importance. So far as my own experience and observation are concerned, and the opinion of the great mass of the people in the North-West whom I have met there, there is really—speaking in the general—but one opinion as to the importance of doing away with the second homestead.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I think this clause should not have effect on those persons who at the present time, or at the passage of this Act, had received the certificate mentioned in clause 37, or who have been recommended for patents, or who have applied for a second entry. I do not think these people should be debarred from obtaining the second entry, but there is no provision here which will prevent them from being debarred. I do not think that the Bill should be retrospective, and I should suggest an amendment of this kind:

But this clause shall not affect the right, at present existing, of any person to a second homestead entry, who, at the time of passing this Act, shall have been granted a certificate as above mentioned, or who has been recommended for patent, or who has already applied for second homestead entry.

Mr. TROW. I do not think we should prevent a man from obtaining a second homestead. The new settlers, as a rule, are the pioneers of the country, and many of them, after making some improvements on their homesteads, can sell them to advantage to new settlers, and then proceed westward. They require another homestead and they place a good homesteader in their old position, and so are the means of settling the country. This is the case in Ontario and Manitoba, and I think it is wrong on the part of the Government to deprive anyone of a second homestead under such circumstances. For instance, it often happens that immigrants come in from the Old Country with $300 or $400 who have families in charge, and are not prepared to travel far in search of homesteads. They come to these places which are partially improved and squat down on them while the other proceeds westward. I have known parties of that description, after making small improvements, go on 100 miles further west, and then after a few years proceed still further west. I think they are a class of settlers who should be encouraged.

Mr. MILLS. I agree in the view of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow). There are many parties who are good pioneer settlers, who are not very thrifty or prosperous; they become involved; they find they can sell their homesteads to advantage after acquiring them, and begin anew. I think, so far as the Government and the country are concerned, when they have sold out, we have just as much interest in securing them by giving them additional homesteads as if they were applicants for the first time; otherwise, when they sell they will cross the border.

Mr. TROW. I am prepared to state that one-half of the Canadian settlers who have left our North-West and gone to Montana, Dakota and Minnesota are of that class who have sold out in Manitoba; and finding they could not get a second homestead, have travelled a few miles across the border, and obtained homesteads in the United States.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The only difficulty in the statement of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Trow), whose opinions on North-West matters I value highly, is that these people have the opportunity of getting a second homestead in the North-West, and it is difficult to see how that could be their reason for leaving it.

Mr. TROW. Only very lately.

Mr. BLAKE. During the great bulk of the settlement there was not the right to the second homestead.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There was for a good many years.

Mr. TROW. For about two years.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I may say that there are parts of the country which have been very seriously injured by settlers performing their duties in a very perfunctory way, with no other idea when they got their patents than not to sell their land but to go further west and obtain another homestead. The first address with which I was honored when I went to the North-West was at Minnedosa, and the first clause of that address was a very strong one recommending the abolition of the principle of a second homestead, as having been found to be exceedingly injurious to that part of the country. No doubt the principle upon which the second homestead provision was adopted, was exceedingly plausible, that is, that a settler coming in accustomed to pioneer work would make some improvements, put up a house and do some cultivation, and then that the new settler coming in, generally from the Old Country, unaccustomed to pioneer methods, finding such a place would purchase it, while the old settler with his pioneer methods would go further west and get another. If that had been found to be the practical result, there would have been something to justify the principle, but as a matter of fact that has not been the general experience. You will find in the Rapid City settlement, and in many other portions of Manitoba and the North-West, that the old homesteads taken up by the original settlers have really no improvements upon them, that they are worse instead of better, by the so-called improvements that have been made upon them, than they were in the original prairie, because it is well known that by breaking up the prairie soil and leaving it and allowing weeds to grow up in it, it becomes much more difficult of cultivation and much less valuable than the original prairie was. That has been the practical effect of allowing the second homestead. The fact has been that people go into the North-West with land-hunger strong upon them; that is one of the incidents of settlement in the North-West country; they go in with the intention of getting a first homestead, of performing the duties in the most perfunctory way, and then going on further west and taking up another and make some more improvements there. But it is three years taken out of their lives, and many of these men who took their second homesteads told me that they would have been infinitely better off if they had remained at the first homestead and cultivated it in the way they cultivated the second. The effect has been injurious to these men themselves, and injurious especially to the part of the country they leave—not selling their homesteads, but leaving them in the hope that they will become valuable by settlement

around them, and that they will get a better price by-and-bye. I know that a large number of the newspapers of the North-West were at one time strongly in favor of the second homestead principle, but I know that they have practically admitted that experience has led them to change their minds, and they now hold the very opposite view. Some of the most influential journals have changed their minds on this subject, as the result of the practical experience of the operation of what appeared to be a most plausible system in the first instance; and if the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to examine the records of the land department in the United States—if he looks at the last volume issued under the title of the "Public Domain," he will find a number of very plausible schemes, which were adopted for the purpose of facilitating the settlement of the country, but almost every one of which has been afterwards, as the result of experience, protested against very strongly by the officer specially charged with the administration of the laws. He prays Congress to repeal them, but the complaint there is that Congress cannot be moved to deal with these matters. Probably if the heads of Departments were Ministers, with the responsibility of Ministers, these things would have been changed in the United States long ago. The danger in all these cases is in taking an individual case, which seems to be perfectly plausible, and drafting on that a general system, which proves to be disastrous to the people who avail themselves of it, as well as to the country at large. There is a good deal of force in the amendment the hon. gentleman has proposed, and I do not think I have any objection to accepting it.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Certainly the hon. gentleman has made out a very plausible case. But two things have to exist to induce a man to go further west; either his land is no good, and it is not worth his while to settle upon it, or else he can sell it to advantage. If the latter is the case, the country loses nothing; it merely gets a new settler, and the man has gone further west, perhaps to catch up with some of his relatives or friends who have come from the Old Country or from the east, and whom he wants to associate with. But if the land is no good, are you going to compel him by Statute to stay there and reap thistles every year? Suppose he goes to a part that is arid or that has not good water, but which looks pleasant to the eye, and he finds, after he has been two or three years there, that the longer he stays the poorer he becomes, are you going to oblige him to stay there or leave the country, as the hon. member for South Perth says, and go to Dakota? The Minister says he had an address presented to him at Minnedosa, one of the clauses of which favored this change; but it may be that that was a temporary and isolated case on which he was drafting a system. But we here, as representatives, knowing something about the North-West and about the settlement of lands, ought to consider this matter carefully, and ought, as legislators, to pass laws in the interest of the whole country.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course we are now endeavoring to profit by the lessons of an experience of considerable length as to the progress of settlement in the North-West under existing regulations. Two years ago we agreed to the proposition of second homesteads. The hon. gentleman says the experience of the last two years has proven that that was a mistake, and it may well have been the case; I have no means of forming a judgment except from what I hear in this place. But when we are asked to act on the experience of two years as to a change which it was thought would largely facilitate the settlement of the country, it would be well that we should have a little more information than the hon. gentleman has yet communicated to us as to that basis of practical experience on which he asks us to act. He has said some things which was not very pleasant to hear, about the condition of the homesteads left by the homesteaders in many cases. I did not understand whether the homesteads to which he referred were abandoned homesteads.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). They were abandoned in the sense of being the first patented.

Mr. BLAKE. They are left unoccupied?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I can well understand a certain amount of disinclination, in portions of that vast territory, amongst those who remain, at seeing a process going on, under which some of their neighbors leave their lands and go to other lands. I think it just possible that the memorial the hon. gentleman refers to was to some extent instigated by a feeling of that kind; and those people may wish to have a law which by a gentle constraint would make it less easy for people to leave their homesteads, so that they would have their pleasant companionship still. It may be that that is quite right. But there is obviously a bias of self-interest in that view. The hon. gentleman says there are many cases in which men have declared that had they worked on their original homesteads in the manner in which they have worked on their second homesteads, they would now be well off, and he attributes to this plan a practical operation which I do not think it possible in the nature of things that it could have had, for the reason that the right of second homestead has only existed two years, and the people who spoke thus must have done their work under the impression that they would have no right to a second homestead at all.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It was done by the Act of 1883.

Mr. BLAKE. It was only about two years after the Act was passed that he had the interview with these gentlemen.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Practically nothing is done in the first year.

Mr. BLAKE. But these are cases, I apprehend, in which a good deal of work had been done before it was the law that there might be a second homestead. Now, I do not, of course, object to our listening to the lessons of experience, but when there is a considerable opinion that this proposal would be an advantage, we ought to know a little more of the evil and the good, if there is any, which has resulted from the operations of the change. Does the hon. gentleman know in how many cases the privilege of the second homestead has been availed of? How many cases have there been of pioneer settlers, men who have a certain aptitude or liking for making first improvements, but who are not, perhaps, very skilled farmers, and who, after making the first improvements, abandon their homesteads and take up new ones further west? They are in this way useful members of society whom we ought not to discourage. The suggestion has been thrown out this afternoon that the main object of this section would be accomplished by a limitation which would prevent to a considerable extent the evil to which the hon. gentleman has referred; that is by coupling as a condition for the privilege of a second homestead, that the first homestead must previously be sold. There you would have the certainty that the pioneer was accomplishing his object of opening up new country; but even without this proviso, it is questionable whether the evil referred to could exist to any extent, since he who is a pioneer is little likely to be able to cultivate two homesteads, apart from each other, in remote sections of the country. It would be well to know to what extent the privilege of a second homestead has been availed of, and to what extent it has been coupled with the sale or retention of the original homestead.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I cannot give the precise information on this point. I have arrived at my opinion

more from conversations with settlers and from conferences with them at public meetings in the North-West—and I have had about twenty public meetings, or rather conferences, with them during my visit to the North-West—than from any other source. In every meeting the question of second homesteading was discussed; and in no case was there an opinion adverse to, but, on the contrary, a strong expression of opinion in favor of the policy of abolishing the second homestead. I arrived therefore at the conclusion to abolish second homesteading, from the statements of these men who had practical experience of its operation. No doubt what the hon. gentleman says is quite true, that, so far as the feeling in Manitoba is concerned, it is due to the fact that as the settlers leave, the advantages the community expected to get from their presence—advantages of a social, religious and educational character—are lost, and it is that fact which undoubtedly, to a large extent, in the western part of Manitoba, causes so strong a feeling. That feeling is not confined to western Manitoba, but obtains very largely in the North-West Territory as well. No doubt we could ascertain, without very much trouble, the number of second homesteads taken up; but the hon. gentleman will see the law has been in operation but for three years, and the number in itself would be a very imperfect test by which to judge of the failure, or otherwise of the system. The practical experience of the people who are in daily contact with it is of greater value. As to the suggestion that we should limit second homesteading to cases where the original homestead is sold, I have discussed that point with some of the officers of the Department, and others as well. The practical difficulty of carrying it out is this: You have given a second homestead, and you have no security that the new resident on the old homestead will remain, or is in fact a *bond fide* resident. The new purchaser may hold it as did the original homesteader until it increases in price. One of the difficulties is, the system of alternate sections, a difficulty, of course, which time will remove as each section is taken up and settled upon; but we would increase the difficulty if, in addition, we offered an incentive to settlers to leave as soon as they have obtained their patents, with the view of getting other sections further west, and holding them for a higher price.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see that the difficulties would subsist to any great extent if the condition of granting a second homestead was the prior alienation of the first. I attach the greatest weight to the unanimity of feeling which prevails among the people. The hon. gentleman saw, subject to this observation, that Parliament is entitled to know, not merely that these gentlemen thought so and so, but the reasons why.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I explained the reasons as they told them to me.

Mr. BLAKE. I heard only this reason, as I apprehend it. The hon. gentleman says he will get—and I am sure he will—the number of cases in which this practice has been followed. I do not agree with him in the view that it is entirely immaterial how many or how few cases there were. If there have been only a few cases, it is impossible there can be a number of grievances growing from this system If it is the opinion of the people that there would be grievances rather than that they have had practical experience of grievances, we ought to know it.

Mr. TROW. The experience of the hon. Minister in the North-West has, no doubt, given him many practical ideas, but he has been misinformed with reference to the evil results of seconding homesteading. There are various reasons to show the benefit of second homesteading. I have known settlers in Manitoba, the first settlers from Ontario, who returned to Ontario and induced a number of their friends to come out with them and settle in their section of country, but on reaching there they found they could make no purchases of land from the adjoining settlers, and the result was that the first settlers, who had been residing for years in Manitoba, sold out and went with their friends further west to the Birtle district, where they formed quite a nucleus from the older Provinces. Under the rule now proposed, they would have had to remain in Manitoba, because they could not have got a second homestead elsewhere, and would thus have been isolated from their friends. As regards the remarks of the hon. Minister with reference to the settlement of the Western States, my opinion is the reverse of his. I know that a large portion of Illinois was settled from Ohio, that a large portion of Wisconsin was settled from Illinois, and that a very large number of settlers, who had been for years in Wisconsin, removed to Minnesota, and then, following the line of railway, went still further west, many of them, with whom I am acquainted, going to Bismarck, and others still travelling west. The settlers to whom the Minister refers, might be a number of half breeds who left the Assiniboia after they had sold out there.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No.

Mr. TROW. And who were not, in many instances, practical farmers, and in as good circumstances as when on their previous old homesteads. I know many people who have settled further west, where they are doing better than they did in their old settlements.

Mr. WATSON. As one who strongly advocated the granting of a second homestead when the Land Bill was passed in 1883, I regret with others that that provision has not proved as great a success as we thought it would. At that time there was need of this provision, as I knew hundreds of people who had sold out their land, and not being able to receive second homesteads went to the States. Southern Manitoba, in consequence of this, was almost depopulated. There are numbers of them from southern Manitoba, and in fact they left Southern Manitoba almost depopulated. I cannot say it is the fault of the Act or of the provision in the Act, but these unfortunate circumstances have been brought about by our having had practically few or no immigrants into the North-West during the last two or three years. I believe, if the immigrants were coming into the North-West as they were in 1880, 1881 and 1882, we would not have the state of affairs which now exists, and would not find the vacant homesteads that have been abandoned. Of course, the people avail themselves of the opportunity of taking second homesteads. I would suggest a remedy to the Minister if he intends to do away with these second homesteads, as he proposes in this Bill. He refers to the petitions and representations made to him at Minnedosa, and Birtle, and other points, as to the settlers leaving. It was stated to him that the operation of the Act was not in the best interests of the country, and also that pre-emptions should be given for the second homestead. Now, if he would allow the homesteader to take up his pre-emption as a second homestead, he would overcome all these grievances in these two instances, the settlement would go on, the settler would get benefits and would remain in the district. As the Minister has seen fit to allow one clause to stand, I think it would be well to allow this clause also to stand. I think with a little consideration some provision might be made by which this clause would not be wiped out entirely, and yet the interests of the older settlements would be protected. I think also that it would be an improvement to allow homesteading under conditions of cultivation. If this land had improvements on it, that would be a sufficient inducement to a settler to locate on that land, and someone would be residing on it instead of its being vacant. The system of giving patents for lands

with little or no improvements on them has been the greatest possible curse to the country.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be a great mistake to allow that to be carried out, because the homesteaders would simply move from the homesteads to the pre-emptions, would leave one lot vacant and occupy the other. One of the most fruitful sources of the desire to select another homestead in the west was, that the original settlers there, who, perhaps, brought a young family from Ontario or some of the other Provinces, found that in the meantime they had grown up, and there was an ambition to go west, so that their family might settle around them. I think the aim was a good one. I know a great many in southern Manitoba expressed a desire to go west for that reason, and of course they are always better fitted for pioneers than others from a different country. I would ask the Minister if there is any provision whereby a homesteader, in the event of his finding the surroundings were such as to make it impossible to get along, might, before he took out a patent, abandon his homestead and select another somewhere else. I think some cases of that kind have come before the Minister of the Interior or his predecessors, with which they have had to deal, where it seemed almost absolutely necessary to have some provision or some power vested in the Governor in Council to allow of this change being made.

Mr. MULOCK. I can hardly follow the reasoning of the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) when he says that to allow the pre-emptions to be paid for at an earlier date would facilitate a change on the part of the settler. He says the settler would abandon his homestead for the pre-emption quarter-section adjoining. I cannot understand on what ground a settler would abandon a free grant of land and move to the adjoining section which he has to pay for.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I said if it was allowed for a settler to select his pre-emption as a homestead after having completed his entry on the homestead.

Mr. MULOCK. And select his homestead too?

Mr. FAIRBANK. I would not for a moment underestimate the value to the North-West of the trip of the Minister of the Interior. I think it a great misfortune to the whole country that similar trips had not been made by his predecessor, and the information that a man gets on the grounds, the practical information, is vastly better than any theoretical. But I would ask the Minister of the Interior if, in the consideration of this question, he has given due weight to what he has himself mentioned, the hunger for land which seems to influence men when first arriving, and the disposition to take up the first piece of land that comes in their way. We know that, during the boom, there was great anxiety all over the country that in a very short time there would be no more land in the world anywhere, and it was very necessary to grapple on to the first piece that was within reach. Again, if it would not be considered treason to the North-West, I almost tremble to make the remark, experience has developed that certain sections there are more exposed to frost than others, that the season is held in pretty closely by two frost walls, and it required pretty active attention to avoid grazing upon the one or the other. In case such a circumstance has been developed—I do not say it has—and the man has taken up his claim on one, is he to be forever debarred from taking up his claim on another? Again, has the Minister given due weight to a disposition of the business men of Manitoba to speak against and discourage any emigration from there? The business men—I speak of them all—of course are very anxious for people to remain there, and will speak very ill of any disposition to change from one locality to another. Again, in hearing the information he did, he must have necessarily heard it very largely from those who remained, and not from those who went away. Again, I am sure he must have observed in that country that one of the great drawbacks is the loneliness. I shall never forget the answer I received to an enquiry from a settler's wife near Regina, who had left my own county, who had gone there very strong, in having four or five grown-up boys. They had very large fields of wheat, and had made a great deal of improvement. I asked the lady if she was ever lonesome. The look she gave me I shall never forget. She said: "There are times when I feel I must leave here immediately, but I have come for a certain purpose, and I am going to remain," alluding to the settlement of her sons. She said: "However, we have retained our old place upon the Sydenham, and perhaps we shall return to it." I hope the Minister of the Interior will grapple with the question which is known as the chequer-board question, and if possible obviate the difficulties which arise from it. Again, I would ask whether he gave due weight to the fact that some of these settlers have pitched their tent in the expectation of speedy railway accommodation, in which they have been disappointed. I admit it is a large question, and one, which I presume, he has given his full attention to. He has seen much more of it than I have, and I would not set up my judgment against his in this particular. Yet it does seem, in theory at all events, that there are certain irreconcilable difficulties in saying to a man who has acquired his patent, and wishes to change, that he is forever debarred from becoming again a homesteader.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I think the number of those settlers who favor the proposition which is now under discussion by the committee, is not as large as we have been given to understand by the statement of the Minister of the Interior. I have a letter from the North-West Territory which states that at a recent meeting the proposition to abandon second homesteading was protested against, and I am given to understand in that letter that the determination of the meeting was communicated to the Minister of Interior. The statement is that at that meeting it was unanimously resolved that the resolution to abandon second homesteading, so far as the present settlers were concerned, at least, was a breach of faith with those who had already taken up homesteads, and it was urged that the tacit agreement made between themselves and the country when they took up those homesteads, should be respected, and that they, at least, should be exempted from any change in the Act. I am given to understand that at a largely attended meeting of the settlers in the neighborhood of Moose Jaw, such a resolution was also unanimously adopted. This shows clearly that the proposition to which second homesteading is not unanimously commended, and that possibly some of the reasons given in favor of such abolition elsewhere are largely local ones. Those who have had experience in the early settlement of Ontario know that the pioneer was a very valuable individual, but he gradually receded on the fringe of civilisation. Perhaps other reasons, largely the incident of the movement that occurred in 1881-82, may account for the desertion of homesteads that has been spoken of, to an extent that is scarcely creditable. I am unable to speak from personal experience, and consequently will pay every deference to the opinion of those who have been up there, and I would have said nothing whatever but that I feel that these resolutions which have been communicated to me, show that the second homesteading is not looked on with so much disfavor by settlers in many sections as we have been given to understand; but, at any rate, I would urge upon the Minister the propriety of giving some consideration to the case of those who have been induced to take up homesteads since we conceded the right of second homesteading.

Clearly these men are entitled to consideration in any alteration of the law that is being made, and I think the proposition of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), meets the circumstances of these individuals to some extent.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In answer to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), who asked me about the number of second homesteads, Mr. Burgess has handed me a memorandum in which he says that by the report of 1884-85 it appears that 141 second homestead entries had been then made, comprising 29,879 acres. The number is not in the last report, and I am told it would take some trouble to go through all the entries and find out the exact number. But that is at the commencement, and I am inclined to think there was a larger number last year than the year before.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry that the course of the Department of the Interior in this, and, I am afraid, in some other respects, is rather to give us less information from year to year in their report, instead of more. They begin by giving us the number of homestead entries, and in the second report they do not give it.

The CHAIRMAN. It is proposed to amend this clause as follows:—

That such report shall not take away the right of any person who, before the passing of this Act, had received such certificate, or a recommendation for a patent.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. WATSON. It might be in the interest of those parties who have received these benefits, and the interest of the settlement, that they should not have to go forty miles away from the previous homestead to take up a second one. That is one of the reasons why some sections of the country have been depopulated, to a certain extent. An Order in Council was passed that forty miles was the nearest distance within which they could take up a second homestead, and if they are to avail themselves of that, they have got to leave the section of country they are in.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I will consider the suggestion of the hon. gentleman. I think that can be done by departmental action; I think the forty-mile provision was made by an Order in Council.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Minister propose doing away with that?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I will think about it, I cannot promise now.

On section 9,

Mr. BLAKE. Why should the Minister of the Interior take this power?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I desire that that clause should stand, because the amendments I referred to just now related to the original clause. I may say the reason the Minister takes that power is that it required an Order in Council in every case of a colonisation company, or anyone else, to put settlers upon the land; it required an Order in Council to get authority to make the amount they had granted to the settler a lien upon the land when the patent issued.

On section 10,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The Act provides now a means by which a patent obtained through fraud or error, upon reference to the proper tribunal, can be cancelled, but no means by which a homestead entry obtained by fraud or error can be cancelled. Once the entry is made it is irrevocable, and the object of this is simply to enable that to be done by the Dominion Land Board.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that there have been no cases in which homestead entries or pre-emption entries have been passed on this ground?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). None that I am aware of. I am so informed.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it proposed that this authority shall be given to the Land Board? Of course, this may involve serious and complicated questions of law. Are patents liable to be cancelled by the Land Board?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No. This provision deals with homestead entries, and the object is to cancel without delay any entries that have evidently been obtained by fraud.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Land Board be empowered to take evidence under oath?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). They have power to take evidence under oath on everything connected with land matters. If a case occurred where it is desirable to take evidence, it would be taken under oath.

Mr. MULOCK. There is no provision in the Bill to that effect.

Mr. BLAKE. To what class of cases is this section intended to apply? Is it intended to apply to a case where a man has already obtained a homestead and is not entitled to a second homestead?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That would be one of the classes of cases. I will give the hon. gentleman one case that occurred in Regina a short time ago, as illustrating the difficulties connected with the matter. A homestead entry was given by error on what turned out to be an Indian reserve. It was not marked on the map of the local agent as being an Indian reserve, and so he gave the entry. The agent found out two days afterwards that he had made an error; but the man for some time insisted on keeping it. In that particular case the matter was arranged and the party eventually took another homestead. In that case the Dominion Land Board could have interfered and cancelled the entry if this provision had been in force.

Mr. BLAKE. There might be no particular hardship in that case as the error was discovered within two days. But suppose one or two years elapsed before an error of that kind was discovered, and in the meantime the homesteader spends his time and money in improvements, and meanwhile his chance of getting an available location is diminished, it would be an extraordinary state of affairs to permit the cancellation of the entry, which had not been made by fraud on his part but through the error of the Government agent or officer, at all events without proper compensation being made to the individual.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is almost an impossible case. Cases do occur where men obtain entries through fraud or misrepresentation. The land may be land already taken and the former entry was, perhaps, omitted to be looked up; it might be land occupied by someone else and fraud and misrepresentation might be made in regard to it. Cases of this kind do not often occur, but I am told by the commissioner that one or two have occurred, and it is desirable that the proposed provision should be made. If there is fraud in case of a patent there are means by which the patent can be set aside; so when an erroneous or improper entry is made, and where it is not desirable to go through the forms of trial before a law court on matters of small moment, the Department wants power to cancel it.

Mr. LANGELIER. I do not see any procedure indicated for the cancellation of the entries. I see only this provided: That in all cases of proved fraud or error entries may be cancelled by the Dominion Land Board. That is a very

useful provision provided there are the necessary precautions taken. On a previous occasion the hon. gentleman made some remarks about something that took place in the Province of Quebec, and a paper supporting his party made much of the cancellations that had been made by the Department of Crown Lands in that Province. A provision of the same kind exists and has existed there since 1872. Here is the defect that was found to exist in that law: There was no protection given to the settler. The Department of Crown Lands was at liberty to cancel location tickets. I understand the entry is practically the same as a location ticket. The Minister of Crown Lands could cancel any location ticket without giving notice to the settler, without giving him any chance of producing proof that there had been no fraud or infringement of the rules of the Department. When I was Commissioner of Crown Lands in Quebec, in 1878, I had the law amended in order to give a chance to the settler to be heard. I remember, when the law was discussed in 1872, my hon. friend from Quebec East most strenuously opposed a provision of the same kind as that now before the House, and he predicted, with remarkable foresight, exactly what took place not long afterwards, and he wound up a very eloquent speech by addressing the then Prime Minister, Mr. Chauveau, to the following effect: He said if this provision remained in the law, not long hereafter the Government will see a great many emigrants leaving the country for the United States, and they would be in a position to go to the First Minister and say: *Migraturi te salutant*. It was most extraordinary that what had been predicted by the hon. member for Quebec East took place within three years. A great many settlers were deprived of their lands without any chance whatever being afforded them to protect their rights. Other parties who wanted to secure those lands or who entertained some spite, political or otherwise, against them, denounced them in the Department of Crown Lands for a so-called infringement of the conditions of the location ticket. When those settlers were deprived of their lands, that was the first time they knew they had violated the conditions of the location ticket, and they had no chance whatever to defend themselves against the charges brought against them.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Would not the point be met if we added the words: "After due notice to all parties concerned."

Mr. LANGELIER. What form of notice is provided? I introduced a provision which was found very effective, and since that time there has been no trouble whatever. The provision I introduced concerning the management of Crown lands was that notice should be published in the *Official Gazette*, giving the number of each lot in each township that was proposed to be cancelled, and that notice must be published sixty days before cancellation was made. I found that this notice would even prove inefficient, and so it was provided that printed notice must be sent by post card or registered letter—post card will do—to the party interested, at his last known post office address. This even was not found sufficient. Another provision has been introduced, which I admit might be difficult to apply to the present case, and under it that notice must be posted at the church door, or at the door of any other public place in the locality where the land is situated, stating that such cancellation is going to take place. After all those proceedings have been taken and cancellation is made, still the settler has another resource. He has a right to appeal from the cancellation within sixty days after cancellation has taken place. We found in the Province of Quebec that this was necessary to protect the settler, because, in many cases, the Department might be deceived by parties who had some aims with respect to the land, and unless those precautions were taken it would only be after the poor settler had been deprived of his land that it would be discovered the Department had been deceived. In order to protect the settler in the North-West it is necessary that some provision should be inserted in the law to give sufficient notice to the settler, in order that he might defend himself before the Department, and if he is charged with having committed a fraud, or having done something which makes the entry illegal, he should be notified of those charges in order to have the opportunity of defending himself.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The cases which the hon. gentleman mentions are not at all analogous. The cases in the Province of Quebec, with which the hon. gentleman and his successors had something to do, in the county of Mégantic, as well as in the county of Ottawa, were cases in which there were a large number of settlers whose lands were to be cancelled for non-performance of duties and obligations. That is not at all the case here. Publication of a notice in a newspaper, in the case of a settler whose title had been cancelled, owing to improvidence or error, would be entirely unnecessary, and would, besides, be very expensive. I think it is better to leave it in its present form so as to ensure a personal notice, which will answer the purpose far better than a notice in a newspaper.

Mr. BLAKE. My difficulty goes further than that which my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Langelier), has very rightly pointed out. Fraud is one thing, and, no doubt, if a man obtains an entry through fraud there should be proper machinery for meeting such a case, but I do not see that the error or the improvidence which the hon. gentleman makes the ground for cancellation may be merely the error or the improvidence of the settler. It may be that there will be improvident or erroneous acts on the part of the Crown. For instance, a man may buy a piece of land and the Crown, after it has fully considered of the matter, may think it more suitable to be reserved for say a public park, or hot wells may be discovered upon it. They have found out its value in this way, and I am not objecting to the cancellation taking place, but there may be a case in which the man, knowing that these lands are set out for homestead purposes, knowing that he is entitled to ask for such lands, knowing perhaps that there are incidental advantages, applies for the land; you give it to him; he complies with the terms, and goes on *bonâ fide* and makes his improvements, and yet at any time until he gets the patent you have the right to assert: "I, the Department, acted erroneously or improvidently in granting the land, and therefore I will undo my act without making any compensation for the loss of time and labor on the part of the applicant." Now, that is an arbitrary power, which I do not think should be capable of being exercised in its naked form. It is true that the Department might not exercise it in a harsh manner; still the conditions upon which they should turn a man out should be definite, and they should not involve the man in loss of time or labor through the error of the Department. While I want to secure that no advantage should be taken of the State, yet we want to make the tenure of the man who proposes to settle in the North-West just as certain as we can, if he honestly complies with the conditions, and we want therefore not to put a clause in the Statute in which it may be said to him: It is quite uncertain whether you will get your land; they may tell you years hence that there was a mistake, and the Land Board will adjudicate on the matter and cancel your entry, and the terms are dependent on the good will and the tender feeling of the Department.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Referring to clause 10, I think it would be desirable to let it stand until we go into committee again, and I will endeavor to get specific information as to cases which are liable to arise, and possibly in that case I may recast the clause so as to meet the objections which were made.

On section 11,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). This clause simply extends the privilege of pre-emption, which will expire this year, until 1890.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the reasons for this change?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Under the law as it stands to-day the privilege of pre-emption expires at the end of this year, and we propose to allow it to continue until 1890.

Mr. BLAKE. I am aware that is the proposal, but I asked for the reason.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). We do not propose in the meantime to deprive the people of the privilege of pre-emption, that is all.

Mr. BLAKE. The present law ends this privilege at a particular period, and the hon. gentleman proposes to extend it. Is this upon some representation made from the North-West, or upon what ground?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Simply because we believe the general feeling in the meantime is in favor of pre-emption.

On section 13,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). These clauses have relation to surveys. The first one would have the effect of leaving out Provincial land surveyors admitted before 1872, who have not practised since.

Mr. MILLS. What reason is there for making this alteration? It seems to me if no abuse has grown up in the Provinces, if it is not found that any but parties qualified to make surveys are admitted to practice, there is no reason for depriving them of the right to do so.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Under the present law, as I understand it, no person can be employed as a Dominion land surveyor who has not passed an examination. The Board of Dominion land surveyors, who have urged the adoption of these clauses, think that if a person admitted before 1872 has not practised since that time, he ought not to be continued. If he has been employed as a Dominion land surveyor since that time, then the power goes on as before.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Suppose a person has been engaged as a Provincial land surveyor. If there has been no work for him to do for the Dominion up to the 1st of January, 1886, why should he be deprived of the right to be employed hereafter?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He can become a Dominion land surveyor any time he likes by passing the examination.

Mr. LANGELIER. It appears to me that this clause does an injustice to Provincial land surveyors who were admitted before 1872. It will deprive them of a right they have been enjoying for several years without giving them any notice. I do not see any reason why they should be deprived of that right, if there has been no grievance under the operation of the present law, and I do not know of any.

Mr. BLAKE. If a man has ceased to practice after 1872, he must pass a skilled examination?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The rule has been, with regard to persons who have passed a skilled examination, that the longer time that has elapsed since they have passed it, the more reluctant such bodies are to impose examinations on them at a later date. Here the hon. gentleman proposes that Dominion land surveyors shall not be qualified unless they do so. I wonder how many there are whom it is proposed to disqualify under the proposed law, and who they are; because under the existing law they are qualified, and now it is proposed to take their rights away.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not know their names; I daresay if I did, the hon. gentleman would say I had some motive for disqualifying them. I have no motive one way or the other in regard to this matter. The Dominion land surveyors are very much like the profession the hon. gentleman belongs to, and the Dominion Land Board is very much like the benchers. That body has made changes from time to time which have borne heavily on some people, and they have had no difficulty in inducing Parliament to grant them what changes they ask. These amendments come from that body. If Parliament thinks this ought not to be done, as a matter of course the clause will be dropped; but I think a body of that kind might fairly have the opportunity of getting what they ask.

Mr. BLAKE. I think Parliament ought to be very cautious about taking away a right which it has itself conferred on a body of men without knowing who the persons are, or what the reasons are; because the hon. gentleman has given us neither the names nor the number of the persons proposed to be deprived of this right, nor any reason why they are to be deprived. A former Parliament gave them the right to practice. It is now proposed to deprive them of that right, simply because some board or other thinks it proper that that should be done. He, without getting from them the reasons why, adopts every view and every conclusion of theirs.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not say that. The reason they give is this, that persons who were old Provincial land surveyors, at a time when the question of land surveying was much less guarded than it is to-day—persons who, in 1872, were Provincial land surveyors, and who have not been appointed Dominion land surveyors since, are not qualified. That is a fair presumption.

Mr. BLAKE. Just suppose that a land surveyor has been employed to survey one lot in the North-West between 1882 and 1886, how much better qualified is he to survey to-day than the man who had not his good fortune? The body to which the hon. gentleman refers never dreamed of such a step being taken as that which he proposes to-night, that is, to take away the right to practice from anyone who had got the right, although he had not the opportunity of practising for a number of years. I never heard of such a thing being suggested before in any legislative body.

Mr. MILLS. No doubt the persons to be affected by this change in the law will be very large in number. In many of the towns and villages of the country, there is a large number of persons qualified as Provincial land surveyors, who have never been employed by the Government to survey lands in the Territories. Those who had the good fortune to be employed would, no doubt, approve of the provisions of the Bill, because it, in fact, greatly limits the number of those who might seek employment at the hands of the Government without having to undergo a new examination. I do not object to the standard qualifications being made higher in the future, if it is thought desirable. Higher scientific attainments, more acurate knowledge of the higher departments of mathematics, are no doubt valuable acquisitions for persons engaged in geodetic and topographic surveying, but the hon. gentleman knows that to raise the standard of qualification with regard to those who are to be

admitted to practice land surveying in the future, and to deprive those of the right to practice, who have already undergone their examination, and have been engaged for years in the services of the Provinces, if not of that of the Dominion, is a wholly different proceeding. As the provision now stands, a large number of persons, who are by law qualified, although they may not have had the good fortune to have practically surveyed, ought not to be deprived of the right which has been secured to them by law. The Board of Examiners have erred in proposing this particular provision of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. The board want to examine as many people as they can. They magnify their office. Because a surveyor was not lucky enough to get employment in the North-West, the hon. gentleman wants to exclude him from the practice of his profession there. "From him that hath not, shall be taken away even that which he hath."

Mr. WOODWORTH. The Board of Examiners passed a resolution which reminds me of that passed by the body of men who crossed the Atlantic in the *Mayflower*. "The saints," said they, "inherit the earth, and we are the saints, consequently we inherit the earth." The board made a resolution to shut out anybody who was not one of themselves.

Mr. BLAKE. They are going to survey the earth instead of inheriting it.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Yes; they are monarchs of all they survey. This will militate against some of the surveyors of Nova Scotia, where I come from.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then of course it cannot pass.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I am from that Province, and no pent-up Utica contracts my powers. Charity commences at home, and if this Bill affects my Province I intend to draw attention to that fact, and let others speak for their Provinces. With me the Province of Nova Scotia has the first claim on my attention. I believe this clause will militate against the surveyors there. I have some little experience of those cases, where men arrogate to themselves certain privileges and rights, and are very conservative when they once get in, and should be looked upon with a good deal of suspicion. The lust of power is quite human, and it is not confined to the Government or to bodies of as grave and exalted and august character as they. It extends beyond, and I believe this little coterie called the Board of Examiners have in view the perpetuation of their own power, and their present action should be looked upon with a good deal, I will not say suspicion, but with a critical eye, and if good reasons are not given for passing this, we should not pass it. If you do injustice to this proposition to any one surveyor in any portion of the Provinces, without benefiting the whole of Canada, on general principles, we ought not to pass this clause.

Mr. TROW. By passing this clause we will do a great injustice to very competent surveyors who have not been employed heretofore by the Government. The number employed by the Government is very little compared with the number not so favored. You are quite aware, Sir, how a very large number of the surveyors got their situations in the North-West. In some instances they might not have been altogether competent, but succeeded in getting positions through their influence with members of Parliament and others. No doubt many such got positions, while others more capable did not succeed through the want of that influence. You will do away with competition, if you confine surveyors to the limited number heretofore employed.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman say how many have been employed in the Dominion service, whose titl

to such employment depends upon the old law he is altering, and how many Provincial land surveyors he is debarring from work by this Bill?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I cannot give the information asked for. I think it is important, and I will get it.

Mr. BLAKE. The great bulk of surveyors in the North-West have been engaged under the auspices of hon. gentlemen opposite. They made their arrangements, partly by the employment of persons they deemed competent, and partly, at one time, by competition. A great number of Provincial land surveyors would not, I presume, think of tendering for that particular class of work, as they are in a large way of business in their own localities, and not desirous of taking a contract for the survey of townships in the North-West; and they may be more competent than a good many who got contracts in the North-West, and are consequently qualified. I do not wish to depreciate in the slightest degree the qualities of those gentlemen, but I must say, if I am rightly informed, a good deal of the work was done very imperfectly indeed; and yet the circumstance, that, by favor or good fortune, or by tendering low for the discharge of the work, or by the fact that the other party was not a competitor being sufficiently employed at home, one party got the work—the circumstance is to give those fortunate enough to get work from the Government a qualification which the others are to be deprived of. Both are now, no doubt, at work in country towns and villages, &c., and both are entitled to the title of Dominion land surveyor as well as Provincial land surveyor. To-morrow, the one who happens to have surveyed a township in the North-West, no matter how badly, will continue to be a Dominion land surveyor, but his neighbor, however qualified he may be, must pull his sign down and will be relegated to the position of a Provincial land surveyor. I think better reasons than the Minister has given should be produced for the adoption of this provision.

Mr. FAIRBANK. The question arises, what is all this about anyway? Have all the surveyors who have been employed in the North-West proved themselves so thoroughly efficient that no other surveyors in the Dominion of Canada are to be considered qualified? I think the records of the Department will prove the contrary. Of my own knowledge, men have been employed in the North-West whom certainly the Department will not employ again. Why this blow should be struck at the land surveyors of Canada, as a class, I cannot for the life of me understand. Not only must they have been surveyors before 1872, but they must actually have done work in the North-West during this time. I think it is anything but a compliment to the surveyors of Canada.

Mr. TROW. The system of surveys heretofore, or for a number of years, has certainly been very erroneous. The men were paid for the amount of work they performed, so that it was to their interest to make as many timber limits as they could. I find, on examining the field notes in the volume published by the Minister of the Interior last year, that there are many townships described there as valuable timber lands, in some of which I will guarantee that there is not a stick of timber.

Mr. BLAKE. Occasionally, I believe, a surveyor went out to the North-West under a Government commission and with instructions from the Government to survey townships, but he also had private commissions to find timber lands for gentlemen of influence with the Government, and to report upon available and good lands. We know there was a great deal of patronage connected with these appointments. These men had passed, or at least they had their title and were qualified as Dominion land surveyors under the general law, so that in that respect the Government were not choosing ineligible persons, though perhaps

they did not take the most eligible persons; but is it not enough that they got this advantage without depriving their less fortunate colleagues of the oppportunity of serving as Dominion land surveyors?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The statement just made by the hon. gentleman, if I rightly understood him, is, I think, a very serious charge, which he should not lightly make, unless he is prepared to give the names. He states, as I understand, that surveyors were sent out to survey land under instructions from the Government, and also with instructions from the Government to look out——

Mr. BLAKE. No, I did not say so.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Then I certainly misunderstood the hon. gentleman, and I am glad I gave him the opportunity of making the correction. I frankly admit that all these clauses relating to the surveys are the work of a body for whom I have the greatest respect, because they have charge of this particular work, and know a great deal more about it than I do. This particular matter does not in any way affect the general provisions of the law with regard to examinations and matters of that kind which follow, and, if there is a feeling against it, I should be disposed to drop the clause.

Section 87 struck out.

On section 88,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The explanation I have is that the present dates of the meetings of the Board of Examiners, May and November, have been found inconvenient. Those members of the profession who are employed in surveying Dominion lands are required to be in the field before or very soon after the second Monday of May, and very often young gentlemen who are under articles, and who would present themselves for examination in November, are prevented because their work in the field is not completed in time. It is therefore proposed to empower the Minister of the Interior to call the board together when he may find it in the public interest to do so. On account of an amendment proposed to be made to another sub-clause of this clause of the Act, under which sub-examiners can conduct examinations somewhat after the manner in which the Civil Service examinations are conducted, meetings of the full board need only take place henceforward at headquarters. Hitherto, the full board has been required to meet to conduct these examinations, and it has been a source of expense and trouble. The members of the board are scattered over the western part of the Dominion, and it is now proposed that the examination can take place before one member, and the papers be sent in to the board here in Ottawa. It is proposed to provide that the swearing in may take place before a judge of the Supreme Court. This system will be less expensive than the system of local boards and will tend to a greater uniformity in the standard of examination.

Mr. BLAKE. At present the examination has to take place before more than one of the board. Is it before the full board?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Before a quorum, I think; that is, a majority. Three would be a quorum.

Mr. BLAKE. Now, it is proposed that the examination may take place before one only?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, the result being sent in.

Mr. BLAKE. I think from the explanation of the Minister, there ought, perhaps, to be a greater facility given than at present exists, but the hon. gentleman will readily understand that it is extremely difficult to get an equality in the actual test applied to the qualifications of the candidate if you have the examinations taking place before a single member of the board, and practically finally at his disposition. It is almost essential for that purpose that more than one of those who belong to the board should deal with the case. There is such a variety of temperament, apart from the accuracy of views as to the answers, and so forth, amongst men, that it really is extremely difficult to handle the case with a correct result, as applicable to the different people, if you have only one at each place.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Such examination is to be subject to the rules and regulations made by the board and the results are to be approved by the board.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but unless it is put upon a certain set of questions and the answers are in writing and the whole result is submitted to the board——

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think that is what is intended.

Mr. BLAKE. It does not say so. There is nothing here about a written examination.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It leaves the board to adopt rules and regulations.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me the board should prepare the questions at each period of the examination, and that all parties, in whatever part of the Dominion they may be examined, should be subject to the same examination and at the same time, and that the value of the answers given ought to be determined by a committee of the board here, instead of by the individual examiner before whom the party is examined.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think that might fairly be left to the regulations to be made by the Board itself. We know, the clause we have just dropped shows the disposition on the part of all boards, representing a profession of that kind, to restrict as much as possible the number of those who are in. The tendency in all these examinations—I think the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) will admit it is the case in matters of law—is rather to strengthen the character of the examination than otherwise, and it may fairly be left to the board to see that the examination is not too lax, and that too many people do not get in under such a lax examination.

Mr. BLAKE. If I rightly recollect the system which has been adopted for Civil Service examinations it is analogous to that which my hon. friend has referred to.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It is.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that the Civil Service system is one of written examinations, the papers being prepared by the central authority, and local examiners being appointed to conduct the examination. Of course that is a mere qualifying examination, of a comparatively low grade as compared with the scientific examination which ought to prevail in cases of this kind. Therefore, the precautions which Parliament thought proper to take in the case of a comparatively low grade of Civil Service examination, might very properly be introduced into this. The hon. gentleman leaves everything to the board, but I have not such great confidence in boards as he has—speaking of boards generally.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think the tendency of examining boards is rather to restrict than to widen the door of admission. But the case here is not precisely like the case of Civil Service examinations. These people are not confined to the employment of the Government; in fact, very few of them are in the employ of the Government. They take the degree of D.L.S., as giving them a certain status in their profession, which, I think, might be fairly left to a board of that kind. I do not think the Provincial law, for instance, defines the exact regulations under which

students in the profession of law are examined; that is left to the bar, and I think we might leave this matter to a body of that kind, who, on the whole, are more competent to deal with it than we are.

On new section 88,

Mr. MILLS In this clause the hon. gentleman has provided for the appointment of certain parties, but he does not state for what time, whether they are appointed for one examination or whether the appointment is permanent; are the appointees to hold their appointment at pleasure, or during good behavior, as members of this examining body?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It is during pleasure, undoubtedly. If it was during good behavior, it would be so stated.

On new section 89,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). This simply proposes certain subjects for the preliminary examination. It is to give an advantage to young fellows just coming from school, who are better qualified to pass this examination than after they have been at work in the field for some time. We give them an opportunity of passing this examination just when they have left college, and are in a position to do so. It simply changes the time in which they may do it.

On new section 91,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). This is to remedy a defect in the original Act which did not define the time of service required. It requires twelve months actual practice in the field.

Mr. MILLS. I think this is a very doubtful provision. Suppose a Frenchman, or a German, comes out to this country, are you going to deprive him of the right of practising his profession, although he may be very well qualified, and is ready to take an examination, simply because he has not had a training under a Dominion land surveyor? I remember we had a case something like this some years ago. Two young gentlemen from Aylmer came before the board for examination, and one of them was admitted; the other passed an admirable examination, but it was ascertained that he had studied for the profession of surveyor at an institution in the State of New York. Some members of the board were disposed to object to him, not because he was not well qualified, for the Surveyor General said he passed a most admirable examination, but because he had not acquired his knowledge in Canada. The gentleman I refer to is a Mr. Aylmer, son of Judge Aylmer, I think.

Mr. LANGELIER. I might mention a stronger case in point, that is, the present Surveyor General. He never had been admitted as a Dominion land surveyor, though he has been found able enough to be appointed chief surveyor of the Dominion. Before coming to the Department of the Interior he had been employed in Quebec for some years as inspector of cadastral surveys, and before that he had been an officer in the French navy, and yet he could not have been admitted as a Dominion land surveyor under this regulation. It would be much to be regretted if men of his ability should be deprived of the right to enter the service until they had served a regular apprenticeship of three years. I think this clause should be amended.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The requirement of three years service is the law as it now stands. We do not propose to amend that part. The only thing we propose to do is this, that three years being required, one of these years should be in the field. Capt. Deville, to whom my hon. friend refers, is himself very strongly in favor of this clause, and the object was merely to ensure that a portion of that service, at any rate, shall be in the field, where a practical knowledge can be obtained.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Mr. BLAKE. There are two points to which I wish to allude. One is that this additional provision ought not, according to general principles, to be applied so as to injuriously affect those who may be just about approaching the expiration of their term of service under the existing regulations. Supposing a man by the 24th May would have finished his three years service, it would be rather unreasonable to say that he should be required practically to have four years service, because he had not served twelve months consecutively in the field, which up to this moment has not been required. Unless we are going to have very extensive surveys in the North-West the general results of the Dominion service will not be continual service in the field. It will rather be work among surveyed lands. You must not make a permanent law with respect to a somewhat exceptional state of things. You should not require that the men in order to be examined should have been at work on some of the large Dominion surveys, which are now being undertaken to a more limited extent than formerly, and of course there will be a much smaller number of persons employed on them.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman will observe that mention is made of three years, in which period the twelve months will be included. I take it that the meaning is twelve months active work in the field spread over the three years. The hon. gentleman appears to think that the surveys would necessarily take place in the North-West. The work may be done anywhere.

Mr. BLAKE. I pointed out that the work was not in the nature of continuous work such as there would be on a large survey. The hon. gentleman has not answered the point with regard to persons about completing their course of study under the existing law.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I will make enquiries as to how that would apply, and will consider the matter.

On section 16,

Mr. MILLS. Will the hon. gentleman explain the change proposed.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Provincial land surveyors commissioned after 14th April, 1872, are now entitled to obtain a certificate as Dominion land surveyors without examination, other than with respect to the system of survey of Dominion lands. The standard of qualification is different in all the Provinces, Quebec and Ontario only having the standard at all similar to the Dominion standard. The clause is proposed to be amended so as to require that Provincial land surveyors shall pass a similar examination to Dominion land surveyors, in order to obtain certificates as Dominion land surveyors.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it proposed that those persons shall pass a general examination as well as a specific examination in regard to Dominion lands surveys?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes.

On sub-section 2,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). This clause of the Act as it now stands provides for the admission of surveyors of three years' service in any part of Her Majesty's dominions other than the Provinces of Canada. It is pointed out by the Board of Examiners that a man may go to the Maritime Provinces and obtain, without the requisite certificate, a Provincial certificate and present himself for examination as a Dominion land surveyor; and the amendment is intended to prevent this.

On sub-section 3,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The memorandum I have is that this is to confine the privilege of examination after

one year's service to civil engineers and graduates of the Royal Military College. The amendment places it in the discretion of the Board of Examiners to say whether the instruction in any college or university is of the kind required by the Act. The statement that no college or university except the Royal Military College furnishes that instruction is, I think, wrong, because the technical department of McGill does so—I do not know how it is at Toronto University—and we must, therefore, take care that this privilege is not restricted to any one college.

Mr. MILLS. The information on which this clause is based is erroneous. There is special instruction given at Toronto University on this subject, and also in McGill College, and I believe also in Victoria; and that being the case, it seems to me this is merely an attempt to make a close guild, and thus prevent the admission of others as Dominion land surveyors. The whole of these clauses are objectionable. They constitute a departure from the principle that should be observed in granting certificates as Dominion land surveyors. It is no doubt right and proper for the Government to constitute a board to see that those who engage in the business of Dominion land surveying are persons possessing the necessary scientific attainments; but I do not think beyond that the Government should go. I do not think, for instance, in a country like this, where we are seeking to encourage immigration and additions to our population, that we ought to say to all parties when they come here from abroad, that unless you are prepared to become hewers of wood and drawers of water we do not want you; that if you are educated men and men of scientific attainments you have no business here. I do not think that is the policy we should adopt in this Parliament, and it is a policy, I can assure the hon. gentleman, which is practically being adopted by these provisions of the Bill. It does not matter how or where he obtains his knowledge, or how long he was in obtaining it, what we want to know is if he possesses the knowledge, and if he does, he should be at liberty to apply it quite as readily as any person born in the country. I am certain that so long as we adopt the policy of trying to exclude educated men and make this profession a close guild, we are not likely to secure any other class. The admission of educated men from abroad to participate in those professions which belong to educated men, will largely contribute to bring others of a different class into the country. I am sure the hon. gentleman has not been well advised with regard to this clause. I remember that, in 1879, when the Surveyor General, acting under the instructions of the board, of which he was the head, was anxious that provisions of this sort should be adopted at that time; but I objected very strongly, because I believed that the principle was an unsound one, and I think the hon. gentleman is making a mistake in pressing these particular clauses. The changes should be in the opposite direction.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not think the hon. gentleman's interpretation of the clause is correct. It seems to me it must be a matter of great consequence to us to encourage in every way in all the professions, and this along with others, the obtaining of a liberal education in connection with them. No one can doubt that a four years' course in the Royal Military College or a two years' course in the technical branch of any university or college where engineering is taught, is better than two years' service in the office of a Dominion land surveyor. Now, the only effect of this clause is to substitute either a four years' course in the Royal Military College or a two years' course in any university or college—not merely in Canada but wherever it may be situated—the certificate that they have taken the degree of civil engineer in those colleges, for two years' service in a Dominion land surveyor's office. A year's service in the field is required the same as in the other; we do not propose to restrict that in the least; and I think, having regard to the importance of getting educated men into the professions, the provision is a good one and one which does not bear the restrictions which the hon. gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. BLAKE. The clause which it is proposed to amend did not include specifically the graduates of the Royal Military College. There was an attempt made at one time, I remember, to include them preferentially, but that attempt was resisted, and to some extent resented, by those who represented other institutions which were not included. I see no reason, having regard to the course pursued in the Royal Military College, why the graduates of that institution should not be placed on precisely the same footing which the law proposes to place the graduates of other institutions which deal with this subject, as, for instance, the University of Toronto where there is a course specially devoted to this matter, under the authority of the Provincial Government, and I believe also in McGill College. But I think they may object, and not unreasonably, to the proposed re-introduction of a sort of preferential statement in connection with the graduates of the Royal Military College. You assert by Act of Parliament that the board shall have no right to discuss the question whether the course of the Royal Military College is adequate or not. It has the right to deal with the question as to all the others; I do not complain of that; but I see no reason why you should place the Royal Military College in a different position. We trust to the board, and we are told we ought to leave a great deal to the board, and what we do not leave to them we should take in trust from them, and therefore I think we might leave this to them as well as the others.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The Royal Military College is an institution under the direct control of the Dominion Parliament and Government. We fix the studies; we have the whole control of it; it is sustained at great expense for the purpose of specially training young men in engineering, civil and military; that is the special object of that college, and we really require a four years' term there, while we only require a two years' course in the others. We mention the Royal Military College simply because it is not a university, but an institution which we have ourselves established for the special purpose of training young men for this profession, and I do not think it is unreasonable that we should mention a certificate from that college as being taken in lieu of two years' service in the office of a Dominion land surveyor. We also say that two years' service in any branch of a university which has a branch dealing with this particular subject shall have the same effect.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman makes a little too much of the four years' course. The hon. gentleman knows that the law is not so regardless of the facts as he puts it, because he acknowledges that he puts in two years' course for the other universities. The young man at the Royal Military College begins as a boy, and he has to study a great deal more than surveying and engineering. He is engaged in the ordinary studies of youth for a considerable portion of the time——

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Not for a long time.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, I have seen the course of studies, and I think most of the ordinary studies of youth are pursued, with the exception of Latin.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The others are largely optional.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, two years compared with the four years in the sense in which the two years are put in the one institution and the four years in the other, do not make as great a difference practically as the hon. gentleman implies.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not attach much importance to the question of four years or two, but what I do attach importance to is that we have established by Parliament and have voted large sums to a college specially devoted to these very studies, and therefore when we are dealing with that profession it is not too much to name that college and to say that taking a course in it shall stand in lieu of the two years' service in a surveyor's office, or a two years' course in any college in which these subjects are taught.

Mr. DAWSON. With reference to what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said, while there can be no objection to admitting foreigners and professional men generally, still as regards surveying, no matter what the surveyor's attainments may be, practice in the field is as essential to proficiency as any course in any university whatever. It is a necessary part of his training.

On section 17,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In a previous clause we added to the preliminary examination certain subjects which under the old law belonged to the final examination. We here deduct them from the final examination. The rest of the new clause 99 is substantially the same as before.

Mr. BLAKE. I must say that for my part I have very great objection to the system of examining everybody upon oath. I think the hon. gentleman had better reconsider the new clause 100, which makes such a provision.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). What is the objection?

Mr. BLAKE. My opinion is that you are lowering the general standard of morality and truth in the country when you are continually calling upon people to be examined on oath, implying that you cannot take their word.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In that view I quite concur with the hon. gentleman. I think if oaths could be abolished, except in rare cases, and with surroundings of special solemnity, it would be of great advantage. I will drop this clause.

Mr. MILLS. The clause in the Act as it stands, makes a similar provision, and the hon. gentleman should declare that section 100 is hereby repealed.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think we had better not repeal it until I speak to the Surveyor General to see if any general cases have rendered this necessary.

On section 18,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As proposed to be amended, the new clause 101 would permit a surveyor to be sworn in before a judge of any superior court, instead of requiring him to come to Ottawa to be sworn in before the board as at present.

On section 19,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The arrangement of subjects in this clause has been altered, and some changes have been made in the wording, but that is all.

On section 20,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The only change proposed in this clause is that a fee of $2 shall be paid to the secretary of the board by each surveyor who receives a certificate as a topographical surveyor, and also that a fee of $2 shall be paid for testing a surveyor's standard of length.

Mr. BLAKE. Are these fees for the use of the board?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No; they are paid to the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General.

Mr. BLAKE. That is provided in sub-clause 6, but it does not appear in sub-clauses 7 and 8. I think the board has rather come it over the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Not very seriously.

Mr. BLAKE. No; it is something for "the boy." How is the secretary paid, and did he draw these sub-clauses?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He gets no salary. These are fees by which he is paid.

Mr. BLAKE. How has he subsisted up to this time? I think before we fix these commissions, if this secretary has been serving the public up to this time gratuitously, and is now to be paid by fees, we ought to know what his duties are, and what the result of the fees will be.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I will try and get the hon. gentleman all the information. I have been told that he has been paid nothing, and as to how much the fees will amount to in the future, I cannot give that information, because it will depend on the number who will apply for examination as Dominion land surveyors.

Mr. BLAKE. But we can ascertain how many have been examined for some years back, and we can apply the ordinary methods of averages and calculation.

On section 2,

Mr. BLAKE. Is the secretary to attend the examination?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He attends every meeting of the board.

Mr. BLAKE. This is an additional emolument for the secretary. I thought he was going to have nothing but the former fees, but he is to receive a certain sum for each day's sitting. May I ask who is the secretary?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Mr. Symes of the Surveyor General's office, is the secretary. Hitherto he has been receiving fees for ordinary Dominion land surveyors' examinations, but these fees are for those who go up for examination in the higher branches, such as topography, and they average from $100 to $150 a year.

The committee rose and reported progress.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (p. 662) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. BLAKE. Surely the hon. gentleman is going to make some explanation of this.

Mr. McLELAN. In moving that you, Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair, I do not consider it necessary to enter very largely into an explanation of the matter, as the resolutions very fully explain the object in view, which is unlike other propositions that have been made to the House respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway for very many years, and upon which there has been very lengthy, and sometimes very fierce discussion. I think that the proposal submitted in these resolutions is one that will commend itself to the House and to the country at large. The object in view is to enable the Government to make a settlement in full with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to receive back the $20,000,000 secured by bonds, and to make a settlement for the amount that remains secured upon the lands of the company. In 1881, Parliament was called upon and confirmed the contract entered into by the Government for the construction of the Pacific Railway, giving the company for that work $25,000,000 in cash and 25,000,000 acres of land as the subsidy, and agreeing to complete certain portions of the

road. The company entered upon the work, and prosecuted it with great vigor and energy, and came to us in 1884 with the proposition that, if we advanced or loaned to them $2,500,000 and $7,500,000, in round numbers $30,000,000, they would complete the road five years earlier than the time named in the contract. The House, after a lengthy discussion, agreed to that proposition, with the expectation of receiving the road five years in advance of the time mentioned in the contract, the contract being for 1891, and the proposition being that, if they received the loan of money, they would give us the road in 1886, the present year. This proposition required that the rate of progress should be very active. That rate of progress necessitated a very much larger outlay than would have been necessary had the company consumed the five years additional in completing their contract. Every man who has been connected with public works, who has had any experience of them, knows that a great deal depends upon the rate of progress and the time which is given to the accomplishment of the contract. Shortening the period by five years necessitated a very much larger outlay by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company than if they had consumed the whole ten years in the construction of the road. The objects to be obtained by the Dominion in securing the road five years earlier than originally proposed were sufficient to induce the Government to accept their proposition, and the $30,000,000 was loaned. At the time they made this proposition, the Government had made a very large expenditure—somewhere near $50,000,000 in subsidy to the company, in payments to contractors for the portions executed by the Government, in the surveys, and in various subsidies to other lines. In making that expenditure, the Government believed that, at some time, when the road was running, we should receive at the least what was equivalent to the interest on that outlay, not directly, but indirectly; that is, that, in the general benefits to the country at large, there would be a return at least equivalent to the interest on that outlay. Otherwise, I assume that the Government would not undertake an expenditure for the construction of a work if they had not expectation that, either directly or indirectly, there would be a return equivalent to the interest upon the expenditure. Now, if we take that view of the case, we find that we have received the advantages and the benefits of an expenditure of nearly $50,000,000 five years in advance of the time specified in the contract with the company. The value of that to us, as a mere matter of interest, assuming that the indirect advantages of having that road running is equivalent only to the interest upon the money, amounts to a saving to us of from $9,000,000 to $10,000,000 by getting the running of it and the advantages of it five years earlier than the time mentioned in the contract. We have been the gainers in this respect, while the company has incurred a very much larger expenditure by hastening the construction so much sooner than was contemplated by the contract. In 1885, the company came again to us and said: You see that we have made very rapid progress with the work; it is very near completion; but the money which you, under the Bill of 1884, agreed to advance us, is not quite sufficient to complete all our undertakings in respect to that road and its equipment; and they asked us to modify the condition of things which were accorded under the Bill of 1884. Their proposition in 1885, as the House remembers, was that we should divide the indebtedness, that $20,000,000 should be payable to us in cash, secured by $20,000,000 in bonds, that $9,889,000 should be secured upon the lands of the company alone, and that we should advance them a further sum of $5,000,000. This was agreed to by the House, the $5,000,000 were granted, making the total amount advanced to the company, $35,000,000. The undertaking of the company, in floating a portion of the $35,000,000 of the last year's arrangement, was successful, and the $5,000,000 were returned to the Government. They come now with a proposition to re-pay to us the $20,000,000 secured by the $20,000,000 in bonds, and that we shall set apart a portion of land for the $9,889,000 that was secured under last year's arrangement upon the whole lands of the company. The amount that has been drawn of the $20,000,000 secured upon bonds is $19,150,700, the interest upon which has been paid up to the 21st January last. There remains, then, as secured upon the lands under the Act of last year, $9,880,912, upon which there has been no interest paid since the 20th July last. The proposition is that we shall take for that sum and the interest up to the 1st May, amounting in all to $10,189,000, lands at $1.50 per acre; that would amount to 6,793,014 acres. The amount of lands under the original contract to be given to them was 25,000,000 acres. Of these there have been sold 3 465,385 acres, and there remains unearned, of the original 25,000,000, 600,988 acres, leaving as earned by the company and unsold, 20,933,647 acres. The proposition is made that we take the land at $1.50 per acre, and that would leave with us 6,793,000 acres, and the company would have 14,140,633 acres, that are at present earned, and when the whole 25,000,000 are earned there would still remain with them, after what has been sold and what will be set apart to settle the lien we have upon the land—there would still be in the hands of the company 14,741,821 acres. The proposition is to pay us the $20,000,000 five years before it is actually due. The House will remember that the rate of interest they are paying to us upon the $20,000,000 is 4 per cent., while the bonds that have been issued are bearing 5 per cent. interest. The inducement of the company to change a 4 per cent. for a 5 per cent. bond, is, as claimed, in the benefit that will accrue to them from having entire control, with the exception of the lien, of the land grant bonds that have been issued of 14,750,000 acres of land. The company have represented to us that a large amount of capital is still necessary to put the road in such a position that it may compete with all the American roads, and that will be sufficient for the traffic that they believe will come to it from both the east and the west, their desire to make it a road second to none on the continent; a road that will be calculated, in its connections east and west, to draw to this continent and to the Dominion of Canada a very large trade and traffic through it, and they claim that it is necessary they should have control of as much of the land as possible, which remains the only means they have of raising the necessary capital to carry out their undertaking. The Government believe it to be desirable, first, to secure the $20,000,000 cash—very desirable indeed, as it would prevent us again from going into the money market to borrow to pay off the floating indebtedness of the Government at the present time. If we had gone into the market and could have borrowed on terms as favorable as Sir Leonard Tilley borrowed last year, it would have cost us nearly a quarter of a million; that is, the continual payment of commissions and the payment of interest on the other side, would have amounted to nearly a quarter of a million dollars more, as compared with receiving twenty millions in cash at the present time. There would then be, supposing we could float a loan upon the same terms as Sir Leonard Tilley floated his loan last year, a saving of over $200,000 in getting ready cash from the company. In respect to the $10,000,000 that is laid upon the land only in the first place, I have stated to the House that we have not been receiving interest upon that since last July. Under the arrangement of last year the interest is to be paid from the sales of land, and in default of payment of interest from the sales of land, an authority was given to the Government to order the land to be sold to meet that interest. This would continually have brought us into

conflict with the company; to have forced the sales of these Dominion lands would have depreciated the value of the land in the markets of the world and would have been a damage both to the Government and to the company. We have, then, considered that it was both in the interest of the company and the Government in respect to the land upon which the ten million are held as a mortgage, that we should take sufficient of the land at $1.50 per acre to meet that amount of capital and the interest up to the 1st May, and that we should be free to dispose of them as we thought best, and that the company should be free to dispose of the other portions as they thought best, in order to raise sufficient capital to enable the company to complete their undertakings in connection with this great work. Of the $20,000,000 secured by the bonds $19,150,700 have been drawn, leaving unpaid $849,300 and there is yet unearned $708,400. Of the original subsidy there remains unpaid $600,988 and of land 600,988 acres. It is estimated by the engineers that there is required to complete the contract on the eastern section $25,000, on the central section $284,000, in all $309,000; for which there remains of the original subsidy $600,000 in round figures, and of lands 600,000 acres. The unpaid money of the original subsidy and the unearned land of the original grant is held to be more than sufficient to guarantee the completion of the road which is estimated to cost $309,000. In addition, there has been a temporary structure made somewhere in the mountains, and it is estimated that the unearned subsidy and unearned lands will be more than sufficient to complete both. Under the original contract power was given to the company to issue $25,000,000 worth of mortgage bonds upon the land to be handed over to them and issued as the land was earned. $5,000,000, of the $25,000,000 was held by the Government as a guarantee for the running of the road after completion; $8,996,000 are still held by the Government and $3,568,000 are in the hands of the public. It is proposed that the $8,996,000 in the hands of the Government shall be cancelled and that as far as possible those in the hands of the public shall be cancelled and exchanged for new bonds, to be issued upon the land that will remain with the company after setting apart $6,000,000 odd in liquidation of the $9,000,000 that lies as a mortgage upon the whole. It is proposed in the resolutions that the company shall have power to issue new land grant bonds and to such an amount per acre as shall be approved by the Governor in Council, not exceeding $2 per acre, and these shall be in substitution of the land grant bonds that are now out and issued under the old and original arrangement. And it is proposed that the $5,000,000 in the hands of the Government as security for the running of the road may be exchanged for a like amount of the new issue. It it asked in these resolutions that the Government shall have the right to mortgage the Algoma Branch. Under the original arrangement that right was taken away from the company, but under the proposition of last year it was given back to the company that it might mortgage the branch for the extension of the branch itself. It is proposed in these resolutions to restore the power to mortgage that branch and to return to them, upon settlement of the accounts, certain bonds held of the Ontario and Quebec Railway. In fact it is proposed simply by these resolutions that we shall receive back $20,000,000 in cash, that we shall take sufficient lands of the original land grant to set against $9,889,000, which is the mortgage upon them; that we shall settle up all accounts with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that we shall enable them to proceed entirely, or as far as possible, independently of the Government and work out their own destiny. These are the propositions contained in the resolutions before the House, and I assume that more particular details may be given in committee. In general terms this is the nature of the propositions which are submitted and contained in the resolutions before the House.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that these proposals should have been laid before the House, but I cannot say I am surprised, for I never believed that the loan which the Government invited us to contribute to the Canadian Pacific Railway would be paid in full. I feared that their promises, which they made in 1884, would be broken. I suspected that preparations were being made for the breaking of them in 1885; and my fears of 1884 and my suspicions of 1885 are realised to-night in 1886. What is the nature of the proposals before us? The Canadian Pacific Railway Company's shareholders have paid into that company $29,500,000 for their stock. At the recent prices of that stock, prices which prevailed within a short period, though they may not be the prices of the moment, it was worth in the market about $43,500,000. That is an advance of $13,000,000 or 44 per cent. upon the average price which the company themselves realised for the stock. Thus, for each $100 which the shareholders paid into the company they can get on the market $144 at recent prices, and in addition they have received very large dividends upon their investment, from the time that investment was made up to the present time. That is the financial position of the company's stockholders in whose favor we are asked to make this arrangement to-day. Only two years ago we loaned that company an enormous sum of money, about $30,000,000, the greater proportion of which was practically loaned them in order to secure their own dividends. That was the purpose of more than half the loan. They were to repay us this money, both that which was to secure their dividends and that which was to be used in the work, with interest at 5 per cent. That was the bargain of two years ago. And now we are asked to give up our claim to the repayment of ten millions of this money, to add ten millions to our net debt, to add over $400,000 a year to our interest charge in order to relieve these shareholders from the payment of that $400,000 a year, with which they are onerated, although under the less advantageous arrangement of 1885, onerated in a manner inferior to that under the original arrangements. It is proposed in effect to add $400,000 to the profits of the shareholders of that company, and the taxpayers of Canada are asked to accomplish this result. The company in the announcement they made on the recent issue of the balance of the $35,000,000 of their debenture debt, declared that notwithstanding the disadvantages under which they labored through the non-completion of the system, they have earned a net profit over the fixed charges of $100,000 last year. The fixed charges include the payment of interest, include the interest on the Government debt, and therefore it is proposed to add $400,000 to the sum of the net profits already realised by the company. Now, it is to be remembered that the company and the Government declared that the disconnection, the non-completion of the system is a great obstacle to the creation of more profits. I know they told us other stories in former times, but of late years this has been their story, and they say that on its completion it will become an immediately profitable enterprise. The First Minister declared, in his place in Parliament, that the ends of the road would be the most profitable, that that had been demonstrated, and therefore it is an enterprise of this description which is to make such vast profits, which is now on the eve of completion—sometimes we are told it is finished, sometimes that it is just about finished, and sometimes hon. gentlemen tell us, when occasion requires, that it will cost a great deal more to finish it, and that we must enlarge the capital account for that purpose—but just about finished, we will say, and therefore ready to enter on its career of large profits; it is with refer-

ence to that enterprise that the taxpayers of Canada are invited to contribute $400,000 to add to their profits and to make us that much poorer. Now, I should have been glad, if I could at all possibly consistently with the truth, to find myself able to acknowledge to-night that in the forecasts which the Government has made from time to time, when they were inviting this House to enter on the Canadian Pacific Railway policy, in the forecasts they made as to the results of that policy—with reference to the railway itself, with reference to the North-West immigration, with reference to North-West settlement, with reference to the North-West lands, with reference to the loans and advances which were made to the company—I say I should be delighted if I were able, consistently with the truth, to acknowledge that the forecast of hon. gentlemen had been accurate and that my own more gloomy views had turned out to be incorrect. I am not able to acknowledge that, and I can hardly be called on to acknowledge it, when I heard the Finance Minister make a moment ago such a complete travesty of what some of those expectations were, when he declared the modest views of what the expectations of the Government were in incurring this expenditure—that they hoped in some indirect way to obtain something equivalent to the interest of 4 per cent. on $50,000,000—I shall have to point out, in view of that declaration, what the expectations of the Government really were, what their pledges to Parliament really were, what they stated was to be the result of the policy of which we are discussing another phase and another development to-night. In considering that subject, I wish to point out first of all that the Ministers pledged themselves most absolutely to the finality of the obligations under the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, and arrangements which they proposed to us; secondly, that they promised us as the result of the active Canadian Pacific Railway policy which they proposed in the spring of 1880, and enlarged in the winter of 1880-81, enormous advantages from the rapid construction of the road through the great development by immigration to the North-West, and the introduction in great numbers from the old world of new taxpayers into our North-West dominions; next, that they declared that the Canadian Pacific Railway policy which they proposed to us would result in the very rapid sale of the Crown lands; so that every cent of our expenditure in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the interest, would be paid to us out of the sales of those lands, and no burden would be imposed on the country at all; next, that they declared that the railway company would itself build branches all over the North-West with a view to utilising its land grant, and that as a result of the subsidy in land and money, which we gave in the year 1881, we would secure not merely the construction of the main line but also the construction, free of cost to us, whether in land or in money, of the branches and feeders which were admitted then, as they are admitted now, to be absolutely essential to the development of the North-West; next, that they declared that the railway company was going to do the immigration work which otherwise we would have to do, and so that a large saving of expense would be obtained by the Government; and further, that the monopoly which they proposed would not affect—could not affect—Manitoba, and would not injuriously affect the other Territories; and lastly, that they would secure—and they professed they had secured—arrangements for fair play and free competition between the different eastern portions of the Dominion, notably the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec, by the conditions which they imposed on the Canadian Pacific Railway as to the rates of freight to the neutral point, Callander, as between the roads constructed or projected in the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec. Now, Sir, on all these points the forecasts and pledges of hon. gentlemen have been falsified by events. First of all, as to the finality of the bargain. You recollect that the subventions which we were asked to give in the year 1881, were then denominated by the Ministry as large, ample, liberal, and the hon. gentleman who now leads the House specially declared that they were so of set purpose, in order to avoid what might otherwise happen—the company coming to us again Session after Session for further aids. They said we want at once to make this final, to get the business ended by giving large and liberal subventions at first so that there may be no further demands upon Parliament. What they said I wanted, was, that the subventions should be so pared down that the Government would come and say, we did not give them enough and we must give them more. In 1884, having made in 1881 these final arrangements, the element of finality having been so specially dwelt upon by the then Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper) by the First Minister, by the Minister of Public Works, as the great joy of the occasion, as the thing upon which we should congratulate ourselves in 1881, in 1884, they came to us and asked us to lend $30,000,000 to make the final agreement finally final. We were told then that it was a profitable 5 per cent. investment. If I recollect aright, the present Minister of the Interior pointed out that there was really a gain to be made, that it was a prudent investment; we were borrowing money at 4 per cent. and were going to lend it to the railway company at 5 per cent.; and yet the hon. gentleman to-night talked about this being a losing transaction! And as to there being any risk of the principal and interest at 5 per cent. not being repaid to us, the idea was scouted by the Government and their supporters. It was calculated that we were going to get back our principal and our interest at 5 per cent, and so make a very good thing out of this loan. We were also told that this loan was to provide ample funds; that the road was being built a little faster than originally intended; but it was obvious that there would be a severe competition between this and other transcontinental highways, notably the Northern Pacific; and it was necessary that we should have a first-class outfit for our road in order that it might compete on good terms; and so we were to lend the money necessary—a good investment, sure to be returned with 5 per cent.—to put the road in a first-class position; and the arrangement was to be finally final. We were also asked during the same Session, and partly in a previous Session, to engage for about $12,000,000 more in connection with the completion of the work, in accordance with the enlarged ideas—in connection with the settlement with British Columbia in the west, and in connection with the arrangements for finding an Atlantic port, and, also, for the relief of the Province of Quebec from its contribution towards the extension into that Province. We were told that all these arrangements were ample for these purposes, and the finally final arrangement was finally final for just one year. For, in the year 1885, we were asked to add some millions more to these eastern engagements, because they were found inadequate. We were also asked to lower the rate of interest on the loan from 5 per cent. to 4 per cent. The somewhat hard-headed and close-handed views of hon. gentlemen when they were persuading us to lend the $30,000,000, had changed in the course of twelve short months, and it was thought rather a mean thing to ask the railway company for 5 per cent. They forgot that it was they who were mean, for it was they who had made the bargain; but they thought that the Dominion of Canada ought to be above asking more than 4 per cent., as we were told that was all that the money cost us; though now we hear the Minister of Finance saying that we are paying commissions when we borrow the money, and paying commissions when we pay the interest and when we get the loan back, so that the money is costing us more than 4 per cent., and it is really paying us to get back the loan. It

is really difficult to follow the hon. gentleman's calculations, and derive any particular result from the calculations of more than one occasion. We were also asked at that time, in 1885, to enlarge the borrowing powers of the company to a considerable extent. We were told that further demands were made upon the company's resources, with the view of making the complete equipment, and the admirable road, more complete and more admirable still; and a sum of $15,000,000 more was wanted. We re-adjusted the security system of the company, with the view of enabling it to get from the public $15,000,000 more money, which it did get, in order that its equipment might be made ample, and its construction perfect. We were also then asked to impair our securities on which the interest had been lowered to 4 per cent.—to impair them as to the bulk and as to the $10,000,000, roundly speaking, which it is now proposed to adjust by these resolutions. So that our position was that the arrangement which was final in the year 1881, and which was made finally final in the year 1884, was proposed to be altered again in order that it might be made finally finally final in the year 1885 in those various matters. But there was one thing, Sir, that we were not asked to do; we were not asked to buy back our own land grant in order to supply the company with further resources Parliament was not asked to do that; the company asked the Government to do it, but the Government—as I thought then and said, and as I think now, though they have changed their minds—wisely declined. They declined the proposal made to them by the company that they should take back a portion of the land grant, and release a portion of this obligation. They declared that they would not ask Parliament to agree to these terms; they declared they would still insist on the debt being continued and being paid; but they professed to be anxious that it should be secured on the remaining land grant of the company, being far the largest proportion of its 21,500,000 acres, subject to a comparatively small portion of outstanding bonds—because for this purpose I may set aside the 5,000,000 of bonds held as security for operation—I say that the 21,500,000 acres were referred to us as good security for the $10,000,000 upon which it was to be placed. We pointed out the inconveniences of this arrangement. The hon. gentleman is painfully alive to those inconveniences to-night. He has urged how inconvenient the situation is. He says, here we are, we have not had any interest since the 1st of July last; we cannot get it; the lands have not produced it. We told him last Session they would not, but he did not believe it then. He says it is rather awkward for us to force a sale of lands—it would depreciate the price of the other Dominion lands if we do. We told him last Session that this would be his situation, but he did not believe it then, and he comes to us to-night saying, I have made such a bad arrangement, contrary to your advice last Session, that now, to get out of this hobble, we must buy back some of the lands absolutely and give up the debt *pro tanto*. This is a more rapid step in the direction of the result which was predicted last Session than a good many people expected. We were not asked to do this then, but we are asked to do it now. We were told then that this arrangement of 1885 would provide ample funds for every purpose—that the company would be free to accomplish the great and enlarged objects which had been set before the country by the Government and the company as to be accomplished by means of the new arrangement. Now, in the year 1886, we are told that that again is a mistake, and that further large sums are required by the company, and that it is necessary to give them further relief in order that those sums may be obtained and those results attained. We are asked by the Government now to do what the Government refused to submit to us for our approval or consideration last year. The company then made this proposal to them, but they would not even bring it down, because they said they did not intend to agree to it. They waited until they could make other terms with the company, and those other terms they brought down. Now, the terms are that this $10,000,000 is to be added to our net debt, that this $400,000 a year is to be added to our interest charge, and that the capital account of the company is to be swollen by an indefinite number of millions more, to be borrowed, in order to make the bargain finally, finally, finally final until the next year or the year after. So much for the pledge of finality; so much for the assurances given to us in the year 1881 that the matter was satisfactorily gone and done with by the arrangement for $25,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres of land. Then, with reference to the predictions and pledges of the Government, as to the result of their rapid Canadian Pacific Railway policy on the increase of population in the North-West, a vital subject to us in more ways than one—a vital subject to us with reference to the making of this nation; a vital subject to us with reference to the financial strength of this people; a vital subject to us with reference to the cost and outcome of the undertaking into which we launched, upon the faith of these predictions, which have been so woefully falsified—the First Minister, in the earlier part of 1880, promised, as a result of the land and Canadian Pacific Railway policy which was then brought down, a great immigration. He went into detailed figures and calculations, which he declared were most moderate and the result of which could be relied upon, as the outcome of the policy on which he was going to embark. The official figures, up to the year 1879 allowing the estimates which I have made of 4,000 for the North-West Territory population in the year 1870, and of 1,000 for the immigration into the whole North-West, including Manitoba, in 1870, for which two points there are no official figures—allowing 5,000 for these two, and adding them to the official figures, the population of the country would stand at 53,500 in 1879, apart from the natural increase. The First Minister promised us an immigration of 245,000 between 1879 and 1885, to which add the estimate for natural increase from the earlier period up to 1885, say 15,000, and you get a total population, exclusive of Indians, in 1885, of 313 500, composed of these three elements: the first is the official figures up to the year in which the Minister made his statement, adding only 5,000 for the two items I have mentioned; the second element is the Minister's figure of population for the six years following; the third element is the natural increase. Now, he declared that to these figures there would be added by immigration, from 1885 to 1890, 325,000, to which, if you add for natural increase on the whole, 44,000, you would get as a result a population in 1890 of 680,000. Sir Charles Tupper declared that no intelligent man could doubt the accuracy of this statement; hon. gentlemen opposite swallowed it, and they acted upon that view. The Minister based these figures of his upon the results in some of the Western States, and he cited the statistics in Minnesota, Kansas, and in several other States in which he declared the rate of progress had been most remarkable, and he stated that we would achieve in the various years for which he gave his figures similar results. In answer to these statements I pointed out what the rate and the resources of increase in the Western Territories and States of the United States had been. I pointed out the case of a group of twelve of these States and Territories, the acreage of which was 634,000,000, and showed that they had a population in 1860 of 5,600,000; in 1870 of 8,640,000, making an increase of 3,040,000 on the population of 1860. Of that population which was there in 1870, there were born in that group no less than 4,390,000 or 50 per cent.; there were born in other portions of the United States 2,500,000 or over 29 per cent., and there were foreign born 1,750,000 or 20½ per cent. There were thus, as I have shown, three great sources of increase which had produced the results to which the First Minister

appealed as the basis of his calculation; first, the natural rapid increase in a fertile and sparsely settled country, while we, in our case, had at that time no substantial nucleus from which to produce a natural rapid increase; secondly, the great immigration from the Eastern to the Western States, while we had only one-fourth in round figures of their reserve store of settled population from which a surplus might be expected to flow—in round figures we stood 4,000,000 to about 40,000,000; third, the enormous foreign immigration to the States, in part direct to the western districts and in large part to the east, having however the very important result of setting free the flow of emigration from the east to the west of the native population of the States. As to this last source I pointed out that we, for several reasons, largely political, could not hope, early or largely, to divert the current of immigration either of Europeans generally or Irish Catholics specially from the United States, so long as those States had, as at that time they still continued to have, very considerable reserves of cheap and fertile lands. Now, the general census for the States for the later decennial period was not then available, and both sides had to resort to the States' censuses in the west for information as to that period. I referred myself to two States to which hon. gentlemen had referred, and upon which they had relied as showing marks of the greatest progress and prosperity; the States of Kansas and Nebraska. I showed what their progress to 1879 had been, and that, remarkable as that progress unquestionably was, it did not furnish a ground for the estimates of hon. gentlemen as applied to our condition. Well, a few months passed over from the period of these estimates of the Government, and they then brought down an altered Canadian Pacific Railway policy, under which the work was to be done, partly by the company, partly by the Government, and in a still much shorter time, taken as whole, than was proposed in the early part of 1880. They declared that the altered policy, with the stimulus to be produced by the more rapid execution of the work, and by the great efforts and expenditure of the company, which they were to make in the immigration field, would have the effect of largely accelerating the settlement of the North-West beyond their former expectations; that it would tend further to brighten the prospects, so bright already, which they had set before us a few months previous. Then, in 1883 or 1884, it was arranged that the work should be still further accelerated, that is, it should be finished in five years from that time; and the Minister once again declared, and the Minister of Finance again reiterated, that this acceleration of the work would still further benefit Canada. The declaration was that it should increase the volume and quicken the flow of immigration, and every effort was made by hon. gentlemen to verify these predictions. The declarations which they made were of the strongest character, and they announced some time afterwards that the facts were going to be as good or better than they had stated they would be. Now, even during the years which had even preceded this acceleration, the year 1881, and particularly the years 1882 and 1883, the Ministers were declaring that these predictions to which I have referred were fulfilled and more than fulfilled, that they had been better than their word. They were booming the North-West to the utmost of their power. They regret the boom now; they sometimes say it did a great deal of harm; they speak of that regrettable inflation, the unfortunate results which have happened, and so forth; but they did all they could to produce it, and they are mainly responsible for its production and for the disastrous results which have flowed from it. They gave official figures of these alleged results of theirs. The official returns of the actual immigration to the North-West, carrying on the official figures from the year 1879, which I gave a while ago, would give, for the immigration to that country, up to the year 1885, 237,000 souls, to which, if you add 13,000 for natural increase, you will get a total of 250,000 as those who ought to be in the territory in the year 1885, always excluding the Indians. Now, I am not speaking—it is as well it should be understood—of the estimates of the hon. Minister now the Minister of Railways. We know what his estimates were. Why, I recollect one time when he told us—I forget the figures exactly, but something equivalent to about twice the whole immigration which has taken place from foreign parts, apart from the Irish immigration, as that which he expected in one season.

Mr. POPE. I only spoke of one season, and we got them.

Mr. BLAKE. No; I asked him on several occasions what the expected immigration was to be; and he gave that. But I am not speaking of the estimates. I am speaking of the official declarations as to the immigrants that actually came in, and it is by these declarations I am proposing now to judge the situation; and by these, taking up to the year 1879, the figures to which I have referred, you find that we ought to have had 250,000 souls in the North-West in the year 1885. These official returns gave us for the year 1881, in round numbers, 22,000; for 1882, 50,800; for 1883, 42,800; and for 1884, 24,400—or a total of 148,000 immigrant settlers into that country in four consecutive years, more than every white soul that is there to-day. I do not believe that there are many more than 125,000 whites in Manitoba and the North-West Territories at this time, only about two out of five of the results of the First Minister's statement of what ought to be there, only about one out of two of the Minister's statements of those who actually did settle there. Now, what has become of them? Where are they? Did they ever go in, or, if they did go in, where are they gone to? Because we find the official figures which indicate to us that they went in, and I am quite convinced they are not to be found there now. But still more, of those settlers, when the calculations were presented to us of the accession of strength and wealth to Canada, the representation was that the great bulk would be from abroad. It was foreign immigration and immigration from the British Isles to the North-West which we were to count upon mainly. In those early years, little, indeed hardly anything was said of immigration from one part of Canada to the other. But, when you look at results, you find under the territorial census over 60 per cent. of the white settlers are Canadian born, and less than 40 per cent. came from abroad; and of those who came from abroad, a considerable proportion may have been, some I believe were, persons who, although they did come from abroad, had been settlers in the older parts of Canada before they went to the North-West. On the same ratio, which is perhaps too favorable, there would be only about 50,000 immigrants from abroad—from the States, from the British Isles, from the continent of Europe, from abroad, in a word foreign-born—out of the whole immigration into that country. Now, that is the result. We were abused for suggesting that these estimates and these official returns did not represent, in the first case the probability, in the second case the actual fact. We were told that we were decrying the country; we were told that we were underestimating the prospects and the results, in order to produce evil effects; but to-day you find the situation altogether changed; to-day you find the principal organ of the Government discussing this very question in very different language. In the *Mail* newspaper of the 5th of this month is an article upon the North-West, from which I quote an extract or two:

"We have repeated boom estimates and quoted boomsters' figures"—

Who made the boom estimates, and whose were the boomsters' figures?

"We have repeated boom estimates and quoted boomsters' figures about everything until we have created in our minds the vision of a region which does not exist anywhere on earth; and now that it has been shattered by the prosaic revelations of the census, we are weak enough to feel sorry at being undeceived."

Again:

"The truth is that, all things considered, the population of Manitoba and the Territories is quite as large, placing it at 125,000 whites, as we had any right to expect it to be. It must be remembered that in all the new regions in the United States, the large part of the population is American born, hailing from the older States. There is no exception to this rule. In Dakota, for example, according to the special census taken in that territory last June, 269,700 settlers, out of a total of 415,000, 75 per cent. were native Americans, leaving only 35 per cent., or 145,000, to the credit of immigration. The same strange ethnic process is at work in our Territories, for by the census just taken it appears that of a white population of 23,000, no fewer than 14,200, or a little over 60 per cent. are of Canadian origin. But if we must assume, in accordance with this law, that the greater part of the future population of the North-West is to consist of the overflow from the older Provinces, then it is evident that the increase in population is sure to be slow as compared with the increase in the newer regions across the line, since our reservoir of population is but a-tenth as large as theirs. Moreover, it is well known that those immigrants who, next to the native-born settlers, have helped to develop Dakota and Minnesota, viz., the Scandinavians and Germans, are not to be procured for our North-West just now. They avoid our Territory because they do not approve of our political institutions. This is an unpalatable truth, but there it is, and we must take account of it. The nativity tables of the foreign-born population in Dakota have not yet been compiled in detail, but the Swedes and Norwegians rank first in number, and the Germans are well up. So that, being practically cut off from German and Scandinavian immigration, and having, as compared with the Americans, but a small overflow from native sources, it is manifestly absurd to expect any tremendous rate of development in our North-West just at present. Our time will come when the homestead lands in the United States are exhausted."

The article then proceeds to point out the last report of the Commissioner at Washington, showing that these reserves have shrunk to comparatively small proportions, and, after a quotation of that kind, the article proceeds:

"In the course of a few years Dakota will be out of the field. The immigration bureau of that territory says, in one of its monthly publications (that for February), that at the end of 1885 the area of vacant Government land, rated as agricultural land and open to settlement, was estimated at 20,000,000 acres, of which 18,000,000 lay in northern Dakota. For the six months ending 31st December, the area of land entered on or filed was 1,524,000 acres—say 3,000,000 a year. At this rate the vacant land will be pretty well exhausted in seven years, and a most formidable competitor to Manitoba and the Territories disposed of. Canada may then surely reckon on an immigration from the continent of Europe, provided efforts are made beforehand to make the people acquainted with the wealth of our resources. Meanwhile we probably need not look for any miraculous development of the North-West. There will be a steady influx of settlers from the United Kingdom, with a sprinkling from the continent of Europe; but the main stream of immigration will doubtless consist of young Canadians who, but for our enterprise in opening up this great region, would find their way to the United States, where so many thousands of our people settled in the days when we had no free prairie homesteads to offer."

That is the present view of those who thought we were going to have this enormous immigration from across the seas into the North-West in the last few years, and in the few years which are to expire before 1891. Now, Sir, I think it very plain that in these respects upon which the country was asked to embark on a scheme of rapid construction and enormous expenditure, with the promise of immediate and tangible results of the most valuable character, events have already shown how false were the predictions and how untrustworthy the guides who led the country into this enterprise after this fashion. Now, then let me take the next point: it is the promise that our lands would be settled fast, and that out of them every cent of our Canadian Pacific Railway obligations and interest would be met. I do not go back before the year 1880; it is not necessary to advert to the older statements. In 1880 the First Minister used these words:

"For the purpose of relieving the people of Canada from the burden of taxation, which the work would otherwise entail, we have offered every second lot at an upset price, so that the road may be eventually built without costing the people one single farthing which will not be recouped. I believe that land can be made productive under the terms of the resolution to complete the whole of that road, to open that immense country, and give us a magnificent railway from sea to sea, without adding to the burdens of the people or without causing any necessity for an increase of taxation. We can do it all by the sale of the lands which we hold as a sacred trust for the purpose of defraying the whole expense of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

Again he says:

"As the road progresses, the annual sale of lands will be more than sufficient to meet all possible cost of the railway."

Again:

"The proceeds of the sale of the lands will meet our engagements as the work progresses, including claims for interest."

The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), in an amendment to the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in the same Session, moved, and the House resolved, at his instance:

"That the policy of the Government for the disposal of the public land in Manitoba and the North West, is well calculated to promote the rapid settlement of that region, and to raise the moneys required for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway without further burdening the people, and that it deserves the support and approval of this House."

Well, Sir, in the same Session the First Minister declared that we would sell, from 1880 to 1885 inclusive, 28,000 pre-emptions, and for the year 1885, 6,250; that we would make other sales, from 1880 to 1885, 14,000 in number and in the year 1885, 3,125 in number. The results have been: Pre-emptions from 1880 to 1885, 15,275, of which I am afraid a great many will be cancelled or abandoned, instead of 28,000; and for the year 1885, 663 instead of 6,250. There were sales from 1880 to 1885, 9,634, instead of 14,000: and for the year 1885, 785 instead of 3,125. He estimated in the years 1885 to 1889, 40,625 pre-emptions and 20,313 sales. What are the estimates to-day, I wonder? We have settled just 138 homesteaders up to the 31st December, on 400 miles of the forty-eight mile belt of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the same year, 1880, the First Minister estimated the cash proceeds of the lands actually to be received from that year to 1890 inclusive, at $38,600,000. The amount which was to be then due but not payable, but still a mortgage on the lands, and as good as cash, bearing interest, was to be $32,700,000, or an aggregate of received and due of $71,300,000. He estimated the cost of survey and the administration of those lands at $2,400,000, and he brought down a handsome balance of net results of $68,900,000 before the year 1890. In reply to that estimate I pointed out that the group of Western States to which I referred had, in 1850, taken up per head of the population twelve and one-half acres, and had improved per head of the population five acres; that in 1860 they had taken up per head of the population twelve acres, and had improved six and one-third acres; that in 1870 they had taken up per head of the population ten and one-half acres, and had improved six and one-half acres. Well, the Minister calculated upon an immigration of 550,000, taking up no less than fifty-nine acres per head; and Sir Charles Tupper, somewhat later, calculated that 100,000 farmers in the North-West would produce 640,000,000 bushels of wheat in one year. You may combine these calculations and you find, Sir, the First Minister calculated that the taking up of land would be in the proportion of fifty-nine acres per soul of the population, and the Minister of Railways declared that 100,000 families would produce 640,000,000 bushels of wheat, and you see by what follies the people of this country have been gulled into the position in which they are placed to-day. I admitted, Sir, that it was probable that a very considerably larger area per head would be taken up in the North-West, under our land regulations and with reference to modern methods of cultivation, than in the earlier period in the Western States, but I declared then, and I repeat the statement now, that the suggestion of fifty-nine acres per head was, and is nothing less than ridiculous. You find to-day the Minister in charge of the Department saying that there is a very strong opinion amongst the population that 160 acres is as much as a

man ought to have—as the average farmer ought to have—and still the hon. gentleman proposed at that early date that about sixty acres per head of the population, or, if you count five to a family, 300 acres per head, was about the calculation for all, including those who lived in towns and villages—merchants, mechanics, farm servants—the whole population. Then, again, as to the proceeds of the sales. I pointed out that the United States, in the eighty-three years preceding 1879, had received, gross, $204,500,000 from their public lands, or $2,460,000 a year; that in the twenty years before 1879, they had received $30,350,000; or for eleven years, about $16,500,000, while we were told to expect a receipt of $38,500,000 in cash in eleven years, and $32,700,000 as good as gold, in mortgages upon the land. I declared then that these calculations were wholly visionary, and I begged the House not to enter into large engagements upon such calculations. A few months later came the bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Government then promised that the sales of land would recoup all our expenditure, and they persuaded the House and the country to agree to the bargain upon that specific pledge. Well, Sir, we then declared that that pledge would be broken; we declared that the country would not be recouped out of those lands for the money which it was expending, and was called upon to expend. You have, to-day, the statement of the Finance Minister, from which you can judge whether our forecasts or those of gentlemen opposite were the more correct. We asked the House to adopt the policy of proceeding as rapidly as required, even in advance of the demands of settlement, in the development of the railway facilities for the North West, but to keep down the unnecessary cost of very rapid construction of portions of the road not then urgently needed, and not to plunge into this enormous expenditure upon fallacious estimates. The delusions upon which hon. gentlemen opposite invited the House and the country to agree to their policy were kept up by them for years. I need not quote their utterances during the year 1881 because I shall show you, Mr. Speaker, that all along after that, and to within a very short space of time, those utterances were repeated and re-affirmed by Ministers. On 10th February, 1882, the First Minister made this statement:

"We have not forgotten the promise made by the Government that they would make the land in that country recoup to the Dominion the $25,000,000 that we have promised the Syndicate, and what the Dominion has already spent, or is spending, on the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is no reason in the world, as I have urged again and again, why the people of the older Provinces should put their hands in their pockets and settle that country and improve it, and build railways at their expense. That country, which is going to reap the advantage of those railways should provide the cost of the improvements, and the North-West, I am happy to say, is so rich, and will be so sought for, that what was a reasonable proposition at the beginning is now a certainty, namely, that it will be able to sell sufficient land, that while preserving the homesteading right, it would be able to repay to those who have contributed to the taxes necessary in connection with building the road the money with interest added."

The Finance Minister to-night has talked about our reaping some indirect advantage equal to 4 per cent. on $50,000,000 or $2,000,000 a year. He was careful to repeat the word "indirect," and he proceeded with a sort of hocus pocus calculation, which I would have been better pleased had he used before he was Finance Minister than which he occupies that position, that we had received that return from the accelerated rapidity of construction and the earlier period at which the money was spent. That was not the promise made to us—not that which the Finance Minister has stated to us in terms which I think will become historical. But the promise was that we would get out of the land in hard cash the money we were contributing to the company and putting into the road, with interest added thereto. And that was the promise as late as 1882—not merely the promise, but we had the allegation that that which had been a promise and a pledge in 1880 had become a certainty in 1882. Well, then, on 2nd April, 1882, not the 1st, the First Minister said this:

"It was the policy of the Government that that country should eventually pay for its own railway."

Again:

"75,000,000 acres are to be sold—they are not to be sold for homestead purposes—for the purpose of relieving the people of the older Provinces who, on the faith of this assurance and promise—and on this promise only—accepted the burden, and have at the polls recorded their sanction of this policy. * * * They endorsed this policy on the understanding that, eventually, that country would pay the whole of the expense."

There I have the statement of the hon. gentleman that it was upon the promise that we were to be recouped in cash out of the lands that Parliament, and afterwards the people, accepted the bargain and endorsed the policy—on that promise and on that promise only. Who is bold enough to declare now that that promise has not been broken?—that policy which the people they confess endorsed on the understanding that eventually the country would pay the whole of the expense? Again:

"It is safe, it is certainly beyond the possibility of doubt to say that every farthing and every cent and every dollar that has been or will be expended in building the Canadian Pacific Railway, not one shilling of this burden will fall on our shoulders, or on the shoulders of the generation that will succeed us. We will be free from the whole amount of that debt."

Again:

"$750,000 was paid in in one day from the recent sales—this is a very substantial commencement of the fund which is to pay off the $25,000,000. It will be put to the credit of the fund and invested at interest for the purpose of paying off the whole of this $25,000,000."

Now, perhaps, the hon. Finance Minister knows, what he did not know when he made his late Budget speech, and when he told us he was ignorant why Sir Leonard Tilley, his predecessor, had actually put those moneys received from the lands to a sort of separate capital account. That is how the matter stood; the Minister of Finance, however, thought he did not suppose it would be of much consequence as the Government then had a surplus, but now times have changed and the amount, although very small, makes a difference, and the hon. gentleman is going to put it to revenue. I point out to him that, in a light and easy way, he is brushing away a promise, a pledge and engagement, that the money would be placed to capital account and invested at interest, and used to repay the debt. Again:

"By this year then there will be 10,000,000 acres granted to colonisation companies under plan No. 1, which means the eventual payment of $10,000,000 into the Treasury."

And again:

"That will be $10,000,000, and with the sales that will take place of railway lands in other portions, we will have, either in money, or in what is as good as money, solid mortgages on every one of these colonisation tracts an amount equal to $12,500,000; so that in one year we may fairly say we have got half of the whole, $25,000,000."

Where is it now? Then on 12th April, 1882, Sir Charles Tupper said:

"The lands have so increased in value as to warrant us in the statement, and to warrant the conviction in the mind of every intelligent man, that at an early date we will not only have the $25,000,000 recouped to the Treasury, but we will go on; and if we have not wiped out our other responsibilities we will soon be in a condition to wipe out the engagements thrown upon us by the late Government, as well as those incurred by our own in reference to the work."

I think I have shown the House what the situation was in 1882. Let me now come to 1883. In that year Sir Charles Tupper declared that our secured receipts from transactions already effected in the three previous years, 1880, '81 and '82, would be by 1885 a trifle over $10,000,000, apart from all new transactions such as railway grants and further sales; they were actual receipts to come in by the year 1885 from the transactions already accomplished in 1880-81-82. That period has now expired. We declared, on those

occasions, that the general result would be that the country would not realise, out of North-West lands, anything appreciable in excess of the cost of the administration, having regard to certain charges which were properly charges upon that administration, charges for police, for Indians, for immigration and for local government; and that if you omitted all those, and took only what the Government called charges of administration, there would not be very much to go towards interest on what we would borrow, and nothing whatever towards the principal. That was the declaration we made. The hon. gentleman declared to the House and the people that those enormous sums would be realised, and would go to a reduction of the principal, and that the interest would be paid also. Which has turned out correct? What are the actual receipts from all sources, not for the transactions of 1880-81-82, but all receipts from 1880 to 1885. The receipts were $4,052,000, and the expenditures for surveys and land officers and that class of expenditure, was $3,320,000, leaving a balance of $732,000. From this you have, in my view, still to deduct certain charges. For example, I estimate that at least one-half of the cost of the Department of the Interior under the old system, before the hon. gentleman enlarged it, is fairly to be chargeable to the land branch of that Department. Of course the Indian branch is a separate branch, and I am speaking of the Interior by itself. Now, half the cost of the Interior under the old scale for the last six years would give you $133,000, and then I take the whole excessive cost of the Interior, beyond the cost in the old time, the cost of the hon. gentleman's policy, as attributable to the lands, and that is $225,000 more in the six years, making an aggregate of $338,000, leaving, as a net result, $374,000, without saying a word about the Indians, about immigration, about mounted police, about local government, or any of those charges. So you may practically say that there has been nothing net out of the lands of the North-West for these years during which hon. gentlemen declared so large a sum would be realised as to recoup us *pro tanto* for the expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway. And this is not an increasing ratio; it included the boom, the speculative period, the period in which they sold in a day to speculators large quantities of land, in which they realised from colonisation companies a considerable sum, the colonisation bubble, the speculative bubble, the town site bubble. Of late years there has been a positive loss, and you can judge that from a statement of the annual receipts. In 1880 the gross receipts were $155,000; in 1881, $164,000; in 1882, $1,727,000; in 1883, $928,000; in 1884, $788,000; and in 1885, $288,000; so that our over expenditure last year was over $223,000, apart from the cost of the land part of the Interior Department, which would show, if you added it, a total deficit of about $300,000 for that year. It is true this expenditure includes a great deal of surveying; we have surveyed a great deal of land—more than we wanted. A large portion of the work was ill-done and expensively done, from the expedition with which it was done; a good deal of it has to be done over again. They had not time to survey where surveys ought to have been made, where the people and the settlements were. They had no time to give to such work, they had to go on surveying by the tens of millions of acres, in places that will not be filled for many years to come. It was announced in the blue-books; the complaints of the settlers on the Saskatchewan were referred to there as well as by the Minister in answer to me. They said we cannot attend to this; we are engaged in a great work; we are developing the North-West; we are building the Canadian Pacific Railway; we are floating colonisation companies, and we have to survey millions of acres; we have not time to attend to the settlers there, and they went on in this wild goose chase of theirs with the melancholy results which I hope we have not yet quite forgotten. But we were also receiving exceptional sums through the boom, and we made exceptional and foolish expenditures with enormous rapidity in useless surveys, and with this result, that they received only $4,050,000 gross and a few hundred thousand dollars net, during this period, and the Minister of Finance tells us that for the future, as the receipts have now grown so small, he does not intend to put them to capital but to revenue account, so that you can judge we are not to be furnished with boom estimates for some time to come, or until some other purpose is to be served. How much is to be netted now by 1890, in view of the $69,000,000 which was to be obtained in cash or mortgage by the estimate of 1880? Will the hon. gentleman say one-half that amount? Will he say one-tenth that amount? I do not believe he will. In 1883 the late Minister of Finance estimated our cash receipts from land in the North-West for 1884 in round numbers at $2,250,000; in 1885, $2,000,000; in 1886, $2,000,000; total, $6,250,000, for those three years. We have actually received in gross for 1884, $788,000; for 1885, $288,000, or for those two years $1,076,000. I do not know how much the hon. gentleman estimated for revenue out of lands of the North-West this year; he did not particularise, but he gave us the gross sum of seven or eight millions of revenue without stating details apart from the Customs or Excise, and we did not get the particulars. I daresay that from this source it was not more than $300,000; I daresay that $1,300,000 or $1,400,000 is the projected result of those three years, in which by the estimate of three years ago we were to have got $6,250,000, resulting in there being no net whatever, and a loss instead of a profit after expenses are paid, for the years in which, according to the view of three years ago, we should have had at least $5,000,000 net profit in cash. In 1883 the Minister of Railways estimated as the cash results of colonisation companies for four years, $2,562,000. The actual results were for the first of these years, $248,500; for 1884, $223,700; for 1885, $1,200, making a total of $503,400 for three out of those four years. I do not believe that the year 1886 will materially increase the receipts, and the result therefore will be about one fifth of the hon. gentleman's estimate. In the same year, 1883, the Government estimated that we would net many millions out of the branch railway lands. We were to sell them to the companies at $1.06 per acre, and after that they were to make large profits—enough to make a basis out of which the roads were to be built. There would be about four or five millions in that way, and it was capable of a large increase. A little later they found that they had been too extravagant; they found that they had been giving the branch railways too large a margin of profit; they were to make too much money out of the North-West lands given to them at $1.06 per acre and they passed an Order in Council declaring that for the future they would not give them to railway companies for less than $1.50, in order that the country might have a fair share of the profits. A few months after the bubble burst altogether, and since then they have remitted not only the extra half dollar of 1883, but the original dollar, and the land grants are free to the branch railways, resulting in free grants of, as far as I can judge, seven or eight millions of acres given, or to be given immediately, for the construction of branch railways which were to have been built by the Canadian Pacific Railway practically out of its land grant. You can judge what the results of that operation are upon the values of land in the North-West Territories. In 1883 the Department of the Interior reported, in addition to the actual payments which had been made, that there would accrue due for the next three years in pre-emptions and time sales $4,393,070. Now, that was for the years 1884, 1885 and 1886. I wonder how much we shall get? I wonder what the Minister of Interior will say now as to the accuracy of that estimate? In that year, to cap the climax, the Department of the Interior

presented, and the then Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper) read a statement to the House, on the 4th day of May, 1883, and this is the statement:

"SIR,—Having given the subject my best and fullest consideration, I estimate that the receipt of this Department from the sale of agricultural and coal lands, timber dues, rents of grazing lands, and sales of mineral lands, other than coal, with the royalties from the minerals between the 1st of January, 1883, and the 31st of December, 1891, both days inclusive, will amount to not less than $58,000,000."

That was as late as the 4th of May, 1883. What will be said on this 30th of April, 1886, as to the result by the 31st of December, 1891? We have been asking ever since for the production of the details, the rivulets, of this golden stream, this stream of Pactolus which the railway was going to throw into the Treasury. And the Minister actually tells us he is not going to put all that to capital account it is not worth while; but he is going to put it into the revenue. A year or two ago this House passed an order for the details of this. We want to see them, to gloat over them, to rejoice over them—to verify not only the results in gross, but the parts in detail—to see how this grand prophecy was going to be fulfilled. The House has ordered them, but the Department has not furnished them, it is ashamed to furnish them; it dare not furnish them; and we are kept in the dark as to that. I think I have shown you that the promises of this Government were precise, clear, emphatic, superabundant, as to what they would do, and what they had made practically a matter of certainty with reference to the lands in the North-West, namely, that all the expenditure they called on us to incur would be repaid to us rapidly, principal and interest, out of the sale of those lands. I think I have shown the calculations on which they based these estimates, and that events have wholly falsified the accuracy of those estimates. Then, with regard to branch railways, if you compare the promises of the Government and company with their performances, you find the results early in the history of the company. They made claims on the Government for large reserves of land in various parts of the country, and laid before them plans of various branch railways that they were going to build. I think that in one year no less than 1,500 miles of branch railways were projected to be constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the North-West. But you know what they have done, and what we have done. We have had to sell at a low price, and afterwards to give for nothing millions of acres of public lands; many municipalities have been called upon to grant bonuses out of their scanty means; the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba has been asked to issue bonds based on the limited resources of that Province, in order to get these branch lines built; and Parliament will probably have to give seven or eight million acres more free, in order to secure that very thing which we were told we were going to secure by the original subvention to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. And we have to give this in part for building through a large part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's own land grant; for if you examine the land grant to the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Railway, you will find that the Government declined to give a land grant, because they said it was going to be built through Canadian Pacific Railway lands, and therefore the Canadian Pacific Railway Company ought to build the line. The company declined to build it, but they said you build it through, and it will increase the value of our lands; you build and we will get the benefit. Then it was said that we were going to save a great deal of money by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company undertaking a portion of the burden which would otherwise have fallen upon us with reference to immigration expenditure. I need not say much about that. You know the enormous expenditure incurred for immigration purposes for years past, and the beggarly results derived from it; and I am sorry to say that the census of the North-West Territories shows how little productive that expenditure has been. Instead of a reduction, there has been an enormous increase in the expenditure for immigration; the economy promised as a result of the arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has not been produced. The official statistics deceive us no longer. We do not appear to have done much more than, if we have done as much, to retain our natural increase with all this immense expenditure. We have brought in many persons unsuited to the country, and many more to compete with mechanics who were already hard pressed. We hope for some better fruit in future from this enormous expenditure; but so far it seems mostly to have helped only party hacks and party newspapers with printing jobs. As to the monopoly, you know that the pledges as to Manitoba have been absolutely violated by the exercise of the power of disallowance, that great discontent has been engendered there and elsewhere, and that relief has been sought at great expense by that Province by the proposed construction of Hudson Bay Railway. The success of the undertaking is said to be doubtful; but its success, though desired as a relief from monopoly, would damage eastern connections, and turn another way the course of trade, so that many of the predictions hon. gentlemen have made as to the results that would flow to Canada from the construction of the Pacific Railway would not follow. Then, you find another evidence of the anxiety to obtain relief from monopoly in the revival of the Red River boats. They have been revived during the last year in order to provide another outlet to the south. Then, you find the feeling of grievance of being locked in all along the line. Then, there is the other grievance, which I have pointed out before, as to fair proportionate mileage rates to places in Ontario, as compared with those to places in Quebec. We do not find that that has been accomplished. A resolution was passed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in fulfilment of the pledges given to Parliament. That resolution seemed to be based on what were fair grounds, that each locality would get under it a just charge, but we do not find that any security had been taken or any arrangement made from which these results are to flow. If I am rightly informed, it has been hinted that the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as to its through traffic with the North-West is to make one rate for all points for Ontario and Montreal, so that whether it is farther or nearer Callander, the same price is to be paid. I say the charge ought to have regard for the neutral point to which freight is carried. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is bound, and the Government is bound, to enforce the rule that freight carried from a point one or two hundred miles beyond Callander may be carried cheaper than freight from a point two or three hundred miles beyond Callander. Now, I maintain that the policy hon. gentlemen have advocated, and the pledges they have made, upon which they obtained the assent of the House and the country, have failed. We have paid enormously; a vast capital account has been created, which will burden for many generations the finances of the country. The policy of boom, the policy of expenditure, the policy of unprecedented rapid construction, has not produced those tangible results that were promised to us. It has been accompanied by a great increase of cost to this country without the return it was pledged to us would take place from the sales of lands, without the prospect of that return, and without those other advantages it was said would flow from it. We have paid for the Canadian Pacific Railway, including surveys and the Canada Central subsidy, about $60,000,000; the company has realised from our lands, sites and bonuses about $11,000,000; we are about to give them for land merely, over $10,000,000; thus their receipts from public resources foot up to about $81,000,000, apart from 14,750,000 acres of land which are to remain

with the company, and $12,000,000 or $14,000,000 engaged in extension schemes. Besides these, the company has borrowed from the public, on debentures, $35,000,000, making a total in cash and works of $116,000,000 which the company has received without touching a dollar of capital stock. Then there is the issue of capital stock to the amount of $65,000,000, for which the company received $29,500,000, making a total received of $145,500,000, which has been expended in some way, and the company is now asking to borrow something approximating to $29,000,000 more, because the borrowing power is to be $2 an acre on its remaining land grant, although out of that are to be paid those land grant bonds which are outstanding. How much more is to be expended we know not; we have no scheme, we have no statement, but we learn that a large increase of capital is wanted and we are asked to authorise that increase. Formerly we were furnished statements, returns, accounts, but that has all passed away now. We are simply told they want more money, and we are asked to authorise an increase of capital. Where has all this money gone? An enormous sum has gone to dividend; large sums have gone in needless, reckless, hasty and premature construction. To dividends has gone, paid and secured, about $21,000,000. The Algoma branch, which was built, as everybody now knows, entirely prematurely, because it has never been completed, and is lying there with the rails rusting and unused, cost $2,500,000, entailing a charge on the shareholders of the company of some 11 or 12 per cent. per annum; and the main line has been built at greatly enhanced cost in consequence of the speed. I remember having been ridiculed when I said that speed meant cost; even the company repudiated the notion that the speed would entail any additional expenditure, but now the hon. the Minister of Finance, as an excuse, declares the road could not be built at this rate of speed without costing much more. I recollect well an official statement from the company and one from the chief official engineer of the Government, which amounted to the declaration that the piece of permanent line in British Columbia, to which the hon. gentleman referred as being a charge on the unearned subsidy, had been estimated in the company's estimate to cost 50 per cent. more than it would if built slower. Under these circumstances, we find the Government coming down to-day, with all their promises as to the results of their land grant policy, all their promises as to the result of their immigration policy and their railway construction policy, falsified by events, with an empty exchequer, having abandoned the prospect of recouping the people for the expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway out of the North-West land—we find them coming down with this proposition. The hon. gentleman says it is different from former propositions and need not involve a great deal of discussion. True, we were told every cent of the loan would be repaid, and now we are asked to compromise by accepting 66⅔ cents cash and our own land for the balance; but still the hon. gentleman says the proposition is an advantageous one. Why, he says, it has been proved that the security on the land is admirable. The hon. gentleman has realised his interest out of it and is able to realise more, and therefore he thinks the land is paying so well that, instead of holding a mortgage on it, on which he can only get his money, he had better have the profits of its proprietorship and make $15,000,000 instead of $10,000 000! No, it is advantageous; but the advantage is to the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because you substitute for the charge upon them and their enterprise of $400,000 a year interest and the ultimate payment of $10,000,000, the re-transfer to the country of the claim of the Canadian Pacific Railway to some 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 acres of land. The hon. gentleman cannot sell his land just now, and he cannot give it away, he has been able to put no more than 138 homesteaders on 400 miles of the forty-eight mile belt of the Canadian Pacific Railway up to the 31st December last, and as he cannot sell the millions of acres and cannot give the land away, he must engage in some land operation, so he buys land back at $1.50 an acre, and says: "This is so clearly in the interests of the country, that we need not debate it." No; the shareholders want a larger share of profits; they want the $400,000 a year which otherwise they would have to pay, and the capital of which would have to be paid some day or other by them, and as it is now plain they cannot get the amount out of the lands, because the land security which the Government took on the whole land grant is not adequate to produce 4 per cent. on the $10,000,000, we are to take over this fraction absolutely in lieu of the $10,000,000 and to provide the interest thereon. I said I suspected this was contemplated. The method which hon. gentlemen have pursued gave ground for suspicion. When they wanted to persuade us to lend the Canadian Pacific Railway Company $20,000,000, they offered us, they said, undoubted security for the interest at 5 per cent. They got the money on those terms and then asked us to reduce the rate to 4 per cent. And having succeeded in getting the rate reduced, their next step, one no doubt secretly agreed upon with the company, was to bring down the proposition before us. I was inclined to suspect they would do this. I was inclined to suspect that having told us we had a mortgage on the land, that it was admirable security, that we were going to get principal and interest, we would find the Finance Minister standing up and saying: This is really costing us more than 4 per cent., we are actually losing money, and there is a great deal of difficulty about the land grant arrangements; they may interfere with the sale of the Dominion lands and with the prospects of the North-West; having accustomed us to these things by degrees, what the Government could not do the year before they deem themselves able to do now. And so they bring down the proposition to-day which they were afraid, or which they did not choose to bring down, a year ago. I do not intend to enter upon some of the details upon which the hon. gentleman said he would give explanations in the committee. It seems to me that the proposal, in the condition of the lands of the North-West, in the condition which is proclaimed of this company, that the people of Canada should retake six or seven millions of acres of this land of theirs at this price, and incur this increase in our net debt and this increase in our annual charge, is one that ought not to commend itself to the House or to the people. There is one other topic not immediately connected with the other topics contained in these resolutions, though flowing, I judge, in the Minister's opinion, from them, to which I wish to address myself for a moment or two before I sit down. I refer to the removal of the shareholders' disqualification for seats in Parliament. Does the hon. gentleman think the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are not powerful enough in this House as it is? Does he think it absolutely necessary to give them the additional power which would be involved in the members of this House being shareholders in this company? This has also been pressed for some time past upon the Government by the company. This company is going for some years to come to have questions between it and the country for settlement, questions connected with its tariff, very important questions connected with its capital account, questions connected with the monopoly policy, questions connected with the extension policy, questions connected with the grants of various kinds, and all these questions have to be settled, I hope, upon just and equitable terms between the country and the railway company; but they are not questions a just or equitable adjustment of which will be facilitated or furthered by making this a Parliament of Canadian Pacific Railway shareholders. I do not believe

that this is at all a time to relax the stringency of the laws regulating the independence of Parliament. If any change were proper to be made in those safeguards, it would be one to increase them very largely. Our institutions in this regard are very much upon their trial; and for my part I shall not record a vote to diminish in any degree the present securities for the independence of Parliament by agreeing that the shareholders in this great corporation, who will for many years have so much to do of an important and vital character with the Government and the people of Canada, shall sit in Parliament and vote upon matters in which they are so much concerned.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Mr. BLAKE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that there was a certain sum still held of the subsidy money as distinguished from the loan money, but I did not exactly catch the figure.

Mr. McLELAN. About $600,000 of the original subsidy money is still undrawn; and there is $800,000 of the loan.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but that is cancelled by this arrangement.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. So what we have to deal with as an asset against the completion of the line will be simply the two items of the unearned subsidy and the unearned lands?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And what was the quantity of lands the hon. gentleman stated was unearned?

Mr McLELAN. There will be the same number of acres as of dollars.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the hon. gentleman stated that the engineer had estimated some $309,000 as required to complete the road, apart from the temporary work which has been referred to.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman say in what part of the central section the $284,000 is required?

Mr. McLELAN. He does not give that. On the eastern section $35,000 and on the central section $284,000 are required, making $309,000, but there is no statement of the places. I assume it is where they are working now.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the estimate which the engineer now makes of the amount required to make permanent the temporary line in the Rockies?

Mr. McLELAN. From $800,000 to $1,000,000, to cover it fully. That is the tunnel. Of course it will depend a good deal on the time given to complete it. The hon. gentleman has estimated that it would cost 50 per cent. more to do the work in a limited time than in a longer time, and it will take from three-quarters to a million dollars according to the time. Against that, you have the balance of the original subsidy, and the balance of the land, and $5,000,000 of land grant bonds in the hands of the Government for the completion of the road.

Mr. BLAKE. No, those are security for operation, not for completion. Then, I understand the completion of the temporary line will cost a minimum of $700,000, to which is to be added the $309,000, so that $1,050,000 to $1,250,000 is required in order to complete the road.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And the security for that is the unearned subsidy of $600,000, I think he said.

Mr. McLELAN. $600,000 and 600,000 acres.

Mr. BLAKE. Has there been any statement made in this connection as to what the plan is as to the completion, how soon it is intended to complete that temporary portion?

Mr. McLELAN. I have not got from the company any particulars as to that, but I understand that the engines they have working upon the heavy grade now are doing very well, and they may not for some little time make the tunnel as proposed.

Mr. BLAKE. And in this same connection, I have asked several times with reference to the questions of snow fall and slides, gravel and snow slides, and the Minister of Railways informed me that observations had been directed to be taken the season before last, and I presume they were continued last season. I should like to know whether the result is such as to satisfy the Government with the location of the line all through the mountains as it now exists, or whether they contemplate any further changes.

Mr. McLELAN. I have not the information in regard to that. The Minister of Railways is not here. Of course he will be here to give the information before concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course it is quite obvious that we are dealing with a proposition which involves the handing over of the security for the construction of the road, and it is of great consequence to understand what the condition of the enterprise is, and the hon. gentleman should give a general statement about that.

On resolution 2,

Mr. BLAKE. What is the process by which it is intended to ascertain, as between the company and the Government, what lands the Government shall retain, and what lands the company?

Mr. McLELAN. The plan is not quite yet settled upon, but it is specified here that they shall take just an average quality of the land that may be earned by them.

Mr. BLAKE. I see what is stated. It is a very admirable result to arrive at, but perhaps not extremely easy. We find the plan, which was very excellent last Session, has been found to involve difficulties which require a change this Session. We would like to investigate this a little bit.

Mr. McLELAN. I see that in certain sections of the country the surveyors have reported as to the qualities of certain tracts of land. There are so many million acres in that tract and so many in another, and they report upon the quality of the land that will go to the company and so on, wherever the company's land may be. We look over the reports of the surveyors and see the quality of land they give, and take the proportion out of each one of the tracts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of fact, have the company selected their land?

Mr. McLELAN. No, they have not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much have they selected, for instance, south of the Canadian Pacific Railway tract?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think none have been selected south of the railway belt proper, connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The selections so far have been within the railway belt.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much has been selected within that?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think somewhere between eight and nine million acres, speaking from memory. The exact figures cannot be given now.

Mr. BLAKE. This question really is one which is likely to give rise, unless the mode of that adjustment be defined, to very great risk, that the Government may impose upon the company inferior lands, and that they will take the price of the land for themselves. In the interest of the company, therefore, I suggest that justice and fair play demand something which will secure their change.

Mr. McLELAN. If the company has selected 6,250,000 acres in the south, that is a-fourth of the whole 25,000,000, we will take our proportion out of that. And if they select another 6,000,000 in the poorer sections of the country where the land is not so good, we will take our proportion out of that; but on concurrence we will be able to give you particulars as to where they have selected.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In point of fact the hon. gentleman has made this arrangement, that wherever the company goes he goes, and takes his proportion. Is that the arrangement?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, a fair average over the whole.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will take, therefore, about 27,000,000 acres. The company have disposed of 4,000,000, I understand, so that you will have to take one-third everywhere—is that the idea?

Mr. McLELAN. That is the idea.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whether it be south or whether it be north?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; wherever it is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That includes what they have already selected, and everything that they have not sold?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; the lands unsold.

On resolution 3,

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended under this that the mortgage of the Algoma branch shall be for another purpose than that which is defined in that former Act? The hon. gentleman will recollect that the former Act permitted a mortgage of the Algoma branch for the specific purpose of taking this road to the Sault. I do not know whether it included bridge powers or not. By this I judge that it is proposed to increase the power of mortgaging to a larger amount per mile than is now permitted, but is it to be for any other purpose than that?

Mr. McLELAN. Under the Act of last year, the hon. gentleman will remember, we agreed that if it was necessary for the company to extend the Algoma branch, although he held it as part of the security for our general debt, we should allow them to mortgage it for the extension of the branch. Well, when we have received our money, and when we have settled for the $9,000,000 by taking, in round numbers, the seven million acres of land, and they have paid us all off, then we give them up the right to mortgage the Algoma branch for such purposes as they desire. We had taken from them the power to mortgage that.

Mr. BLAKE. We had not taken from them the power to mortgage that; we only gave that power for a specific purpose. As I understand, at the present moment, we have arrangements under which, if the Algoma branch is mortgaged, it will be mortgaged only to secure the completion of the road to the Sault; and it is now proposed to give the company power to mortgage that for an increase of land per mile, and for any purpose they please, so that they need not go to the extension to the Sault.

Mr. McLELAN. It is put in the position of the main line.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Mr. DAWSON. It is understood the Algoma branch will go on.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, everything is understood. But the best security for the Algoma branch going on is to provide a fund for the construction of the Algoma branch.

On resolution 4,

Mr. BLAKE. This clause divides itself into two parts. One is as to the question of accepting in exchange for $5,000,000 a like amount of the new issue. That is of little practical consequence in view of the notice which the hon. gentleman has on the notice paper, which I presume means that not many months after the House is prorogued the bonds will be handed over to the company, and therefore that part is hardly worth while talking about and is only waste paper. The other part involves a question of public credit, and is of a rather serious character. The existing land grant bonds in the hands of the public are secured by thoroughly adequate security. Nor do I mean to say that although the security is very much diminished by this proposed change, inasmuch as there are those $7,000,000 taken away from it, nor do I mean to say for the smaller amount of the land grant bonds remaining the lands are not quite good security. But we have no right to impair in any degree the security of any one of the land grant bondholders without the Government of the country, at all events, becoming directly responsible for the amount, or arranging that it will reserve funds for that land grant bondholder and hold them for him. The hon. gentleman provides, and very properly so, that there shall be an exchange, that there shall be a cancellation of all land grant bonds obtainable; but he says there may be some not obtainable. I may have a land grant bond which I do not choose to sell, and in some cases the addresses of the holders may not be obtainable. If the company is unable to obtain all of them from the holders we have no right to alter their security in any shape or way, at all events until we see money placed in the hands of the Government to pay them their half years' interest and ultimately the principal. This proposal is setting a very bad example.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman will bear in mind that we hold now $9,000,000, in round numbers, of land grant bonds in connection with those outstanding in the hands of the company, while $25,000,000 are in our hands or in the hands of the public, and have been cancelled and paid off. Then we cancel $9,000,000 of those bonds, and the company make a new issue of $9,000,000 that we are now holding, and they make an exchange with the public, so far as it is possible to do so, and they leave in the hands of the Government an equal value.

Mr. BLAKE. No. At present there are outstanding, I forget how much——

Mr. McLELAN. Between $3,000,000 and $4,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Say between $3,000,000 and $4,000,000; I did not think the amount was so much. But of that a very considerable proportion is covered by sales actually made to parties. At all events, such was the statement made last year, and we have heard nothing lately. The Government have $9,000,000 more in their hands.

Mr. McLELAN. And we have the $5,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. We will put that on one side.

Mr. McLELAN. It is $5,000,000 nevertheless.

Mr. BLAKE. We will put that $5,000,000 on one side and consider it by itself. There might be $9,000,000 issued by the company, or by the Government, at the instance of the company, and there are $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 out on 23,500,000 acres of land. You now propose to give authority

to the company to mortgage a less quantity of land, to mortgage what remains of the land, 14,750,000 acres, at $2 an acre, making something over $29,000,000. And what you say is this: The company will pay all the bondholders they can pay, and those who do not choose to take their money will receive an equivalent amount of lands. But it is not equivalent.

Mr. McLELAN. Bonds of equal value.

Mr. BLAKE. How are you going to estimate the value?

Mr. McLELAN They are now put at $1 an acre, and if the lands increase in value they may bear a larger amount.

Mr. BLAKE. It must be remembered that a parliamentary and public contract has been made with the holders of those land grant bonds that the product of the sale of those 22,500,000 acres of Canadian Pacific Railway lands should be applied to the payment of their debt. Trusts have been created, and all the proceeds are to go into the hands of the trustees, there is to be a drawing of the bonds and they are to be cancelled. Now Parliament is asked to say that we will take on ourselves to cancel the whole security and issue a new set of securities of unquestionably and admittedly less value.

Mr. McLELAN. We do not admit that we exchange them for securities of less value.

Mr. BLAKE. The securities are of less value because there are more dollars estimated as to the value of the lands, and we declare that we will judge for outstanding parties what they think would be a fair proportion of land to hold for them as their security. We have no right to interfere with the interests of persons in that way. The only method we could adopt would be this: If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company pays in cash the amount required to redeem those land grant bonds, we will hold it for them and pay the holders in cash; or for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to place in the hands of a trustee an amount representing the value of the bonds. But for the Government to be the judge as to whether the new security is equal to the old and to decide for those holders who do not choose to accept the new securities, is to introduce a new doctrine.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that there are outstanding bonds on lands estimated at $1 an acre. There are $9,000,000 in our hands. We hold them as security for the $9,000,000 that is upon the land. We now take the land at the rate of $1.50 an acre in extinguishing $9,000,000 worth of land grant bonds in our hands. We therefore increase the value of the other securities in consequence of taking 7,000,000 acres of land at $1.50 an acre and extinguishing $9,000,000 of land grant bonds, leaving the rest.

Mr. BLAKE. What will happen? There are 14,000,000 acres of land left, that you are proposing to authorise the company to issue securities upon, and that to the extent of $2 an acre, and you therefore issue about $29,000,000 on 14,500,000 acres, and you say if the company cannot obtain some of these outstanding bonds you reserve them from the new issue. That is, you arbitrarily proceed by an Act of Parliament to alter the contract made between you, the bondholders, and the company.

Mr. McCARTHY. Surely the hon. gentleman will not say that there is anything in this resolution which deprives the bondholders of the first issue of any security they have already. We have the bonds issued under the authority of the charter, and we have the authority of the mortgage deed which gives to them in pursuance of the charter the proceeds of the land which are sold until the bonds are paid off. The result, as I understand, will be this. There are already some seven or eight millions of dollars of the bonds paid for by the sales of the land. There are $5,000,000 in the hands of the Government, which the hon. gentleman says are to be wiped out by-and-bye, but for the purpose of these resolutions it is to be exchanged for $5,000,000 of the new issue. Then there are still nine or ten millions dollars which represent the debt that will be wiped out; so much of the land will be given, and therefore the bonds are reduced to the other three or four millions of dollars which the public hold. They still retain their position—if not it should be made clear—they still retain their position as being of the first issue, and the result will be that the bondholders will hold as security the lands ahead of and before the bondholders of the second issue, so that parties holding any of the second issue will be second encumbrances on the whole of the lands. The money which the hon. gentleman spoke of just now is in the hands of trustees for the payment of those bonds, and it must be appropriated to the payment of those bonds. The clause to which the hon. gentleman refers, and which I read at first as my hon. friend did, is a limitation of the power of the company to issue bonds. It provides that the bonds are to be held in the hands of the trustees and those trustees will retain a sufficient amount of them, not to be sold until the other bonds are taken up, so that there shall not be on the same quantity of land a double issue of bonds. I think, if the hon. gentleman reads it, he will find it is so. Nothing here purports to take away, and I doubt if this Parliament could take away the vested rights of the bondholders of the first issue. That vested right is to be found under the terms of an Act of Parliament which gives them a first charge on all the company's lands, and that is made more clear by the mortgage deed which was executed at the time, and by the appointment of trustees who sell the lands and receive the proceeds of the sales, who are bound to apply the money to the redemption of those bonds, and whose position is not at all affected by the power now given to the company to issue a second series of bonds, not in exchange for the first, unless at the will of the bondholder, but to be placed on the market as the old bonds are wiped away.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, if that is the true construction, the hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that no interference is effected with the bondholders, but it is a question whether that is the true construction. The Minister of Finance did not certainly place that construction upon it. We are now upon clause 4 of the agreement which we are asked to confirm, and of course, when it is cited in the paper itself, it has an important bearing upon what the meaning of the subsequent clause will be. That is the clause in the criticism of which I have been engaged, and I think it has a very important bearing on the meaning—otherwise perhaps ambiguous—of the subsequent clause. That clause refers to these bonds as first mortgage bonds. They are, therefore, first and not second—not bonds subject to the land grant, but first mortgage bonds. Then if the scheme were one such as the hon. gentleman indicates, it would not require to reserve any portion of these mortgage bonds to pay off the first mortgage bonds.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is a limitation.

Mr. BLAKE. I say you would not require it. When you are authorising a company or an individual to make a second mortgage, you do not require to provide that out of the second he shall pay off the first, or in this case that all outstanding land grant bonds are to be first duly cancelled. Now, why this provision, if they are to be second mortgage bonds. What have we to do with the land grant bonds if this security is to be entirely subject to them? It is clear that the scheme is a substitutionary one. It says that such and such things should be done with those in the hands of

the Government and so on, and it is substituting one security for another, *nolens volens*.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman will not pretend to say as a lawyer that there is anything in this clause which compels the first bondholder to accept a second bond in place of it. It is true they are called first mortgage bonds, as I may call any second mortgage bond a first mortgage bond, but that does not affect the security. I understand that this is not an uncommon term to apply to such bonds. The mortgage bonds which have been sold recently by this company are, I believe, called first mortgage bonds, but they are nevertheless subject to prior charges on two portions of the road. If the hon. gentleman will read the clause again, he will see that if any person chooses to come and take his money, and if the trustees have the money in hand to apply in the redemption of these bonds, they are to be obtained. They have the right in the first place to issue $29,000,000 bonds; that amount is to be placed in the hands of trustees. If a certain amount which the public hold of the three or four millions of dollars is not obtained, the trustees are to retain the new issue, the result being that the new issue will not be placed on the market. It does not affect the question of the security of the first bondholders; but it does prevent the company taking so much of the second bond issue and selling it. If the company have chosen to agree to that, or the Government have chosen to impose these terms, while it looks like a scheme of substitution, I do not think my hon. friend will pledge his reputation as a lawyer to the proposition that it does in any way affect the security of the first bonds. If it did, I would quite agree with him that we should do nothing to affect in the slightest degree the position of the public creditor.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not make any distinction between my opinion as a lawyer, as a member of Parliament or as a man. I think this scheme is a scheme of substitutionary security. I think it quite possible that a critical examination of this second clause may indicate that the words are not quite strong enough to enable the company to do what the Government give them power to do, to grant first mortgage bonds to the detriment of the existing bondholders; but the scheme is such, and the Minister of Finance acknowledged that that was the intention.

Mr. McLELAN. I did not acknowledge that it was the intention to weaken the security of any man, and we believe that the resolution does not do so.

Mr. BLAKE. That declaration from the hon. gentleman removes all difficulty, because all we have to do now is to make it secure by an express declaration that nothing in this is to affect the rights of the outstanding bondholders, but this clause as it stands does not make that clear.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I am face to face with this question personally, because the moment I go home, I shall be met with the question from one of these bondholders, a lady friend, whether this proposition affects the value of the bonds held by her. The investment was made in these bonds because they ran for forty years, and the first question I shall be asked will be, is it desirable that she should give up these bonds or not. If these $3,000,000 of bonds are exchanged for the bonds now proposed to be issued to the extent of $2,000,000, or if the bondholders do not choose to do that, what will the result be? But if they rank in their own original position, then I say every dollar of the bonds you cancel makes their security better, and I shall be in a position to advise my lady friend to hold on to her bonds; but if they are only to rank with these securities you are now proposing to issue, I shall be compelled to say to her, I think you had better take your money and do something else with it. I should like to know from the Finance Minister absolutely whether they retain their position, whether the old bonds take precedence of the new issue, or whether the new ones shall be equal to the old ones.

Mr. McLELAN. I may repeat that we do not intend to weaken the security of any person who has invested in the present land grant bonds, and if the language of the resolution be not sufficient to bear that construction, it can be amended so as to make that certain. Nor do we propose to diminish or increase the security that any person who has invested in these land grant bonds shall have.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). My own impression, on reading the resolution, was that their security would be to a certain extent impaired.

Mr. BLAKE. I think, on further consideration, the hon. gentleman will find that the effect of this resolution will not be either to increase or diminish the security of the present land grant bondholders. I think it will be found to have one or other effect.

Mr. McLELAN. We do not propose to cancel $9,000,000 of land grant bonds and let the $3,000,000 remain on the same security.

Mr. BLAKE. Then you do propose to alter the contract?

Mr. McLELAN. No, we propose to leave the security the same.

On resolution 5, paragraph 2,

Mr. BLAKE. That proviso is a modification of the agreement.

Mr. McLELAN. When that was put in, it was uncertain whether the agents on the other side would agree to issue the bonds before the Act was passed or not; but it was found afterwards that they consented to the issue and the money has been raised.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the proviso is not necessary now.

Mr. McLELAN. In practice it might not be necessary, but it was put in for that reason, that they might not be paid exactly on the 1st of May, but that the time might be extended.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The whole is to be paid by the 1st of July.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

On paragraph (*b.*),

Mr. BLAKE. This hardly bears out the brief explanation the hon. Minister gave of the purpose of the Government in making this modification, because instead of embracing the mortgage on this branch in the general mortgage, it is proposed to make it a specific mortgage on the branch line; yet while it is to be a mortgage on the branch and extension line, the proceeds, instead of being devoted to the completion of the Algoma branch, may be used for other purposes. I may point out another difficulty which arises in this clause. We have created a mortgage for $35,000,000, in favor of the public, which covers rolling stock and tolls and revenues, but this clause seems to give the contractors the power of allocating a certain portion of the stock and defining what they believe are the tolls and revenues of the branch line given as securities for the mortgage. They ought to have no power to take a portion of the stock, and say: This stock is applicable to the branch and another portion to the main line; nor ought they to have any power to define, adversely to the mortgagees of the other parts of the system, what are the revenues which are proper to be allocated to the branch line as distinguished from the general system. The mortgagees of the main line have a direct interest in ascertain

ing what proportion of the tolls and revenues of the main system shall be allocated to the branch.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman has stated we are going further in relation to the mortgage upon the Algoma branch than we went last year. We had last year a greater interest in limiting the proceeds of the mortgage than we have at present. We had a better right to control it. It was part of our security, and we agreed we should give up the security, provided the company mortgaged it for the purpose of completing the branch; but at present, when they have paid us our debtedness, we have not the same right to dictate to the company that they shall make only mortgages for the extension of the Algoma branch, although it is intended that shall be the purpose.

Mr. DAWSON. I think the resolution provides as strongly as language can for the construction of the Algoma branch. The words are:

May issue mortgage bonds secured upon the branch of the said railway known as the Algoma branch, constructed and to be hereafter constructed, completing the connection between the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the River Ste. Marie."

There can be no doubt that it is the intention to build the Algoma branch, and that this resolution ensures the construction of that line. What value would a mortgage on that branch be if it were not to be completed? Who would advance anything by mortgage on a branch which is only partly completed, and can be of no value until it is? I am very glad to see this resolution, because this branch, when completed, will add an immense deal to the Canadian Pacific Railway, connecting it with American lines at Sault Ste. Marie, and bringing the traffic of a great portion of the Western States through by that direction, and above all bringing a great deal of traffic over the line to Montreal. It will complete the system of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and be of vast advantage to the district I have the honor to represent. I can see nothing in the resolution to give occasion for the slightest doubt that the line will be completed. It is put as clear as words can put it, that the money raised on the mortgage on that line is to be applied to the construction and completion of the Algoma branch.

Mr. BLAKE. All I can say is that the hon. member for Algoma has heard the Minister of Finance declare it is not proposed to limit the company in that way, that there was a reason for doing so last year, but that now, as they are going to pay us off in full, we have no longer right to limit them. The hon. gentleman's faith in the interpretation of the clause is stronger than his confidence in the Minister. The hon. Minister has not answered the question as to the power given the company to deal with the rolling stock and with the revenues?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it is important, and I am quite sure the hon. member for Algoma will agree with me, that there should be no doubt about it. If the language of the clause is not sufficiently definite, it ought to be made definite, so that the proceeds of the mortgage should be applied to the equipment of the branch and its completion,

Mr. McLELAN. The company had no objections to that being stated. I do not see we have a right to demand that, but the company is perfectly willing that it should be embodied in the resolutions and expressed in the Bill. The object in taking power to mortgage that was for the extension of it, but I stated some time ago that I did not think we had the right to compel them to expend the money for the extension of it, but they were willing to do it, and, if it is any satisfaction to my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson), that it should be expressed more clearly in the Bill than it is here, it will be done.

Mr. DAWSON. I think it would be more satisfactory that it should be done. It is quite strong now, but, as the hon. Minister suggests, I think it would be well to have it stronger.

Mr. BLAKE. I have twice appealed to the Minister with reference to the rolling stock and tolls.

Mr. McLELAN. It says: "And such rolling stock and plant appertaining thereto." That is, as much as may be fairly provided for the branch. The holders of the $35,000,000 have already a lien upon the rolling stock and plant appertaining to the main line, and the company cannot mortgage it again for the Algoma branch.

Mr. BLAKE. And about the tolls and revenues?

Mr. McLELAN. They cannot mortgage the tolls of the main line for the Algoma Branch, but only the tolls and the rolling stock of the branch.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will perceive in a moment, I think, that, when the Algoma branch is to be worked by the same company that is working the main line, it is a simple question, unless some protecting clause is inserted, what proportion of tolls they choose to allocate to that line, and what proportion of their traffic they appropriate to the Algoma branch. They may starve the Algoma branch for the benefit of the main, or they may starve the main for the benefit of the Algoma branch, by a simple, easy, and not at all unknown process of bookkeeping. If the hon. gentleman will look at the course the two great American Pacific roads have taken, their course as to the administration of the branches as compared with the main line, and the amount of traffic they have put on the branches as compared with the main lines, he will understand what I mean. Having already created a mortgage on the main line for $35,000,000, it ought not to be put into the hands of the directors, as this proposes to put it, to arrange their traffic for the benefit of the branch.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is not my hon. friend a little hypercritical? Does he not see that it is clearly provided "without interfering with the rights of the holders of other securities of the company?"

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. Pardon me, it does, and further it says, "such by-laws to be submitted for approval to the Governor in Council." I do not know what more could be done. It is provided that this mortgage is to be upon the tolls, revenue, equipment and so on, without interfering with the rights of the holders of other securities, and that the by-laws are to be submitted to the Governor in Council for approval. Of course, when we come to deal with the Bill, we can take care, if it is necessary, that the other creditors are not interfered with, but, I think, in a resolution like this, the provision is quite sufficient.

Mr. DAWSON. To return to the Algoma branch, I think it would be well if the words suggested by the hon. gentleman were put in. There is nothing like making assurance doubly sure.

Resolution ordered to be reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 30th April, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 121) to regulate the employment of children, young persons and women, in the workshops, mills and factories of the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Bergin.)

PROTECTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 96) respecting the protection of navigable waters.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there no explanation ?

Mr. FOSTER. In introducing the Bill, I think I explained it pretty fully. It is an adaptation of the present law, with some changes in the verbiage and some new sections. In section 2 there is an addition, which makes it necessary for the owner of the obstruction, whatever it may be, when it shall have sunk, or is lying ashore or grounded, to place on it by day a signal, and a light at night, so that ships may avoid it. Section 3 is new, and provides that in case the owner does not put a signal upon it by day or a light by night, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may be empowered to do so. In section 4 there is a provision which enables the Department to take the expenses incurred in placing and maintaining such signal or light out of the proceeds of the sale, if the obstruction has to be sold. Section 5 is the same as in the present law, with the exception that in case the wreck, when taken out by the Department and sold, does not bring sufficient to pay expenses, the Government is empowered to come upon the owner for such deficiency. At present the law does not give the Department that right. Section 7 is a remodelling of the old section with reference to throwing out mill refuse, sawdust and the like, into navigable waters. The change in the Bill is that navigable waters are taken instead of navigable streams. The old clause simply gave authority to prevent refuse being thrown into navigable streams; it did not give any authority to prevent the throwing of rubbish, sawmill refuse and the like, into other navigable waters than streams. A case has recently been tried in Ontario, in which our fishery inspector prosecuted a sawmill owner, I think it was for throwing rubbish and sawmill refuse into a little bay which is a very valuable fishing ground, the refuse being injurious to the fishing,as well as obstructing navigation by filling up the bay. It was decided that under the present law there was no authority for the fishery inspector to bring such a suit or obtain the penalty. That is the addition in section 7. Sub-section 2 of section 7 is the same as at present.

Mr. WELDON. The word "owner" should not be confined to registered owners, because the register does not necessarily show the ownership. With respect to the second section I would suggest that where an obstruction is caused in a navigable stream by the foundering of a vessel, the Department should at once place a light there and make payment of the cost obligatory on the owner. That course would be the better one, for otherwise serious injury might arise to a vessel, and the penalty recoverable is very small, $10 a day. With respect to the seventh section I think the provision covers streams not formerly provided for. But in the old Act it provides ,that no refuse shall be thrown into any river or stream, whether above or below the navigable point. The hon. gentleman has omitted those words in this section, and I would suggest whether it is not advisable to continue them. The words now proposed in regard to a stream are "any part of which is navigable;" and that might not cover a part that is not navigable. With respect to the third sub-section, that is the same as the last Act. I question very much whether any person acquainted with the streams of New Brunswick, and the great obstructions in them, is not of the opinion that any stream should be exempted. I do not see any advantage to be gained by allowing parties to throw mill refuse or rubbish into any stream. It may not cause injury for a time, but it will eventually. Therefore I would like to see a law framed so that no stream would be exempted from the operation of the Act.

Mr. COOK. I understand the Ottawa River is exempt from the seventh clause. The case referred to by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was that of Campbell & Co., on Georgian Bay, who were prosecuted by the fishery inspector once, twice or thrice. There was a hardship in that case. The Messrs. Campbell have a mill on a waterfall. The fish cannot get beyond the mill, and the water below the fall is an arm of the lake. The lumber is thrown from the mill on scows; it is taken down the arm of the lake for some distance and is dried previous to shipment. I think this case is a pretty hard one. I have no sympathy with Mr. Campbell politically—in fact, he is one of the hon. gentleman's political friends—but in that case there was a good deal of animus shown by the fishery inspector. The same state of things might exist on different waters on Georgian Bay. Most of the mills are on inlets, where there is some protection from the lake, and it is impossible to build and operate a mill, particularly a water mill, without depositing some refuse in the water, and if the fishery inspector has a grudge against the mill owner he can give him any amount of trouble. Mr. Campbell was talking the other day to me and asked me to draw the attention of Ministers to these facts. He said he did not think they quite understood the position of mills in that part of the country, and a great deal of hardship would ensue if the Act was carried out, and therefore it should be well considered. I think it is a matter which should be well considered. For instance, not only is a great deal of damage done to the fish and to navigation by this sawdust and refuse being thrown into these waters, but it is well known that the sawdust sinks to the bottom, gas accumulates in it and explosions take place, by which boats are sometimes wrecked. If the Government are going to legislate on this subject at all, they should not legislate in the interests of the strong and the powerful—the men who have political influence. Such men are generally able to protect themselves, and the Government should rather legislate in the interests of the weak, than exempt certain portions of the community from the operations of the Act simply because they possess a little more political influence than others. I hope the Minister will enter into the matter more carefully before legislating in this way, and I hope that he will deal fairly by all classes of the community.

Mr. GILLMOR. I think it is a wise provision that the Governor in Council should, under certain circumstances, regulate this matter, and I do not see how it can be done in any other way. Of course the fishing interest is important, but the lumber interest is also important. I differ entirely from my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon), because there are many streams upon which mills are erected where investigation would show that it is not of importance to the fishing interest that the sawdust and other refuse should be kept out of them. As a rule it is better for streams and harbors that it should be kept out, but there are others where it does not injuriously affect the fish, and some in which there are no fish. I am under the impression that it does not injuriously affect the fish here

in the Ottawa River. Many of the old styles of water mills are so constructed that it would be quite impossible for them to take care of this sawdust, and though, of course, the public interest may require in certain cases that they should reconstruct the mills, that is something which should not be done without enquiry by the proper officials under the Governor in Council. I think, therefore, it is in the public interest that the Government should have power to look into the circumstances of each locality, and ascertain how far the fishing interests may be injured by the refuse from these mills, before ordering that they should be taken down and new ones erected.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me that the Minister proposes by the seventh section of this Act to go a great deal beyond the jurisdiction of this Parliament. The fish and the fisheries of Canada are under the control of the Government and the Parliament of Canada, so long as they are within their jurisdiction. They may make such regulations as they see proper within their own jurisdiction, but fish, like wild animals, are not under the control of the Government, if they leave the coast of Canada and go to the coast of the United States. The hon. gentleman should not follow the wise legislator who declared that they were British fish; and so, too, when these fish go out of the waters that are under the immediate control of the Government of Canada into waters that are under the control of the Provinces they are as much in foreign jurisdiction as if they had gone to the coasts of the United States. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes not merely to make regulations applicable to the waters of Canada, but to make regulations which are applicable to the waters of the Provinces. The hon. gentleman knows that there is a decision in the Supreme Court recognising the old common law rule of England that the fish belong to the Riparian proprietors, where the boundary is drawn in the middle of the stream, and in all streams not regarded as navigable streams. Those fisheries are not under the control of this Parliament. The Local Legislatures may make such regulations as they see proper with regard to them. For instance, the Government of Ontario have its own policy with regard to mills and mill sites. If they sell timber limits, the value of those timber limits and the amount which the Government receives for the sale of timber may depend on the regulations which they may choose to make or to allow for the regulation of the mills which are erected on those streams. Now, the hon. gentleman comes here with a Bill and says: "I am not going to recognise the policy of the Local Government within its own jurisdiction, and with reference to waters under its jurisdiction, but I am going to make the regulations; there is a remote possibility of injury, and I am going to legislate with reference to that remote possibility; I am going to extend my authority and the authority of Parliament for the purpose of more effectively carrying out my policy; I propose to extend that authority beyond the waters under the control of the Parliament of Canada, into the waters under the control of the various Provinces. That is the provision which the hon. gentleman proposes. Now, if the hon. gentleman proposed to make regulations with reference to the navigable waters of Canada, if he proposed to say that mills should be built in a certain way, and that sawdust and refuse should not be thrown into these nevigable streams, he would be acting within his authority; the question of policy alone would be before us for consideration. But by this clause he does not stop at that point He goes further, and proposes to regulate small streams which are not navigable, which are no more under the control of the hon. gentleman than the Crown Lands of the Provinces are under his control. The hon. gentleman could not say, for instance, that a man should not be allowed to cut down trees on his land and fall timber into those streams. It may be that the falling of certain kinds of timber might be injurious to these streams, for the purpose of the fish ascending them to deposit their spawn; yet the hon. gentleman could not say that a man engaged in clearing his land should not fall his timber into the stream, that he should not be at liberty to obstruct it; that he should not use his land as he pleased. He can no more do that than the Government at Washington can do it. The boundaries between the local and the Dominion authorities are as clearly defined as if they were landmarks made by international regulation, or by the surveyors' posts. They are marked out here by the British North America Act, and, under the provisions of that Act, it is clear the Local Legislatures may say whether timber should be fallen into streams or not—whether obstructions should be removed which may be an impediment to fish ascending the streams or not. All those regulations fall within the domain of another Government, and the authority must be exercised by another Government and Legislature. The hon. gentleman proposes not only to legislate for those waters which are under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, but for those waters which are beyond its jurisdiction. It is true that the policy the Local Governments may pursue with regard to non-navigable streams may not be favorable to the fisheries; it may be true that the policy pursued by our neighbors in Michigan may not be favorable to the fisheries that lie between the two countries; but that if we had power to legislate, we might legislate for the interests of both, is no reason why we should undertake to exercise that power. It is not a question of convenience or advantage, but a question of jurisdiction, and as such it is perfectly clear that the hon. gentleman proposes to do what he has no power to do. The question of policy is therefore excluded to a large degree, because it is hardly worth our while to discuss whether the proposal is wise or unwise if it lies beyond the limits of our jurisdiction. I, therefore, think that certain provisions of this clause should be struck out. If the hon. gentleman thinks there should be a change, he might communicate with the various Local Legislatures to obtain it, but we ought not to undertake to legislate on the subject here.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The question my hon. friend from Bothwell has raised is a very important one, and deserves very serious consideration. For my part, I desire that this Parliament should go as far as it legally and properly can in legislating to prevent sawdust being thrown into rivers and streams, and thereby destroying the fish in them, and seriously impeding navigation. In my own county and in other counties that I am familiar with, I have heard constant and reiterated complaints against the destruction of navigation and fish in rivers by saw millers throwing sawdust into them, when by the expenditure of a reasonable amount of money they could consume the sawdust or otherwise dispose of it. But I must confess that there is a great deal of force in the objection taken by the hon. member for Bothwell to this Bill, that it proposes to legislate on a matter beyond our jurisdiction. I think it is quite within our functions to declare that no sawdust shall be thrown into any navigable stream; but when we propose to legislate as to streams which flow into any navigable water, we clearly, to my mind, go beyond our jurisdiction. In doing that, we assume power to legislate for every little stream or creek on which there happens to be mill-power. I think the clause should be amended by striking out the words, "or which flows into any navigable water." While I should be glad that the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell should be taken, that there should be some communication with the local Governments with the view of obtaining some legislation as to streams and waters that are not navigable, I think we ought to confine our legislation to navigable waters only.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The difficulty in the Act as it formerly stood, so far as I understand, was that there was no provision preventing sawdust being thrown into water that was not a stream. In the case referred to by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) as the occasion of this clause, the mill was on the edge of a stream and also on the edge of the lake, and the space between the stream flowing into the waters of the Georgian Bay and the water of the bay itself is so slight that the fishery officer was not aware that the sawdust actually went into the Georgian Bay, and consequently the injunction was set aside. For that reason it was very evident than an alteration of the law was required, because it was just as mischievous, in the interest of navigation and fishing, to put sawdust into the inlet as into the stream that ran into the inlet.

Mr. COOK. No one uses that stream except the parties interested in the mill.

Mr. O'BRIEN. That may be but the hon. gentleman knows that the navigation of almost every harbor in the Georgian Bay has been affected for several years past by sawdust being thrown into the water. In the harbor of Parry Sound the depth of the water has been so reduced that a vessel that formerly took a full load at the wharves can now only take a partial load. That is the case in a number of other harbors; and although this provision may only affect persons owning mills at present, I do not know what right they have to make permanent obstructions in the water, which will be injuriously felt in the future. It does seem to me a curious thing that while mill owners on the rivers emptying into the Georgian Bay are compelled by law to do what most of them have done, erect extensive furnaces for sawdust, the owners of mills on the Ottawa river are permitted to throw their sawdust into the water without let or hindrance. Anyone who notices how this magnificent river is being destroyed through the operation of mill owners, must feel that this is really more than a local matter—must feel that it is a national injury. The great trouble with this legislation is that it is about 25 years too late. A great deal of mischief has been done, and I think it is the duty of the Department to prevent further mischief as far as possible by carrying out the law strictly. The fisheries have not only been injured and are being injured every day, but the navigation of the waters of Georgian Bay have been very seriously interfered with. If there is any question as to the wording of the clause, it can easily be amended, but the great thing is to make it criminal to put sawdust into a lake or inlet as well as into a stream.

Mr. ABBOTT. It seems to me that we are running some risk of frittering away the jurisdiction of this House almost infinitesimally. I understand that the object of this Bill is to prevent the filling up of rivers with sawdust. The question whether sawdust is to be put into a navigable water by being conveyed in a cart and put into it, or being carried to it in a small stream, does not seem to me to be important. It might as well be argued that we cannot say that sawdust shall not be carted to a navigable river, because we have no jurisdiction over the carts in the Provinces, as that we cannot prohibit it being conveyed thither by a small stream. The pretension that we cannot prohibit sawdust being put in a stream which flows into a navigable river would be as absurd as to say we could not prevent it being carted into a navigable river. We have jurisdiction sufficient to protect our navigable waters from injury, and we may as effectually prohibit the transmission of sawdust into navigable waters, by means of floating it down streams, as to prevent it being put in by means of an elevator or conductor in the sawmill or from a waggon on the road.

Mr. COCKBURN. I think the Bill is in the right direction, but it does not go far enough. It is desirable that a penalty should be inflicted for the obstruction of navigation, not only by this means, but also by means of floating logs, rafts and booms. In the west men have gone to great expense in building burners for the destruction of sawdust, thus preventing it floating into rivers to the injury of navigation and the destruction of fish as well. I hope when we go into committee that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will extend the clause to make it apply to cases of obstruction by booms, rafts and logs. The only remedy at present, the lawyers say, is to get out an injunction in Chancery to prevent the impeding of navigation from which private individuals have suffered to a great extent, or by civil action to recover damages; but that is not sufficient, and I hope a penalty will be provided in this Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. Whether the Bill goes far enough or too far, I beg to add my concurrence to what has been said by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott). The purpose of the Bill being to protect navigation, this Parliament has the right to legislate in respect to the tributary waters which are supposed to carry the obstruction into the navigable waters, and the right to legislate for that purpose can only be in this Parliament.

Mr. MILLS. Suppose that in ploughing a field, the wash of the field carries the sand and subsoil into the river, to the obstruction of navigation, would the Legislature have the right to determine how the field should be ploughed?

Mr. THOMPSON. Of course a very extreme case can be suggested.

Mr. MILLS. It is a practical case.

Mr. THOMPSON. As regards any matter even of purely police control, in respect of which there may be obstruction of navigation, this Parliament has undoubtedly the right to interfere with the civil rights, police matters and local regulations, provided it is in good faith, dealing with a subject which is within the control of this Parliament.

Mr. McCALLUM. We need only look at the Ottawa River to show the necessity for this Bill. As to sawdust running into navigable rivers, I have known it to float twenty miles and then collect into a harbor, and the Government is paying a large amount of money yearly to dredge sawdust out of our harbors. It accumulates with dirt, from time to time, sinks to the bottom, and there forms a bar. At Port Colborne, for instance, there are large banks of sawdust, and what happens there must happen elsewhere. The question is one of navigation rather than of the preservation of fish. A large expenditure would be saved, which is now made in keeping harbors clear, by preventing the emptying of sawdust or the floating of sawdust into navigable rivers, and we have a very good chance to show the good results of such a policy by commencing right away with the sawdust which is allowed to float into the Ottawa River.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is a subject which has occupied public attention for many years. When I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it was agitated a great deal, and steps were taken to try and prevent the evil. I am in entire accord with the hon. Minister in his efforts to get additional powers in relation to this matter. It is painful to see the way the Ottawa River is being destroyed, not only by sawdust, but by the slabs, refuse and bark thrown into it. The latter are quite as, if not more, injurious than the sawdust. When you reach Carillon or Grenville by steamer, in order to take the cars there, you will see, at either place, forty or fifty acres of sawdust banks, the accumulation of refuse from the Ottawa mills. That should be put a stop to. In other portions of the country it is not allowed to exist. Take one of our greatest lumbering and manufactur-

ing sections, that of Miramichi, from which I come, every mill owner there has his furnace for burning up sawdust and the refuse from his mills, and by that means we have kept them out of our rivers, and our navigation, such as it is, has been largely preserved by the regulations established by the Department for the purpose of preventing sawdust and refuse being thrown into the river. It is iniquitous the way in which the Ottawa River is being destroyed, and I am in entire accord with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his endeavor to get additional powers in this respect.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The hon. Minister of Justice has admitted he has no control whatever over unnavigable rivers, and yet, in order to bring in legislation, which I admit is a benefit to the country, he puts aside the control of the Provinces and legislates how these rivers will be controlled. I think there is no more right for him to legislate on unnavigable rivers flowing into the navigable ones than he would have if any river coming from the United States should enter into our navigable rivers, and bring sawdust, as it does in some of our rivers. I think that is a matter of arrangement between the Provincial bodies and the Federal one, and not of simple legislation by the Federal overpowering the Provincial rights. I think the objection taken by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Cameron) is good, and ought to be admitted.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew.) I am glad to see that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has reserved to himself the right of exempting from the provisions of this clause in cases where it may be deemed not against the public interest to allow sawdust to be conveyed into streams. Some reference has been made to the fact that sawdust is allowed to be conveyed into the Ottawa by mills in this vicinity. There are two sides to this question. There is the question of navigation, which is a very important one, and which ought to be paramount, but there is also the question of the interest of those people who have a very large amount of capital invested in the construction of sawmills, giving employment to a large number of persons, who would be subjected to enormous cost and great inconvenience, especially in a place like the city of Ottawa, in disposing of their sawdust in any other way than that in which it is now disposed of. This is not a new question. It engaged the attention of the Government of the hon. member for East York, when he was leader of the Government and Minister of Public Works, and, if I understand aright, a commission was appointed, either in 1876 or 1877, to enquire into the question of the obstruction of the Ottawa River by the depositing of this mill refuse, and, as the result of the investigations of that commission, the practice was allowed to be continued under certain conditions and restrictions—one of the conditions being that all the slabs and edgings had to be converted into small chips or pieces by machinery placed in the mills. It would be a great and serious inconvenience and a great loss to the laboring population of this locality, if the power were taken away from the Minister to exempt certain localities from the provisions of this Act, if, in the wisdom of the Governor in Council, it was deemed expedient and proper that those localities should be so exempted. It is quite true that there have been banks of sawdust formed in the Ottawa below the mills; but, as far as my observation has enabled me to judge, those banks have accumulated, not in the navigable portions of the stream, not in the deep water, but along the shores and in the eddies, and so they have not obstructed the navigation to any appreciable extent, though they show themselves in passing down the Ottawa. I venture to express the hope, and to concur with the opinion of the member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), that this portion of the Act shall not be expunged from it, but that the power shall be continued to the Governor in Council to make exemption where it is thought necessary to do so.

Mr. HILLIARD. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member who has last spoken. There are two sides to this question. There are rights which should be regarded to a certain extent. There are mills in operation which were built before the passage of the present Act, and when no provision was made for keeping the sawdust out, and which cannot keep it out. With respect to the mills in this city, I should like to have a suggestion from any member who has spoken of any plan to keep the sawdust out, short of rebuilding the mill from foundation to superstructure. Where there is direct action with the water wheel it is impossible to keep it out, and the mills on the Ottawa are built on that plan, and it is impossible to keep it out without raising the water wheel, and even then I do not see how it is to be done. The result would be to put certain mills to an expense altogether inadequate to the damage done. With respect to the damage on the Ottawa River, I find, from a report of Mr. Mathers, who was appointed by the Government, in 1873 or 1874 to investigate the matter, that the damage was not done on the Ottawa by the sawdust alone going in, but in the early history of the lumbering interests of this country by the unwarrantable practice of throwing slabs and edgings in, which formed a network which caught this sawdust, but after the mills ceased to put in whole slabs and edgings the damage was almost completely neutralised. While I agree that something should be done as far as possible to prevent this thing, at the same time the interests of the mills, which were built without any regard to the keeping out of sawdust, and when it was not compulsory to keep it out, should be protected. If this Act were enforced in its entirety, it would be tantamount to closing down these mills. Is it right that these people, who have invested in good faith, should lose their investment? In regard to another point, I think there is one part of the Bill which should be amended somewhat, the clause referred to by the member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), prohibiting the throwing of sawdust, etc., into rivers, streams or other waters, any part of which is navigable or which flow into navigable waters. I venture to say we have not a rivulet in the Province of Ontario that does not flow into a navigable water. I think that should be modified, and certainly there should be some provision made for the protection of vested rights.

Mr. KAULBACH. The proposal of the Minister of Marine is a step in the right direction, the object being to protect the navigable waters of rivers, but, while protecting the navigable waters of rivers, it interferes very largely with mills already erected on the tributaries of these rivers. I find that to be the case on a certain river in the county that I represent. The injury done to the navigable waters of that river is simply from mills erected immediately on the river or a short distance up the stream. The smaller mills remote from navigable waters cause no injury whatever. I feel satisfied that some effort should be made by the Minister to avoid causing inconvenience to the small mill owners which they might sustain by the enforcement of this Act. To enforce the law upon these small mill owners who have already erected their mills, and find it a great inconvenience to arrange a different machinery in order to consume sawdust, would be a hardship for them. If the Minister could in any way arrange so that the overseer of fisheries might protect the small mill owners from injury, I would support the Bill cheerfully.

Mr. VAIL. The question raised by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is a very important one, and if he is right, then all our legislation in regard to this matter has been wrong. I understand him to say that the Dominion of Canada has no authority to interfere with

waters above high-water mark, as concerns putting anything in the stream. Without arguing that point, I wish to say that if Parliament has not that authority it ought to have it; it ought to have the power to take all necessary measures to protect the fisheries, which are so important an industry in this country. The object of the Bill is to make the law more stringent, and I understand the effect of the change will be that no mill owner on any stream can deposit sawdust or anything of that kind in a river, because every mill erected on any navigable river in Canada, impedes it to some extent, and therefore the Bill gives the Minister power to prevent sawdust being put into any navigable stream. Now that, I think, is going a little beyond what is necessary for the protection of the fisheries. I think the law was quite stringent enough before in that respect, but the trouble has been that the law has not been carried out. I have found often that mill owners point to the Ottawa River opposite this city, which is a navigable river, and they say that if the Government, within sight of the Parliament Buildings of Canada, allow the law, as it was originally intended, to be set aside, they see no reason why they should be bound to obey the law. It is clear that you have made one law for the rich, and for the people who have invested largely in mills on the Ottawa, and you have made another law for the poor people who have small mills, and who would be put to great inconvenience if they were obliged to burn their sawdust and edgings coming from the mills. I am rather opposed to the last clause, and I think this law would be much more effective if it did not give this power to the Dominion Government to exempt any stream from its operation. If the law is good, it is good for everybody, and if it is bad, it ought not to be on the Statute book. I am in favor of doing away with this clause which gives the Government power to exempt any stream; then there would be no difficulty in carrying out the law, and no one would be in a position to say that he ought not to be bound by a law that was violated within sight of the Parliament Buildings.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section *b*,

Mr. WELDON. I suggested to the Minister the doubt whether it was well to make the expression "owner" mean the registered owner, because the real owner may not be the registered owner. Frequently vessels are passed into the hands of other persons and are registered in their name for various reasons—as security for a mortgage, for instance.

Mr. FOSTER. It is placed in the Act to meet difficulties that have arisen. There was the case of a steamer wrecked in the River St. Lawrence above Quebec. It was impossible to get at the registered owner, and the result was that the Department was put to an expense of some $7,000 in order to raise the wreck. It is thought that the registered owner, in the majority of cases, will be the more responsible man.

On section 2,

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend from St John suggested that it might be better for the Department to take authority to place the light at once. That is very well from one point of view, but it often happens that the owners would rather place the light themselves, thinking that they could do it more cheaply. I have a case in my mind now of a small vessel wrecked in the western part of Ontario, where the Department placed a light and kept it for a number of weeks. When the charge was made the owner objected to it, saying that he could have put a light there for some dollars per day less. This gives the option to the owner to do it himself, if he prefers, and of using the lights or small boats he may have.

Mr. COCKBURN. Can the Minister do anything with respect to other obstructions, such as rafts and booms?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that anything that sinks, or lies ashore, or grounds, is taken under this Act. I think we have an Act outside of this that relates to slides, booms and dams, which is carried out by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Public Works conjointly; but anything that proves an obstruction to navigation in that way is covered.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I do not think the Act to which the Minister refers, as giving the Government control over the interruption of navigable streams by rafts and logs, goes far enough; the machinery is too slow and tedious, practically, to remedy the grievance often suffered. A suit was brought some few years ago by the owner of a steamboat against a man who was bringing a large raft of logs down a river in my constituency, and who for about six weeks kept the logs in a boom, completely obstructing the navigation for about three-quarters of a mile, so that the steamboat owner could not get up to the people of the village, and the public were inconvenienced by having to drive or walk three-quarters of a mile down the stream to a very uncomfortable place for embarkation and debarkation. The people suffered inconvenience and the steamboat owner suffered loss. An action was brought and the right of the steamboat owner and the public to navigate the river was established; but it turned out afterwards, when the Government sought to deal with the matter, that the only direction in which they had power was to order that certain booms be placed so as to keep the logs within certain limits and leave navigation open. While that was all very well as a remedy for the future, it was useless as a remedy for the present; and the question is, whether the Government ought not to have power, when a person drives a raft of logs so that he will necessarily impede navigation, to interfere in some summary mode and prevent him, which I do not think at present the Government have the power to do. Persons who drive those logs, moreover, are usually responsible men, foremen for lumbermen and raftsmen, and they do the work by contract. The owner of the logs is not answerable, and any person bringing a civil action does so against men from whom he can recover nothing, and the party with a grievance simply goes to the Government and asks them that hereafter a boom shall be placed in such a way as to prevent a recurrence of the trouble. If the Government had power to interfere summarily and prevent the obstruction of navigation, and some provisions were inserted in the Act of a similar character to those dealing with wrecks, the case would be met. I was not aware that the question was coming up to-day, but I throw out these suggestions to the Minister in order that he may be impressed with the necessity of extending the powers of the Government in the way of preventing, and immediately preventing, by some summary process, such troubles, instead of leaving persons aggrieved, as they are now, to recourse by civil action, and to see other persons at a future time relieved from the inconvenience which they themselves had to redress. If the Minister looks into the subject he will find that the Government have not clothed themselves with sufficient power to meet the grievances to which I have referred.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is quite true. I do not think the Act has reference to that point. I suppose in few instances rafting takes place on navigable streams, but the driving of logs is on streams not navigable, and it is a

difficult matter to interfere in any way with the timber or logs which are being taken down. I quite understand that in some cases it might be very prejudicial to navigation.

Mr. COCKBURN. There have been cases where whole rivers have been boomed from shore to shore, and it is a very dangerous thing to open one of such booms or to cut a boom. I remember a man had a narrow escape from going to the penitentiary, although the village was blocked for several weeks. Of course there was recourse to civil damages, but it is difficult to obtain them. Such action should be made a misdemeanor, as well as the parties aggrieved having recourse to civil action.

Mr. COOK. In that case you will stop the lumbering business. In some cases it is impossible to do anything else than block small rivers, if a man is bringing down a large quantity of timber. In the case referred to in the county of Ontario, it could not be avoided. It must be remembered that over $22,000,000 revenue are derived from the lumbering industry. Are the Government going to stop a revenue of that kind for the sake of running two or three mud-boats up a river occasionally. I think that would not be very much in the interests of the country. As regards the driving of logs down rivers, I think the lumbermen as a rule facilitate the navigation of rivers. I do not believe the Government should attempt to cripple so important an industry.

Mr. COCKBURN. I was not referring to particular cases, for I am aware there are numerous cases throughout the country. There have been cases in a dozen constituencies. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) knows of a case in his county and others elsewhere. What I wish to bring before the House is the high-handed manner in which some lumbermen block navigation, to the injury of villages. I know an important village which was blockaded for two or three weeks, and that could have been avoided by dividing the river and booming it. Some remedy should be provided and some penalty imposed, besides leaving the party the right of obtaining civil damages in cases where the trouble could be avoided. There are undoubtedly some cases where the lumbermen must block streams for a short time. I fully realise the importance of the lumber trade as much as does the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook). In regard to mud-boats, the remark is not very complimentary to the navigation interests, and particularly when the hon. gentleman is himself a director of a line of fine steamers. If the hon. gentleman calls them mud-boats, we must expel him from the directorate.

Mr. HILLIARD. I think this is a matter of such importance that it should be referred to a committee, on which there should be some lumbermen, in order to consider the difficulties in framing legislation. In my section of the country we come into contact with steamboats navigating the waters, and the idea of dividing the channel with booms is a perfect absurdity. In my vicinity an endeavor is now being made to divide a stream for five miles, and the plan adopted is worse than useless. It will actually intercept both the navigation and the transportation of logs to a very serious extent. I am satisfied myself that the money is completely thrown away and that the booms and piers will have to be removed. This is a matter that requires a little consideration. There are points on many navigable streams where the logs cannot be controlled; they can be managed through the still water, but while they are passing rapids it is utterly impossible to control their action. Some plan should be arrived at by which both interests would be served. It would be unfair to say that the great lumbering interest should give way to the navigation interest. In many cases the navigation interest is a mere bagatelle, whereas the lumbering interest is of great importance. No doubt there are grievances in many quarters, and it is desirable, in order to overcome them, that there should be some plan adopted whereby the interest of both industries would be secured.

Mr. COCKBURN. My hon. friend from West Peterboro' (Mr. Hilliard) has misunderstood me, as what I meant was to divide the river at the mouth, the lumbermen taking one half and the steamboats the other. I did not propose to divide the river for five miles or so, nor did I object to floating logs. What I did object to was booms running from shore to shore. There are cases where the navigation men and the other parties interested have compromised the matter by arranging that the lumbermen and the owners of the booms may run time-about—for certain portions of days or night, but in some instances the lumbermen make the excuse that the action of the wind prevents their moving their logs, and thus navigation is closed sometimes for several days. Mention has been made here of the fishery overseer in connection with these rivers, and we might arrange matters in that way with reference to navigation, the Government holding the balance between the lumbermen and the vessel owners and seeing that each should get fair play.

Mr. HILLIARD. I agree with my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Cockburn) that both should have fair play, but I want that one should have as fair play as the other. The difficulty arises from the fact a lot of logs may be kept in one position for three or four days at a time owing to the pressure of the wind—the wind driving them together in spite of the efforts of the men in charge. In these cases they are not under the control of the lumbermen, and the lumbermen should not be held responsible for the action of the elements. These are matters which should be fully considered in the making of these regulations, and I believe that the idea of dividing the stream, even in comparatively still water, would be an utter failure, as the action of the wind on those large masses of logs would frequently stop them completely in their course. For these reasons I think the matter should be referred to a committee in which there should be some practical lumbermen who have had experience in driving logs.

Mr. COOK. I quite agree with my hon. friend from West Peterboro' (Mr. Hilliard) that it would be an unfortunate thing if decisions on matters of this kind should be arrived at by a fishery inspector, who may not know a saw log from——

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). From a sucker.

Mr. COOK. From a steamboat. I know some of these officers who are about as intelligent as that. I know some streams where the driving of logs is affected very much by the wind, as mentioned by the hon. member for West Peterboro' (Mr. Hilliard), and they sometimes remain in one place for weeks, to the serious loss of the owner, who has to keep his men all the time. The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cockburn), no doubt, refers very largely to the waters running into Lake Muskoka from Bracebridge. There was an arrangement made between the lumbermen and the steamboat company, which the lumbermen carried out as far as possible. They were allowed to get their logs over the slide at a certain time of the night, but when the wind arose there was a block, and for that the lumbermen were not to blame. I want to assure my hon. friend from Ontario that when I referred to mud-boats I did not refer to the magnificent line of steamers of which he is manager and of which I have the honor to be one of the directors, as I certainly would not disparage any company that I happened to be connected with. I had reference to some boats on Rice Lake, and some other waters I might mention.

Mr. FOSTER. I would point out that there is nothing in this clause with reference to rafts, and that unless some

hon. member proposes to move an amendment dealing with them, we are rather spending our time to no purpose in this discussion.

On section 7,

Mr. GIROUARD. In order to meet the objection raised by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), and also the observations made by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott), I move:

That the words "any river, stream, or other water, any part of which is navigable, or which flows into any navigable water," be struck out, and the following substituted therefor: "Any navigable river, stream, or other water, whereby the same is carried into any navigable water."

The purport of this amendment is, that whenever the saw-dust is thrown into any non-navigable water, and is carried into a navigable water, it shall be an offence.

Mr. WELDON. I hope the clause will be allowed to stand as it is. I am satisfied that the power rests entirely with this Parliament. I do not think the objection raised by the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for Victoria has any force. The Supreme Court decided merely the question of the right of riparian proprietors with regard to non-navigable streams. The property in the right to the fisheries was extended to the owners of the land, and therefore the power of dealing with this property was not vested in the Parliament of Canada, but the power of this Parliament to regulate the fisheries was never interfered with. The court held that this power was given the Parliament of Canada, and everything is incident to that, among other things the protection of fish. This is a power that can be exercised by this Parliament, and is entirely within its jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLS. I have listened to the observations of my hon. friend and others who have taken a different view from that which I have expressed, but I am still of opinion this clause is *ultra vires*. While we have the right to legislate for the protection of our fisheries to a reasonable extent, we have not the right to legislate in a way that practically interferes with the expressed powers reserved to the exclusive jurisdiction of the local Parliament. In the decision, in the Queen against Robertson, Mr. Justice Strong said:

"Under this provision Parliament may enact laws for regulating and restricting the right of fishing in the waters belonging to the Dominion, such as public harbors, the beds of which have been lately determined by this court to be vested in the Crown in right of the Dominion, and also for regulating the public inland fisheries of the Dominion, such as those of the great lakes, and possibly also those of navigable non-tidal rivers. There is, therefore, no unreasonable restriction of the power of Parliament in construing the twelfth sub-section as I do."

He further observes:

"These fisheries, although often in practice not conserved by the Provinces, are certainly not public fisheries open of common rights to all who may choose to avail themselves of them, as is the case with regard to the fisheries in tidal waters and the great lakes; but the Provincial Government may, without special legislation, and in exercise of their rights of property, restrict their use in any manner which may seem expedient, just as freely as private owners might do."

I pointed out the logical inference that would be drawn from the observations of the Minister of Justice. He took the position, that if sawdust which might fall into a non-navigable river or stream, no matter how remote, was ultimately carried down the stream in such a way as to impair its navigation, this Parliament would have the right to legislate in such a way as to regulate those streams, and it might be for the purpose of enabling fish to ascend those non-navigable streams to the same extent as it might be for the purpose of navigation. I put this extreme case. I pointed out that in some of our western rivers which flow through alluvial countries, there are a hundred thousand cubic yards of earth carried down and deposited in navigable rivers. Take, for instance, the "Thames." Every few years it has to be dredged for the purpose of removing the bar thus formed at the mouth of the river. If the hon. gentleman can legislate on non-navigable streams for the purpose of protecting the fisheries or navigation, he might on the same grounds control the cultivation of lands along the banks of the River Thames or of any other river that flows through an alluvial country. There is no difference between the obstruction of navigation by the deposit of mud and its obstruction by the deposit of sawdust. Look at the facts Here, in the Province of Ontario, and I daresay the same is true of New Brunswick, there are hundreds of non-navigable streams flowing through well wooded districts. The Local Government authorise the construction of dams to deepen the water, so that the streams may be made floatable for logs. Can the Government here declare at any time that no timber shall be carried down those streams, but that they shall be kept open? Can the Government declare that no timber shall be floated down those streams because that would interfere with the fish reaching their spawning grounds? If the hon. gentleman is right, it would be in the power of this Parliament to legislate in such a way as to interfere with the lumber trade in every lumber district in the Dominion. I say this Parliament has not the right to so legislate, I say that nothing is more clearly set out than the right of the Provinces to legislate with regard to property and civil rights. Property in non navigable streams is absolutely under the jurisdiction of the Provinces, and the Parliament of this Dominion must exercise its legislative authority in such a way as not to interfere with the authority conferred upon the Provincial Legislatures. Each one is in the enjoyment of liberty, and has the right to exercise it in a way perfectly consistent with the liberty of another, but he has not in the assertion of his right to liberty and freedom the right to impair or interfere with the liberty and freedom of others. The rule is the same with regard to jurisdiction. We have certain powers and the Local Legislatures have certain powers, and we cannot exercise our powers in such a way as to impair or interfere with the powers of the Local Legislatures. There is no paramount authority vested in this Parliament. Its power to legislate is derived from the British North America Act, and the Provinces derive their power from the same high source. The one is as sovereign in its sphere as the other. When the hon. gentleman proposes to provide that:

No owner or tenant of any saw mill, or any workman therein or other person, shall throw or cause to be thrown, or suffer or permit to be thrown, any saw-dust, edgings, slabs, bark or rubbish of any description whatever, into any river, stream or other water, any part of which is navigable, or which flows into any navigable water.

He is going beyond his power. Take this case: Here are numerous streams in which logs are put for the purpose of being floated to mills, they are carried hundreds of miles, and may not reach the mills in the same season. The bark is all knocked off by the time they get to the mills, and if the hon. gentleman is right, this Parliament might say that the bark from those logs is as injurious as saw-dust to the use of those rivers as fisheries, and enact that no log shall be put into any non-navigable stream lest the bark may be deposited and interfere with the use of those streams as fisheries or lest it may ultimately be carried down to navigable waters, and may seriously interfere with or obstruct navigation. Where are you going to draw the line upon the theory you start out with? If you legislate with regard to saw-dust, you can legislate with regard to mud coming from the farmers' fields; you may legislate in regard to the bark taken off the logs. It is perfectly clear that the hon. gentleman lays down a rule, which gives to this Government the absolute property or control over the non-navigable streams or rivers of the country, and yet it is clear that the absolute property in these non-navigable streams is in the Crown as represented by the several Provinces. It is so

declared. The proprietors have only a fee, not the absolute property. The residue, after the fee is parted with, still rests in the Crown as represented by the various Provinces. I say the hon. gentleman does propose legislation which is here *ultra vires*. We have a right to legislate for the purpose of protecting the fisheries, but we must legislate in such a way as not to interfere with, to impair or to derogate from the rights of the Provinces of this Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not a lawyer, but I think I have a little bit of common sense left, and I do not understand at all how my friend who has just sat down found out or can establish the parallels he attempted to draw before this House. One of his parallels was, that if we have a right to stop a man from putting saw-dust into a stream which runs into navigable waters and thus becomes prejudicial to the fish or to navigation, we have just as much right to punish him if he cut down a tree on his own land which casts a shade on the water, if we could trace, that by the shade being taken away by the action of the man, there might be something prejudicial to the cultivation of the fish in that stream. His other parallel was even more absurd. A man owns a farm, he puts his plough into it, he ploughs his fields, the forces of nature operate, a large rainfall takes place, and the water goes down the gully carrying with it a certain amount of debris from the land the farmer ploughs, and that goes into the river. He makes this a parallel to the case of a man building a mill in or over a stream and of his own motion allowing the saw-dust to fall into the stream when it is perfectly competent for him to carry it off in some other way. The other is simply an operation of nature. If the hon. gentleman carries his logic so far, I must say that I cannot go with him. But he cut out the pegs from under himself a moment afterwards. He says: You may have the right to a certain liberty, but, if that interferes with or restricts the liberty of another, you have no right to go so far; you may have a certain privilege, but if that privilege restricts or interferes with the privileges of others, you must not exercise it. Let the gentleman, with his logical mind, apply this to the case in hand. If you are at liberty to build a saw mill just above where a stream is navigable, and if, for your own personal gains and ends, you cut up the logs, and, because of a little expense to you, allow the saw-dust to go into a navigable stream, where it interferes with the rights of all who are interested in the navigation of that stream, and with the fish that live in that stream, and with the people who use the fish, you are plainly, in exercising this liberty, interfering with the liberties and privileges of others. The hon. gentleman has thus cut the ground from under his own feet when he declared that he must not use his liberty if to any large extent he thereby interferes with the liberties of others. I may not know a cent's worth of constitutional law, but I have common sense enough to know that it is not a fair parallel.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman certainly has not paid very close attention to the observations I made.

Mr. FOSTER. I did.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to put a construction upon my words which I think they will not bear. I said nothing about the shadow of trees falling on a stream; I said nothing about a party not being at liberty to cut and take away the timber; but I say the authority which the hon. gentleman claims by this Bill to say that a party shall not build a mill or make saw-dust to fall into a non-navigable stream, however remote from one that is navigable, will also prevent him from cutting down timber which will fall into the stream. On the same ground he must not fall timber into a stream which will obstruct the fish. Is there any difference between obstructing by saw-dust and obstructing by a fallen tree?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. MILLS. There may be a physical difference, but there is certainly no legal difference in the obstruction, no matter how it is brought about. Then I pointed out that, if you cannot obstruct a non-navigable stream by saw-dust, neither may you obstruct it by putting in logs, of which the bark may come off before they are taken out. The hon. gentleman has only to go to anyone of the lumber mills and he will see thousands of logs without bark. They had bark when they were put into the stream in the first instance. Is there any difference between the obstruction by the deposit of bark and the obstruction by the deposit of saw-dust? If he has the power to legislate as he proposes, he has also the power to say that no logs shall be put into any of these streams; he may prohibit the use of these streams by the lumbermen, he has as much right to say a log shall not be put in as to say that no saw-dust shall fall in, the principle is the same. I put that extreme case for the purpose of showing that Parliament had not the power the hon. gentleman was claiming for it by this Bill. I say the control over these non-navigable streams, the property of which is vested in the riparian proprietors, belongs to the Local Government, and the hon. gentleman cannot ask Parliament properly, under the pretence of protecting navigation or of protecting the fisheries, to legislate so as to assume control over property which belongs to the Provinces.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says we have a right to legislate to a reasonable extent for the protection of the fish, but he objects to legislating to prevent the saw-dust being put into the rivers to poison the fish. Would we have a right to allow a manufacturer to put a poisonous acid or to empty lime into a stream?

Mr. AMYOT. That would be a crime.

Mr. McNEILL. It would be the natural result of his operations. It has been done in England in many cases.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not concur in the conclusion my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has arrived at. It seems to be clear that we must have this power. He says the Local Legislatures have control over property and civil rights. So they have, but their right is subject to the paramount right which is given to this Parliament where special subjects are relegated to it; and I think my learned friend will see that, if the subject of the sea coast and inland fisheries is expressly relegated to this Parliament by the sub-section of the 91st section, we have therefore the right to pass laws on this subject, and, if we interfere with civil rights in passing those laws, we do no more than we do in fifty other cases where the power is given to us to legislate upon certain matters, but in the exercise of our power we interfere with civil rights. He quoted some remarks made by Mr. Justice Strong in the case of the Queen *vs.* Robertson. I have looked at that case, and the decision of the Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Strong and other judges, clearly go to show that we have the power beyond all doubt. Justice Strong says in that case:

"I am of opinion, therefore, that the thirteenth enumeration of section 91, by the single expression 'inland fisheries,' conferred upon Parliament no power of taking away exclusive rights of fishery vested in the private proprietors of non-navigable rivers, and that such exclusive rights, being in every sense of the word 'property,' can only be interfered with by the Provincial Legislatures in exercise of the powers given them by the provision of section 92 before referred to. This does not by any means leave the sub-clause referred to in section 91 without effect, for it may well be considered as authorising Parliament to pass laws for the regulation and conservation of all fisheries, inland as well as sea coast, by enacting, for instance, that fish shall not be taken during particular seasons, in order that protection may be afforded whilst breeding; prohibiting obstructions in ascending rivers from the sea; preventing the undue destruction of fish by taking them in a peculiar manner, or with forbidden engines, and in many other ways providing for what may be called the police of the fisheries."

Now I think that phrase gives the key to the extent to which we may go, and where we may stop. If our regulations may properly be construed as in the nature of police regulations for the control of the fisheries, we are within our lines; if we go beyond that in extreme cases, then we may be going outside of our power. I will trouble the House with one observation of the learned Chief Justice in that case of the Queen *vs.* Robertson, which seems to me to be equally as strong. He says:

"Such being the state of matters at the time of the Confederation, I am of opinion that the legislation in regard to inland and sea fisheries contemplated by the British North America Act was not in reference to property and civil rights—that is to say, not as to the ownership of the beds of the rivers, or of the fisheries, or the rights of individuals therein but to subjects affecting the fisheries generally, tending to their regulations, protections and preservation, matters of a national and general concern and important to the public, such as to the forbidding fish to be taken at improper seasons in an improper manner, or with destructive instruments, laws with reference to the improvement and increase of the fisheries; in other words, all such general laws as enure as well to the benefit of the owners of the fisheries as to the public at large, who are interested in the fisheries as a source of national or provincial wealth; in other words, laws in relation to the fisheries, such as those which the Local Legislatures were, previously to, and at the time of Confederation, in the habit of enacting for their regulation, preservation and protection."

Now the observation made by the learned Chief Justice seems to meet that particular point. Then he goes on to use the following general words, which seem to me to be *à propos* of this discussion:—

"To all general laws passed by the Dominion of Canada regulating 'sea coast and inland fisheries' all must submit, but such law must not conflict or compete with the legislative power of the Local Legislatures over property and civil rights, beyond what may be necessary for legislating generally and effectually for the regulation, protection and preservation of the fisheries in the interests of the public at large."

Therefore we have clearly, according to Mr. Justice Strong's opinion, the right to legislate generally and effectually for the regulation, protection and preservation of the fisheries, and it seems to me that the clause before us is just such a regulation as may well come within the meaning of the phrase used by Justice Strong, as a police regulation.

Mr. MILLS. I certainly am not aware of there being any such thing as paramount authority in this Parliament. I understand that there is a division of power. There is exclusive jurisdiction on certain subjects vested in the Local Legislatures, and there is exclusive jurisdiction over certain other subjects vested in the Parliament of Canada. These are complementary of each other; but one is not paramount to the other. They stand upon a footing of perfect equality. There is one clause in the British North America Act relating to agriculture, providing that in certain specific and mentioned cases where the Parliament of Canada legislates, this legislation shall supersede that of the Provinces. That is the only case, but in every other case it is a question of jurisdiction, whether the power is vested in this Parliament or in the local legislatures. It is not possible for this Parliament to legislate in such a way as to obtain control over any subject that is within the exclusive jurisdiction of any of the Provinces. Take, for instance, the regulation of the fisheries. The hon. gentleman has read statements of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; I am not questioning the accuracy of the decision, I would not pretend to do so. There is no doubt that the Government of Canada declare that a certain season shall be a close season, but that is a wholly different thing to making a declaration that shall interfere with the right of any party. They do not take from the Local Legislature any right that the Local Legislature possesses. But if they go up a non-navigable stream and say that a dam shall not be put across that stream, or that no mill shall be built upon it, that the water shall not be deepened over a rapid for the purpose of floating logs, because by doing so they would obstruct the use of the stream as a spawning place for fish

—I say in doing that they are not merely making regulations under the authority of the British North America Act in reference to inland fisheries, but they are interfering with property that is exclusively vested in the local body. The authority of the Legislature here is not more specific, it is not more absolute over the subject of the inland fisheries, than that of the Province is over this subject of property that is specifically vested in the Local Legislature; and you can no more obliterate the authority of the Province over property, than you can obliterate the authority of this Legislature over the subject of the fisheries, by the extreme extension of that authority. Well, Sir, that is what the Government propose to do. I say that my hon. friend has not undertaken to answer my objection, that if for the purpose of protecting navigation, they may legislate in such a way as to declare that logs shall not be put into a stream, or that saw-dust shall not be put into a stream, because the bark of those logs may fall off and may obstruct navigation, or interfere with the ascension of fish in the river. Now I say that in making such a regulation they are going beyond the authority they have. It is perfectly true that were there no power conferred upon another Legislature, there would be no limitation, because there would be no boundary drawn, but whenever this Legislature, in the exercise of its authority, undertakes to encroach on the authority of another Legislature, then it is going beyond the powers conferred upon it by the British North America Act, and that is precisely what is done in this particular section.

Mr. WELDON. I think the language of Chief Justice Ritchie entirely confirms the opinion of my hon. friend alongside of me, where he says:

"While the Local Legislatures have no right to pass any laws interfering with the regulation and protection of the fisheries, as they might have passed before Confederation, they, in my opinion, clearly have a right to pass any laws affecting the property in those fisheries, or the transfer or transmission of such property, under the power conferred on them to deal with property and civil rights in the Province, inasmuch as such laws need have no connection or interference with the right of the Dominion Parliament to deal with the regulation and protection of the fisheries, a matter wholly separate and distinct from the properties in the fisheries, by which means the general jurisdiction over the fisheries is secured to the Parliament of the Dominion, whereby they are enabled to pass all laws necessary to their preservation and protection, this being the only matter of general public interest in which the whole Dominion is interested, in connection with river fisheries in fresh water, non-tidal rivers or streams such as that now being considered, while at the same time, exclusive jurisdiction over property and civil rights in such fisheries is preserved to the Provincial Legislature, thus satisfactorily, to my mind, reconciling the powers of both Legislatures, without infringing upon either."

It seems to me there was a clear, broad distinction pointed out, and this was the question argued in this case: That while the Dominion Parliament had no power to deal with the property of the fisheries, they had power to make necessary regulations for the preservation of the fisheries, which necessarily involves their protection, not only in navigable streams, but in non-navigable waters.

Mr. O'BRIEN. This discussion, interesting and valuable as it is, might as well have not taken place. The object of the alteration of this clause was not intended to affect the streams at all. There is no necessity whatever for it, because the Fishery Act gives the Government all the power requisite for the protection of fisheries in streams. This clause would answer all purposes if the latter words were left out, "falling into any navigable stream." That is not necessary to accomplish the object of the Bill; it is altogether apart from the question, apart from the constitutionality of it. The Minister would have all the power necessary if those words had never been inserted, because, as I have said, the Fishery Act gives power.

Mr. COCKBURN. I desire to make an explanation. Speaking in regard to obstructions placed in streams, the House would naturally be inclined to think that this is a question between steamboat men and lumbermen. I rose

to speak with an entirely different view. I had in my mind when I spoke the interests of the people who are affected. Trade is very often diverted owing to obstructions on a stream, and hardship is caused to settlers. I was speaking in my capacity as a representative of the people and not as a steamboat man, because steamboat owners can obtain protection and damages. I wish to make it distinctly understood that I spoke as a representative of the people.

Mr. COOK. I should like to address the Minister as to one point. I can tell him how to get over the difficulty as to the constitutional question very easily; it is by striking out entirely clause 7, for which there is no necessity whatever and which is not contained in the old Act. If this clause is to apply to bark, the running of logs will be entirely prevented. If there happens to be a crank of a fishing inspector on the river, and he has a grudge against any lumberman, he will have power to prevent that man getting his logs down the stream because some bark may fall into the water. There is no necessity whatever for this clause. I have no interest personally to serve in this matter of depositing refuse at the mill. All the mills I am connected with have large iron furnaces which consume all the refuse. Of course we cannot prevent the bark falling off saw logs coming down stream; and yet, if this clause is allowed to pass it will prevent lumbermen driving, unless they obtain the consent of the Government. I do not like that feature. The Dominion Government is not very favorably inclined to a man like myself who opposes them. There are many instances in my recollection where this Government has been very harsh with political opponents, and at the same time they have assisted their friends. I have in my mind's eye an incident which I am going to tell the House. Some few years ago a vessel ran into a bridge on the Welland Canal and damaged the bridge. The damages were estimated from $1,200 to $1,500. There was damage done to public works years and years before by vessels of the Richelieu Navigation Company, to the extent of $100,000. Yet because there was one man who was connected with this vesssel in question, who happened to be a Reformer and a somewhat prominent one in his way, he was compelled to pay the damage, although the vessels belonging to that company were allowed to go scot free. How are they going to do in this case? Suppose there was a man in the lumber trade who was opposed to them, what would they do? I have no more confidence in them when dealing with a case under this Bill than in the case I have mentioned. I might have some more confidence in the Minister of Marine because he is not so hardened in the sins and iniquities of the Tory party, as he has not been in it so long. I desire to say something about the fishery question on Georgian Bay. The only commercial fisheries of the lakes are those of whitefish and salmon trout. Those fish do not go up rivers to spawn, they spawn in the lake. The only fish that go up to spawn are black suckers and pike and pickerel. But suppose the fish in the rivers were killed it would not be a great injury to the country; if it would only kill suckers, pike and pickerel not much damage would be done. I know there are black bass, but they are caught by sportsmen and are not a commercial fish. There are also speckled trout. It is strange if the rivers are to be set apart for fishing at the expense of the lumber trade. The particular case that induced the Minister to introduce this clause was that of A. H. Campbell & Son. The hon. gentleman stated that case in his opening remarks. I think the Campbells were right. It is a rock-bound country where they are; no other persons go there but themselves; they own the property, and it cannot be any injury to any person except themselves if the navigation is obstructed. A hardship was done them, and I say so although Mr. Campbell is a political opponent and a respectable man, which cannot be said of many of the Tories in Ontario. It is not a very wise act to pass a clause to cover this one case.

Mr. FOSTER. The section was placed in the Bill before I heard anything of that case.

Mr. COOK. I had supposed that that was the reason the amendment was proposed. Mr. Campbell thinks so; he thinks it was drawn with the special purpose of meeting his case.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me say that in the last clause we have the same power given to the Governor in Council.

Mr. COOK. I do not want to give that power to the Government. They have too much power already; I do not believe in giving that power to twelve or thirteen men. If it is desirable, let it be put on the Statute-books and made law and not used in every shape and way. It may be used for political purposes by the Government. I know cases just as bad if not worse than this when power has been so used, and this House should not permit thirteen gentlemen to say what four and a half millions of people should do or what one man should do. The matter should not be left in the hands of the Governor in Council, that is where I take objection to the hon. gentleman's proposed legislation.

Mr. McMULLEN. After hearing the discussion on the question and the difference of opinion expressed, I think it would be a wise course to adopt for the hon. gentleman to send the Bill to Mr. Mowat, and no doubt he would set hon. gentlemen opposite right. That gentleman has taken considerable trouble during many years to set hon. gentlemen opposite right when they were wrong, and I think the wisest course for them to pursue would be to ask his opinion on the subject.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman has so little faith in the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) is rather inconsistent. He started out by saying that he had no personal interest in the matter, because he had a furnace in which he burned the refuse, but he says now that if this Bill interferes with respect to the rubbish off logs, he is interested in the matter. He went on to say that there was no need for protecting the fish in the streams or rivers; but, if that is so, why should we have an army of fish inspectors appointed by the late Government for the purpose of protecting those fish. He assumes that there are no fish of any value to be protected, but in my part of the country they are considered of great value. There are speckled trout in the streams all over that part of country, and we have inspectors there to prevent fishing in the close season, and also to prevent saw-dust or other destructive matter from being thrown into the stream. I think it would be an act of great folly to appoint men to discharge certain duties without putting a law on the Statute-book giving them authority to perform those duties. If this Parliament has not that authority, then we should discharge those men and not assign them duties which they have not authority to carry out.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. AMYOT. I think the amendment is an infringement of the rights of the Local Legislatures. It is evident from the 91st clause of the British North America Act that this Government has the right to control fisheries like those of the gulf, the sea fisheries or the large lake fisheries. But this Government has no right to interfere with the fisheries in non-navigable rivers.

The CHAIRMAN. I would just point out to the hon. gentleman that I declared the amendment lost. The clause is now before the committee.

Mr. AMYOT. I am against the clause too, for I defy any one to find a river in this country which does not flow into navigable water, and by the very words of this clause you take possession of the whole of the rivers of this country, and you assume power to legislate upon them. If that is not an infringement. I do not see how you can infringe in any case. You take possession of every river, small or great, navigable or non-navigable, and you say that on those rivers you shall not do certain things. If you have a right to say that with respect to the fish you have the right to say it with respect to anything else—the using of the waters for mills, for the carrying of timber, for the use of the soil near the water—you will have the right to deal with those rivers in any way whatever. When the Confederation was formed it was understood that each Province would settle those questions as to the non-navigable rivers. The reason is obvious. The Province of Quebec may not judge its interests in that point in the same way as the Provinces of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. It has been settled that the majority of each Province shall deal with those matters and when the majority of the Dominion Legislature deals with them, it is an infringement of the spirit of the Confederation, and it is our right as well as our duty to protest against the infringement. There might be a way to give this jurisdiction if you should say that the doing of such and such things was a crime or a misdemeanor. But when that part of our legislation was given to this Parliament defining of crimes and misdemeanors, it was understood that a certain discretion would be used, and I do not suppose that it has been found just or fair to decide that throwing saw-dust, &c., into rivers would amount to a crime. If the hon. Minister of Justice thinks it is a crime against good order, or against morals, or the high principles which govern society, let him say so, but up to the present it has been only a matter of municipal order and that is dealt with by the Local Government. I think that the Local Legislatures would be very glad to come to an understanding with this Government, and propose legislation which would be combined with our legislation here, in connection with non-navigable rivers, but in fairness to the Provinces and considering the importance of the principles which we have to lay down here, I would ask from the Minister of Justice, who I have reason to believe is animated by right motives and a fair interpretation of the law, to consider this clause a second time and not to press on this legislation without such consideration. It would expose us to the liability of having this clause declared illegal by the courts, which would not be very flattering to this House. I think we should respect the privileges of each Parliament. Let us legislate to protect the fisheries in navigable waters, and if we want legislation to protect them on other waters let us apply to the Local Legislatures, who I am sure will gladly do it.

Mr. THOMPSON. After what the hon. gentleman has said it is only courteous that I should again express the opinion I entertain on this subject, and that my learned friends on the other side have stated as fully and as forcibly as I possibly can. Admitting that the decisions and principles referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) go to the full extent that he seemed to argue, that is to say, that these non-navigable rivers and fisheries are private property, we clearly have the right to say that no man shall use his private property in such a way as to destroy navigation, and inasmuch as the protection of navigation and fisheries is vested in this Parliament, it is as clearly within our power to legislate in this direction as it would be to legislate that it would be a crime. It would be equally infringing the right of private property to declare it to be a misdemeanor, but since we are legislating for the purpose of effectually protecting navigation it seems to me to be no answer to say that we are to some extent invading what would otherwise be the private rights of property. I do not agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that the two spheres of jurisdiction are entirely distinct and exclusive. I think that in dealing with questions that are relegated to us we nearly always have, for the purpose of effectually legislating upon them, to infringe to some extent on matters within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. In criminal matters we deal with civil rights; so with bills of exchange, insurance and other matters of that kind. The principle is well established, as cited by my hon. friend opposite, that we have the right to do it for the purpose of legislating effectively on matters in which we have the power to legislate.

Mr. COOK. Will the Minister consent to strike out the word "bark" in this clause. Bark is not injurious to the fish, but it is the saw-dust which gets into their gills that injures them.

Mr. FOSTER. Don't bark.

Mr. McNEILL. This is not dealing with bark which falls off logs but only with that which is thrown into the streams.

Mr. COOK. Yes, I know.

Mr. McNEILL. I understood the hon. gentleman to speak of the danger and injury that would accrue to lumbermen by bark falling off the logs into the stream. This relates to bark thrown into the stream.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. Minister of Justice says we have a right to protect navigable streams; but he proposes to protect navigable streams by going into streams that are under the jurisdiction of another Legislature. If the hon. gentleman may do this, he may go further. Let me give an instance which I have seen myself. An artesian salt well is sunk; the water from it flows into a small stream or river, and destroys all the fish in it. Would the hon. gentleman under the pretence of regulating the fisheries, close up that salt well? If the hon. gentleman's contention is right, the assumption in the case of McLaren *vs.* Caldwell is all wrong. If the hon. gentleman is right, for the purpose of protecting a fishery that might not be worth $1,000, he would have a right to destroy a lumber trade that might be worth a million. I maintain that that is not a well founded contention.

Mr. THOMPSON. We may have the right, although it may be very improper to exercise it.

Mr. MILLS. Well, the hon. gentleman will admit that the right to say whether the stream shall or shall not be made navigable rests with the Local Legislature. Suppose that a Local Legislature, with the view of making a stream navigable, builds a dam across it, or constructs a canal around some rapid; it might, by so doing, absolutely destroy the usefulness of that stream as a fishery. The hon. gentleman assumes that it has not the power to do so, but that this Legislature at any time could remove the dam. I contend that in navigable waters this Parliament would have that right, and anything done by a Local Legislature could be superseded by the action of this Parliament; but within its own jurisdiction the right of the Local Legislature is paramount. We have discussed the question of fisheries, but this is not an Act relating to the fisheries; it is an Act for the protection of navigable streams, and for the purpose of protecting them he proposes to assume jurisdiction over non-navigable streams and to state how they

may be used. I contend that we have not the power to do so.

Committee rose and reported.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 70) respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Ross.)

STE. URSULE, MATTAWIN AND LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 74) to incorporate the Ste. Ursule, Mattawin and Lake Temiscamingue Railway Campany.—(Mr. Hurteau.)

Bill reported.

Mr. HURTEAU moved for third reading of the Bill.

Mr. DAWSON. Before the Bill is read the third time, I wish to make a few remarks. I think this is one of the most important Bills that have been put before the House this Session. The railway will pass through a country with which I am well acquainted, from along the Mattawin, a tributary of the St. Maurice, to the north of Lake St. Peter, thence to Lake Temiscamingue and then south-westerly until it joins the Pacific Railway at or near another Mattawan, a tributary of the upper Ottawa. This road will be a means of leading settlement to a very important country, where there is an immense deal of good land and good timber. It is very important to Lower Canada especially, that some way should be found to lead settlement into the interior, and this road will be the means of drawing settlement from the densely populated districts on the St. Lawrence away back to the interior, and opening a field for colonisation, thus preventing the people going to other lands to seek homes. If this road can be carried out, and I hope the promoters will be able to find the necessary capital, it will be one of the grandest and best schemes brought before the House this Session. I could not let this opportunity pass without expressing my opinion of the importance of this work and I hope its promoters will meet with every encouragement from the Government.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS—IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 105) to amend the Act to provide for the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company.—(Mr. Pope.)

Bill (No. 108) to amend the Adulteration Act.—(Mr. Costigan.)

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 109) in further amendment of the Weights and Measures Act of 1879.

Mr. WELDON. What is the object of this Bill?

Mr. COSTIGAN. When I moved the resolutions upon which this Bill is based, I gave explanations why this short Bill was introduced. I stated that it was to remove doubts as to whether the Governor in Council had power to determine what weights and balances should be verified, and what should not be verified. Dr. Wilson, the law clerk who prepares these Bills, gives it as his opinion that the Act does not really give the power. When I gave that explanation before to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr Blake), I stated that the Government had acted upon the supposition that it had the power since 1879. I might have gone further, and said it was the policy of the former Government from 1874, because I have looked up the Orders in Council passed since the Weights and Measures Act came into operation; and I find the same principle has been acted upon all through by both Governments. Here is an Order in Council passed in 1875, which declares:

"The following balances are to be admitted for verification:—(a) Balances having equal arms; (b) balances commonly known as steelyards or Roman balances having unequal arms; (c) weigh bridges."

Then the last paragraph in the regulations states that no other balances are to be stamped, thus taking power to exclude all others. This is a short clause to give the power which it was supposed the Act gave, but which the law clerk thinks it did not.

Mr. VAIL. Does that give you power to change from time to time?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, we have exercised that power constantly.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

INSURANCE AMENDMENTS.

Mr. THOMPSON, in moving the second reading of Bill (No 111) respecting insurance, said: The object of this Bill is principally to consolidate the laws with respect to insurance and to embody in those laws the amendments which were suggested by the revisors of the Statutes. Substantially the Bill before the House will be the Bill as printed in the dratt of the revisors. Two or three amendments are made which I do not think it necessary to discuss at this stage, because I propose that the Bill shall go before the Committee of Banking and Commerce for thorough investigation and explanation. I think that course will meet with the approbation of the House, and it has been desired by several gentlemen who are particularly interested in the subject of insurance and desire to have the amendment which they will propose, thoroughly considered.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

RELIEF OF THE TOWN OF COBOURG.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (page 866) for the relief of the corporation of the town of Cobourg. He said: The object of this resolution is to effect a settlement with the town of Cobourg. In 1850 the Port Hope and Rice Lake Road was sold to the corporation of the town of Cobourg for the sum of £4,600, interest at 5 per cent. to be paid annually, and the Cobourg harbor was also sold to them in May, 1850, for £4,000, at 6 per cent. interest until paid off. The interest fell in arrears, and in 1859 a re-arrangement was made for the principal and the accrued interest, and debentures were issued on account of the Port Hope and Rice Lake road for $23,587, and for the harbor, $21,210, making the amount of the whole indebtedness of the town of Cobourg, for the road and for the harbor, $44,798. In 1876-77 a proposition was made to construct a harbor of refuge at the port of Cobourg, and a grant was made by the Government for that purpose, the town of Cobourg contributing $25,000, which was paid in. The Government has continued the work at that harbor, and has made an expenditure altogether of $139,687, upon the consideration that it is a work of public importance, being the only harbor of refuge, with any considerable depth of water on

the whole coast between Kingston and Dalhousie, a distance of two or three hundred miles. The town of Cobourg view the expenditure upon the harbor as of a public character, and more beneficial to the public than the town itself, there being very little shipping owned in the port, I think something less than 1,000 tons, including schooners and small vessels. They have represented to us that if we will give them credit for the amount they contributed towards the construction of the harbor of refuge, they will pay off the balance of the indebtedness of $44,000; and to effect the settlement, feeling there is considerable justice in their claim, it is proposed to ask the House to pass this measure. Credit will be given for the amount they contributed, $25,507, and there will remain a balance of $19,270, which the town proposes to pay to the Government, and to receive the bonds now held by the Government from the town of Cobourg.

Mr. VAIL. I should like the Finance Minister to explain to the House the difference between the position of this harbor and the position of almost every breakwater in the Province of Nova Scotia. The breakwaters along the shores of our Province are of general advantage to Canada. They have been built largely by private means; in a great many instances the Government contributed a certain amount, in some instances nothing at all, and the Government have taken charge of the property. If it is the policy of the Government to refund the sums paid in Ontario, I think surely the Minister of Finance should be prepared to bring down a measure that would enable him to repay amounts to Nova Scotia and deal out the same even-handed justice to the Maritime Provinces as he proposes to do to Ontario in this particular instance. I can see no difference in the two cases. If the people of Ontario have contributed under the circumstances referred to, and the amount is to be refunded, in all justice the hon. gentleman should at all events make early enquiry as to what sum of money has been spent on public works in Nova Scotia, and be prepared to do equal justice to contributors to public works there.

Motion agreed to, and resolution concurred in.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 122) for the relief of the corporation of the town of Cobourg.

Bill read the first time.

COMMISSIONS TO PUBLIC OFFICERS.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved the second reading of Bill (No. 110) respecting commissions to public officers of Canada. He said: The Bill is only intended to enable the Government to issue commissions to a certain number of officers who do not at present receive them. Since Confederation two Departments have been created, and the custom which has been followed from time immemorial to issue commissions has not been followed in regard to certain officers in the Departments so created. For instance, collectors of Inland Revenue and inspectors of Inland Revenue do not receive commissions, while the corresponding officers in the Customs do. This Bill is to allow the Government to make regulations to issue commissions when it may be thought proper.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think this Bill is a satisfactory Bill, although it is upon the line of a great many Government measures. It provides that the Governor in Council shall declare to what parties commissions shall issue. This is practically placing the regulation of the matter in the hands of the Governor in Council. What the advisers of the Crown should have done was to consider carefully to what parties commissions ought to issue, and instead of coming down to Parliament and asking from Parliament power by Order in Council to determine the matter, the Government should have settled upon what general principles they propose to act, to what class of public officers commissions should issue, and thus have provided for the matter by Act of Parliament instead of by Order in Council. The whole tendency at the present time is, instead of carefully thinking out the principles and proposing an Act for the purpose of giving effect to them, to give the minds of Ministers a holiday and allow them to come here and ask power to do work by Order in Council. The effect of this has been to transfer from Parliament to the Governor in Council a large portion of legislative business which properly belongs to Parliament. The hon. gentleman will see that this is not a mere ministerial Act; it is a legislative Act. It is a proposal to declare to what particular class of officers commissions shall issue. That ought to be done by Bill, but instead of doing so by Bill it is proposed to delegate the power of Parliament to the Governor in Council, and that the power that should be exercised by the three branches of the Legislature, should be transferred to one. I think that is an objectionable mode of procedure, and the hon. gentleman ought, instead of proposing to confer power on the Governor in Council, to have clearly laid down the lines upon which action is proposed in the Bill and have submitted a Bill to give effect to that decision.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This measure is introduced so as to allow the Government to regulate the fee in case of minor commissions and commissions similar to those already issued. That power is already in the hands of the Government. In regard to large and important offices it is always provided by a Bill that commissions shall issue, and as regards minor offices this power has been exercised by the Government; and this Bill will allow them to regulate the fees to be paid hereafter on those commissions.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MILLS. Will the hon. gentleman indicate what classes of persons he proposes to appoint by commission under the great seal. We know that Ministers of the Crown, judges of courts of record, and Lieutenant Governors, are so appointed, but I think, as the hon. gentleman has probably considered what other classes of officers he proposes to appoint in this way, he should give us some idea of what officers they are.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I might mention that at Confederation several of the old Departments of the Civil Service were divided and new ones created, and although many of the old officers received commissions and continued to receive them, no provision was made for issuing commissions to the officers of the new Departements excepting the Deputy Heads. Hence in the Customs Department, commissions are issued to collectors, inspectors, landing waiters, &c., but in the Inland Revenue Department, which before Confederation formed a portion of the Customs Department, no commissions were issued to collectors, inspectors, and preventive officers. This also applied to officers in the Marine and Fisheries Department. It has also been deemed advisable for the sake of uniformity to include among those officers receiving commissions certain other officers of the same grade and of equal importance. This would take in post office inspectors, post masters of cities and towns, wardens of penitentiaries, chiefs of Departments, Dominion lands officers, officers of the Indian Department, immigration agents, assistant receivers general, savings bank agents, officers commanding Government vessels, &c., The greatest publicity will be given to them because it is provided in the Bill that each commission shall be advertised in the *Canada Gazette*. I would have no objection to adding a

clause to the Bill that within fifteen days after the opening of the Session of Parliament a list of the new commissions issued during recess shall be laid before the House.

Mr. MILLS. I think it would be advantageous if that were done, but I think it would be still better that the hon. gentleman should provide generally by a Bill relating to all public officers whom it was proposed to appoint under the great seal. If the hon. gentleman proposed to make any minor appointments by Order in Council, it seems to me that those lines of distinction would have been easily drawn and that we should know what classes of persons were to be appointed regularly under the great seal and what classes appointed in some other manner.

Mr. VAIL. I think we should know how far the Secretary of State intends to go in making these appointments under the great seal. Surely he does not intend to appoint all the fishery wardens and overseers receiving $40 or $50 a year under the great seal.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No more than we do with respect to third-class clerks, landing waiters, &c.

Mr. VAIL. I think we should know how far it is intended to go, especially as I cannot see that giving a man an appointment under the great seal would confer any more authority upon him than if he were appointed in the usual way, unless it is intended simply for the purpose of raising small fees from such appointments.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I cannot see that there is any objectiong to these men contributing a small fee to the revenue to pay for the expense of issuing the commission.

Mr. VAIL. I object to it on the ground that other Civil servants are not obliged to pay a fee when taking out commissions.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They will be hereafter.

Mr. MILLS. I would ask whether it is proposed to appoint some special officer to prepare the patents.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, it is not; and if the hon. gentleman cares to see how the work is done, I will deposit a copy on the Table of the House.

On section 2,

Mr. VAIL. I would like to know from the Secretary of State whether it is intended that these provisions shall apply to officers already in the service, or only to those hereafter to be appointed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It will apply to new officers of such rank as I have described.

On section 3,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I move to add the following words to this section: "and a list of such commissions issued during the year shall be laid before Parliament within the first fifteen days of the then next ensuing Session.

Amendment agreed to, and Bill reported.

MANITOBA CLAIMS SETTLEMENT.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution respecting the removal of doubts arising under the Act for the final settlement of the claims of Manitoba on the Dominion (page 866). He said: In the agreement entered into between the delegates from Manitoba and the Dominion Government in 1885, on the application of the Province for better terms, it was agreed that the estimated population upon which the Province should receive a *per capita* allowance should be increased from 17,000, the number fixed upon when the Province was formed, to 125,000. In the Bill passed last year to carry out that agreement, it was omitted to state that there had been two allotments to Manitoba upon that population of 17,000. When Manitoba was created a Province, the same sum *per capita* was allowed to her as was allowed to the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, amounting to a capital sum of $472,000; and in 1873, as the House will remember, it was agreed to assume $10,000,000 of the debts of the old Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and to give to all the other Provinces a proportionate sum according to their population. That arrangement yielded to the Province of Manitoba $70,000, which was added to the capital sum upon which her first allowance was based. That made a difference to her of something over $4 per head. In the Bill of last year, for carrying out this arrangement, reference was made only to the original Act, the later addition of $70,000 being omitted. The object of this resolution is to correct this omission, and to specify that what is intended is that the Province of Manitoba shall receive an allowance based upon a population of 125,000 at the larger rate *per capita*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand that the sum total in dispute amounts to $70,000 only?

Mr. McLELAN. No. The capital sum of the Province was calculated upon an estimated population of 17,000 originally, and she was given the same rate per head as the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, namely, $27.77. Then in 1873 the same sum per head was added to Manitoba as was added to all the other Provinces, amounting to about $70,000 more, making a total of $551,477, which made the *per capita* allowance $32.44; this is to be calculated on a population of 125,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So that the amount involved is about half a million?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the exact sum now to the credit of Manitoba, on which we shall pay interest?

Mr. McLELAN. I have not the figures here, but the increase makes a total capital sum of $4,055,000 from which is to be deducted the sums which have been advanced to Manitoba and have been spent for strictly local objects.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. Minister intend us to understand this is a final settlement with Manitoba? That it covers all the claims advanced by the Government of that Province?

Mr. McLELAN. That is as we understand it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There has been some dispute in the Manitoba Legislature as to whether this is to be taken as an instalment or as payment in full, and it would be interesting to know whether we are going to get a receipt in full of all claims on this account.

Mr. McLELAN. On the first visit of the delegates, they reported the settlement which was then made and which was concluded by the words "settlement in full." In the Manitoba Legislature objections were made, and it was not accepted. The delegates came back and modified that in some slight degree, and it has been accepted by Manitoba on the understanding, they reading it, as we now propose to make it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You mean as a discharge in full?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can you state exactly what you have to pay them now.

Mr. McLELAN. I have not the figures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You are not going to take a second reading?

Mr. McLELAN. I propose to introduce the Bill, and on the second reading I will give the details required as to how the account stands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In our account, the only late accounts we have, apparently all that is allowed Manitoba is $170,000 for subsidy allowance, $225,000 for public lands, and a very small sum as interest.

Mr. McLELAN. They have drawn nearly the whole half million dollars placed to their credit in capital account.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very little indeed of the $4,000,000, which is now allowed them, will remain.

Mr. McLELAN. A settlement is to be arrived at as to what might be termed strictly local, as chargeable against them, and then what they have drawn as capital. There will necessarily be a settlement between the two Governments, as to what will be charged against them as strictly local.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will give us the details of the present account?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, I will.

Resolution reported.

Mr. WATSON. I would ask the Minister of Finance to bring down with the other information he has promised, information as to what quantity of land will be transferred to Manitoba under these very terms. Last year there was no definitive amount arranged, and it was a matter of conjecture between the Local Legislature and the Dominion Government as to what should be termed swamp land and what quality should be transferred to the province. I hope we will get information as to the quantity.

Mr. McLELAN. I will make enquires of the Department of Interior and see what steps can be taken to ascertain the quantity.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 123) to explain the Act 48-49 Victoria, chap. 50, intituled: An Act for the final settlement of claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion.

Bill read the first time.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM STATIONS.

Mr. CARLING moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (page 866) respecting the establishment of experimental farm stations. He said: It will be remembered that two years ago a committee was appointed by the House to examine into the working of agricultural interests in the Dominion. That committee, after very careful enquiry and investigation into the different interests of the different Provinces, made a very full and elaborate report which was received and ordered to be printed by the House. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) was chairman of the committee. Last Session a sum of $20,000 was apportioned towards the inauguration of the scheme with the view of establishing an experimental farm as recommended by that committee. To obtain further information Professor Saunders was appointed to visit the different institutions in the United States, and to enquire into their working in order to ascertain the quantity of land, the annual expenditure, and the general results of their experimental farm stations, and he was also requested to enquire into the working of similar institutions in England, Germany, Russia and France. His report was made to me early in the year, and has been distributed in the House, and I think is in the hands of all the members at present. It is the intention to establish an experimental farm or station in the neighborhood of the capital, as this is considered to be an average climate of the Dominion. Tests, &c., will be made here of all the different seeds, and experiments made as to the raising of cattle, tree planting and fruit culture, and the analysing of different kinds of artificial manures; and the results of such experiments will be made known by monthly bulletins through the press or otherwise. It is found that those experimental stations have worked very satisfactorily in the States and in Europe, and, as the agricultural interest of Canada is the greatest, it is very important that we should do everything that is possible to assist in advancing that interest, and I feel confident that, if the resolution which I have placed in your hands is adopted, and the experimenal farm stations are established, that is the central one and the stations which are suggested in the different Provinces, it will greatly tend towards the prosperity of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt that these stations, properly conducted, are capable of being of great service, but I did not understand from the hon. Minister exactly where he proposed to establish them. He spoke of establishing one here, and one, do I understand, in every one of the other Provinces; or how many does the hon. gentleman propose to establish, and generally what amount of money does he expect will be required for the conduct of each farm? These things, if done at all, I would remind the hon. Minister, must be done thoroughly well. The agricultural institutions which have been established in England and Ireland, although they have been undoubtedly useful, have required a considerable sum of money, and therefore it is desirable that we should know at starting what the intentions of the Government are, and in particular how many farms they propose to establish, and what they think would be the cost of them.

Mr. CARLING. The intention is to establish a farm of 400 or 500 acres in the vicinity of the capital. No particular site has been selected, but I should think within five or ten miles of the capital would be suitable. It is intended to erect farm buildings, propagating houses and apartments for testing the different varieties of seeds and various breeds of stock, and making all the experiments usually made at stations of that kind. I think the total expenditure on that central farm would be something like $120,000. The proposition is—whether it will be all carried out at the present time or not is not finally decided—to establish an experimental station in the Lower Provinces, one for the three Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, one in Manitoba, one in the North-West Territories, and one in British Columbia. The total expenditure, if all were fully carried out, would be something like $240,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have you made any calculation as to the annual expenditure.

Mr. CARLING. Yes, the estimated annual expenditure for the central station and the other stations, if carried out, is from $30,000 to $35,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has any selection been made of the site where this farm is to be located?

Mr. CARLING. No; no selection has been made.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I think no measure has been brought before the present Parliament of such an important character as the one now submitted by the Minister of Agriculture. When we consider the vast strides that have been and are being made throughout the Dominion of Canada in the agricultural products, I think a measure such as is now proposed by the Minister of Agriculture to increase our products, to give a greater scientific knowledge to the farming community, to correct many errors into which they have fallen, and to give them necessary information, will meet with the approval of every class of people in the country. I have some figures here to show the vast increase in the exports of the products of the farm in the last nine years. In 1876, our exports of horses amounted to $443,000; in 1885, it has increased almost four-fold, to $1,640,000. Our export of cattle in 1876 was $600,000, and in 1885 $7,500,000. Our export of sheep during 1876 amounted to $507,000, while during 1885 it reached the value of $1,264,000. Our export of butter during the year 1876 was $2,504,000, and during 1885 it head fallen off nearly a million dollars, being only $1,577,000, while cheese had increased from $3,700,000 in 1876 to $8,900,000 in 1885. Our export of eggs was $580,000 in 1876, and $1,830,000 in 1885. Our export of poultry increased in the same years from $74,317 to $175,000. Our export of fruit was $170,000 in 1876, and in 1885 it had increased almost fourfold, being $640,000. This makes a total in these products for the year 1876 of $8,500,000, while in 1885 it amounted to $23,540,000. I think it is worthy of consideration that, as those gentlemen on the opposite side would say, with a decrease or a very small increase in the population, the farming community have increased their exports in those nine years by the enormous amount of about $15,000,000; and we must further take into consideration that the people have increased in prosperity in this country during these years, and have been better able to buy and consume the products of the farm, and that there has been a very much larger consumption of these articles in the country in 1885 than in 1876. We have in the Province of Ontario a model farm which, in many respects, may, perhaps, be doing a very good work. We are told, on good authority, that for the variety and excellence of their stock they cannot be excelled, perhaps, by any farm of the kind in any of the States of the Union, or in any of the countries of Europe? But there are many respects in which that farm is not doing the work which this experimental farm will do and which the interests of the country, I think, require should be done. For instance, they spend a great deal of time and a great deal of money in educating men to the business of farming. I think that is a great mistake, and I hope in this Bill too much attention will not be paid to teaching people farming. My own impression is that the best way to teach a young man farming is to let him go to a good farm where a prosperous and successful farmer is carrying on his business, and he will there learn better and in a shorter time how to make farming pay and how to do it successfully. So I think too much attention should not be given to teaching young men how to farm, but the object should be to carry out the scheme of making experiments, letting the public know the results fully and promptly by the issuing of bulletins, weekly or monthly as may be necessary. I think there is no part of this Dominion where such experiments are required so much as in our North-West. That is a new country, and the people who go up there are too busy trying to make a living and struggling with difficulties to have much time to spend in making experiments. I therefore think that the Minister of Agriculture should establish two or three of these experimental stations in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. As an instance of the good they would do, I may mention that last year a considerable portion of the wheat crop of the North-West was injured or destroyed by frost, and it has been discovered since that a great portion of that wheat could have been cut much earlier than it was, if the farmers had only been aware of the fact that wheat will ripen very much in the shook, and will be at least as merchantable as wheat for flour as if it had ripened on the straw in the field; and although it would not be as good an article for seed it makes as good if not a better quality of flour. I know an instance myself where a man, in order to be a little ahead of his neighbors in the North-West cut two or three shocks of wheat before he considered it ripe and the frost came a day or two afterwards and destroyed all the rest of his crop. He took the wheat he had cut and, as an experiment, threshed it out and sent it down to Winnipeg, and it sampled there as "No. 1, Northern," an excellent quality of merchantable wheat, whereas the rest of his wheat was almost totally destroyed by the frost. Now, the stations proposed to be established might conduct such an experiment as this and be the means of great benefit to the people of the North-West, and conduce largely to their prosperity. Another thing that I would recommend the Minister of Agriculture to consider is the question of forestry, not only in the North-West but also in the older Provinces. This is a very important question. A few years ago the great ambition was to chop down the trees, now the great desire is to have them grow up again; and in the North-West, perhaps, more especially it will be necessary to make experiments in growing trees to find out what kinds are best adapted for shelter, what other kinds are the most rapid growers, so as to be useful for timber, and what kinds make the best fuel. Another thing that a great attention should be paid to, is to find out the kind and quality of fruits that are best adapted to for the North-West. I find in the report of the Minister of Agriculture an account of two eminent scientists who travelled over a large portion of the Russian Empire and went very far northward, to find out what kind and quality of fruits, and especially of apples, are adapted to the various climates of that vast empire. I think that they collected samples of cuttings and specimens of apples and plums, and they find that they can cultivate apples and cherries in Russia very far northward. Those same fruits might be brought into our North-West and be grown there with equal success. I will say in conclusion that I hope the Minister of Agriculture will push on his policy of establishing these experimental stations, not only in the older Provinces, but in the North-West, and I feel assured that nothing will more conduce to the prosperity of this country than the proposal now before the House.

Mr. WATSON. I approve of the proposition of the Minister to establish experimental farms. If properly managed, I think they will prove of great benefit to the country, especially in the North-West, which is just being opened up. For my part, I have thought in the past that the Local Government should establish such a farm, but they have not the means to do so, and we would be very glad to have the Dominion Government take it up at present. Every farmer in the North-West has to be an experimental farmer himself, and if it can all be done on one farm, and reports sent out through the country, I think it will be a great benefit. For instance, if it were known what variety of fruits can be most successfully grown in and ripen in the various sections of the country, it would be a great benefit to the farmers if they could know also where to get them. I believe, also, that a great deal could be done by importing certain variety of wheats, say, from Russia, where they grow hard wheats that ripen successfully, and which might be successfully grown in the North-West. While we have got to look for wheat that will ripen in short seasons in some sections of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, we have also got to look for a quality of wheat

for milling purposes. While every farmer is anxious to grow hard red Fyfe wheat, it is found by experience that in some sections of the North-West it is impossible to grow that variety of wheat, as it takes, probably, longer to ripen than any other variety. I was a little amused to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, when he stated that wheat that was cut before it was ripe would make first-class flour, but would not make good seed. I have had a little experience in both farming and milling, and I am under the impression that the hon. gentleman ought to serve his time on one of these experimental farms. I know no wheat that has not matured sufficiently to grow again, that will make good flour, and I can assure him that it will not.

Mr. MILLS. I do not propose to oppose the proposition of the hon. gentleman, but I think it is not in the public interest that such a policy should be pursued. I think that the line of distinction between the functions of the Administration here and the Administration in the different Provinces, is very clearly drawn, and I do not believe that it would be for the interest of the Provinces of the Dominion and certainly not in the interest of the Treasury, that experimental farms should be established all over this Dominion. I do not think it would be possible for the Government to exercise effective control over them. I can well understand how an experimental farm in any one of the Provinces might be properly conducted by a local Administration. The Local Government would know that the institution was supported out of the revenues of the Province, and care would be taken to administer it economically, and fair results might be obtained for the work done. There may be something said, also, for the establishment of experimental farms in the North-West Territories, if we did not know what were the conditions of the country. But we have there a fair population who are carrying on farming operations in their own particular way, and who will not, for many years to come, be able to avail themselves of any high order of scientific farming, who, in a great measure, must make use of their limited resources and avail themselves of the most advantageous circumstances in their locality. I confess I do not see in what way the hon. gentleman is going to confer any advantage upon the agricultural population of this country by his proposal. We have in Ontario and, I suppose there are in the other Provinces, agricultural colleges; there are experiments carried on at these institutions at the public expense. There are professors who have done something for the organisation of farmers institutes, and have discussed the various means employed to ascertain the best results which can be obtained from the capital and labor applied to agriculture. The hon. gentleman may establish other farmers institutes, but they will simply be doing work already done by those institutes. He may employ other professors of agriculture, but if he does they will do the same work and give the public the same results they now obtain. Looking at the circumstances, looking at the functions of this Government and at the functions of the Local Governments, at the sphere in which their respective operations are being carried on, it seems to me that the proposal of the hon. gentleman, while it may place some burden upon the public Treasury, is not going to be of any particular advantage to the agriculturist. I think there are other means of promoting the interests of the farmers, of protecting them against mischievous effects in their business other than those which the hon. gentleman has proposed. It seems to me, therefore, that if the Government were to propose to establish institutions of this sort, and place them under the control of the Local Legislatures and local Administrations, that of itself would certainly be a better proposal than that of the hon. gentleman. I will mention this case: Suppose the hon. gentleman was to establish an experimental farm in British Columbia, does he think it is possible to exercise that supervision over it; to see to its operations; to profit by the work done to the same extent as if it were carried on under the control of the Government of the Province? Does he not think the Government of British Columbia would be in a better position to watch the operations of the farmers; would not the Ministers and all the parties connected with the Government and Legislature be better prepared to exercise an efficient supervision over it, and obtain more useful results, than a Government 4,000 miles away would be able to accomplish? Such an experiment tried in British Columbia—and I do not say but that such an institution might not do much good in that Province—an institution established under the control of the Department here, would be no more under its real control than if the establishment were at Simla, at the base of the Himalaya Mountains.

Mr. HESSON. I sympathise with the movement now before the House, and I think every hon. member should do so. I feel it is one of the most important measures before the House this Session. There is no industry in which we are all so deeply interested as that of agriculture, and we feel that everything which can be done for the farmers should be done by this Parliament. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) would be glad to shirk the responsibility devolving on members of this House and throw it back on members of the various Provincial Governments. We know perfectly well from experience that, with the single exception of Ontario, nothing in that direction has been done.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. HESSON. We have, at all events, heard very little of any other enterprise of that kind, and a long time would have to elapse before anything of that sort would be done by Provincial Governments in the North-West and British Columbia. I will take the hon. gentleman's own words. He said that farmers there will not for many years to come engage largely in experiments, or enter upon what might be called scientific farming. That of itself is a reason why the undertaking should not be delayed, and why we should not shirk the responsibility of endeavoring, as far as possible, to make those experiments for the poor farmers who are unable to do so and who have to take the chance of the results of experiments made in their own behalf. It is the duty of the Government to do this. If the farmers' interests are worth protecting, preserving and encouraging, it becomes the duty of this Government, above all others, to enable them as far as possible to reach that high state of perfection to which they desire to attain. The movement suggested by the Minister of Agriculture is in the right direction. A great deal possibly is still to be considered as to how far we should go in the way of training up young farmers scientifically. I quite agree with what was said by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), that the best training young men could have was probably to be put practically to work with a skilled farmer, and experiment in the way in which the farmer himself has to experiment. What is more particularly required on the part of the Government is to see that various kinds of seed, plants, trees, shrubs, fruits of all kinds, are so tested and so experimented with that the farmers will realise the advantage of experiment and experience without having to meet the disappointments which must inevitably result from time to time from making experiments. We know that very many well intentioned farmers with probably limited means desire to make some advance in that direction, but if they make one or two failures they are deterred from making other attempts; whereas the Government might go on experimenting under the same circumstances, in the same country, with the same climate and soil and make trials in the interest of all. I quite understand

that the Minister of Agriculture will be most anxious that the experiment should be made in the North-West as soon as possible. Nothing would do more to encourage immigration there than to show the results of such efforts made by the Government, as similar experiments made by the Canadian Pacific Railway which showed that in what was considered a desert tract there could be successful farming in the North-West. I think, then, it is the duty of this Government especially to make a very early effort to remove this difficulty. There are many people who go into that country who know nothing about the varieties of soil, the soil and climate, and the Government might very well in a year or two be able to issue information to the people by a system of bulletins—which I understand is in operation in many of the American experimental farms—giving valuable information to the people generally as to the success of any particular experiment they may have made. I am satisfied there is no proposal that would meet the wishes of the farming community of Canada more thoroughly than to pay some little attention to the great difficulties always surrounding their particular business, and those who have often to labor under very great disadvantage. I am sure hon. gentlemen should sympathise with the movement and should congratulate the Minister on undertaking such a work. It is not the first time he has embarked in enterprises of very great advantage to the country. When the hon. gentleman had the honor of filling the position of Commissioner of Agriculture in Ontario, he brought in more than one measure of very great importance to the farmers. He it was who first proposed the model farm, which is now such a success in the Province, and I am glad to say it is a success in very many directions indeed, and it has done very much to inform the people, not only as to the quality of stock, but as the state of perfection that can be attained in other branches of agriculture. I trust that the House will aid the Minister in every way to carry out this enterprise, and that he will get the credit that he honestly deserves for undertaking it.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) thinks there is no need for establishing these experimental farms in the North-West, because, he says, the farmer there conducts his farming operations after his own methods, and he thinks that is the best mode for us to deal with this question—to let each farmer farm as he thinks best. I entirely differ from that view of the question. I think that just the very object which the Minister of Agriculture has in view is the object of counteracting that diversity of method—the object of assisting the farmers—of preventing their being obliged to experiment for themselves, and of having some system of experiment conducted, to which the farmer can refer and refer to with security, as being something that he can depend upon. I think, from what has fallen from two hon. members, in the course of this short debate, we see the great necessity for the establishment of some system of thoroughly reliable experiments in the North-West. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Wallace) told us it was very important that wheat should be cut before it was fully matured. An hon. member on the other side gets up immediately afterwards and says no greater mistake could be made. Now, you see at once the importance of having some authority to refer to on this subject. For my own part having some little experience in farming, I agree with my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Wallace). I think from what I have gathered, that a great mistake is made even in the Province of Ontario by our farmers leaving their wheat too long on the ground. I believe that if wheat is cut when most farmers would consider it is green, it will be found to produce a much better milling wheat than if it is left until they would consider it thoroughly ripe and a great deal of the grain has turned into bran.

Mr. WATSON. I said that it should be matured well enough to make good flour. I agree that it should be cut on the green side. But not so green that it would not be liable to grow again.

Mr. McNEILL. I think the hon. gentleman expresses fairly what he said, but he said also that he considered that wheat might make better milling wheat if it was cut on the green side, but if it was cut so green as not to be so good for seed it would not be equally good for milling. Now, I doubt if the hon. gentleman ever made an experiment of that kind.

Mr. WATSON. Yes, I have.

Mr. McNEILL. But how much too green was it cut? that is exactly what we want to know, because there is no question of more vital importance to the farmers of this country than the question of at what stage their wheat, oats, peas, and other grain, should be cut. If these experimental farms were properly to elucidate that one question alone, they would be of immense value to the farming interests of the country. But there are very many other matters, as has already been stated, as to which these farms would be most valuable. Nothing is more important in connection with the North-West than that we should discover some kind of wheat which will mature rapidly. The seasons there are short, and if we can produce seed grain which will mature a week or so more rapidly, which will require to be a week or so less time in the ground than the wheat used at present, it may make all the difference in a season between a great success in farming and a failure. So, too, we require information with regard to other seed, with regard to the forest trees which will grow best there, and with regard to fruit trees. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) so far as I could follow him, if he pushed his argument to its logical conclusion, would do away with the Minister of Agriculture altogether. I do not see that, taking his view of the case, we require a Minister of Agriculture at all; we should simply leave the matter to the Provinces. It seems to me that whenever anything is proposed by the Government of the country, dealing with the general interests of the people of this country, whether it be a question with reference to agriculture such as we are dealing with now, or a question with reference to the preservation of our fisheries such as we were dealing with this afternoon, or whether it be a question with reference to the adulteration of food, the hon. member for Bothwell comes with a wet blanket and endeavors to smother the whole thing and say that we had better leave it alone, or leave it to somebody else. Now, it seems to me that what we have to do here is to legislate for the benefit of the people, and it is time enough for us to hold our hands when the legal tribunals of the empire decide that we have gone too far. It is best to be on the safe side, and in this case the safe side is to legislate for the benefit of the people. It is a very good direction in which to go too far, to legislate for the benefit of the country.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill), has misunderstood the position of the hon. gentleman for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), with regard to this proposal to establish an experimental farm. I did not understand the hon. gentleman for Bothwell to oppose the proposal. He pointed out to the Government what I think was perfectly proper, that if it were practicable it would be better to establish these farms by the Local Government, and have local supervision, on the ground that the experiments would be more efficient, but I did not understand him to oppose the principle of the establishment of these farms. I think the agriculturists are entitled to every consideration from this House and the country. They pay the great bulk of the taxes, and these taxes, I am sorry to say, are often expended for worse purposes than the establishment of experimental farms. I hope, however

that the Minister of Agriculture will remember that the finances of the country are not in the most flourishing condition that we could desire, and that he will exercise a due economy in putting the scheme in operation, that he will be specially careful as to the character of the purchase he may make near this city, that he will select a suitable site and take care that an extravagant price is not paid for it. It is probable that the operations of an experimental farm, in so far as they would be really beneficial to the people, would be rather limited in their character. It is not necessary to establish one to show the people what is the right stage at which to cut their wheat, whether it is better to cut it a little green or a little ripe. The intelligent agriculturist has ascertained that information for himself; he knows it already. It is unnecessary for an experimental farm to inform him on that point. With regard to forestry, which was alluded to by my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) I apprehend that a model farm will do very little towards renewing the forests of this country, and that that question will have to be dealt with in another way. With regard to the introduction of hardy fruits from cold countries such as Russia, that, too, I have no doubt, is a matter which will be coped with quite as satisfactorily by private enterprise as by an experimental farm; in fact, the question is pretty well understood already. Intelligent and enterprising nurserymen have introduced Russian fruits, and they are offered for sale in great quantity—fruits suited for extremely cold countries like the North-West. Of course the Government can experiment in these matters, but I doubt whether it is absolutely essential to the farming interests of the North-West that the Government should expend a large amount of money in this direction. I am glad to hear the admission made by my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Hesson), with regard to the Ontario model farm. His eulogy upon the management of that institution, and his eulogy upon the Minister of Agriculture who, he says, had the honor of founding that institution, may be taken as a very graceful compliment to the Government of Ontario, coming from the source it does. We have all noticed in past years how the management of that farm and the character of its operations have been bitterly assailed by the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature; and when we hear from a disinterested witness like the hon. member for North Perth the truth of the matter, it is very gratifying to this side of the House, and I am sure will be to Mr. Mowat and his associates. I am told that the Minister of Agriculture had the credit of purchasing the Mimico farm, which proved to be utterly worthless, and unsuited for the object in view, and that the present farm was purchased when Mr. Mowat came into office.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman is quite incorrect. The Mimico farm was approved of as an excellent farm for the purpose.

Mr. MILLS. Three hundred acres of Canada thistles.

Mr. CARLING. I beg pardon; 600 acres were purchased at Mimico, and the farm was highly recommended by Prof. Buckland, a man of great experience and integrity, as the best selection that could be made.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would not attribute to the Minister of Agriculture anything wrong in the purchase of the Mimico farm. It seems, however, that it was found unsuitable; and the location was changed to Guelph.

Mr. CARLING. Not at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. However, it is not a matter having any bearing on the present subject. I have only to repeat that the country is somewhat impecunious at present; and that I hope the hon. gentleman will not go too fast in establishing these farms, and will see that they are efficient.

Mr. McCALLUM. This is an important subject. As a practical farmer I do not think the Government could better spend some of the public money than in teaching the people of this country how to pursue agriculture in a more efficient and scientific manner than they do now. If they spent the money on forestry alone, it would pay, as we are destroying our forests very rapidly. An hon. gentleman opposite intimates that this work should be done by the Local Governments; but how about the North-West? There could be no better investment made by the Government than to spend a quarter of a million in planting trees in the North-West. If that were done, I believe it would very greatly change the climate and character of the country. Then, there is the question in raising wheat, as hon. members say on the other side of the House, whether it should be cut green or ripe, because if you cut it too green it is useless, and if you cut too ripe it will shell out. The farmers know when to cut their wheat without any further knowledge on that question. Then, there is the subject of seed; if you could obtain for the farmers of this country a proper seed that will stand the climate and give a good return, that alone would justify the expenditure of a large amount of money. This House is always ready to vote money for other purposes and why not for the improvement of agriculture? We have been told that the land might yield twice as much as it does if we seeded it down with the proper kind of grasses; and the Government might do something to teach farmers how to establish permanent pastures. No individual effort in forestry can be of much advantage, It is estimated by competent parties that a piece of land planted with walnut trees and kept 40 years, will yield more than it will if cropped every year, in addition to the benefit the trees would confer in the way of shelter and in improving the climate. It is only the Government of the country that can afford to wait so long for a return. What the North-West most stands in need of is the planting of timber which would act as shelter and as wind breaks for cattle and for settlers. There are thousands of acres in that country now that are hardly fit for settlement, but that will grow timber that would add largely to the revenue in the future. I am glad the Government have taken a step in this direction.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Whether this subject comes within the jurisdiction of this Parliament or that of the Local Legislatures, certainly the hon. Minister who has introduced it is deserving of the gratitude of the agriculturists of this country. I believe he was the founder of the experimental farm of the Province of Ontario, and he has brought into this House the principles he then pursued. There is no doubt that the agricultural interests of this country are not second, but first of all the interests in the country. We have labored much in this House, and we have spent much in legislating on the subjects of trade and commerce; but, Sir, the foundation of all trade and commerce is agriculture, and it is the duty of this House and this Government to see that a certain amount of our money and attention are devoted to the interest that forms so large a share both of the capital and industry of this country. It is the duty of this House and this Government to see that the agriculturists of the country are furnished with the greatest possible facilities for gaining information on scientific agriculture. Until the present time this was not so necessary. The original fertility of the soil led farmers to depend largely upon simply sowing and reaping; but that time has passed by. The agriculturist has found that something more must be done, that he must know the nature of the soil, what it contains, what the food of plants is, what are the elements of this food in order to keep the land in a good and proper condition. As the hon. member for Monck

(Mr. McCallum) has said, it is impossible for an individual to arrive at this knowledge; experiments are too expensive. It must be done in a united way by a united people, and I cannot see any better way in which it can be done than by the Parliament of the country and the expenditure borne by it. The farmer must be taught, and there is no other way in which he can be taught than by experimental farms of this kind. He must be taught what is or what is not contained in the soil that is necessary for the production of a peculiar and particular kind of grain or fruit; he ought to be taught what the mineral elements of the soil are which are required for the production of wheat, oats and barley; he ought to be able to have the soil analysed at a minumum or no cost at all, and rely on the expenditure of the Government to see whether it contains these elements or not. If it does not, he has information that will guide him as to what kind of grain he should sow on that soil. Not only that, but the duty of the Government is to ascertain where these elements can be obtained, if not in the soil, in order that the farmer may be able to obtain them and return them to the soil. In the first place he must be taught what kind of mineral food is necessary for the production of grain, and, as I said before, whether the soil contains that food. He ought to be taught also, and he can only be taught this by bulletins issued from an experimental farm, whether his farm contains these elements or not. It is a very simple calculation for a scientific man to enter into, but very difficult for a man without the means of investigation to ascertain. Perhaps not one in a thousand agriculturists in this country know what the mineral food of plants is; perhaps not one agriculturist out of a thousand knows what amount of this mineral food is obtained in the average soil of the country. I could give you the amount of this mineral food that is contained in the average soils of the country, but it would take too long. If the farmer has already the amount of mineral food contained in the land, and the amount of mineral food each crop of wheat, oats and barley extracted from the land, it is only a matter of simple arithmetic to ascertain the number of crops he can raise from that soil in order to entirely exhaust it of that food; and as soon as it is exhausted, the soil becomes useless almost exclusively and entirely. It requires different food for wheat, barley and oats, and different elements to produce hay to what is required to produce wheat and barley. It is the duty of the Government to afford the farmers the greatest possible facility for obtaining this knowledge, and as soon as it is obtained he can pursue his vocation, not only with profit to himself, but with great advantage to the country. A great many of the farmers of the country believe that they can restore to the soil all the elements required, by returning the barnyard manures to the land. I can point out and will use this as an illustration to show how necessary it is for the farmer to be untaught this. Take land that produces wheat. We find that the ash of wheat is composed of 7 per cent. phosphoric acid; we find phosphates enter largely into the bones of animals and wheat; we all know as a matter of fact that the wheat of nearly every farm in the country is sold off the land never to be returned; we know that the bones of animals raised on that land are sold off, never to be returned. Then it is a question of arithmetic to ascertain how many crops of wheat and bones of animals can be sold off land to exhaust it of phosphoric acid. The reason why the wheat of the older Provinces is of a soft character and does not yield that good flour that was produced from the wheat in the earlier history of the country, is that the soil is exhausted of phosphoric acid, and the reason why the wheat of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, as well as Minnesota, is worth 10 cents per bushel more than the wheat of Ontario, and will produce a better quality of flour, is because the land is new and contains a large proportion of phosphoric acid. This is a matter of exact certain calculation from a scientific standpoint. It is then the duty of the Government to conduct experiments, because no individual can conduct them at his own expense, for he has not the knowledge or facilities for doing it. The Government should supply the farmers with that information in order that they may carry on their avocation with profit to themselves and the country at large. I will not go into the chemical analysis of soils, or into the chemical analysis of grains, as probably I might show the great importance of this measure. I will take it for granted the House is thoroughly convinced of its importance, and will only say again that the thanks of this House and of the farmers of this country are due to the Minister of Agriculture for introducing the subject to this House.

Mr. WIGLE. Representing as I do an agricultural constituency, I feel I would not be doing my duty to my constituents if I did not stand up here and endorse the action of the Government on this occasion. One reason why I have every confidence in the establishment of experimental stations in the different Provinces, is because I know their establishment is left in the right hands. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carling) was Minister of Agriculture in the Sandfield-Macdonald Government of Ontario, he established a farm near Toronto. I had occasion to look into the matter and I found it was a better farm than is the Agricultural College and the farm of Guelph to-day. He purchased some 600 acres within seven miles of the city of Toronto, located near the line of the Great Western Railway, so that it could be easily visited in ten minutes by parties coming to the capital of Ontario, but for party purposes and the satisfaction of good Reformers near Guelph, the Mowat Government appointed a commission, and one of the greatest reasons why the commission recommended that the Stone farm should be purchased was because there were too many Canada thistles on the other. Then it would not be practicable as a model farm, and they reported that the Ontario Government should purchase the Stone farm, because there were no Canada thistles on it, and it would make a model farm from the start. I took occasion to go into that matter at one time, and I found in the report of Mr. Johnston, who was the manager of the Stone farm which was run by the Mowat Government and was bought because there were no Canada thistles on it, the statement that field so and so, and field so and so grew nothing that year because there were so many Canada thistles on them that they could not grow anything. They bought that farm because there were no Canada thistles on it, and in a few years they could not grow anything because of the Canada thistles. That don't show the right kind of farming. I remember seeing in the *Farmers' Advocate*, published in the city of London where the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) lives, a statement that the roads around the model farm at Guelph were so polluted with thistles that they were interfering with the farmers all round them, and that the farms in the vicinity of that institution were not worth so much as they were before it was established. I have every confidenec in the Minister of Agriculture in establishing these farms. I believe he will establish them for the best interests of this country, and I believe he will not carry on a college with the farm as they do in the Province of Ontario. While the Province of Ontario's farm may be very well, if it were managed properly it would be still better for that Province than it is at present. There is one thing which I believe the farmers of this country are deeply interested in, and that is fencing. I am satisfied that in the older Provinces rail timber is about exhausted. We find the fences in this country are about rotted down, and it would be a great thing to experiment as to what kinds of hedges would be the best to plant out in the diffe-

rent Provinces. In the county where I live we are growing the Osage orange to a great extent just now. That might not do further north here. It might freeze, and it would be a good thing to experiment which would be the best kind of hedges, for I believe one of the greatest expense to the farmer to-day is keeping up his fences, and the first thing I would recommend the Minister of Agriculture to do would be to buy a fine farm near this capital of Ottawa, as he did near the capital of Ontario, and fence that in with orange and other kinds of shrubbery and find out the best kind of fencing for the people of this country. In that matter alone, it would doubly pay for the cost of establishing the farm. Another thing is finding out the best kinds of seeds for permanent pastures. A man may buy half a dozen kinds of seeds for permanent pastures, but his neighbor three or four miles off would not be likely to know the result of his investigation; but in this case, the agricultural station will test the best kinds of seeds, how much it will cost per acre, and so on, and will send the result all over the Dominion, and we will be doubly paid in two or three matters of this kind for the expense. I am satisfied that this will be carried out. It is in the hands of a good, honorable gentleman, and in the hands of a good Government. The hon. gentleman says it will only cost about $240,000, and from $30,000 to $35,000 a year to run these stations. In the Province of Ontario, we find it costs about $20,000 or $21,000 a year to run that institution over and above the revenue they derive. They buy eggs for the use of the farm, they buy their own butter, they buy their corn stocks to winter their cattle. They do not grow enough to feed their cattle, because they are not carrying it on on a proper principle. We find the class of young men who are sent there to learn agriculture are young men whose parents would not trust them in a business of their own, who are wild and whose parents would not establish them in business, but send them to the Agricultural College to learn farming. The result is that not one out of a dozen have gone into farming after they leave there, and if they did, they were not successful. They were taught there that it cost $1.75 to raise a bushel of wheat, and that they only got 80 cents for it, they cannot farm practically on that basis. I intend to support the Minister of Agriculture, and I am satisfied that this resolution will be carried by a large majority.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was rather pleased with the remarks of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) with regard to the model farm of the Province of Ontario. I think that model farm has been a decided success, and I was rather disappointed to hear the remarks of my hon. friend who has just sat down. I know, and I think he knows, that for the last number of years from several of the United States delegations have come to visit that farm, and on every occasion they have complimented the Province of Ontario on the very excellent model farm we have, and have complimented the managers upon the manner in which they have managed it. I am satisfied that this is true and I can prove by records in my possession that it is true. I do not think it is fair here to decry an institution of that kind, which is in its infancy, but unfortunately it has been vigorously opposed by the Opposition in the Local House who are the friends of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. Notwithstanding that, it is progressing and continually improving, and it is an honor and a credit to the Province of Ontario and to the Government which has brought it to the position in which it is now. The hon. gentleman said it was highly desirable that the Government should take steps to secure to the farmers of the Dominion a cheaper kind of fencing. I remind him that a few nights ago, when the hon. Minister was delivering his Budget speech, we added an increased duty to wire, which is the very thing which would tend to cheapen fencing to the farmers of the Dominion. It is a pity that on that occasion he did not draw the Finance Minister's attention to the necessity of keeping the duty off wire. I believe my friend in front of me made a motion in behalf of the people of the North-West, urging that the increased duty should not be put on, as wire was the only thing they had to fence with there; but, notwithstanding that, the duty has gone on wire, and the people of the west will have to pay for it. I am very glad to know that something is to be done in the interest of the farmer. I am quite willing to support and assist in establishing these farms if they are to be a benefit to the farmers of the Dominion. Anything which will tend to improve their position shall have my assistance. But, in 1878, loud professions were made, when the National Policy was introduced, as to what was to be done for the farmers. They were to have a home market provided for their surplus products, they were all to be made rich, and the operation of that policy was to make them prosperous. They have found, to their sorrow, that it has not had the effect which was promised, and now, at the end of seven or eight years, the Government feel that, unless they can show the farmers on an approaching occasion that they are going to do something for them, they have been so disgusted with the results of the National Policy that the Government will not be able to whip them into line and make them vote again as they did in 1878. That is their object, and they are going to show that they are going to establish model farms and experiment on certain kinds of seeds. They are going to purchase a certain kind of tree, and a certain kind of fruit, and do everything else for them if they will only renew their confidence in another election. If the farmers will give the present Government their support once more, the Government are going to take them out of the mire and the troubles in which the National Policy has landed them. I shall be glad if the establishment of these farms do any good. For if there is a class in this Dominion, at the present time, that requires the serious attention of every man in this House, that requires aid and assistance, it is the farming community of this Dominion. They have undoubtedly suffered seriously in the past through loss of crops, through the increased price of everything they consume, and to-day they stand in a worse condition than they have for several years past. With regard to a remark that fell from my hon. friend who has just sat down. He thought he had made a strong point when he said that in order to please some Grits in Centre Wellington, a farm belonging to a certain Grit friend of the Government, was selected for the model farm. Well, Sir, that gentleman is not very well posted. He should remember that Mr. Stone, the man he referred to, is a strong Conservative, and always has been, and in the last election he was nominated in the Conservative interest. You find that the Ontario Government, when they want to acquire a property for Provincial purposes, do not ask whether the owner is a Conservative or a Grit, but if it suits their purpose they buy it and pay for it. But hon. gentlemen opposite, if they want a piece of property for Dominion purposes, generaly try to hunt up a Tory that has got a property to sell, and buy it from him. I would just say in conclusion, that as far as I am concerned I shall give the proposition of the Minister of Agriculture my hearty support, and if it will do anything at all in the interest of the farming community, I shall be glad to assist it in any way I can, but I am afraid that it is a second edition of the humbug practised on the farmers in 1878.

Mr. COCHRANE. As I represent an agricultural constituency I feel disposed to say a few words on this subject, although pretty nearly all that can be said on it has been said. I am sorry that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) cannot discuss any question without

dragging in other questions that do not pertain to it at all. I do not see any connection between the National Policy and an agricultural farm. He made an assertion that I deny. He says that everything the farmer uses to-day is dearer than it ever was before, that they have been humbugged by the Conservative party, who led the farmers to believe that they were going to make them wealthy. Sir, the Conservative party never made any such promises, but they did lead the farmers to believe, and I believe they were correct, that they would have the advantage of their own market, that when there was a surplus of production in this country the people of Canada would get the advantage of it, that if the supply in Ontario was not equal to the demands in the Maritime Provinces, the grain would be kept out of this country which was formerly supplied by the Americans, and we had the benefit of the protection. That is what we advocated, and what we accomplished. What we advocated in reference to the National Policy has been more than fulfilled in this country.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the subject before the House.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am answering the question the hon. gentleman raised.

Mr. SPEAKER. At this rate we will never get through the discussion.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then you should not have allowed him to raise the question of the National Policy. He said everything was dearer in this country than it was before, and I will not allow any gentleman, in my presence, in this House, to try to force that down my throat, because he knows as well as I do that it is not a fact.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. COCHRANE. There never was a time in this country when machinery was so cheap as to-day.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has now denied the assertion of the hon. member, and I hope he will confine himself to the subject under discussion.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, it is very strange if you allow an hon. gentleman to make use of those arguments and will not allow me to answer him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is all very well to cry "chair," but you don't like to hear the truth. I am a farmer, and I know what I say. These gentlemen, lawyers and money-shavers, can draw fine distinctions in law which nobody else can understand, but when it comes to farming they don't know what they are talking about. An hon. gentleman says that he knows all about cutting wheat, whether it is green or ripe; I doubt very much whether he knows anything about it, I doubt if he would know a field of wheat if he saw it, but there is a larger question even there, there are very few men in this country who know when to cut their wheat, or, if they do, do not do it in proper time. In my opinion, the farmers lose a large amount every year by letting their wheat get too ripe. There is a great question in reference to artificial manures which the farmers of this country have been humbugged into using, and for which they have wasted a large amount of money in purchasing. Would not the farmers of this country be more than recouped for the money expended in the establishment of an agricultural farm if it could test the value of the artificial manure that so many of them have been using? And then there is the question of the most suitable kinds of soils for the different crops, the analysis of the soils, also, to show what is necessary to make the soil productive. We have all read that a man who makes two blades of grass grow where one grew before, is a public benefactor. That is what we are going to accomplish by this farm. We shall know what to use and what to put on the soil to make it most productive. It will also be useful in testing seeds. Few farmers in this country have got money to spend in experimenting in seeds. There has been a great deal of money taken out of the farmers in the purchase of seed grain. In our section of the country large sums of money have been paid for certain kinds of wheat that were brought into the county and represented to be just the kinds that would grow best, and when we came to test it for ourselves, we found it was not the wheat we wanted at all. An agricultural farm could test the seeds for us, and in that way there would be a great benefit to the country. There is also the question of butter and a thousand other subjects that will come under the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, and I am satisfied that everything will be done for the best interest of the community. I think the farmers should have some consideration. There is no class in the community that pays so high direct taxes as the farmer. They have to pay the most indirect taxes. Notwithstanding the glowing colors in which the Ontario Government has been painted by hon. gentlemen opposite, they have never raised a finger to equalise taxation in the Province of Ontario. The farmer pays taxes on his farm or the money that is invested in it. If he improves the farm the assessor comes round and raises the value of the farm by adding the value of the improvements and his labors, and he pays taxes on that. But do these business men do that? Does the money shaver do that? No, Sir, he can go to the village and hang out his sign, "Money to Loan," and he only pays interest on the income. Has Mr. Mowat done anything to equalise the taxation of the Province of Ontario? No. We want something established that will give the farmers of Ontario and the Dominion some return for the amount of money paid into the Treasury by them.

Mr. IRVINE. I find we are all friends of the farmer to-night. I should like to be a friend of the farmer too. I am not specially so. I claim to be a friend of the manufacturer and of the professional man and I wish success to all classes with one exception, and that is the legal profession. I would send a portion of them to grass; but to all the rest of the people I wish success, and I am not specially a friend of the farmer more than of the others. I love my country, and I do not think any hon. gentleman can say that although I come from the small Province of New Brunswick, which appears small in the eyes of some, he ever heard me utter a disrespectful word of the West and of our country, either in this House or out of it. I say I love my country, I love the farmers and I wish them success; I wish success to traders, merchants and laboring men, because I was once a laboring man myself. It is only to the lawyers I do not wish success. In this House we do not need of lawyers more than a Minister of Justice and one hon. gentleman on the other side to watch him. We have heard agriculture discussed in its various phases. We have had a lecture on agricultural chemistry. And I am very sure if that hon. gentleman had an opportunity of addressing an assembly of agriculturists the very first question put to him would be give us a market for the produce we raise, the soil and climate of the country answer our purposes. The farmers would turn to the hon. gentlemen and say: How do you think we can live in the North-West with wheat at 45 or 40 cents a bushel? How can we live in the East with oats at 25 cents a bushel as they were last fall? How can we live with butter selling last fall at 12 or 13 cents a lb.? What difference does it make to learn of what the soil is composed when the farmer is unable to get sufficient for his produce? Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that by raising wool at 18 cents a lb. the farm can pay? What is the use of telling the farmers that we will build

agricultural colleges, and tell them the properties of the soil, and that they are not raising as much out of the soil as they should do. Men with ordinary common sense will say that it is a market they want. We want money in exchange for our produce, and our farmers understand well how to till the soil. But the hon. gentleman has given us a lesson in harvesting wheat. Go to any practical agriculturist, and what will he say? He will say that we have the elements to contend with in harvesting our wheat. Sometimes when we know wheat is ripe for the sickle we have a week of fine weather and sometimes we have the reverse. Practical men understand this; but hon. gentlemen who have been talking on the subject are not practical farmers, if they are they have been talking in a very unpractical way. I am of opinion, notwithstanding the declaration of the last speaker, that our farmers as a body are intelligent and know precisely what to do in their business, that they understand when wheat is ripe and should be cut, and how to market it. All they want is a price for their wheat. Would any practical man say, as an hon. gentleman told me he heard a farmer near Ottawa say, that he could make a living by raising cattle and selling them at 3½ cents per lb., live weight. The truth is our farmers are raising too much and they are not paid enough for what they raise. The soil is productive and the climate is good, but we want a market, and we want the Government to turn their attention in that direction. Hon. gentlemen opposite promised a market—they promised us bread and gave us a stone. I am not opposed to the present proposal; but I will relate the saying of a member of the grange which I heard when I sat on the committee that reported on this subject now before the House. Various phases of agriculture were being discussed and a member of the grange, who was a delegate from Ontario, and was an intelligent man, said in regard to skilled agriculture that the most successful agriculturist he ever saw in New Brunswick was a man who signed his name with a cross. In all my travels at home and abroad I have found that whether an agriculturist is educated or uneducated he soon learns to till the soil, to take care of his farm, to know what it is capable of producing, and those crops which will tend to make the family as happy and comfortable as the market prices obtained will permit. But I will say this: That I fully concur not in what hon. gentlemen have said about the colleges or model farms in various parts of the country, but in regard to the proposal as it was submitted to the committee. As submitted to the committee it was understood to be a proposal to establish a small farm where experiments would be made in various kinds of grains, seeds, shrubs and trees, fruit, ornamental and forest. That would not be a very extensive undertaking; but if it means the establishment of a college here and of a model farm there, which would involve an enormous expense, I am decidedly opposed to the arrangement. I do not believe that we, with a population of less than 5,000,000 would be justified in incurring such an enormous expenditure; but I think, on the other hand, that something like what was proposed before the committee which reported on the subject ought to be beneficial to the people and in the interests of the agriculturists. Now, of course, I have not a quarrel with any of those hon. gentlemen and I do not want to go any further on this subject than I have. I am willing to do anything that I can by word or deed to benefit any portion of the community, any trade or calling in this country, not merely the farming community, but any other trade or industry in the country. I should be glad to coincide with the hon. gentleman on the other side in that way, and to build up any trade or calling in a legitimate way, but not at the expense of any other. I do not want to build up the agriculturists of this country at the expense of any other calling. I am one of them, and I think they are able to take care of themselves; I am satisfied that all they want is a fair field and no favor.

Mr. IRVINE.

They have not received that from the Government of this country in my judgment. They were promised under the National Policy——

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman should refer to the National Policy.

Mr. FARROW. I desire to say a few words on this important question. I think a more important question could not be raised for consideration in this House than the one we have before us. If we look abroad through the length and breadth of the country, from the east to the west and from the north to the south, we are an agricultural people. Probably Ontario bears the palm so far as regards agriculture, not because she is the oldest Province, but probably the land is on the whole somewhat better than that of the others—I am now speaking of the older Provinces—with the exception of Manitoba and the North-West. Some of the members on the other side who have spoken seem to have a particular pick at my friend who sits beside me (Mr. Hesson) because he said the Agricultural College at Guelph was a success. Well I think it is a success in some points. It is a success in spending money. It is a success in bringing foreigners from other countries into its halls to learn agriculture. I think the practical farmers in Ontario are on the whole opposed to the Agricultural College as it exists at present. I say this advisedly; I say it because they have told me so. For my own part, I look upon the Agricultural College at Guelph as doing very good work. I think during the past three or four years it has done much better work than it did formerly, and I think the reason is that the Government of Ontario is listening to the Opposition a little more. Some things that the Opposition proposed several years ago, the Government have adopted during the last Session. I think the professors in that college have been doing good work, by going outside of the college and travelling through the districts of Ontario, giving lectures. I know that great interest has been created all through our part of the country, by these lectures. The farmers would flock to central parts, where these men were to give lectures and hold farmers' institutes, where they would receive a great deal of valuable information, such as I suppose this experimental farm is intended to give. They would receive instruction in farming generally, in stock raising, in butter making and in cheese making. I think one of the most important subjects they have introduced during the past winter, was permanent pastures. One of our friends said, the man who could cause two blades of grass to grow where only one grew before, was a benefactor to his race. Well I believe these permanent pastures will be more than that. I think Prof. Brown has given it as his experience that if we put down permanent pastures, we could feed three head of cattle where we feed only one now. Now what does that mean in Ontario? It means a vast amount of good beef extra, and it means a vast amount of hard cash in the farmer's pockets. What I find fault with, and what I will find fault with, in these experimental farms which are to be established, if they go on as the Agricultural College at Guelph has gone on, is the spending of too much money to very little purpose. The idea that they should have 500 or 600 acres of good land and men to work it, and yet cannot make both ends meet is absurd. What would the farmer be thought of in any part of Ontario who would come out $7,000 worse than nothing at the end of the year? Is that the kind of example we should set before our farmers in Canada? The Ontario college is bankrupt every year; $22,000 expenditure and only $14,000 receipts, or nearly $8,000 of a deficit. That is a state of things that should not be. In this new central institution which is to be situated near the capital and is to do, as it were, for Quebec and Ontario—if the institution is conducted properly, if those experimental

farms are to give information to the people of the country, respecting different subjects pertaining to farming, I think it would be a very good thing. But as an hon. friend opposite said, if they launch out into a large amount of money, with a professor for this and a professor for that, and probably nearly a dozen professors doing very little and costing the country a great deal of money, I believe the farming community will condemn them. Now, what we want is this: We want an experimental farm conducted with as little cost as possible, and giving the greatest amount of information. Who is the best farmer in Canada? It is that man who can raise the most off the land and leave it in a good condition? Some men will live on a farm where others will starve, just by better management. We want experimental farms, and I will tell you why. What is doing more for arable land in Ontario to-day than anything else? It is draining. In some parts of the country drains are made with stone, in some parts with boards, and in some parts with tiles. Some men will tell you that you are to sink a drain three feet deep; another man will come along and say two and a-half feet is deep enough; a third will come along and say that is too deep, two feet is plenty. All these men are right, but it is not every farmer who knows it; the depth just depends on the kind of soil. It is not every man who can build a stone drain; I have built stone drains with my own hands, but there is a great deal that I do not know about draining, and I would like this experimental farm to tell us all about it. Then, we in the west have lately been troubled a great deal with a little midge in the clover. We used to make large amounts of money from clover seed, which we sold for $7 or $8 a bushel; but of late years the midge has been destroying the seed. Might there not be an experiment in that direction to tell us how to prevent the operations of this midge? We have found out a little ourselves. All who have pastured their clover until about the 10th of June, and have then left it to go to seed, have raised a good crop of clover seed. That brings the seed just at the right time to miss the midge; but the men who cut the hay and then depend on getting a crop of clover seed miss it. There is another thing about which this experimental farm might do a great deal of good; that is the blight on fruit trees. Farmers have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars during the past five years by the loss of apple trees especially. I got a batch last year that cost me about $20. Last summer a man came along and wanted me to give him an order for some more, and I took him into my orchard and told him to look at these. First a little blackness started on the tree, and then it spread till nearly all the trees were killed; and I said: "It is of no use getting any more apple trees." He said: "These are going to be better," and at last I gave him an order. If this experimental farm would tell us what to wash that spot with when it first appears, and kill the insect or whatever it is, tens of thousands of dollars would be saved to the farmers. If the Minister will inaugurate colleges which will give us practical information of this kind without costing very much, then I will be well satisfied with experimental farms.

Mr. IRVINE. Any standard author on entomology will tell you that; you can get it for a couple of dollars.

Mr. FARROW. I understood that the hon. gentleman came from a country where they could not write, and where they signed their names with a cross. I was going to say——

An hon. MEMBER. Tell us about that apple tree.

Mr. FARROW. I agree with the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Irvine) that we have too many lawyers in this House. I think it would be better if we had a few more practical farmers that understood hard work, that understood what it is to earn their living by the sweat of their brow. It appears that the hon. member who has spoken of apple trees does not know much about farming. I suppose he would not care if the farmer lost all his trees so long as he got plenty of law suits. I do not think we have enough farmers in this House, but you are going to have more farmers here by-and-bye. I will tell you why. The farmers are beginning to say that they are just as good as the lawyers and just as level-headed as the doctors. Another farmer says: Well, if I have not, my boys are coming that have. There are John and Charles, they have a pretty good common school education, they can do a little more than make a cross, they have been to a grammar school, and you will find these boys in these halls by-and-bye, and these farmers' sons will be able to cope with your lawyers, day in and day out. You will have more farmers in these halls than you have had in the past, depend upon it; but to the question. What we want is an experimental farm so that we may learn how to deal with a great many subjects about which we know nothing at present. Take the trouble we had last year from Ottawa to Sarnia and inland through the potato rot. It is my opinion that if we had had an experimental farm, we would have had a great deal of information as to planting this spring, and I am glad to see the Agricultural College of Guelph has issued some instructions which, if the farmers apply them, will make them comparatively free of the potato rot this coming season. We want an experimental farm with reference to fertilisers. When the Agricultural Committee was sitting, one of its members told me that in the Province of Quebec they had been more humbugged about fertilisers than almost anything else by laying out large amounts for something that was utterly worthless. It has been so, undoubtedly, to a great extent all through Ontario, and we want an experimental farm to direct that. We also want an experimental farm to tell us the utility of farming implements. Suppose a man gets a bad self-binder, which costs him $210, suppose he gets a meanly constructed binder, why he is half ruined. Suppose he gets a miserable mower or reaper, he suffers great loss. Now the experimental farm ought to try these articles and tell the people which is worth buying, and if they would only do that hundreds of thousands of dollars would be saved to the farmers. It will also give us undoubtedly a great deal of accurate knowledge about the rotation of crops. If there is anything that people are ignorant about more than anything else, it is the rotation of crops. There is very little system in Ontario as to what they shall sow. A man sows wheat this year and right away sows wheat again. That ought not to be so, but if he was correctly informed about the rotation of crops it would be of great advantage to him. I think an experimental farm in Manitoba and the North-West would do a vast amount of good. I think on the whole these experimental farms would be of great advantage to the country, and I intend to give them now my hearty support; but depend upon this that if they go on spending money, doing no good from year to year, I will be down upon them.

Mr. SPROULE. At this late hour of the night, I feel reluctant to detain the House, but the importance of this question is the only excuse I offer for saying a few words on this subject. We are in an enlightened age, in an age in which it has been demonstrated knowledge is advancing very rapidly, and those who attain to the highest standard of knowledge receive the largest return for their labor. It is said that the professional man who is able to reach the highest rung in the ladder is always sure to succeed no matter where he may settle, and to receive the largest return. This is the case also with every class of men, with every community, and with every country. Those who have attained the most advanced intelligence are the most likely to succeed in life. For the last few years there has been a strong agitation

going on all over the world with reference to what may be done for the advancement of that very large class of people represented by the agriculturists of the country. It is not alone in the Dominion this question is attracting public attention. It is not alone in the United States that the great scientists of the age are giving attention in this direction, because we find European countries are directing their attention largely towards the matter. It is only within the last few years it has obtained its importance; it is scarcely more than eight or ten years ago, at the latest, since the principle of experimental farms in the different countries of Europe was established as one of the important necessities of the age, and, perhaps, on an average, it is not more than six years since the first farm was established on the continent of America. To-day we find the subject is considered of so much importance that almost every State in the Union is possessed of an experimental farm. I have a list of a large number of States that have adopted this system of diffusing a better knowledge amongst the agriculturalists. They are Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Oregon, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Ohio, Michigan, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin. All of these States have adopted the system of advancing the intelligence of agriculturists; and not alone in America, but in Europe also the attention of agriculturists has been directed to this question. In England these experimental stations have been established eight or ten years; in France, Germany, Belgium, Russia, China, and in various other countries, they are established; and in Ontario, which may be called one of the first Provinces, an agricultural college was, I am happy to say, first introduced by the Minister of Agriculture who to-day is moving in the same direction, but only in a wider field—the Dominion. The hon. Minister who is to-day initiating the system here, is entitled to the thanks and congratulations of the agriculturists for endeavoring to promote this system to-day. When he introduced it into Ontario some years ago, he was cried down in the country, but to-day the mass of the people of Ontario will admit there is great good being done in the Province by that establishment. And, while I believe that years of labor have been practically wasted, that a great deal of time that might have been turned to useful advantage has been wasted in connection with that institution, I am glad to find that the advanced intelligence of the present day has developed a system that is very much in harmony with the system which is intended to be inaugurated in connection with this work, and a system which I believe will prove of incalculable benefit to the agriculturists of Ontario. While I am rather inclined to the opinion that these experimental stations or agricultural colleges would be better suited as provincial institutions, still I am far from believing that a great good cannot be accomplished and a wider range taken by a Dominion institution than by provincial ones. I am led to believe that, while provincial institutions may, in their limited capacity, do good in the localities where they are situated, I believe that knowledge emanating from a central authority like the capital of the Dominion of Canada can be more extensively circulated and can do a good in proportion to the size of the country that is quite equal to the good which is being accomplished by the provincial institutions. By looking over the history of the various experimental farms which have been established in other countries, which is given in this report laid upon the Table and which is a very valuable and practical document, in which we have condensed information gathered not only on the continent of America but on the continent of Europe, we may gain information of a very valuable character which we may bring to bear on the pursuits of our people, and by which we may work out some of the difficult problems of life to the advantage of our agriculturists. That report tells us that the people of foreign countries, as well as our own, are spending their labor for what might be termed a half-return, that they are following agricultural pursuits, in a great number of cases, not intelligently but very much on the principle of the intelligence that was represented by the anecdote told by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Irvine), with an intelligence which is not even beyond, perhaps, the mark that is indicative of what may be called from a literal standpoint, the lowest intelligence of man. I thought, when he referred to the granger who made the remark that the best agriculturist of his county was obliged to sign his name with a cross, he forgot to add that that very man, when he came before a committee here, in reference to the interest of the agriculturist, strongly advocated the establishment of agricultural colleges, believing it to be very important in the interests of the country that a more extensive knowledge of the better class should be diffused among the agriculturists. The history of the grangers of this country goes a long way to prove the importance of these institutions. The object of the grangers has been to acquire more extensive, practical and scientific knowledge in reference to the pursuits in which they are engaged. I am far from believing that it is essentially necessary to have a scientific knowledge in all cases for farming, but I believe that it is important to be possessed of at least a good rudimentary knowledge in reference to analytical chemistry, in reference to the nature and adaptability of different grains to different soils, in reference to the importance of manures and the kind of manures to be used, in reference to the necessity of a rotation of crops so as not to divest the soil of those elements which are the source of the crops, and in connection with that the importance of the grasses which may be used in order to yield the largest return and the kind of food which may be used in order to give the largest return to the stock raiser who is preparing his stock for foreign markets. The member for Carleton said what the agriculturists want to-day is a market for what they raise, not so much to know how to raise more. I wonder if this hon. gentleman knows anything of the experience of the farmers in his country, because I believe it is the same as the experience of the farmers in our country. We know that soil which a few years ago would yield twenty-five to thirty-five bushels an acre will not to-day yield more than ten or twelve. If a scientific knowledge can be brought into use so as to enable the agriculturist to improve his soil in such a way that it will return to its previous condition and again yield twenty-five bushels, can he not see that, although he sold that grain for 50 cents a bushel, it would yield as much as if he sold half the quantity at $1 a bushel? It is important that both these matters should be considered. While I believe the Government are doing everything they can to open up new and better markets for the agriculturists, I believe it is as important to diffuse a better knowledge, and enable every farmer to raise two bushels where to-day he is only raising one. As to the agricultural colleges, we have a pretty good knowledge of their uses and of the uses to which they may be turned in the interests of the agriculturists. It appears to me that the history of those institutions, not only in America but in European countries, the consensus of information which has been received proves that what is asked for by the agriculturists of this country to-day can be accomplished. Subjects have been brought before the farmers' institutes of Ontario, when the professors of the Agricultural Colleges mix up with them, and endeavor to give them an enlightened knowledge of their own pursuits. What were the important subjects brought up? The agriculturists said: We want

to know the best kind of manures, so that we may not waste a year or two by putting on something which is practically useless. We want to know whether a rotation of crops is the best means of maintaining the virgin strength of the soil; we want to know whether the class of grain that we are sowing can be exchanged for others, which will yield better flour and a larger return. In some parts of our country, at least I know that, where better grains have been introduced, the experience has been of the best kind, and the parties who have introduced them, having fields alongside of each other, one with the improved quality of grain, and the other with the older quality, have been able to raise nearly double the number of bushels per acre, with the improved grain, that they could with the other. Is it not then important to endeavor to obtain these grains, and to ascertain, by experimental farms, which kind of grains is most needed? It is unfortunate that every step in knowledge to the agriculturist must mean a year's labor or a year's profit lost. If a farmer sows grain, which is not adapted to the soil and the climate, he must not only waste a year before receiving the intelligence which the experiment can give him, but he must also waste the labor of that year. In view of that, how important it is that these stations should be founded, and the experience gained by the few, and given out to the many, so as to economise the labor of the mass of the people, and economise their time, and put in their hands information of the most valuable character that can be turned to the best possible account. In connection with stock-raising, the same rule applies. We know that a very large percentage of farmers are wasting their time in relation to stock. They are raising stock which is not suited to the market in which they must sell, stock that requires a large amount of feeding, and yet when sold give no adequate return for the outlay. It is an acknowledged fact that it is just as easy to raise an animal that will sell for $50 as one that will sell for $30; and if the agriculturists can so improve their stock by means of the practical experience gained at a central point, we can easily understand the immense benefit that will accrue to the country. If they can sell their animals for 30 or 40 per cent. higher. I remember only two years ago there were professors devoting their attention to the dairy interest, and they gave it as their opinion that the butter produced in this country was depreciated at least one-fifth in value by reason of the improper methods taken in producing it. It was calculated, also, that the same rule would hold good in reference to cattle. Now, when we remember that the farm exports last year represented something like $35,000,000, a saving of one-fifth of that would represent $7,000,000 saved to the people. I think the Minister of Agriculture deserves the thanks of the people of this country for his efforts in favor of agriculture, and I am satisfied that his name is a sufficient guarantee that this agricultural farm will be conducted so successfully that the people will regret that the system had not been adopted earlier. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) appears never to be at home unless he can drag politics into the discussion of every question, and he endeavors to find fault with everything coming from the present Government. I am sorry that so many hon. gentlemen opposed to this Government, whilst admitting their desire to support a measure in the interests of the agriculturist, still endeavor to throw cold water on this scheme, while they admit in the same breath that great good is going to be accomplished by it. If those hon. gentlemen would only show a greater desire to work in harmony with the Government in its efforts to advance the interests of the farming community, I think their constituents would feel more grateful to them. There is not a single page in this report of the Minister of Agriculture that is not full of information that gives the strongest assurance that the effect of the proposed institution will be of great practical benefit. We find that one of these farms in England was established by Sir J. B. Lawes, and in reference to fertilisers he says that by nineteen repeated applications the exact effect of every fertiliser was obtained, and a most instructive series of specimens secured. Speaking in reference to grain, he says the unmanured examples show about half the size and weight of the manured. Now if this applies to grain, it applies with equal force to every line represented in the pursuits of the agriculturist. He says that the relative yield was about twice as much by keeping the ground cultivated, manured, and by a rotation of crops. Now this system could be practised in this proposed establishment, and the farmers could ascertain how to get the most value from their crops. I have no doubt at all that the country will receive greater benefit from this institution than we anticipate, and that in the future the name of the Minister of Agriculture, who has to-day inaugurated this scheme, will be handed down in history through the ages as one of the great benefactors of the people of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. IRVINE. I rise to a personal explanation. I understood by the hon. member who followed me that he stated that the man who made his cross was a New Brunswicker. I did not intend any offence toward any Province in what I said. What I said was that a Dominion granger from Ontario made a statement before the committee, upon whose report the action of the Government is based in this instance, that the most successful farmer he ever met in his life was a gentleman who signed his name with a cross. If I said any Province, I did not mean it.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I have considerable sympathy with you to-night, Mr. Speaker, if you know anything of farming, because it reminds me a good deal of the old times when we used to have an election campaign, and people from the city came down to talk to us in the country. We were then assured that farming was an important interest, that the horny-handed sons of toil were the back-bone of the country, that they could not do anything without them, that they bore the burdens, and that sort of thing. Those olden times came back to me, when we used to listen to the orations of those gentlemen who wanted our votes. I suppose farming is like other things in this House, it has got to have its innings. There is one thing we are certain of, that whether we get a successful experimental farm or not, we may make up our mind that so far as expense goes, we will have a thoroughly successful institution. I have not a bit of doubt but that after our friends have tried it, they will have the experience of other States and Provinces with reference to experimental farming, and we will find out that we have got a tolerably costly thing, and that it is much easier to start an institution than to make it successful afterwards. We have heard a few bitter criticisms on the operation of the Ontario Agricultural College and experimental farm this evening, and I did think, when I heard the hon. member for Essex delivering his bitter diatribes, against the management of that college, that if he had been as familiar with it as I was, perhaps he would have moderated his statements a little with reference to the condition in which that farm is. We have been accustomed to just such attacks upon the management of that college throught the Province of Ontario for many years past. I believe, upon the whole, the college has been an advantage to the people of Ontario, and the best evidence of that is that it has been adopted as the example upon which this Government now propose to establish similar institutions in view of the time when they will present themselves to the electorate of this country and ask them for their vote. It occurred to me when heard some of these gentlemen that they had been present at some of the farmers' institutes held by the professors of that college, because some of their speeches sounded to me very like what I have heard on previous occasion in connection with these farm-

er's institutes; and as I said before, I think the best evidence that that college has been successful is the fact that these gentlemen now find it necessary to take an interest in the farmers and make a move in the same direction. An hon. gentleman said this evening that it was a serious ground of complaint to spend $20,000 a year in its annual administration and only succeed in earning $14,000, and that any farmer that pursued that policy would naturally become bankrupt. Well, I could not help thinking of the operations of one hon. gentleman here in administering one of our public Departments, which it seemed to me was a much worse position. It strikes me that if we were to foot up the receipts and expenditures we would find that the income of the Department of Railways had not been quite equal to the outlay, without looking at the original cost involved; and yet that hon. gentleman did not seem to see anything wrong there, although there was no pretense made that the Intercolonial or any of the other railways were being operated for the purpose of diffusing intelligence through the country, and at some future day we would be recouped in the general good conferred on the country. No, the hon. gentleman seemed to forget that in operating such an institution as that under discussion, experiments must necessarily be conducted at a certain amount of loss, because some of them must be unsuccessful; and the best test you can give to a great many plausible theories is to put them in practice, and see how they will work. I have one thing to say with respect to the experience to be gained from the history of agricultural colleges, not only in Ontario, but in the United States that should serve as a warning beacon to us in establishing a new Dominion institution. It is this: That if we undertake to equip a large and thoroughly furnished experimental farm, and a large agricultural college here, for the purpose of teaching farming as a scientific study, and demonstrate it in operation, we will realise a gigantic failure, in so far as the financial administration is concerned. I believe the history of the Royal Agricultural College of England will, to a large extent, apply to our college, if we start an institution of that class. If you reflect for a moment upon the extent, resources and varied position of the several Provinces and the fact that one central institution representing the whole Dominion will naturally attract the attention of everyone who looks at things from a theoretical standpoint, you will find the difficulties the same as those of which the hon. gentleman complained with respect to the Ontario model farm, that of attracting men from foreign countries and thus losing the labor that ought to be bestowed on our own people, and expending our resources in cultivating men who will not be farmers in our midst. That evil will apply in a tenfold degree to any institution that will be established in this centre of the Dominion with that object in view. There is this additional difficulty, that however thoroughly equipped and satisfactory a great many of the experiments may be, especially at this particular locality and particular climate, they will be utterly unavailing when carried into the more distant Provinces that form the Confederation. I believe the only successful way in which those things can be carried out is either by each Province conducting the experiments for itself, or if the Central Government will conduct the experiments, when they should be conducted on a thoroughly careful basis, in the various localities representing the different degrees of climate and conditions under which our agricultural population is placed in the various portions of the Dominion. It seems utterly preposterous to think for a moment that a series of experiments upon soil and climate at this central college would be of any material advantage to the farmers of the North-West Territories, of Manitoba or of the Province of British Columbia; and yet it is plain on the face of it that unless our central organisation is simply used for the purpose of being a centre to direct well conducted experiments at those various outlying points, we will only expend a large amount of money and secure very unsatisfactory and barren results, and that an administration of that kind can only result in conspicuous failure and to be open to the charge of spending a very large sum of money without doing any benefit except to a few individuals in the immediate locality. The changes that have transpired in the mode in which agricultural operations are being carried on during the last few years make it imperative on any Government establishing a new institution of that kind to look well at the class of men placed in charge of it. I have no hesitation in saying that if you get men settled down into the old grooves and routines of an agricultural college, there will be a conspicuous failure. The history of the Agricultural College in Ontario has not been a history of unvaried and satisfactory success. It was only when the college came into the hands of energetical and practical as well as scientific men that it began to take hold of the agricultural population of the Province and became thoroughly useful for the purpose for which it was originally established. It is the easiest thing in the world to secure a large staff of professors and establish a certain round of expenditure, which will be presented very nicely rounded up in the annual reports, but which will present very unsatisfactory results when applied to the farmers and the farming operations of the country. It is desirable that we should take some steps in this matter, more especally with a view to securing for the great North-West, to which we look forward as being the future back-bone and centre of this Dominion, for that particular climate and particular condition of soil to which the production of this country are exposed seeds and plants that will be adapted to a severe climate and a short season in which to ripen, and unless those experiments are conducted on the spot and with a degree of care and attention that is somewhat rare, I fancy the school would only end in conspicious failure. While I hope for better things, yet at the same time I do not feel very enthusiastic over the proposition to establish an agricultural central college with various branches at this centre. I fear, unless more than average care is displayed, we will find that we have got a huge machine on which must be expended a large sum of money, and so far as the farmers are concerned the results will not be satisfactory.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is under a wrong impression in thinking that we propose to establish a huge agricultural college. It is not intended to establish a college at all. The intention is to establish an experimental farm and station, and make experiments without having a college as they have at Guelph. The Ontario Government has made a mistake, I think, in the very great expense incurred in carrying on the college and bringing young men to learn agriculture. It is not intended to do so at this experimental farm or experimental stations; but everyone who goes there will be paid his days' wages. But the idea is to make the experiments, and distribute the results throughout the country in the shape of bulletins, once a month or oftener if necessary. Now it has been stated here to-night by the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and other gentlemen, who I do not think have any desire to mislead the people of this country, that every article that the farmer purchases or consumes is dearer now than it was some years ago. Now I think the House will bear with me for a few minutes if I state what I have ascertained to be the prices which are paid now and in 1878 for articles which the farmers and the mechanics use and consume. I have a letter here from the proprietor of the Grimsby agricultural works, in which he says:

"Machinery of all kinds, mowers, reapers, ploughs, cultivators, rakes, drills, &c., are fully 25 per cent. cheaper than ten years ago, but this does not mean that the manufacturer is losing it altogether. Expenses

of selling are higher, but the improvements in manufacturing enable all these goods to be made much cheaper than formerly. Iron, steel, &c., are all considered to be down to bed rock prices, but labor is higher."

This is from a firm who carry on a large agricultural implement establishment in Grimsby. Then with regard to other goods, I have here a list of prices which were paid for dry goods in 1878 and the prices paid at the present time. These figures were furnished to me by Messrs. A. B. Powell & Co., of London, Ont., and are thoroughly reliable. Men's Canadian tweed suits which sold in 1878 for $10, now sell for $7; those at $12.54 in 1878 sell for $10 now; those at $18 in 1878, $12 now; men's overcoats that sold for $10.50 in 1878 sell for $7 now; $15 in 1878, $9 now. Men's all wool undershirts that sold for $1 in 1878 sell for 65 cents now; those that sold at $1.12 in 1878 sell for 75 cents now; at $1.25 in 1878, 90 cents now. Boys' all wool undershirts that sold for 65 cents in 1878, sell for 45 cents now; those that sold for 75 cents in 1878 sell for 50 cents now; those that sold for $1 in 1878 sell for 75 cents now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rise to order. You called an hon. gentleman to order before for indulging in a most irrelevant discussion, as this appears to be.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think this refers to the experimental farm.

Mr. CARLING. Then I shall not go on. The hon. member for Wellington stated that all articles that the farmer consumes or uses were much higher in price now than they were some years ago.

Mr. IRVINE. Have you the price of wool?

Mr. CARLING. Perhaps I have, if the hon. gentleman will allow me to go on. If I have not the price of wool; I have the price of manufactured woollen goods. Wool is not consumed or used in its raw state.

Mr. KIRK. I would like to ask the Minister whether he intends that this model farm shall conduct experiments in live stock as well as in seed and grain.

Mr. CARLING. That is the intention.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee).

On section 1,

Mr. CARLING. Now, if I am in order, I will continue the prices I was about to give.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not the slightest objection, except that it is now twelve o'clock, and if the hon. gentleman goes on there will be a long discussion. Besides, it has already been ruled out of order.

Mr. CARLING. It will not take me more than a few minutes. Boys' union underwear that sold in 1878 for 35 cents now sells for 20; that which sold for 50 cents in 1878 now sells for 35.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think this is relevant to the question before the Committee.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. CARLING introduced Bill (No. 124) relating to experimental farm stations.

Bill read the first time.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 117) to amend an Act to authorise the granting of subsidies in land to certain railway companies.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). This is simply to authorise the giving of subsidies in block instead of in alternate sections. I think everybody is in favor of it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have not read the Bill but I was under the impression that it was perhaps making a change with reference to all the lands in alternate townships, but I understand not. This is for future grants.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, and there is one given to the Galt Railway Company in townships, subject to the action of Parliament.

On section 2,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). This is merely to include the statutory allowance for roads. It is necessary to do that when the grant is made in blocks.

Bill reported.

SALARY OF A JUDGE.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the salary of an additional judge of the Chancery division of the High Court of Justice for Ontario (page 877).

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose this is in accordance with a demand of the Ontario Legislature?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes. In the Session of 1885 the Legislature passed an Act reducing the number of judges of the court of appeal, and providing that the next appointment should be to the chancery division instead. The salary in the estimates is transferred from the appeal court to the chancery division.

Mr. McCARTHY. A matter that perhaps can be spoken of later is the question of the salaries of the judges. This question was brought up two Sessions ago, and the Government promised that it would be dealt with, I think before this Session. I do not intend to do more to-night than simply to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the subject. I may bring it up again at a future stage.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. THOMPSON introduced Bill (No. 125) to amend the law relating to the salaries of certain judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Ontario.

Bill read the first time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 12.20 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 3rd May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CROWN CASES RESERVED.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 126) to amend the law respecting Crown cases reserved. He said: What is known as the Speedy Trials Act, applying to three or four Provinces of this Dominion, contains a provision that in the Province of Ontario the county judge who exercises the jurisdiction conferred by that Act, may state a case for the opinion of the court in the nature of a Crown case reserved, and may so obtain a review of the legal questions arising on the trial. A similar provision exists with regard to certain judges in the Province of Quebec who exercise the jurisdiction under that Act; but it is desired in the Province of Quebec that the right of so stating a case should be extended to other judges, and this Bill provides that all judges who exercise the authority conferred by that Act shall have power to state such a case.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BOUNDARIES OF KEEWATIN.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 127) to extend the boundaries of the district of Keewatin, and to amend the law respecting such district. He said: The object of the Bill is to provide a system of law in the territories of Canada, outside of the territories known as the North-West Territories and Keewatin, by extending the district of Keewatin so as to include the territories not at present included.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DEBTS OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he is able to state whether any progress has been made with respect to the debts of Ontario and Quebec. The hon. gentleman knows that for a couple of years we have been in constant expectations of having that matter settled. I think there have been several conferences, either under him or under his predecessor, with respect to the relative claims of Ontario and Quebec. I should be glad to know how the matter stands, and whether the hon. Minister has, or expects to have, any communication to make to the House about it within a week or two.

Mr. McLELAN. I think that before my predecessor left office the matter was narrowed down to one or two points that remained unsettled, and before the House rises it is probable that these may be in a shape for settlement.

NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BEATY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 17) to amend the Act respecting the North-West Central Railway Company.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Before that motion is adopted I should like to offer a few remarks to the House. I think it is due, Sir, that a statement should be made by me in regard to this matter, which has been more or less commented upon by the public press of the country and by public men. I did not know that the measure was coming up to-day until a very few moments ago; but although somewhat surprised at its coming up so soon after its passage through the Committee on Railways and Canals, I think it my duty to state that I believe this Bill should not be committed to a committee of the House, and should not have a passage through this House. The statement has been made, which hon. members are perfectly familiar with, that this Bill is merely a re enactment of the old Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway charter, which lapsed by effluxion of time. The North-West Central Railway Bill was passed through this House in the Session of 1884, and became law. I introduced the Bill to this House and promoted it in committee. I may say it was the first railway Bill that ever I did promote, and I think it will be the last that I will promote for a railway company in which I am a director while being a member of this House. I was not aware, Sir, when I promoted this Bill, nor am I yet aware, but that it was the general custom of members of Parliament to be interested in railway charters if they pleased, just as if they were not members of Parliament; and believing that, I went into this matter the same as though I were not a member of Parliament. I never had a thought that it would be commented upon unfavorably, that because I was a member of Parliament I should not be one of the charterers, and for a very good reason—because there is not a Session of this House in which more or less Bills are not passed, of which members of the House are promoters as members of the company chartered. Before this measure was introduced by me, the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) came to me and asked me to join him in introducing the Bill, to promote the Bill, to introduce it, and to manage it through the House and the committee; and there were certain conditions which he said would follow—that both of us were to be mutually interested in the Bill—in its franchises, and in everything that pertained to it. As I say, I was quite unsophisticated in reference to railway charters, and hardly knew what the duties were. All I knew was that I was to be equally interested with him in whatever the undertaking might bring forth. After the Bill was passed, and became law, the member for West Toronto went home. I remained here to obtain, if possible, 6,400 acres a mile, the amount granted to other railways in like manner situated. I remained here, at the instigation of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), for some weeks after the Session of 1884 had prorogued. After that the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) went to England to get the money for the road. He came back and stated that there was no doubt he had the money to build the road. During the Session of 1885 he went to New York, and on his return said he had found some parties there to build the road. I interrogated him, and then went to New York on the Friday, arriving back on the Monday following, and I found that the company in New York was a myth. I forget their names—Herbert, I think, was one—but, at all events, they were men of straw. They were brokers in a certain way, but they had no money, and could not build the road. They said, however, they hoped to sell the bonds in England. I told the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) that had he told me the truth I would not have gone to New York. There were other contractors here, Canadian contractors, who wanted to build the road, and I was anxious they should have the contract; but the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), for some reasons or other, which I knew not then but which I have had since developed, would not hold any conversation with me, and avoided me. I then, in my seat here, wrote him a letter, a copy of which I did not keep. I wrote it hastily, and the main facts of the agreement between us are in that letter, namely, that after $50,000, if the road could be made to pay that, was divided among the other directors, whatever franchises were left we were to be mutually interested in. I did not know that there would be $5 or $1 left, but whatever was left we

were to be mutually interested in. That letter he never replied to. I wrote him another asking him to reply to the first, but he did not reply, and I found out afterwards that he had taken those letters, while ostensibly a member of the same party to which I belong—if I belong to any party—and showed them to members of the party opposed to him, if he belongs to the Conservative party; I found that, without being accosted by the reporters of the Reform press, he interviewed them, and made statements to them with regard to his connection and mine with the road. He even went so far as, when I came into the building and he was talking to a Mr. McNee, the reporter of the Winnipeg *Free Press*, to ask Mr. McNee to come out into the corridors, as he did not wish to talk before me. After having filled the ears of the members of the Opposition and the correspondents of the Reform press, he went to New York and attempted to make another agreement. When this Session opened, the member for West Toronto introduced a Bill to amend the North-West Central Railway Act. I looked at the Bill, and found that all the guards, all the checks, ensuring payment to the workmen upon the road, the old Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway, of which this was a revival, had been left out I found that, in so many words—and I have the Bill here—he introduced his measure, leaving out those clauses, without which the North-West Central Railway Act would not have passed in 1884. When that Bill came before the Committee of Railways and Canals I objected to it, and in the course of my objection I made, in substance, the statements which I have just made in the beginning of the few remarks I am addressing to the House. The committee at once, almost unanimously —I think quite so, with the exception of the member for West Toronto and two or three of his co-directors—struck out all these objectionable clauses, and left the Bill merely an extension of time; but then they told the member for West Toronto that they would give him certain time to produce evidence of his ability to build the road. The committee adjourned, and when they met again the member for West Toronto could not show any ability to build the road, but said he expected the papers that night, and asked the committee to be kind enough to adjourn again. The committee adjourned for a week, and I think there was another adjournment, besides, to give him time. There were three adjournments altogether, and when the committee met last Friday, they met for the purpose of enabling the member for West Toronto to show his ability to build the road, because the statements made during the meetings of the committee at different times seemed to me to indicate the feeling of the whole committee that the present promoters of that charter, notably the member for West Toronto, as its president, should not be allowed to go on. That was the unanimous feeling of the committee, but when we met last Friday we were informed that it was determined this Bill should pass, extending the time, and if the promoters did not show their ability to build the road by the first of June next, when the proclamation would issue, bringing into effect the charter, the Government would take upon themselves the responsibility of adopting such measures as would ensure the building of the road. That was certainly not what the committee expected. I am sure I was never more surprised in my life than when that announcement was made, because I thought we had been adjourning from time to time to give the member for West Toronto an opportunity to show that he was able to build this road. However, when it came to this announcement, which was an entirely different matter altogether, the member for West Toronto sat there and never opened his lips. The remarks were all made by the hon. Minister of Interior in the favor of the member for West Toronto, and perhaps some other hon. gentleman made remarks as to the position of members of Parliament; but the Minister of the Interior made the defence. Now, during those meetings of the committee, that had been adjourned from time to time, to which I alluded, I made the statement, as I told you, at the first meeting of the committee, that we were mutually interested in the road. The member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) got up and denied it *in toto*; he said there was not a word of truth in the statement. Well, I said, I have your letters—I had one which I had not handed over—and I have given them to the hon. the Minister of Finance; I gave them to him last summer, and I said they will prove my statement. I was there in the presence of my peers, I was there in the presence of almost the whole Parliament—160 members formed that committee—and, having made the statement that I did and having it denied by the member for West Toronto, I found myself uncorroborated; and when I made the statement that the Minister of Finance had letters which would prove it, I was asked to produce those letters. I wrote to the Minister of Finance and asked him to produce them. The Minister of Finance replied what has been in the papers, but, as it was done before a committee, of course it was not taken down in the *Hansard*. The Minister of Finance replied to me that he could not find my letters, that he had mislaid them in shifting his office from the Ministry of Marine and Fisheries, but that the impression made upon his mind by reading the letters, which he had done, was that the member for West Toronto and myself were mutually interested in the road and all connected therewith. Therefore, I was enabled, although my letters were not forthcoming by no fault of mine, to prove from the Finance Minister of Canada, my statement made before that committee and most solemnly and positively denied by the member for West Toronto in the presence of the chairman of the committee, in the presence of the leader of the Opposition, in the presence of every member of that committee—and it was filled to overflowing—notwithstanding his denial. After another adjournment, I stated to that committee that I had a letter to show that the member for West Toronto had demanded as his share of the profit in building that read, from a contractor whom he wished to undertake the work, the modest sum of $675,000. I read that letter. That was denied, as my statement had been denied to which I have alluded as corroborated by the Finance Minister. At a subsequent meeting I read a letter from another man whose name I forget now, saying he was present when the member for West Toronto saw the man to whom I have referred as writing the first letter, and that he heard the member for West Toronto demand that as the modest sum he wanted for what he called "the boy." That was also denied. Now I have in my hand another piece of evidence of the member for West Toronto endeavoring to sell this charter, for it is nothing but that. There was no honest attempt made to build one foot of this road. There was not an honest attempt to put a theodolite on the road, to take a measurement, to take a level, to do anything, to go out there even, as I understand, to put a foot on the road, but merely to hawk the road, not from Dan to Beersheba, which were the old Palestine distances, but from America to the continent of Europe, to hawk it about; and had there been an honest attempt, and had there been a spade stuck in the ground in order to build the road, or anything given excepting wind, which always was given, I would never have been heard from in regard to this Bill, we never would have had this Bill introduced into this House to amend the North-West Central Railway Company's charter. We might have had one for an extension, but we would not have had one with the obnoxious clauses to which I have referred, and which the committee at once unanimously struck out. I say this was a charter selling, and nothing else, and no honest attempt to build the road. Here is a copy of an agreement which I shall read in support of the contention I make. It is signed

"James Beaty, President N.-W. C. Ry. Co," and dated Toronto, 17th October, 1885:

"The undersigned, president of the North-West Central Railway Company, duly authorised by the board of directors, do hereby declare that I will let the contract to Alexander Macdonald, to build the line from Brandon to Battleford, in accordance with the Acts and Orders in Council on the following terms, and on the condition hereafter mentioned. These terms are as follows:—

"1st. That Macdonald will get bonds to the value of $25,000 per mile, one quarter of the company's capital stock, bonuses and town sites.

"2nd. That the bonds for each one hundred miles be deposited in advance of construction into a bank to be named by him, to be sold by English friends of his, and replaced in the bank by the cash realised by their sale, which shall be held by the bank and paid out only on the engineer's certificates as the work is done and the material furnished; the stock to be transferred when the first fifty miles is completed, the bonuses as they are acquired and the town sites as they are located.

"3rd. That Macdonald will allow at the rate of $1,600 per mile to be deducted each monthly estimate, which will be paid over by the bank to the company, and will pay one quarter of the company's old indebtedness for work done on the old grade. Macdonald will pay for working up bonuses all places but Brandon. He will also locate and pay for laying out the town sites. Macdonald will furnish a bank guarantee for the interest on the whole of the bonds for two years from the date of their issue.

"The condition above mentioned is that Macdonald will prove soon that he has money deposited to begin the work and grade this fall twenty-three miles, that is to say, from Brandon to Rapid City. On that condition, I will let the contract to Macdonald, as aforesaid."

Now, I stated before the committee that I had letters to prove that the member for West Toronto, and president of this company, Mr. Beaty, wanted the sum of $675,000—$1,500 per mile—which he denied, although there were two letters, both saying the writers were prepared to swear to the truth of their assertions; but this document, signed by the member for West Toronto's own hand, says that Macdonald will allow at the rate of $1,600 per mile, to be deducted from each monthly estimate, which will be paid over by the bank to the company, and will pay one-quarter of the company's old indebtedness for work done. But Macdonald will also provide for working up bonuses, and will furnish a bank guarantee for the interest on the bonds. Macdonald is to furnish the interest for two years on the bonds, in addition to giving $1,600 per mile. Now, who owned most of the stock of this company? The member for West Toronto. Before the committee, at our first meeting, while he was in the mood of being loquacious, and before he had become suddenly silent and allowed other people to do his work for him, he confessed that he had $386,000 of the stock, upon which 10 per cent was paid, and he had never paid a dollar himself. I stated to him then that I believed it could be proved—at least, I told him that I wanted his denial of it—that he had sold thousands of dollars worth of the old stock, at what figures I did not know, had put the proceeds in his pocket, and had travelled around the country and lived on it. I have had no denial, and this House has had no denial, of that statement up to this hour. Now, Sir, I say that in presence of these facts, I think the committee took an extraordinary course when they passed this Bill. It was very easy to charter another company; notice had been given, and had passed through the Standing Orders Committee, and a Bill could have been brought into the House and passed in an hour, figuratively speaking, giving to an entirely distinct and new company, after these revelations had been made, power to build this road; but that had not been done, for what reasons I do not know. The committee changed its tune all of a sudden, and those who affected to be shocked and revolted at the statements made, were the first to jump on their feet and say: "Let us pass the Bill." What had occurred, Sir, between the first meeting, when they struck out those objectionable clauses, and only allowed the extension to stand? If the president could not show his ability to build the road—what had occurred from that first meeting up to last Friday, to make the committee change its base in that manner? Who had done it? What occult influence was there? I stated, and I state now, that I held not a word of communication with members of the Government in regard to it, I did not know what they were going to do, and I was certainly surprised when I found what was being done. My name, of course, has been used in connection with this matter from different standpoints. I know to-day of no wrong act I have done in connection with this matter. I did not know then, I do not know now, what profits were to be had. I never attempted to sell the charter; I never attempted to hawk it about. My intention was to have the road built, after $50,000 were got out of it to give to the directors. But that was in 1884. I knew nothing of what was in it. I never knew until lately of the president attempting to hawk that charter about and attempting to sell it, as it has been proved that he did. Therefore it comes down to this fact that I, as a member of Parliament, was in a railway charter. Well, Sir, I have had noble precedents before me; this House was teeming with them, and I do not think I should be made the scapegoat for what hundreds have done. Therefore, I cannot see in what respect I am blameable in regard to this matter. It may be, Sir, that I did very wrong when this Bill, without the slightest notice, was brought up in the committee, and when I had been struck off the board by this mighty magician of railways, when he had put a younger man, a more influential and abler man in my place, without either of them saying, by your leave, Sir. When they had done that, of course, I suppose I did a grievous wrong, a heinous and unpardonable sin, when I dared to assert in committee that the Bill should not pass, first, because of its objectionable clauses, and secondly, owing to the personal conduct of the president of the road. I succeeded in my first demand that the objectionable clauses should not pass. In the second, it is true that I succeeded for a while; the scales remained pretty evenly balanced for some time, and all at once, Sir, I kicked the beam and down went the president, outweighing me. All right; he outweighed me, what weights were used, how I was handicapped, and what false weights were put in, I do not know; but I did not have a fair race; I know that. Now, Sir, I say that it was obligatory upon me to make this statement. It has been charged, again, that a free grant was given to this road, and I cannot see, for the life of me, any objection to that. I quite agree with the Minister of Interior in that respect, because I want to deal fairly in this matter, and I think that any attempt to make capital out of the assertion that a free grant was got by members using undue influence, cannot be substantiated in this case, and I will tell you why. Members on both sides of this House, and the press throughout the country on both sides of politics, demanded that a free grant should be given to this road. That is undeniable, and it is too late, after all that had been done before a free grant was given, for any person in this House, or outside of it, to say that undue influence was exercised with the Government in getting a free grant. That is not the trouble with this charter; it is what was done after the free grant was given and the object of getting a free grant. Allow me to read, in support of my contention, from the Winnipeg *Free Press* of 9th October, 1884. Everybody knows that that paper is one of the most pronounced Reform papers in the country, and here is what it says in an editorial:

"BRANCH LINES AT LAST.

"An Ottawa telegram states that 'the scheme' proposed by Sir David Macpherson to give free grants of lands to North-West Railways has been submitted to the Cabinet, who approve of it.

"We congratulate the Cabinet on the good judgment they have displayed in approving of the proposal submitted to them by Sir David. We also congratulate Sir David on his ability to perceive and his willingness to be guided by good advice.

"This scheme for aiding branch railways which, as presented by Sir David, has so commended itself to the Government that they have determined to act upon it, was first proposed by the *Free Press* last winter.

"It also received the endorsation of the Winnipeg Board of Trade."

So a free grant was demanded by that staunch Reform paper and its friends. I have further evidence. The *Globe* of September 12th, 1884, says in a leading editorial :

"BRANCH LINES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

"Sir Richard Cartwright, speaking in Winnipeg some days ago, said, that the construction of branch railways is one of the means by which the depression in the North-West could be removed and its progress assured, and he suggested that the construction of such roads would be greatly encouraged by giving the 6,400 acres of land per mile free to the companies instead of charging them a dollar an acre, but on such conditions as would prevent the lands being locked up for speculation and would promote their settlement.

"This proposal found such favor with the people of the North-West that the Government suddenly felt themselves impelled almost irresistibly to accept the advice and follow the lead of the Liberal leaders in this as in so many other instances."

On October 8th, 1884, the *Globe* had another editorial article headed "Land grants to railways; the *Globe* has again triumphed." Again, on October 14th, the *Globe* had another leading article, all taking credit to the Opposition for obtaining free grants. As I told my friends in the House and out of it, the land grant to this railway was urged before it was given by the Reform members of the House, notably by the member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), and the press supporting the Reform party, or at all events the leading papers. And nothing, therefore, can be made of this cry of undue influence. But what I complain of is the mode in which the charter was handled or attempted to be handled. The railway is an absolute necessity for the opening of that country. Not only that, but the settlers who have gone in, long expected it. Not only that, but men have given their time, their produce, their materials, who have spent themselves and their goods and their cattle in trying to build a few miles of railway, and have not received one dollar of compensation. Those people find it hard that they have not got the road when this free land grant was given, and as the member for South Huron properly said that it should not be given to be locked up, but for the purpose of building a railway. That was not done, but the charter was hawked about from Dan to Beersheba, as I said before, and the president did not attempt to build the road, but endeavored to secure two-thirds or over one-half of the stock, for which not one dollar had been paid, and to see how best he could put into the pockets of himself and his friends the money which should have gone towards building the railway. I have read letters before, and they are in the newspapers, to show that the great builder of railways, the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), did not believe in building the railway first and selling the bonds afterwards. I have a mass of documents here. I have the letters here which will prove the facts, if a committee is granted as I asked for in another place, to which I will not allude. Instead of attempting to build the road the president and his friends attempted to put the money in their pockets; they sought to sell the road, and when a member of a syndicate in New York wrote that the proper way—and he had been engaged in railways—was to first build a portion, say fifty miles, and afterwards sell some of the bonds, the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) said: No, sell the bonds first and build the road afterwards. He had the president before his eye all the time; it was the "*ego sum*;" he took care of himself. From the day the road was chartered nothing has been done. It is an easy road to build. Fifty miles can be graded for $2,000 or $3,000. Yes, with the appliances they have for grading railways to-day; not the old style of scraper, but the new mode of constructing railways, by which they throw up grades almost by magic, as has been done by the Canadian Pacific Railway and other roads. I heard a member of a contracting firm, who were out of a job and who possessed some hundreds of horses and mules, say, last fall, that he wished the president would let him build fifty miles of road, and he would complete it before winter. So, if the company had commenced in the fall, fifty miles would have been graded and hope held out to the people of the district. That did not, however, suit the president. It suited him better to hawk round the charter and get possession of a majority of the stock, for which he never paid anything, and get power of attorney from other directors, and get his brother on the Board and his relatives there, and then come down here, not for the purpose of securing an extension of the charter so much, as for the purpose of shutting out the claims he would have to pay to honest laborers. But I feel that I have taken up the time of the House sufficiently long to give an exposition of this affair. I do not feel as if I had done a single wrong act in this matter; I am quite conscious of that myself. Any member of the House will do me a kindness in pointing out where I have overstepped the bounds of proper conduct in this matter. I do not at this moment know where I have done so. I promoted the road all I could. I was anxious the road should be built, and every one who knows me is aware that I am not very much of a sluggard; that I would not, if I attempted to build a railway, allow the work to lie idle for years and not put a spade into the ground; and that for the miserable ducats I might be able to put in my pocket I would not allow the people of the country to go without their road all this time. It has been said in a portion of the public press that I was an avaricious man, that I was seeking after unholy gains. Well, my answer to that is, that the people who know me best, the boys who have grown to manhood by my side in my own home, would laugh to scorn such a statement whether made by the hon. member for West Toronto or anyone else. If I err at all, perhaps, it is the other way. I did not feel, that after being treated in the manner I have been treated, I should sit idly by and see those clauses wiped out and the charter extended for the purpose of putting $675,000 into the pockets of the president and his relatives. I do not think the Bill should go into committee. I think it is the duty of the Government—I never advised them before in my life and I presume they will not take this advice, but it is wholesome and manly advice—after the revelations made, after the statements made in the committee by the president, and which were proved by one of his own colleagues to be untrue—after the statements made by other people, who say they are prepared to prove their statement on oath, that the charter was being bartered and sold—I say it is the Government's duty to take power themselves to build the road, and not extend the charter, for the purpose of giving the president of the road, although he is a supporter of the Government, and some of his friends who are supporters of the Government, a chance, not to build the road, but to see if they can sell the charter. For we have no criterion for the future but the history of the past, and if their conduct in the future is similar to what it has been in the past, they do not intend to build one foot of the road. I therefore say it would be the manly course for the Government not to allow this Bill to go into committee, but to take power to themselves to build the road, and, if necessary, allow all the facts connected with the matter to come out in evidence, and then act upon them. There is no necessity for this Bill being pressed forward into committee. It cannot become law until the Governor General has put his sign manual to it, and that will not be for some time. Why, then hurry it through; why not endeavor to get at the bottom of the whole thing and act in a manly and proper way in regard to it? The Minister of the Interior knows—I did not know until I saw the *Mail* that he said so much in Committee the other day—that this company came, that some of the directors came here and asked for an extension of the land grant after they had shown their inability to construct a mile of the road. After the charter had lapsed, because the company could not build the number of miles required in the charter, they came to Ottawa, and the Government extended the land grant while

the charter was defunct. Why was it done to this company particularly? While they did that, there were two notices in the *Canada Gazette* by companies asking incorporation in order to build this very line of railway. Thus there was no necessity to charter this particular company in the interests of the people of that section; there was no necessity for extending the grant in the interests of those people; the only reason for extending the grant was in the interests of the then corporators of the North-West Central Railway Company, and I do not know what particular or special rights they possess, and the Government, I think, as stated before, should pause—I do not know whether they will or not—but I think they should pause after the statements I have made, after the statements I have been able to prove—statements every word of which I can prove to be correct, and I do say that this Bill should not go before the committee, or receive the sanction of this House.

Mr. MITCHELL. When this matter was up in the Railway Committee, I found, from the statements and developments which were elicited there, very much in substance as they have been stated by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) to-day, that the character of the transaction was not such as it appears to me should have been sanctioned by a committee of this House. I heard the statements and the recriminations which were indulged in by the promoters of the Bill, and I called the attention of the Minister of the Cabinet who presided over that committee to the facts which had been brought out, and I stated to him that I thought, after the developments which had been elicited, that that committee ought not to pass the Bill without consideration, and I asked what action the Government would take upon it. Sir, as stated by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), the committee adjourned on three different occasions to enable Mr. Beaty to show the *bonâ fides* of the men who were behind him to construct this road. It appeared that the discussion was going entirely on the *bonâ fides* of the people who were aiding Mr. Beaty in the construction of the road, but I called the attention of the Committee to the fact that there was a deeper question than all that in it; that there was behind this question of *bonâ fides* the question of the statements which had been made by the member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) and which were partially admitted by the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty)—that these statements were such that they developed transactions of charter trading and speculation in relation to the public domain which I thought ought to be dealt with by the committee, and especially dealt with by the Government. Sir, I do not know what the opinion of members of this House may be about these transactions, but I know what my own is. Canada has a noble domain out in the North-West. She is proud of it; and for the last few Sessions of this Parliament, and during the preceding Parliament, we have been endeavoring so to develop that immense territory that we would in the first place attract immigration into it, and settle as much as we could and as rapidly as we could. In order to do that it has been a recognised fact that we must subsidise railways and endeavor by the construction of roads to do as they did in the Western States—to let the railways precede the settlement of the country, if possible. This Government, I say it to their credit, have done much to develop the settlement of Canada. They have gone beyond what, in the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, they ought to have done; they have surprised Europe as well as America by the success which has resulted in the promotion of railway development throughout this continent; and, Sir, having accomplished the great object of building a road from the Atlantic to the Pacific, it was their next desire—it was their duty, and they realised that duty and acted upon it—to endeavor by a system of subsidising local roads to open up and develop side connections with the great artery which they had already contracted to build, and that they proposed doing. Sir, as I understand it, some four or five years ago, when this Souris and Rocky Mountain charter was granted, the object was to develop a fertile portion of that North-West which it was claimed could not be settled satisfactorily unless it had railways. It was stated at that time, and it has been frequently stated since in connection with that scheme—of which this North-West road is the outcome and the successor—that there were a number of settlers in the portion of the country through which this road would go, to whom it was necessary—in order that they should compete on even terms with other settlers in the North-West who had a certain amount of railway communication—that they should have a railway through that portion of the country. The Government granted the necessary bonus to enable that road to be built. It got into the hands, in the first instance, of speculators, who, as I understand, did very little but speculate in the sale of the charter. Some work was done in grading the road, but the charter lapsed and a new company came in. I am not going to enter into the difficulties between the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) and the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty). I divest myself entirely of the difficulties with which they have surrounded this matter. But, Sir, I take this stand: that when the Parliament of this country vote that a portion of the domain of the country shall be granted to the enormous extent that it has been granted in this case, for the purpose of developing that portion of the country, the spirit as well as the letter of the charter demands that if it is developed during the discussion, during the procedure, that the object of these men is charter selling—trading in charters—trading on the generosity of the Parliament of Canada, it is the duty of this Parliament to put their hands upon it, and say: We will not allow these men to come here for that charter. It is true they have failed to carry it out; they got the bonus granted by Order in Council conceding them 6,400 acres of land per mile for some 450 miles of territory—an enormous grant, a grant which, if land in that country is worth anything—and everybody who has travelled over it knows it to be very valuable—is worth a great deal of money; they got the Order in Council passed granting this land to that road, if within a certain time they were able to build the road. Since that time they have failed to build the road, and they have forfeited their charter. They have failed to build the road, and this Government has granted an extension of time for the land grant. We know we have had appeals from the Parliament of Manitoba. They have asked by three successive telegrams received by the chairman of the Railway Committee, Sir Hector Langevin, that no charter shall be granted except to persons who are competent to carry out the scheme and build the road. Sir, that touches upon the competency of the men who are behind the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty). That hon. gentleman asked three successive adjournments of the Railway Committee, but he has entirely failed to bring any evidence before the Railway Committee to satisfy them that these men who were behind him were competent to build the road. Sir, the Minister who presided over the committee had to admit that fact, although the hon. gentleman was a friend of the Government, although his co-charterers were friends of the Government, although the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel) and the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Billy)—the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) had retired from the charter much to his credit—but the hon. Premier for Manitoba, and I am told also the hon. Speaker of the Legislature of Manitoba, who sent these successive telegrams, had their names on that charter. Not one of these men has come forward and satisfied the committee or this House, or the Government whom they support, that they had anything of a *bonâ fide* character behind them which would

warrant this House in confirming an extension of time, to enable them to go any further in disappointing the people of that section of the country in their just expectations. The object of granting these bonuses is not to enable men who happen to be friends of the Administration to go into the markets of Europe and America and discredit the Parliament of Canada, and decry and run down, as their acts do decry and run down, the conduct of the men who form this Parliament. The object of Parliament in granting charters and these munificent donations is to get railroads built; but the object of the gentlemen who are now asking for a renewal of this charter and an extension of the time for building this road, is to speculate in their charter, and to get out of it an enormous sum of money irrespective of whether the road is built or not. Sir, these are bold statements to make, but they are made on the evidence that came out before the committee; and they stand uncontradicted. Whether they are true or untrue I do not know; but, from the evidence that came out before the committee, from the statements of Mr. Woodworth as to letters which he had handed over to the Minister of Finance, then the Minister of Marine, and which letters were mislaid, I will say that the statements of Mr. Woodworth have been sustained, and the statements of Mr. Beaty have not been sustained. Sir, the Minister of Finance wrote a letter which was laid before that committee. Mr. Beaty had stated that Mr. Woodworth held no letters which gave him a right to a division of the spoils. Between these two gentlemen I am not going to interfere; that is a matter for themselves; but when they are washing this dirty linen before Parliament, it behooves us as the representatives of the people, to refuse to take upon ourselves the responsibility for transactions which this Parlitment ought not to sanction. The Minister of Finance, in a letter which was read before the Railway Committee, stated that the statement made by Mr. Woodworth, that Mr. Beaty was to divide the swag—excuse me for using the term—to divide the profits between them—was correct. If that is true, I am bound to accept the statement of the Minister of Finance, then I think this Parliament ought not to extend the charter to enable any further charter selling to be carried on at the expense of the credit and reputation and success of the enterprises of Canada in the North-West. These facts were brought out before the Railway Committee; and I did think, on the first occasion the committee sat, that the feeling of the committee was to reject the Bill and refuse to extend the charter. But, Sir, there were some influences; I will not say what they were; I will not even suggest to this House what I myself believe them to be; but I have my own convictions and conclusions about them, and I will say that much to my surprise it was announced at the last meeting of the Railway Committee, that the Government were determined to call on their friends to sustain them, and they did sustain them, in assuming the responsibility of these scandals, and they passed the Bill through the committee. Sir, I felt it to be my duty as an independent man in that committee, to endeavor to have an investigation. I felt that if an investigation were had, there would have been developments as to this matter that the public did not know of. I have myself some personal information, which is not in such a position that I can present it to this House, which leads me to believe that there are scandals behind this thing. I am not able to prove it; but I think if we had a committee of this House to investigate the matter, we would find that the gentlemen who voted against my resolution in the committee the other day would hesitate before they extend this charter and give the enormous bonus asked for. Does any man believe, when Mr. Beaty demands that he should have $600,000 profits for a railway in the North-West, and that a majority of the stock should be given to him, that that is a transaction which this House ought to sanction? After the grave statements that were made on the responsibility of a member of this House, statements sustained to a certain extent by written evidence, and after the correspondence with regard to a division of spoils that had taken place, was it the duty of the Government to bring to the aid of the promoters of this Bill their great majority, and all the forces they possess, in order to prevent us getting a committee of enquiry appointed? I moved before that a committee should be appointed to investigate this matter. Objection was taken to that motion by the hon. Minister of the Interior in a very able, and eloquent speech—and the hon. gentleman, when it suits his purpose, is always able and eloquent; but the main feature of the question, the immorality of the whole thing, was scarcely touched upon. Now, Sir, I feel that the Government have assumed the responsibility of these scandals; they have refused to enquire into them, and have determined to give their sanction to Mr. Beaty getting an extension of his charter; they have already passed an Order in Council to enable him to get his land grant. All these things place upon them the responsibility of this act. It is not yet too late, however, for them to retrace their steps, and I hope the leader of this House, the hon. Minister of Public Works, will take upon himself the responsibility, before this Bill goes a single further stage in this House, of moving for a committee of enquiry to look into the whole transaction, and if it is found to be a transaction which has anything shady in its character, which reflects discredit on Canada, which will retard the settlement of the North-West and prevent the construction of the road, this House should at once refuse to sanction it. I, at all events, have determined to wash my hands of the responsibility of this matter. I have framed a resolution, upon which I propose to divide this House, if I can get four other members to join me. It is this:

"That the House do not now go into committee on this Bill, but go into committee upon it this day three months."

That is my motion, if any one will second it—I have not asked anybody.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will second it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would just like to ask the leader of this House to relieve himself of the responsibility, and say to his followers that the Government do not make this a party question, but leave it open to every one to vote as he likes; then he will see what a vote there will be.

Mr. BLAKE. I am simply amazed that we should not have heard from the Treasury benches on this question. I regard it as one of the most important questions that can possibly come before us. It is important in every aspect of it; it is important in the various aspects presented by the two hon. members who have spoken; and the decision we arrive at upon it to-day will very materially affect the credit and reputation of this Parliament and this country throughout the world at large, in so far as the world at large takes any interest in us and our concerns. This corporation is the continuation of an older one, and at a particular period of its existence, as it appears, it was thought expedient, in order that its interest might be promoted, that the complexion of its directorate should be to some extent changed. That was the period at which the hon. member for West Toronto obtained that share in the directorate which he has since retained. The corporation had not got on very fast or very far in the way of getting that assistance and recognition at the hands of the Government and of Parliament, which were thought important to its success. And being up to that time, as far as I could judge, a directorate of business men, it was converted very largely into a directorate of politicians and members of Parliament. Amongst the papers which were brought down to Parliament last Session, is an application

to the Government to accord to this particular railway the privilege of acquiring lands at the price which was at that time stipulated as the price for railway grant lands. It will be remembered that in those days of boom and expansion, it was believed that a grant to a railway of railway lands at $1.06 per acre would be a very good thing for the railway as well as for the country, that it would afford a large margin of profit and of credit to the company, thus strengthening the basis for construction, in addition to the intrinsic merits of the enterprise itself. The Government took the power to give to such railways as they thought fit, this opportunity, by selling them lands at $1.06 an acre. An application was therefore then made by the political directorate of this railway, which I read in the committee, praying the Government to grant to this particular enterprise the usual grant of 6,400 acres a mile at the usual price of $1 per acre and 6 cents per acre for surveying, and that application was signed by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel), the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Billy), the hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Woodworth), and Mr. Bunting, a gentleman who, though not at that time a member, had been for some years in Parliament, and who then occupied and occupies still a very important political position in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite as the manager or editor, or as having some very intimate relation with their chief organ in the Province of Ontario. It was also mentioned in that paper that Mr. Norquay, the Prime Minister of Manitoba, was another director. Thus, you see, the political directorate was composed largely of members of Parliament, and you will find that it was able to accomplish what had not been accomplished by the business men, who had, up to that time, been engaged in the enterprise. The Government looked favorably on their request, and granted them, by Order in Council, the privilege of purchasing this land. Very soon afterwards there came the rumor that the Government policy was about to be enlarged and that the Government were about to propose to Parliament free grants to railways instead of grants at a price. I need hardly say that that made the position of the corporators who had obtained Orders in Council, and of those who might expect them, infinitely better, provided the Government should decide to submit to the Legislature the names of their enterprises as worthy of this additional favor; because if it was possible to obtain a basis of credit upon the merits of an enterprise, with a grant of 6,400 acres a mile at $1 per acre, the credit was just $6,400 a mile better when the $1 was removed. Under these circumstances, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), in his capacity as president of the company, pressed the Government, as appears by papers which are upon the Table, pressed the Minister of the Interior and the First Minister, to recognise the rights or the claims of his company—I may call it his company, I think, in a very peculiar and special sense, under the circumstances—to be amongst those which should receive this favor that the Government proposed to ask the Legislature of this country to grant to railways, namely, 6,400 acres a mile free. Well, the Government came down with their policy to this Parliament, they brought down proposals in reference to several railway companies to give them free grants to the public domain, in furtherance of the new policy, but they did not bring down any grant for the North-West Central Company, and we can now partly conjecture the reasons why. But the pressure continued, and was, after the Session, successful. The hon. gentleman obtained an Order in Council for the free grant, subject, of course, to the ratification of Parliament, so that the Legislature was to be invited by the Government to agree to this. In the meantime, as appears very plainly, the hon. gentleman was not, any more than any of his political colleagues, a railway builder; he was not engaged in that trade or occupation. I believe that the hon. gentleman belongs to the same profession as that to which I belong, and that this is his vocation in life as a business man, but he certainly was not a railway builder, and no more, as far as I know, were his political colleagues. It has been made very plain that their purpose was to make money out of this contract, to sell this charter, and that the efforts which had been made in England, in New York, and elsewhere, had been efforts to sell this charter, at a price and under circumstances which might put large sums of money into the hands of the hon. gentleman, and certain sums of money, in all probability, into the hands of his colleagues. I think it would be very unfair, from any evidence that has appeared before the committee, or any facts that have come to my knowledge, to impute to the hon. gentleman the slightest design of selling his company. I do not think there is any evidence to show that he intended to get a private advantage to himself personally, and fraudulently to represent to his co-directors that he had sold the charter less advantageously that he did, or made an arrangement less advantageous than that which he really did make.

Mr. BEATY. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. I state that, because I heard the hon. gentleman repudiate in the committee, and repudiate it, I thought, unnecessarily, because I had not heard him accused of it. But since he did repudiate it, I at once say I have heard nothing to justify such a charge, if one were made. The hon. gentleman's position, in fact, was so fortunate, as he has declared in committee, that it was hardly to be expected he would propose a private advantage to himself, if that could be consistent with honor and honesty, which considerations, I have no doubt, although we not altogether agree about what those principles require, would have prevented the hon. gentleman taking such a course. It appears that out of $750,000 of stock, he is the holder of $368,000 worth, which, he stated to the committee, on my declaring I thought there was some dispute as to his holding part of it on account of others, he held entirely himself. He therefore was the holder, according to his own account, of more than one-half the whole stock, and, according to the information, the inaccurate information, it seems, I had received, the holder, not of so large, but still of a very enormous proportion of it. You see, therefore, if he could make a very handsome bargain by which the charter could be sold, the larger proportion of the profits would go into his pocket, without the necessity for his resorting to any such unworthy practice between himself and his co-directors, as that which he very properly repudiated, if he supposed any one charged him with it. If, therefore, an ultimate gain of $750,000 were made out of the transaction, the hon. gentleman would have become hereafter tolerably independent of the electors of West Toronto, with his share, whatever that might be. Now, here is the case which we have to consider: Whether it is to the credit and respectability of the Legislature and of this country, that such relations, when they come up, when they are made apparent between members of Parliament and the Executive, shall be countenanced by the Legislature, shall be approved of, shall be ratified, by our granting that vitality to this charter which but for our act it cannot have. We are called upon to say whether we will give it life, and, if it be unworthy to have that life, then we ought not to give it that life which is asked. I ask you if it is consistent with the independence and respectability of this Legislature that the practice should grow up of these enterprises being taken up by members of Parliament who are not concerned in them in their profession or walk in life at all, taken up as the intermediaries between the Executive of the country and the Parliament of the country in order to procure grants of money or of land, public advantages, the larger share of which will in all probability go into their own

pockets. That is the first question we have to answer. I ask any sensible and candid man, what degree of independence can be expected of a member of Parliament who is suing and soliciting, first the Administration of the day, and afterwards the Parliament of the day, to make a grant of money or of land, tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars of which he expects practically to pocket if he is successful. He expects to place himself in a position in which he will be enriched by means of the greater degree of strength and availability which is to belong to the enterprise by virtue of the public domain. Now, you find this matter before us in this plain example. You find it a case in which it is impossible for any sensible person, who does not impute to members of Parliament a moral stature altogether different from that which they would have if they were not in this House, to say that their independence of character here can consist with their being allowed to assume unrebuked and approved of by this House such relations to the Executive and to the Legislature of the country. What degree of independence can the man have who knows that, if he stands up and opposes the Government upon any public question, the Government, which holds in the hollow of its hand the question whether it will make the grant or will submit it to Parliament, without which it cannot be made, will turn round and say: We support our supporters? What independence can you expect if these relations are allowed to grow up between members of Parliament and the Government? I was quite rejoiced to hear the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) open his observations by saying that, after the developments which had been made in this case, he felt disposed to come to the conclusion that he, at any rate, would not be any longer a promoter of railway enterprises in this Parliament. I believe that was a wise and just view of the hon. gentleman's. I admit with him that the practice has become largely common. It has been objected to on this side of the House; it has been objected to by us in the country; we have pointed out what the fruits would probably be, and the hon. gentleman now perceives that it is at any rate liable to abuse. I go further and say it has been shamefully abused, and I say it will be in the most marked manner shamefully abused if we agree to grant this Bill under the circumstances which have here been developed. Now, what good will we do the country if we consecrate this principle of members of Parliament having to do with grants through the Executive of money or of lands out of which they may personally profit? We will do a great evil. What good will we do the country if we approve, adverting to the particular ground that the member for King's took, of the principle of charter selling anyway? I say it is a wrong principle. I fully supposed, after the hon. member for West Toronto declared to us that he was prepared, or rather would be prepared, to lay before us the proof of ability to construct, that we were going to have had the opportunity of seeing what that proof was. I thought it was for that we were waiting. We were told we were to have it; we adjourned twice for it, and we were told it had been actually despatched prior to the last adjournment and would be received in a day or two. We gave a long time in order that we might be quite certain that the proof would be here. I say we have no right, irrespective of any other consideration, to grant charters to people in order that they may speculate in them. It is on the presumption that they are persons prepared to go on with the building of the road that we grant them. In this case, the hon. member for West Toronto has $386,000 of this stock upon which 10 per cent. has been paid by some body else, and he does not pretend that it is proposed to call up the stock or to put a dollar in that way into the enterprise. The proposition is to sell the charter, not merely in order to build the road, but in order to make something good out of it for the company of which he forms so large a part. Now, if there was anything to be made by the stockholders, it ought to be made out of the stock, by reason of the substantial character of the enterprise, after the road had been built on the cheapest and best terms on which the road could be built. It is said to be quite a cheap road to build. The evidences of that are before Parliament. They are contained in statements which the hon. gentleman himself submitted to the Government, and which have been laid on the Table of the House, from which it appears that the road ought not to cost more than $15,000 a mile to build. It is through a settled country, a country so very largely settled for the first 100 or 150 miles that the promoters say its operation will, from the very beginning, be profitable from the local trade. I have before said, and I repeat, it is of the last consequence to the future of the North West that we should take care that the country is not burdened unnecessarily by having to pay tolls upon too high a capital account for the construction of its branch railways. That would be a public and permanent burden, and, when you find this sort of arrangement, that bonds to the extent of $25,000 a mile are to be issued, besides a large quantity of stock, to build a $15,000 road, although 6,400 acres a mile have been granted to aid it, you then want to know what is to become of the difference. You want to know where the excess between the $15,000 and the $25,000 is to go. I know a considerable portion will go in discount on bonds, and in that private account which I am told some railway corporations keep under the name of "oil and waste." But there is a large margin between fifteen and twenty-five, and I believe that, if you were to investigate the matter, it would be found that this arrangement partakes in some shape or form of the character of former arrangements such as the hon. member for King's read a while ago, by which there is to be a reservation out of the money paid to the contractors to go into the pockets of the members of the company. That is so much charge upon the North-West country for the benefit of a few members of Parliament and others. It is just that. I have understood, and I believe the committee understood, that to us, who were asked to consider whether we should extend this charter, would be submitted the evidence of the ability at any rate of the people to build, and the Legislature of Manitoba called upon us not to do anything which might practically throw the road over by continuing the charter to those who had not the ability; and their last telegram was very strong, in truth, against granting it to this corporation at all—at least, so I interpreted the words. Instead of that, when the matter came up the last time, I find by the reports—I was unfortunately unable to remain in attendance—and I find by the clause in the Bill itself that, so far from the ability of the company being pretended to be proved, the clause introduced into the Bill is an express statement, to which the House is asked to assent, that it is not proved, that it has to be proved at some future time, that therefore this company which is to obtain in this extension is to obtain it not having proved, though the member for West Toronto told us most emphatically he would prove, its ability to go on. There is, therefore, to be a further attempt to sell this charter, to speculate in this charter for a short time, and then the Government of the country, it is proposed, shall intervene. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that these transactions are such as we ought to approve of. I think this Bill is an unclean thing, and that we ought to reject it.

Mr. BEATY. I only propose to make a few words of explanation of certain points which have been raised in this discussion and I do it for the purpose of placing on record a few facts which, I think, can be corroborated by the fullest evidence. In reference to the stock which has been mentioned, I state this simple fact, that that stock was assigned to me absolutely, but with the view of controlling

and managing the company for the purpose of carrying out the enterprise of the shareholders. That was the whole object and purpose. The purposes of the stock were settled upon, and afterwards those who assigned it said: What we wish to be done with that stock in the future, is so and so; that is another matter altogether. But that is the object of the assignment of that stock, so that when I went to England or the United States I might make such a contract as could be carried out on the best terms possible. That is the only object I have had in this matter. I have had no object, but the usual business object of a personal character, contrary to any interest which has been committed to me in this matter. Now, I have only to reiterate what I have already said in reference to the allegations of the hon. member for King's, N. S. (Mr. Woodworth), as to the arrangement said to be made with him. I can only say now, and I can say it anywhere and under any circumstances, that never was such an arrangement thought of, suggested, or agreed to, by him or me, and I have never had the matter presented to me in that light by him, until I read his letter of the 19th May, 1885. There was no arrangement as to the directors getting $50,000, or any sum, nor myself getting $50,000 or any sum. There was no such arrangement with any person, or with any director, or any shareholder, or any contractor. I have no interest with the present contract, not one dollar's worth. I have always repeated what I said in that letter I wrote to Mr. Eccles, who was recommended to me, in Toronto, as a person who could negotiate a contract of this kind. I wrote to him that I must stand on one side and the contractors on the other, and I have held that position from beginning to end, and that is the position in which the matter stands to-day. The arrangement, therefore, I simply say, never took place. There was no such understanding, no such agreement. The simple fact was that when that letter was read to a meeting of the shareholders, they dropped the hon. member for King's and elected another director. That is the whole story, and one must understand that they would do so under the circumstances. That he and I, if such were the fact, two against seven directors, that we should act so absurdly, so stupidly, and, if I could put it in any other way, I should say, so dishonestly, as to say that two directors could plunder the seven other directors, and all the shareholders. The thing is utterly absurd and never occurred. Now, I have also to refer to this matter of Mr. Macdonald, which has been referred to; that is a fact. Mr. Macdonald was the contractor of the old company, the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, and did that grading, or whatever there was under his direction, at all events, from Melbourne to Rapid City, forty-three miles. That grading was done under the circumstances which have been generally stated, and pretty well understood, but I had then nothing to do with the company, or knew anything about it. I offered, when the matter was first presented to the Railway Committee, that the debts in respect to the work done, the material supplied and the money paid on that grading, should be paid by this company, and I have stuck to that ever since. And it is one of the greatest obstacles I have had to contend with in floating the matter, because the directors had to pay that in some form or another, and they felt that it was an obligation imposed upon them entirely outside, and which should never have been imposed upon them. The directors undertook the new enterprise, and it is a great difficulty, whatever any hon. gentleman may say of the ease of doing these things, and how they could manage it themselves, how they could build railways—it is the greatest difficulty in the world to get persons of railway skill and experience, of financial capacity and ability, to undertake a new enterprise under circumstances of this character. There is no doubt whatever about that. Until the fall of 1885, in November, we had the charge upon that land of $1.06 an acre, amounting to nearly $7,000 which had to be paid by the contractors before that land would enure to their own benefit as a security. Now, I say, it was impossible, and I found it impossible, to contract for the purpose of building that road unless that was removed. It was removed, but it was not removed at our instance. It was simply a general, public, open policy. It went on step by step with the Manitoba and North-Western, with the Manitoba and South-Western, with the Long Lake Road, with the road known as Sir Alexander Galt's road. We went on step by step with those roads which had no relation to us. It was adopted, too, when I was in England, and I had no direct interference with it, though I made the application before I left, pressing the matter, and explaining that it was impossible to carry on those roads unless some such policy was adopted. There is no doubt about that; and my judgment has been fully established and confirmed by the fact that until this free grant was obtained, these roads could not be built successfully. It was not only the policy of this company, it was a policy for all companies, and it is a policy for any company who can build a road, that they should have this security for the purpose of floating their bonds. Now, this free grant was given, I think, in November, 1885. Up to that it was next to impossible to obtain the money to build the road. There is no great time lost since then. A few months have elapsed in which, I am perfectly satisfied now, we have obtained the men, a syndicate in New York city, who are competent to build this road, and if this Bill is passed this road will be built, fifty miles of it by the 1st December, 1886. There is no doubt about that, in my mind, at all events because the gentlemen who have undertaken this, after eight months from August, 1885, have given attention to this matter, have gone to the trouble and expended money for consulting their own engineers, have obtained their own information, and have enquired into every circumstance—gentlemen who have built the Chicago and Indianapolis Air Line Railway, who built railways in various parts of the United States, who are building a road now in connection with the Kansas Pacific, and who are men represented to me as worth not less than fifteen or twenty millions, and I believe that can be demonstrated, men who are in dead earnest in reference to this matter. They have proposed to build this road, and will construct it on the most reasonable terms possible. Under these circumstances I come to this House for the purpose of asking an extension of time. I think, therefore, that I have good grounds, I have solid grounds, for asking this House to sanction this measure so that all this labor, all this time, and all this work, shall not be lost, that this Parliament shall give to thousands of people in the North-West who have petitioned for the road, and the thousands interested in it from Halifax to Vancouver—certainly numbers of persons, representing hundreds, are writing to me wanting this road to go on, because of their interest in the great North-West country, and of the immense advantages the road will be to those pioneers who went in there from six to nine years ago, expecting the Canadian Pacific Railway would pass through those Territories and they have been disappointed ever since, and their hopes are well nigh crushed out now because of the insane opposition which has been offered to this scheme in connection with the allegations which have been made. I say, therefore, that this road ought to be built. Now in regard to the evidence, which is said to have been produced here? Has not every man in this House heard of Mr. Pew? In the late case of Pew *vs.* Schultz, eight men were brought from his own town of Welland, and every one of them swore that they would not believe him on his oath. A man named McConachie was represented to me as a millionaire, and that was the only reason in the world why I ever listened to him for a moment. This stranger, this traveller

and millionaire, was brought to me, and I found out that he was Mr. Pew's clerk and was not worth a thousand dollars, and that he just did and talked as Pew ordered him. That was proved in the case of Pew *vs.* Schultz. This is the kind of evidence with which I have to be slandered, with which this Parliament is to be outraged, with which this country is to be agitated, for the purpose of damaging a political opponent. That is the effect of it and that is the design. I say it is an outrage on public decency that such witnesses should be introduced for the purpose of damaging a man appreciated in his own city, a man who never had to blush for shame on account of any charge brought against him. The allegation is laid and repeated without a tittle of evidence being adduced in support of it, that there has been charter selling. There is not a word of truth in that statement, from whatever quarter it may come. I deny that I have ever offered the charter for sale; the charter is not sold, and will not be sold, as I have stated again and again. I have said so to the men with whom have been dealing. I could have sold it.

An hon. MEMBER. For how much?

Mr. BEATY. For as much money as would buy some hon. members, but it did not buy me. Why? Because I had interests entrusted to me which I would not betray, and I would not allow any private interest whatever to interfere with those interests so entrusted to me. That was the reason the charter was not sold. It never has been offered for sale; it never has been arranged or negotiated for sale, and it never will be while it is under my control.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope it will not be.

Mr. BEATY. The hon. member need not hope anything about it. Whatever he might do if he held it, he need not fear as to what I will do. Then observations have been made in regard to what took place in the case of Mr. Macdonald, who wrote me a letter offering to do the work. I said: Certainly if you can do it, take your opportunity for doing it, and it will afford a chance for paying you the old debts. That has always been one of the objects of the company. But how could we pay the claim made in court for $140,000 unless we got the money out of the contract? And that is what I am providing for. Notwithstanding what has been said by the member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth), in regard to this matter, when the Bill was first presented to the House I introduced a clause providing that all workmen and claimants for work done, for material supplied or money paid should be reimbursed. That is substantially the clause which is now introduced, and which is clause 3:

"The company shall remain liable for all debts due for the construction of the railway, and if such debts are due to contractors, shall cause all just claims for labor, board and building material in respect of such construction to be paid by such contractors, and in default thereof shall be directly liable to the persons having such claims."

In those words the company were to pay the old claims for work done, material supplied and money expended on the old grading, not one foot of which we would use in the present construction, because that grading was between Melbourne and Rapid City, and our line goes from Brandon to Rapid City; and yet we made provisions to pay for the work done. The amount claimed is $140,000. I repeat, how was that to be paid? And that question was one of the greatest difficulties in all arrangements in connection with entering into a contract. The clause is inserted with the object of paying that debt—and I regret there are yet men who are not paid, but with that matter I have nothing to do, as the undertaking was entered into in 1882-83, and I had nothing to do with the road until the winter of 1884—and it is for the purpose of paying those debts that the money is asked. Is it not reasonable, just and fair that the farmers, workmen and merchants in Winnipeg and elsewhere who have not been paid should be paid, and that I should see they are paid? I said I would do so in the first instance, I have wished to do so ever since, and I propose to do that so long as I have anything to do with the road. This is the original clause:

"The said North-West Central Railway Company shall not be chargeable with any liability of the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, except for actual work done or material supplied in the grading between Melbourne and Rapid City, which shall be payable directly to the several workmen and claimants respectively, on account of such work or supplies."

Then I added: "or money paid." Is that not substantially the same clause we introduced to carry out the purpose and object I have mentioned? Whatever may be said in regard to a member of Parliament having a charter of this kind, I and you, Mr. Speaker, know that this has been done during the last thirty years.

Mr. MITCHELL. There has been too much of it.

Mr. BEATY. That may be. But why make me the scapegoat? I might say so myself now; but again I ask why make me the scapegoat in regard to this matter? Why not refer to other hon. members of the House, to the hon. member for Northumberland, or some other hon. member? Why not have all matters connected with railwas charters opened up?

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you intend to imply that I was ever connected with any railway charter? If so you say that which is not true.

Mr. BEATY. If the hon. gentleman says he has not been so connected, I accept his statement. If there is any objection to members of Parliament having charters, let a Bill be introduced setting forth that members of Parliament shall have no share in companies, banks or institutions of any kind which have dealings with the Government, and I will support and vote for such a Bill. But is it not the express law that members of Parliament may hold shares in all companies having relations with the Government? Has it not been passed over by all Administrations for years and years, and I am told the Reform party enacted the law. If that is so, why should I be made a scapegoat in regard to this matter, when I positively and unhesitatingly deny that there is anything whatever in the transaction that cannot be announced from the housetops of the world, and no transaction which is not honest and honorable in every respect.

Mr. LISTER. Then let it go to a committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. leader of the Opposition stated just now in his remarks that we had three telegrams or communications from the Legislature of Manitoba about this road, and the inference he drew from those communications, especially from the last, was that the Manitoba Legislature was not favorable to this company and wished another company to be incorporated. I am sorry I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman. The inference I drew from those communications was not to that effect; but it was this: That the Legislature of Manitoba wished to have the road built, and fifty miles built if possible this season; and they asked us to see that the present company, or another company to be incorporated, should show they had ability and means to build the railway. It was with that view that the Railway Committee considered the matter; it was in that light that the Government thought they would consider this charter and see whether they could meet the wishes of the Manitoba Legislature and of the people of the North-West who are so much interested in the building of the railway, and whether Parliament could do this by giving the company an extension of time. The hon. gentleman said a great deal about the position of

members of Parliament as directors of companies or promoters of railway companies, especially of companies which receive grants of money or of land from Parliament. I must say that this comes a little late in the day, because we have done it on both sides of the House. Governments and Parliaments which have succeeded one another have incorporated companies, on the directorates of which members of Parliament held places. We have only to open the Statutes of last Session and the previous Session, or for the last ten years, to find the names of members of Parliament on companies incorporated by this Parliament, and therefore that has been the settled policy of Parliament. If Parliament wishes after this Session to turn over a new leaf and to say that a member of Parliament shall have nothing to do with charters of this kind, or—as the hon. gentleman said just now—with banks, or any other corporations receiving their life from this Parliament, that is another question altogether. But in the present case, the company has already had two charters from this Parliament. They have incurred a great deal of labor, and, I have no doubt, a great deal of expense; they have been unable to build the road, and they say: Give us an extension of time. I do not think the Bill, as introduced by the member for Toronto (Mr. Beaty), is the one which we had at first, because we changed it, and we passed it with the provisos which I shall mention hereafter. But that company is in this position: They say, give us an extension of time so that we may carry into effect the object for which Parliament has incorporated us. More than that, this company came at the last meeting of the committee, and they laid before us, as they had laid before the Government, in the person of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, a contract by which eminent contractors have engaged to build this road. When the Government saw this, we said we cannot grant an extension of time unless the company show that not only have they good contractors, but they have the ability, the means of carrying the contract into effect; therefore, in order to save time—this company is already formed; they have been at work trying to begin the road, trying to build it; they have a contract now ready; the contractors and the company have signed the contract; in order to save time, we said we will ask Parliament to give an extension of time. But the charter will have no effect until a certain day, not later than the 1st of June next, during which period they must show to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that they have the means of carrying into effect the charter we are giving them. If by that time they cannot show that they have those means, and are in a position to carry on that road, then the proclamation of the Governor, which would otherwise issue, will not issue; the charter will be waste paper and the Government will, with the sanction of Parliament, take power to incorporate another company which will have the means and the ability to build the road as intended. That is the position. The hon. gentleman has stated to this House that it is very strange that the first corporators of that company were not members of Parliament—at all events not all of them, and that they had been replaced by members of Parliament since that. Well, the hon. gentleman should remember, and I have no doubt he does remember, that there were two charters. There was the charter of the Souris Company, which was replaced by the present company, and then the directorate was changed. The inference which the hon. gentleman would wish Parliament and the country to draw is that, because there were members of Parliament on that directorate, the Government gave to that company advantages which they would not have given, and had not given, to any other company.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, on behalf of the Government I say that is not the fact. There were other companies that had obtained those advantages previous to this company obtaining them, and the hon gentlemen should remember that the Opposition at the last Session were very loud in calling upon the Government not to be stingy about the lands of the North-West, but to give a proper bonus in land to the company—I think it was the South-Western Company. Hon. gentlemen wished that to be done; we have done it during the recess, and we did it I think for another company, the North-Western Company, I believe. Those companies have had the advantage of having the lands, not at $1.06 per acre, but at 10 cents per acre, that is to pay the surveys. But the hon. gentleman also says that this is a company that should not be incorporated in that way, because we are giving too much to the company to build the road. Well, what are we giving to that company? The hon. gentleman says that by their charter they had the right to issue $25,000 in bonds on the road; and besides that he goes on to say that the Government gives to that company 6,400 acres of land per mile, and he said that was enormous. The hon. gentleman should remember, and I have no doubt he does remember, that the $25,000 in bonds could not sell, and would not sell, if we had not granted the 6,400 acres of land, and therefore the mainstay of that road is the grant of land we are giving to that company, the same as we gave to other companies. I have not looked at the charters of the South-Western and North-Western, but I am pretty sure that they had the same right to issue bonds as this company. Therefore, they are all on the same footing; at all events in the Railway Committee, as the hon. gentleman knows, he being an assiduous member of that committee, we always try to put all the companies on the same footing, and if we have allowed them to issue bonds to the extent of $25,000 a mile it is because we granted the same privilege to others. The hon. gentleman must remember also that there was a period in 1874 when hon. gentlemen offered, I think, 25,000 acres of land and $10,000 in cash per mile to build a certain railway, and they could not succeed; those who had that railway in hand could not succeed, even with this grant. If that is the case with regard to that road, how can we find fault with this other company because we gave them $25,000, not in cash, but allowed them to issue $25,000 in bonds to be offered to the public, and 6,400 acres of land per mile? How can we say that this company asks a great deal too much, when hon. gentlemen in their day gave over 20,000 acres of land, plus $10,000 per mile to build a road? What did we give the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build their road? We gave them $12,500 per mile in cash, and 12,500 acres of land per mile; and yet what was the value of their bonds? Their bonds were sold at hardly more than 50 per cent. If that company were not able to do better than that with such assistance, how can this company be considered to have a great deal too much when we are giving them only 6,400 acres per mile, and leaving them to issue their own bonds?

Mr. BLAKE. The bonds were sold at 98, not at 50.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I mean the stock. The hon. gentleman knows that the stock of the company, which hon. gentlemen opposite said would enrich these men and would sell at such a high price, went down as low as 37. Therefore, I think, the hon. gentleman cannot contend that we are giving too much to this company. I wonder if the hon. gentleman would invest much money in the bonds that this company will issue, although the road will run through a good country?

Mr. BLAKE. I would not accept them under the present directorate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps not; but if the hon. gentleman had made an offer, I have no doubt there

might have been a complete change of directors. But I think the Government have taken the proper course in asking the committee to allow the Bill to go through with the proviso that the charter would not take effect until the 1st of June, until the company showed that they had the ability and the means to carry on the undertaking. If they are not able to do that, we will ask Parliament to give us power to incorporate another company, as we have done in other cases. But we thought it best under the circumstances that this company, having given their attention to this work, should have an extension of time, especially when they showed us that they had a contract already signed a few days ago, and in order that they might be enabled to show us whether or not they had the means to carry on the work. I hope, therefore, that this Bill will go to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WATSON. As the hon. Minister who leads the House has made a reference to the last telegram received from the Local Legislature of Manitoba, I would just trouble the House by reading it. That telegram to my mind states clearly that it is the opinion of that Legislature that the charter should be taken from the present holders. The telegram is in the proceedings of the 29th of April, as follows:—

"That as the question of the Manitoba Central Railway comes for final discussion before the Railway Committee to-morrow, it is the duty of this House to again express its views; the more especially as by the despatch of the 2nd April, 1884, the fact of the Dominion having devoted lands to aid railway construction in Manitoba is given as a reason why the House should not press its claim for the public lands in the Province. By the terms of the Order in Council of 23rd January, 1885, the proposal of the 20th of May is incorporated with modifications; consequently it becomes the duty of the House to watch the administration of the railway grants by the Parliament of Canada, who are practically trustees for Manitoba, it having been urged that these lands were set apart for her benefit.

"This House, therefore, as a matter of right, urges that the land grant should be at once placed in the hands of parties able, by constructing and putting into operation fifty miles of road this year, to give the people the benefit of one of the valuable considerations set forth in the above cited documents; and that unless the company now incorporated, or any company to be incorporated during the present Session, are able to show their ability to build the said fifty miles, then that Parliament be asked to give power to the Governor General in Council to incorporate any company by letters patent which may be formed to the satisfaction of the Government during the prorogation of Parliament for the purpose of building said road; and further this House expresses the hope that unless the present holders of the land grant satisfy the Railway Committee to-morrow, the committee will advise the summary cancellation of the Order in Council granting them, and this House feels it its duty to lay their views strongly before the committee, as the people of Manitoba, and more especially those directly interested, have vital interests at home.

"And be it further resolved, that Mr. Speaker be requested to wire the above to the Chairman of the Railway Committee of the House of Commons."

In support of this motion, Mr. Laycock, the mover of the resolution stated:

"Mr. Laycock said that the people in his district were perfectly sick at the way this matter had been treated at Ottawa. The speaker was a Conservative. He was taunted with being such, but he had no hesitation to say that it was time that the people had some redress. They needed railway communication, and men like Mr. Beaty and others, who had done what they had to prevent railway legislation, should be taught a lesson. He would raise his voice against the way the people of this Province had been treated. Such men as Mr. Beaty had gone to New York to traffic on the railway charter. The lands had been given to the people for railway purposes, to give railway communication, and he wanted to see no more humbug about it."

That resolution was carried unanimously by the Local Legislature of Manitoba; and such being the case, I feel myself bound in order to carry out the wishes expressed in that resolution, to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland. In the Railway Committee I expressed the opinion that this company should not be granted another month's delay. They have had the last two years in which to carry out the terms of their charter, and they have made no progress. If Mr. Beaty had shown his ability to construct this road as the Government requested him to do at the last meeting of the committee, I would certainly have been in favor of his retaining the charter and having another month's time. But he has had this charter long enough, and as one of the members of the Local House stated the people of that section of the country have been humbugged long enough. They have had repeated telegrams from the president of the company that he would soon be on the ground and turn the first sod on two or three different occasions; and as hope deferred makes the heart sick, those people are sick of waiting for this company to begin operations, and I think it is time now that the franchises held by them, to enable them to build the road, should be given to some company who would show their ability to do it, without any further delay. I think a month is too long a time to grant to this company; if the Government had given them a week or two, I think it would have been long enough. Mr. Beaty said the company were in a position to construct the work; if they are, why does he not show it at once. We have the Minister of Railway's report to the committee, that Mr. Beaty had not shown him, to his satisfaction, that his company was in a position to construct the work, and therefore it was necessary to give him a month's extension. As I am strongly in favor of the road being built, and that at an early date, I will vote for the amendment, as moved by my hon. friend, believing that parties are in a position and ready and willing to take the franchise and construct the road at once.

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

After Recess.

Mr. IVES. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) who lives near the locality where this proposed railway is to be built, and who ought, therefore, to know something of its merits, informed the House that this enterprise is one of great importance and of great necessity, both to the settlers in that section and the North-West at large. He also tells us that he considers its construction has been too long delayed, and he fears that the present promoters of the enterprise, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), the president of the company, and the other members of the directorate, are not the men who are likely to make an arrangement for its construction. With him it seems to be a question, not of the suitability of these persons, not the question which the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) raised, as to the character of the directorate; not the question which the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) raised, as to the propriety of members of Parliament being directors on a railway board; but the vital question with the hon. member for Marquette is the importance of constructing the railway, coupled with the doubt whether this company have the capacity to effect an arrangement which will result in its construction. That being the position of the case, I find it very difficult to understand the conclusion at which he arrives. He says that if it were proposed to delay the consideration of this matter for a week, or possibly two weeks, he would consent to that, but he thinks it quite too long to defer the matter for a month; and because it is too long to defer it for a month, he declares that he is prepared to vote for the three months' hoist. In other words, with respect to an enterprise of vital importance to his section of the country, the construction of which has been too long deferred already, which it is very important should be constructed, and about the construction of which he has doubts as to the capacity of the present board of directors, he willingly would give two weeks to see whether they could make an arrangement; but he is prepared, seeing a month is proposed, to vote the three months' hoist. I cannot look at the question from that point of view. If the railway is an important enterprise, if its construction has already been too

long delayed, if, as announced by the leader of the House, a contract has already been signed and exhibited to the Government—a contract apparently made in good faith by capitalists able to perform their contract—and if it is only necessary a short delay should be given in order that these gentlemen should satisfy the Government that they really mean to carry out their contract, it does seem to me impossible to come to the conclusion which the hon. member for Marquette has reached, namely, to hoist the Bill, to throw out all chance of this company doing anything, to throw overboard the contract made with the New York capitalists, and to put it entirely out of the power of any private individual to obtain an act of incorporation or charter a company to do the work during the present Session. To vote for the three months' hoist would simply put it out of the power of Parliament to clothe any association of men with the power to go on with the construction of the railway, except by the direct action of the Government. Admitting that the construction of the railway is important, as stated by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), it seems to me we should look at this matter as a matter of business rather than as a matter of party. A contract has been actually entered into by persons who, we have reason to suppose, are able to build this railway, and we are asked to give the Government power, in case they are satisfied by the directors of their capacity to build the road, to proclaim the charter and allow this company to go on. It seems to me we are likely to obtain the construction of the road much sooner by permitting this company to go on than we would by killing the charter, throwing up the signed contract, and leaving it an entirely open question for future consideration. If the Government were prepared to go further than they do, if they were prepared to say, that in case the present company do not build the road, they, as a Government, are prepared to advise the House to construct it as a Government work, there would be more force in the position the hon. member for Marquette takes with reference to the action of the House upon the motion and the amendment. What are the reasons urged against our going into committee on this Bill? First, there is the political aspect of the case, which is raised by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), that members of this House ought not to be directors in railway charters. That is an important general question, but it does not apply to this particular case any more than to many other cases, both during the present and preceding Sessions of this House; and I doubt very much whether the hon. member for West Durham would be inclined to advise his friends or the House to throw up a good contract, supposing this contract which has been made to be a good reliable contract, and leave the whole thing in a state of chaos to the chances of future combinations, unless the Government are prepared to advise the House to undertake the construction of the railway as a Government work. I am not going to take up the time of the House with discussing the political aspect of the case, as to whether members of Parliament should be promoters of railway or other charters granted by the House or not. That is a question which could, as the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) said, be more fitly discussed upon a substantive proposition that hereafter members of Parliament should not be competent to be directors in railway charters. The other question raised is that of the character of the directors and the character of the transactions which are alleged to have taken place among different members of the directorate. Now, it was alleged in committee, and the statement has gone through the country by means of the press, that there was an arrangement between the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth) and the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), that the ordinary directors of the company—these two gentlemen being extraordinay

directors—were to have a bonus of $50,000 divided among them, and that the hon. member for West Toronto and the hon. member for King's were to divide equally between them the surplus of profits. I can only say that there has been no evidence of any satisfactory character to establish that allegation; there has been nothing to justify a section of the press of this country in the course they have taken with reference to that allegation. The hon. member for West Toronto emphatically denies it; the others or ordinary directors emphatically deny it. The proof, or supposed proof, is contained in letters which have been mislaid, which, unfortunately for the hon. member for King's, he is not able to produce, and the only thing he does produce is the letter from the Finance Minister stating his impression is, that the arrangement was that the hon. member for West Toronto and the hon. member for King's were mutually interested in the enterprise. That is a very different thing from the allegation that the ordinary directors were to receive $50,000 and those two were to divide the surplus of the profits. Therefore the charge as originally made in the committee, the charge that has gone over the country, that has been circulated by a section of the press of the country, rests entirely without proof, rests on no proof whatever. That was not the statement either of the hon. member for King's to-day. He said to-day, without making any allusion to the $50,000, that he and the member for West Toronto were mutually interested, were equally interested in this charter, and that would seem to be borne out by the impression the Finance Minister would seem to have gathered from his recollection of the letters. Taking that statement, I do not see that there is anything particularly improper in it, anything in it which would justify this House in refusing to go into committee upon this Bill. Suppose, for instance, it were clearly established that the hon. member for King's and the hon. member for West Toronto were to be mutually interested in this undertaking, is anyone in this House so silly as to suppose that any board of directors are to undertake the labor and anxiety and trouble, and incur the expense necessary to float a scheme of this kind, to build the railway and manage it afterwards, and pay the bondholders their annual interest, without any compensation whatever for it? Does any one suppose that any member of this House or any business man in this country does this sort of thing entirely for the fun of it, and lives on air in the meantime? I need not dwell upon that point very long. I believe it was perfectly legitimate, as long as the House permits members of Parliament to be promoters of railway schemes, for these two hon. gentlemen, these two members of this board, to expect to make something for their time and trouble and expense for the prosecution of this work. It is said there was charter selling, that there was an endeavor to sell this charter. There is no evidence of this fact. There is no proof whatever that the charter was ever offered for sale or was ever peddled from Dan to Beersheba, or through the continent of Europe and America.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hold on now; are you blind?

Mr. IVES. I will hear the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. Are you blind or deaf?

Mr. IVES. I am neither blind nor deaf, nor am I going to speak so long but that you will have an opportunity in a few moments. I have heard no evidence that there was an effort to dispose of or to sell this charter. The hon. gentleman from King's adduced as his evidence to-day a supposed contract between a Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Beaty. Certainly the proof he adduced was no proof whatever. The contract was one under which Macdonald was to take the bonds, and I presume the land grant, and build the road, and pay $1,500 a mile to the company out of the proceeds of the bonds and land grant. That is all there is in it. There

was no proposition to sell the charter. There was no understanding that Macdonald was to assume the organisation of the company and to carry on the organisation of the company hereafter, that these directors were to be discharged from responsibility in the company, that Mr. Beaty was to cease to be president or that the member for King's was to cease to be a director. What was to be done with this road after it was built? Was it to run alone? Was there to be no general manager? Was there to be no treasurer? Was there to be no one to receive the proceeds of the freight and passenger traffic, no one to pay the interest on these bonds? Who was to furnish the rolling stock and pay the interest on these bonds? If you take this sum of $1,500 which, the impression was sought to be conveyed, was intended as a spoil to be divided among the directors, you find it is only one year's interest on $25,000 a mile at 6 per cent., and much less would it buy the rolling stock. This $1,500 a mile will be paraded before the country as what these gentlemen were to divide among themselves. Now, out of that they would have to pay the interest on these bonds for one or two years during construction, and the interest for one year at 6 per cent. on $25,000 a mile would be $1,500 a mile. There was the rolling stock to be provided, there were the old debts of the former company to be paid, or rather three-fourths of them, because one-fourth was provided for under the arrangement; and yet it was said this was trafficking in the charter, this was a sale of the charter, without a word being said as to the capital stock or passing over the organisation of the company to Macdonald or anyone else. But it will be urged that it was a sale of the charter. I contend that it was not, but was simply a contract with Macdonald to build the railway; and it is easy to understand many ways in which this $1,500 would be used and expended without supposing anything improper in the intentions or objects which Mr. Beaty had in view in stipulating for the payment of that $1,500.

Mr. MILLS. What was the dispute about?

Mr. IVES. Dispute about what?

Mr. MILLS. Between the hon. member for King's and the hon. member for West Toronto.

Mr. IVES. The dispute between the hon. member for King's and the hon. member for West Toronto is a matter which does not affect the public interest in any way whatever. It is either important or it is not important that this railway should be constructed. The importance of its construction is not lessened or increased in the slightest degree by Mr. Beaty being the general manager of that road and its president, or by Mr. Woodworth being the general manager of that road or its president. It is not at all, in the public interest, a matter of any consequence whether these two men agreed or disagreed. It is an unfortunate matter because it will require the united energies of both, perhaps, to complete the undertaking. It is unfortunate that they did not agree——

Mr. COOK. Yes, it let the cat out of the bag.

Mr. IVES. But whether they did or not is a matter of no consequence. The hon. gentleman says it let the cat out of the bag. There is only one advantage that hon. members opposite have—they agree so well together that they never split on one another.

Mr. COOK. There is nothing to split on.

Mr. IVES. Then a great deal is made of the fact that the hon. member for West Toronto had assigned to him absolutely a controlling interest in this charter, or in other words that a majority of the capital stock was transferred to him. Now, what does that mean? If you were to listen to some of the hon. gentlemen who addressed the Railway Committee you would suppose that that $386,000 in stock was absolutely convertible any moment into $386,000 in cash. All I can say is that perhaps that stock may be as good as money if you do not need the money, but, if you do need the money and were to offer it for sale, you would find it absolutely worthless. What does that $386,000 mean? It means simply that the man who has it has the control of that charter, and he has the opportunity of going from Dan to Beersheba, taking the words of the hon. member for King's, in the search of somebody who will put money into this land grant and into this railway and construct it. That is what it means, because, whenever you find capitalists who will undertake to put money into the construction of that road or any other similar enterprise, you will find that they will demand a controlling interest in the organisation or company. When a railway company that has money to pay its contractor goes to contractors and makes an arrangement for the construction of a railway, the contractors do not enquire as to who owns the controlling interest in the stock, nor do they trouble themselves as to the stock. But when a company has absolutely no money, which has nothing but the chance to build the road, and the chance to receive 6,400 acres of land, after they have completed the work, when that kind of a company goes before a capitalist, the contractor must be a capitalist in that case, when he goes to a capitalist contractor and asks him to build the railway, the first question the capitalist contractor asks is: Who has the controlling interest in the stock of this company, and can you hand over to me, when the work is completed, the controlling interest? Now, this $386,000 which is talked of as if it were so much money, which appeared in the newspapers as being an enormous find, an enormous swag, made by the member for West Toronto, is simply so much absolutely worthless property, until the railway is completed, and perhaps then worthless except to him who controls the organisation of the railway, and which it was absolutely necessary he should control, before he could possibly undertake to make any arrangements for the construction of this road. Now, I said in the Railway Committee on a previous occasion, and I desire to say here, that I think if, in enterprises of this kind, the capital stock were made to be of much less amount, perhaps confined to a thousand dollars a mile, or something of that kind, the issue made so much less so that it could be paid up by the promoters of the railway and form a fund for surveys and preliminary expenses, it would be much preferable to the present plan of setting these companies on foot. We now allow a railway to issue a capital stock of about $20,000 per mile. Well, as a rule, that capital stock will not be subscribed, and it will not be paid, because bonds must be issued, and they are preferential to the stock, and the result is that the stock will not be subscribed, and will not be paid up, and still it must be subscribed in order to obtain control of the organisation. No one will invest their money as contractors in the construction, until they know where the controlling interest in the capital stock lies, and therefore such measures have to be resorted to as were resorted to in this case. Stock has to be issued absolutely to someone as a trustee to hold it. This is the position in which Mr. Beaty stands in this matter. To him, as the active promoter of this road, the company, his brother directors, issued a controlling interest in order that he might go into the world to find somebody who would put their money into this undertaking. In another particular the newspapers and some hon. members have been exceedingly unfair, and have given a very unfair impression with regard to the position of Mr. Beaty and his brother directors, and that is, as to the amount which was to be paid to the contractors, or which was available for the construction of this railway. Why, you would think, to hear hon. gentlemen opposite talk, that there was an enormous amount of money available. First there is the $20,000 stock;

that is as good as gold. Then there is the $25,000 in bonds, that is $25,000. Then there is the land grand of 6,400 acres, that ought to be worth $1.50 to $2; there is $12,000 or $15,000 more. Why, you would fancy, to hear people talk, that the promoters of this railway had a perfect bonanza. What are the facts? Simply these, that all you have got is 6,400 acres of land, and the chances that the road may pay something more than its operating expenses after it is built. What are these bonds? These bonds are simply obligations of the company they are not assets of the company, but they are merely obligations of the company. What is the stock? The stock is a mere nominal thing which nobody would pay a cent for, which nobody probably has paid a cent for. So when you come to scrutinise the matter you have this 6,400 acres of land, and that is all; so the contractors who undertake the construction of this road have simply 6,400 acres of land per mile and the chances of the enterprise becoming a paying one, that is all there is in it. It is perfectly certain that the attacks which have been made upon the promoters of this road, and the inferences that have been sought to be drawn, and the impression created that there was a bonanza in this thing, are entirely unfair and unjust. Why, what has been the experience of the other Manitoba railways, the South-Western and the North-Western? The Government did for them precisely what they have promised to do for this company, that is to say, to give them 6,400 acres per mile; and these companies, at the head of which were some of our best financial men in Canada—I am speaking particularly of the North-Western—were obliged, before they could get a single dollar in money, to obtain the guarantee of the Province of Manitoba to their bonds. Notwithstanding they had the 6,400 acres, notwithstanding they had the same bonding power, notwithstanding they had the same capital stock to issue, not a single inch could they move until they had obtained from the Province of Manitoba a guarantee of their bonds before they could build a mile of railway, and yet it is said that the member for West Toronto has been dilatory, that he has been trying to sell his charter, that he has not been reasonably active in organising the company, simply because he had not succeeded in doing what such men as Andrew Allan and others, who are interested in railway charters in Manitoba, could not do until they had obtained a guarantee of the Manitoba Legislature. I undertake to say that the charges, so far as the Government is concerned, it appears to me are frivolous and unfounded. This company has not received a single advantage that other companies had not previously received, in which there were no members of Parliament as directors. Thiswas not the first company that got a free land grant. This was not the first company that got a land grant of $1.06 an acre. This company got a free land grant after other companies had received it, and there is not a tittle of evidence that any partiality whatever has been shown to the directors of this company. Now this matter presents itself as a matter of business. I do not look upon it as a matter of party politics at all. This is a private Bill; it is a question whether we should continue the life of a railway company which has already made a firm contract with New York men, supposed to be good, for the construction of a railway of undoubted importance, as hon. gentlemen on both sides seem to be agreed should be constructed immediately. On the one hand it is proposed to throw up this charter, to kill this company, to kill this contract, to throw the matter into chaos, and leave it entirely in the hands of Parliament to organise a company during the present Session, because, at this hour, no private member could carry a Bill through Parliament against the opposition of the Government—and leave the matter entirely in a chaotic state; on the other hand there is a proposition to leave it in the hands of the Government for a month, to proclaim this charter, if these men who have made this contract, satisfy the Government of their capacity and *bond fide*. Now this seems to me simply a matter of business, and there can be no question whatever that this House ought to permit this company to keep the contract it has made, certainly until a reasonable time has been allowed to the Government to satisfy themselves that the parties who have made this contract really mean to construct the railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not being a member of the Railway Committee, I am not familiar with what may have occurred in relation to this matter. I can only judge of this question in the light of the statements that have been made this afternoon, and also from some printed documents, which I suppose are correct, which have found their way into the newspapers. Now, Sir, I cannot at all agree with the last speaker that the only question before this House is whether or not this railway is to be constructed. I agree that it is a matter of importance that every possible step should be taken for the purpose of developing the North-West, and in that light I should be glad to facilitate the passage of any measure, this or any other, likely to open up any considerable portion of that territory. But there is another question which, in my judgment, is much more important than whether fifty miles of railway are to be built in the North-West or not, and that question is, briefly, whether members of this House are to be allowed to use their positions for the purpose of putting money in their pockets by trafficking in charters. This afternoon we have had on this subject three different statements from members of this House. One hon. gentleman, the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth), declared explicitly in his place for the information of the Government, that he was prepared to prove, as I understand him, that the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) had been trafficking in this charter. That I understood to be the declaration of the hon. member for King's. And that declaration was, to say the least, supported, more than supported impliedly by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who intimated that he had reason to believe that the hon. members were going to traffic in this particular charter. Under the circumstances, when we have one hon. gentleman on the floor of this House making a charge of this nature, and another hon. gentleman in the position of the hon. member for Northumberland, supporting that charge, and when we have, further, a statement made by the member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), and not contradicted to the effect that documentary evidence proving his case had been placed in the hands of a prominent member of the Government, the Minister of Finance, and we have the evidence of the Minister of Finance published in the newspapers, and not contradicted by him, admitting that those documents had been placed in his possession, I say that there is much more than a *primâ facie* case to require an investigation into the truth of the allegations made by those two hon. gentlemen before the House proceeds to confide to the member for West Toronto the charge of this important enterprise. I cannot conceive how this House, with due regard for its own dignity and the great trust which the public has confided to it, can, after such statements have been made publicly on the floor of the House, refuse to grant delay and refuse to grant an investigation, unless indeed the Ministers are prepared to take the stand that they pay no attention whatever to the statements made by the hon. member for King's and supported by the hon. member for Northumberland. If that is their position, let them say so and take the responsibility. Let them say they have themselves examined the documents and evidence offered to be produced by those hon. gentlemen and they believe the hon. member for West Toronto is perfectly correct and those two hon. gentlemen are utterly and entirely in the wrong. But I do not understand that such is the state of the case. On the contrary,

I believe I am correct in saying that a motion made by the member for Northumberland to have this matter investigated before a sub-committee was voted down by the Government, and that being the case, I think that now those statements have been made on the floor of the House, the House is bound to order an investigation. With respect to some of the other statements that have been made, I would desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this very important fact. It is quite true I have no doubt that in past years a great number of railway charters may have been conceded to members of this House. But—and this makes all the difference—it was before it was the policy of the Government, formally announced and declared, to aid those railway companies by gifts of money or land from the public resources. And that I say is what makes all the difference between the cases which have come up within the last few years, after that policy was adopted by the Government, and former proceedings in this House. Were there no public interests involved, were there no grants of public money, were there no land grants to those railway enterprises, I do not know that we should condemn very severely the practice of hon. gentlemen taking an interest in those roads. But what I say is this, that this particular instance shows in the clearest light the extremely vicious nature of the practice which has grown up amongst us. So soon as the Government began to give grants from the public Treasury, began to give grants of land from the public domain to railway companies, then, according to every principle of equity and natural justice members of this House being trustees of the people ought to have kept themselves entirely aloof from such enterprises. That is the doctrine which I think will commend itself to every unprejudiced man and mind throughout the Dominion. At this very moment there is an Act on our Statute-books which forbids members of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from being members of this House on the simple ground that we gave large grants of money and land to that railway, and by implication we ought equally to deny to hon. gentlemen in this House, and more particularly I think to hon. members supporting the Government, the right of becoming members of railway corporations which are applicants for or which may expect to receive large donations from the public chest. The hon. Minister of Public Works alluded to the case of the Manitoba and South-Western Railways. He said, and he said correctly enough, that those railways had received grants of land on similar conditions, but he ought to have told the House that those two railways to which he alluded had expended large sums of money, had built a considerable number of miles of railway in each case, and were I think in actual running operation as far as the end of the track before the Government made that concession. The truth is, as the hon. gentleman who last spoke said, that there are certain companies which have only a chance to build the railway; and those companies which put no money into the enterprise and do not propose to put money into it, but merely design to do the best they can, which I suppose means to make the most profit they can out of the enterprise, are very dubious objects for legislative assistance, and in every case it is a very doubtful thing that members of the House should connect themselves with such enterprises. I can conceive nothing which is more certain to destroy the independence of any member of this House than that he should be a promoter of railway enterprises which can make no way whatever without receiving subsidies in money or lands from the Government. And such was emphatically, according to the testimony of the last speaker, the position of this particular railway company. It had, as he correctly said, no chance whatever, except by aid of the 6,400 acres of land per mile of building the railway, except by virtue of a Government grant, it had no way of making a profit for its promoters, that I can see—unless they were prepared to put their hands in their pocket and spend a considerable sum of their own money—other than by in one shape or other sell out the charter. The House will do well to recollect that the granting of a railway charter, which is in all cases a sort of a monopoly, is a very important thing. If you give to any particular company, corporation or body of men, with a view to open a large tract of country, a railway charter running for one, two or three years as the case may be, and if parties in that country are desirous of causing this railway to be carried out, and if they find a wild cat company standing in the way, if they find that men of no means or resources, or men who are not going to put in their means or resources into its construction, stand there with the power to keep back that tract of country for several years together, everybody knows that nothing has been more common in past railway history, nothing is likely to be more common, than for those persons who are interested in promoting those enterprises to have to pay out large sums by way of black mail to the parties who have possession of the charters, for leave to go on and build the railway. The real objection to allowing men of straw or companies of straw to get possession of the charters is this: That they will not part, as the hon. gentleman who just spoke correctly enough mentioned, with their power, their claim, their right to the charter, and consequently, before the railway is constructed, the usual result is that a large sum of money, which ought to have gone to construct the railway, has to be paid to those parties for leave to build the railway; and there is reason, I fear, to suspect that something of this kind was in danger of occurring in this instance. The member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) himself admitted that such a thing was possible, and he also stated that in his judgment such a thing was wrong. He told the House, if I remember him correctly, that he could have sold the charter, although he intimated that he had no intention of doing it, but he admitted it was quite possible that this charter had a money value, that it was quite possible for him and others, having got possession of it to dispose of it, and it is quite apparent from the statements made by the Ministers themselves that these gentlemen had of their own resources no means whatever to go on with the construction of the road. They depended wholly and entirely on the Government grant. And now I think there are two conclusions, and two only, which should be drawn from this. One is, that since the Government had chosen to make it a part of their policy to make grants of land and money to railways—under such circumstances no members of Parliament ought to be allowed to meddle and dabble in these things at all; and the second, I think, is, that particularly after the disclosures which have occurred it becomes the duty of the Government to see to it that for the future railway charters shall not be given without full precautions being taken in the general public interest, to see that the parties who get these charters are men of substance and able to proceed with their road. Now I am not disposed at this moment to complicate the question by discussing the best mode of producing this result, but I say that in the minds of the public this whole course of trafficking in railway charters is becoming a crying scandal. I will not venture to say of my own knowledge how many members of this House may be concerned in these matters, but I do say that it is a matter of public notoriety, that meets one at every street corner, that there are members of this House who are supposed, and I fear with too great reason, to be making a regular matter of business of procuring charters and disposing of them to the best bidders for what they will bring. I can conceive of no practice more degrading or dishonoring to Parliament, or likely to do more mischief to the body politic than such acts; and if instead of fifty miles to be constructed

within a year the question was to construct 500 miles of railway within a year, I say that the true interest of the public requires that no step be taken before an investigation should be had into the charges preferred by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), and as I observe, sustained by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and ascertain whether this was a case of the kind or not.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. member who has just spoken has, I suspect, created the impression, by his utterances, that I had some knowledge—that there were some papers lodged with me that gave me the information that the gentlemen holding this charter had it for sale and were endeavoring to sell it—that they were trafficking in the charter of the company. I desire in that sense to say that there were no such papers lodged with me, that I never had any information, any suspicion, that they were trying to sell that charter, but I had the most direct information that I could receive from the gentlemen themselves, from the delegates from Rapid City, from Winnipeg, from the Manitoba Government, and from various other localities, that they were most anxious that these gentlemen—that this company—should receive the same terms in respect to the grant of land as had been given to other companies. This company, if I understand it, had a charter before that policy was adopted by the Government. They had a charter at the time when it was proposed by the Government to give 6,400 acres of land per mile at $1.06 per acre. That policy was subsequently changed, and changed, I know, with the assent and approval of gentlemen opposite and their organs, and the policy was adopted of giving the land as a free grant. After that policy was adopted, and while I was acting for the then Minister of the Interior, application was made that they should be treated on the same terms as we had treated other companies, and given that land grant free. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), I think, interviewed me several times in respect to that matter, and urged that we should treat this company the same as others had been treated; and, as I said before, the delegates from the Manitoba Government and from Rapid City and other localities, waited upon me and urged most strongly that the same policy should be adopted towards this company as had been adopted towards others, that we should give them the land grant free, in order to enable that company to construct the railway. That is my knowledge of the position of affairs. That I do know. From the letters which my friend (Mr. Woodworth) gave me, I believed from them that he and Mr. Beaty had mutually promoted that company; that they had obtained a charter for that company, and had been equally interested in promoting it and in endeavoring to raise the means in order to construct the railway. That is all I know about it, and I have no knowledge whatever, and never had any knowledge, that they were endeavoring to traffic in that charter, in the sense that they were selling it for their own personal interest, and without constructing the railway. They gave me the impression, from the communications from Mr. Beaty and those connected with him, that they were most anxious to have the railway constructed, as were all those in the section of country through which the road was to pass.

Mr. SPROULE. It may seem a little out of place for me to occupy the time of the House in the discussion of this question, but I deem it my duty to say a few words, seeing that I have received a number of letters from residents of the locality interested, urging a rapid building of the road, and also other letters from many of those who are creditors of this road, through the company having assumed the liabilities of the Souris and Rocky Mountain road for work done on that line. One crowd are urging on me to assist in every way in securing the early building of the road, the other crowd are urging that their rights should be secured and that the money should be forthcoming to the poor unfortunate laborers who put their labor into the old road some time ago, in hopes of an early return from it no matter what company should build the road. There are, I think, under these circumstances, two questions in connection with this matter which we should not lose sight of. The first is how can we best, in the interests of the settlers, accomplish the early building of the road, and the second is in accomplishing that, how shall we secure payment of this large amount of money with which this road is handicapped, that has been spent in building the first fifty miles of the Souris and Rocky Mountain road. Now, hon. gentlemen, including the last hon. gentleman who spoke, have contended that there is a very important question in connection with this case—the question whether it is right to allow members of Parliament to be presidents or stockholders of railways that are bonused by the Government of Canada. In reference to that, I think I need say very little, because I apprehend that the arguments of hon. gentlemen who have already dealt with that question have been strong and conclusive. If I could lead myself to believe that this company got any better terms, any more land mile for mile, or any greater advantages of any sort, because they were connected with this Parliament, then I would hold that to be a wrong; but until I can bring myself to believe that, I must assume that there is nothing wrong being done in supporting hon. members who are pushing this Bill through the House, seeing the important objects they have in view. We all remember that a few years ago a great many petitions were sent to this House from settlers along the line of this road, urging in the strongest language that this Government should assist any company that would promise to build that road at an early date. Both sides of the House joined in that effort; both agreed that the land grant should be free instead of being placed at $1.06 an acre; and in answer to the prayer of the petitioners, this Government decided to adopt the policy of giving free grants of lands to railways in the North-West Territories, and this road received only what was given to other companies. Consequently, I apprehend that no advantage was given to them, nothwithstanding that they happened to be members of this Parliament. We had also petitions just as urgent from those poor unfortunate laborers, who claimed that they had forfeited a year's labor, for which they had received no return, in connection with the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway. We were then anxious to see any company come forward and assume the liabilities of the Souris and Rocky Mountain Company, and give some assurance that the road would be built at an early date. Unfortunately, handicapped as the company was with a claim of about $100,000 standing against it, the promoters of the scheme have been unable to organise a company and go on and build the railway; and we cannot wonder at it when we know that it is so difficult to raise money for building railways in that country, notwithstanding all the advantages it offers. When the liabilities of the old company were assumed by the present company, we were in hopes that those unfortunate laborers would be paid; and when an extension of time was asked for the charter, we supported it, with the understanding that the claims these men had upon the old company should not be prejudiced. That condition has been maintained up to the present time, and I am credibly informed by legal gentlemen that there is nothing in this Bill to prejudice their claims; and it gives the strongest assurance that that road will be built by this company, that the wages of these men will be paid at an early date. What is the position of this question to-day? I have said that the object is the early construction of the road. If the Government took the charter out of the hands of the company, what would be the result? This

company have been trying, not only on the continent of Europe, but also in America, to float this scheme, and no doubt it is a well-known scheme in financial circles to-day, and if they have been unsuccessful up to the present time, notwithstanding the strong commercial and financial interests engaged in the scheme, how much more reasonable is it to suppose that it would be unsuccessful for a length of time in the future if it was placed in the hands of the Government, and a Bill were passed committing the work to any person at all; because the old saying, what is everybody's business is nobody's business, would apply to this scheme. If men of enterprise and ability have been unable to carry the scheme through up to the present time, is it reasonable to suppose that some other company, that we know nothing of, would take hold of it and would build fifty miles by next December? This company gives reasonable assurance that this may be accomplished by it; and we have reason to believe from the external evidence we have of the ability of the company, that that may be accomplished; and if it is accomplished, it will give the very strongest assurance that the whole road will be built in the interest of the settlers, and that those poor unfortunate laborers who lost their all in the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway will be paid at an early day. In view of these considerations, and remembering that there has been no documentary or other evidence adduced showing that anything wrong has been done by the promoters of this company, we have a right to grant this Bill. A great deal is made out of the fact that the principal promoter of the Bill was handed $386,000 of Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway stock; but what did that represent? With the liabilities standing against the old company of $140,000, it represented that he assumed those liabilities, without receiving anything in return, not even a single foot of land; and he took that stock over, although there was only 10 per cent. paid on it, and thereby assumed the liability of 90 cents on the dollar for every dollar of the stock, to those parties who are now in litigation, endeavoring to recover their claims against the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company. It was not only a very hazardous, but a very critical obligation—an obligation that very few men would assume; and it cannot be claimed in all fairness that there was any advantage coming to him in assuming that stock. Now, I say this House has a reasonable hope that that railway will be pushed forward rapidly at an early date, giving the settlers what they want, and securing the payment of those unfortunate laborers. Therefore, I say that we are in duty bound to grant this Bill, to extend the time asked for, and to renew the charter; and in doing that we shall be violating no principle of the independence of Parliament. The only result will be a good to the country, and a good to the parties most interested.

Mr. CHARLTON. To me, Sir, it is an astounding fact, that the Government of Canada, after all the revelations that have been made in regard to the transaction now under the consideration of the House, should insist on granting this charter. The hon. Minister of Finance tells us that he has been waited upon by delegations from the North-West, and has been urged by the hon. member for Marquette to grant this company the charter. Well, I suppose the hon. member for Marquette, and the delegations from the North-West, were influenced by the belief that the promoters of this scheme were acting in good faith—that they intended to build the road, and had the means to build it. The hon. Minister of Finance also tells us he had no knowledge at that time that they were trafficking in the charter. Can he tell us that is the case to-day? He does not say he believes at present they were trafficking in that charter, and the very fact, admitted by the promoters of the road, that they are seeking men of capital to build the road, is an admission that they cannot and do not intend to build it. They obtained the charter without the purpose or expectation of building the road themselves; it was a purely speculative transaction on their part. They obtained the charter expecting they would be able to induce men of capital to take it off their hands. They have admitted they are traffickers in this charter and are looking for men of means to purchase it from them. The Minister of Public Works practically condemns this whole business as wrong. He tells us, if we think best to turn over a new leaf, impliedly admitting it is better we should do so, that he will do so next Session, but to pass this measure now. Well, if the character of this business is such as to render it advisable for Parliament to turn over a new leaf, is there a better time to do so than now? If this transaction is of such a nature as to compel the Minister of Public Works to admit that a new leaf should be turned over, why should he and how can he urge that there should be any delay in taking that necessary and proper step? This business of contract and charter brokerage is a disgrace to this Parliament. A great number of members are admittedly engaged in promoting railway schemes; there are members in this House who have urged the granting of bonuses by, and have received bonuses from, this Government to advance railway schemes in which they are interested, and their conduct is morally just the same as if they had induced the Government to grant them money to put into their own pockets. The whole system is one that ought to be abolished. We have in this case a member of this House in the possession of $386,000 worth of capital stock, which he admits, and which his hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) admits, has not cost him a cent. The stock has been issued to him, not for the purpose of building the road, but for the purpose of controlling the road. That hon. gentleman has got the capital stock in his possession, not because he has advanced the money to pay for it, not that the capital stock represents actual capital, but he has got this fictitious capital into his possession for the purpose of controlling the enterprise, and having obtained it, he is using it in manipulating the concern for the advancement of his own pecuniary interests. That is admitted, no man in this House can doubt it, the circumstances of the case prove it. What those manipulations may be, what is concealed under the surface, I do not know. We are told he has made a contract, but we are not informed what its character or nature is. I am in ignorance as to whom it is made with, as to what the terms are, as to what the hon. member is likely to make out of the transaction in which he has invested no money, in which he has invested nothing but a little time and trouble. The hon. gentleman, in his speech, has made a pitiful appeal to this House not to make him the scapegoat for the sins perpetrated by other members. He does not deny he has perpetrated a sin, and deserves punishment, but he beseeches us not to select him as an example, not to make him a scapegoat for a state of things which has existed for years. It is high time somebody should be made a scapegoat; it is high time we should retrace our steps; it is high time that the independence of Parliament should be more strictly guarded than it has been for some years passed. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) said he would not take up the political aspect of the case. In that he showed a great amount of discretion. The political aspect of the case is the important one; it is that which makes this transaction and transactions of this nature dangerous to the country. Here is a Parliament elected by the people to guard their rights and to look after their interests, but in this Parliament, there are a certain number of members who are looking after their own interests. Now, we have a Statute which imposes a fine of $2,000 on every member of the House for every day he sits in the House, while he has a contract with the Government.

Will anyone assert, that if a member of Parliament has entered into a contract with the Crown for the performance of certain work, he is an offender greater than those who deal in charters, who enter into speculative arrangements, who get land grants from the Government, not in good faith, nor for the purpose of carrying out a contract, but for the purpose of enriching themselves by means of this contract brokerage? So long as this state of things exists, this independence of Parliament is a mockery. This state of things that is countenanced by the Government, and which they ask us to support by our votes in this House to-night, is even more reprehensible than any violation of the Independence of Parliament Act could be. The business of dabbling in charters by members of this House should be summarily ended. No man should be allowed to obtain a charter for a railway who does not obtain it in good faith, and who does not give evidence and pledge of his intention, or the intention of those associated with him, to proceed in the construction of the work for which he asks the charter. Not one charter intended is obtained in this House under any such circumstance. Hon. members obtain charters confessedly and avowedly for the purpose of selling them and making profit out of them. In 1695, when Sir John Trover, speaking of the House of Commons of England, was expelled for promoting a Bill, what would the House have thought of him if in addition to promoting a bill he had got a charter for his own speculative purposes, and got $386,000 of the capital stock into his hands for the purpose of controlling the company, manipulating the concern, and putting into his pocket all the bonuses granted and gain made out of it. Not only would they have expelled him from the House, but they would have sent him to the Tower. We are asked to sanction a state of things entirely subversive of the independence of Parliament, a state of things which ought to be ended summarily, and I will vote for the motion to give the Bill the three months' hoist, and shall oppose on every occasion the permitting of the existence of any such transactions as those which have been shown in this matter to have taken place among the parties interested.

Mr. ORTON. I am considerably amused at hon gentlemen opposite assuming to be extremely virtuous upon this question of giving aid to railways and allowing members of Parliament to become contractors and active promoters of railway enterprises. If my recollection is correct, I remember years ago, when the leader of the present Opposition in this House was the leader of the Government in the Province of Ontario, he inaugurated a scheme by which Government aid, to a very large extent, was given by the Province of Ontario to railway enterprises in that Province, and by means of that scheme, which he inaugurated, and for the purposes of which $1,900,000 provincial money was devoted, and the Province of Ontario mortgaged for a further sum of $100,000 a year for 20 years, members of the Local Legislature of the Province of Ontario were directly influenced. It is within the memory of members of this House that the late Sandfield Macdonald was defeated by only one of a majority; and how did the then leader of the Opposition obtain the majority which enabled him to remain in power so long in that Province? Simply by operating that scheme of giving aid to railways, and there was not a portion of Ontario but had a railway scheme of some kind. Hon. members of the Local Legislature understood this aid was to give them grants of money for their sections, and members of that House, who were elected to support the late Sandfield Macdonald's Administration, turned round directly and supported the Administration of the leader of the Opposition. And yet we hear the hon. gentleman getting up here and denouncing this system of members of Parliament becoming directors of railways.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. McCRANEY. Name one member of the Local Legislature.

Mr. ORTON. I can name any number of members of the Local Legislature——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name one——

Mr. ORTON—that were elected to support the Sandfield Macdonald Administration, and it is within the recollection, I am sure, of every hon. member here who is old enough to remember the political events of that time that the late Sandfield Macdonald's Administration was only defeated by one of a majority, and, in a very few months, a very few days I may say, after the inauguration of that log rolling system which was inaugurated by the leader of the Opposition, his following in that House was largely increased.

Mr. McCRANEY. Name one member.

Mr. ORTON. I have already stated the broad fact which is within the recollection, not only of every member in this House from the Province of Ontario, but of every elector who took an interest in the political affairs of the country at that day. But, perhaps, after all, this system, which I say was inaugurated by the leader of the Opposition, may be a wrong one. He was certainly the first to inaugurate that system of aid to railways projected by members of Parliament, and, if the present Government are wrong, they are wrong because they have followed in the course which was inaugurated by him. Perhaps the day has arrived, I believe the day has arrived, when some measure ought to be introduced into this House to prevent hon. members from becoming directors of railways, but at the same time I agree that this is not the time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ORTON. Why? The hon. gentlemen say "hear hear." I will give the reason why, because the railway under discussion is one of vast importance to the North-West, and, knowing as I do the character of the country through which it runs and the hardships which have been endured by the settlers, the hardy pioneers who went up to settle that country, I believe all consideration ought to be set aside at the present time in order to assist in the early construction of that railway as far as this House can possibly do. While upon that point, I desire to call the attention of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) to the very erroneous course he has taken for the interests of the people he represents, and I hope for his own sake he will reconsider the course he is about to take and will not vote for the three months' hoist of this bill, which means virtually that there shall be no effort made to construct this important railway and give the people of his own county the accommodation they have so long and so anxiously waited for. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) also in his first remarks stated that he was a very earnest advocate of railway construction in the North-West and desired to see that country developed, but he went on to say that this charter should not be given, but this railway should be delayed for another year in order that an investigation should take place. I see no earthly reason why this charter should be delayed, or the apparent early opportunity of constructing that railway should be delayed in order to have an investigation. If the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) has acted in a manner improper for a member of this House, there is every opportunity for hon. gentlemen opposite to have an investigation without mixing it up with this charter. I think, after the assurance from the Government, that if in one month they find the hon. member for West Toronto, in the contract his company have made with these contractors, cannot show that it is made with men able to build that road, they will themselves take power to incorporate a

company and see that the road is rapidly constructed, there is no hon. member in this House who desires to see the railway built this year and the people of that country get the accommodation they have so long waited for who can possibly vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I hope this Bill will receive no further opposition from members of this House. It is true there are some points that do not meet my approval in the course the hon. member for West Toronto has taken in this matter, and I cannot feel entirely in sympathy with him in regard to it. And I must state that the feeling prevails very largely throughout the North-West and Manitoba that the hon. member has perhaps used the position he occupies as president of this road in a manner that may possibly have delayed the construction of that railway. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) stated that he held the position, in consequence of the stock he held, of saying to any contractors: I have got what will give you control of that railway; and that is where the point comes in, and where the question arises in my mind whether the member for Toronto has not held his price too high for that control.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ORTON. Hon. members may say "hear, hear." I quite agree with hon. gentlemen on that point, and I do honestly believe there must have been something to quarrel about, and I am not going to spare the hon. gentleman in that matter, but I desire to see the road constructed and no obstacles placed in the way. The feeling, howeveer, does prevail, notwithstanding the remarks of the hon. member for West Toronto, and I have just as much right to believe the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), and I think the hon. member for King's has, perhaps, not been fairly treated in this matter. I think he has shown his position to be equally as good in this transaction as has the hon. member for West Toronto, and I would like to have seen the Government appoint trustees at once, after giving to the hon. member a just return for the exertions he had made and the expense he had undergone and the loss of time, for I do believe that hon. gentlemen cannot possibly go into the propagation of a railway scheme like that without expecting to receive some reward. I would feel far better satisfied if some trustee were appointed by the Government, at any rate to see that nothing more than a fair amount, a fair consideration, was received by the gentlemen who hold that charter. At the same time, I cannot possibly vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland, simply because it will delay, to an uncertain time, the construction of that very important railway.

Mr LISTER. The only true thing the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has said is, that the difficulty about this matter is that the price was too high.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I think the hon. gentleman should not say it is the only true thing.

Mr. LISTER. One of the true things and probably the truest thing is, that the price of the charter has been too high. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), as it appears, controlled this charter for some time, and for some reason which has not been explained here to-night, this road has not been built. I think I echo the feelings of every hon. gentleman on this side of the House, as well as on the other side, when I say that there is no person in this House but desires to see that road built, no person who does not desire to see the settlers in the North-West country relieved from the difficulties and disabilities under which they now labor, and who would not hail, I am sure, with pleasure any company that would be prepared to undertake the speedy construction of that road; but I say the Government are not discharging their duty in leaving the construction of the road in the hands of the men who now have it. I say, that in view of the disclosures which have been made here to-night, and which have been made in the committee room for two or three weeks or more, it will be scandalous if the Government permits the gentlemen who now control this road to retain control of it. We find the hon. member for West Toronto and his friends on the directorate are not railway builders at all, that they never had anything to do with railways. Most of them, I believe, are lawyers practicing in the city of Toronto. They never did know anything about railways, and I do not suppose they desire to know anything except to get rid of this railway. Now, we have this hon. gentleman supporting the Government, coming to the Government and getting from it the grant of this land, and we have the Government in defiance of their own promise made in the committee room, in defiance of their own demands made in the committee room, requiring that hon. gentleman to present to the committee proofs that he had the ability to construct the road, now asking Parliament to allow him to retain control of the road and to extend the time for completing it. I say, Sir, that it is a monstrous thing that members of Parliament, sitting here representing the people, are permitted to traffic in railway charters. It is a well known fact, that many hon. gentlemen opposite have received favors of this kind from the Government, and I repeat, it is a scandal, it is a burning disgrace upon this Legislature, that such a thing should be permitted. If the Government do not now take this matter up when it has been brought to their notice on evidence that cannot be contradicted, if they do not purge this House of the wrong that has been done by the hon. member for West Toronto, they will be equally guilty with him in the eyes of the people of this country. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman for Wellington to charge that the Local Legislature did this. No charge can be made against hon. gentlemen opposite, but some of them jump up and say: "Oh, but you did something of the same kind." Now, I challenge that hon. gentleman to mention one single member of the Local Legislature, who was a promoter of a railway company, receiving subsidies from the Local Legislature during the time my hon. leader was leading that House, or since. Sir, we all know that but for the hon. leader of the Opposition the Province of Ontario would have been badly off for railways. It was felt that the Province being rich, it was the duty of the Government to expend its surplus moneys in opening up that country. It was a wise policy, and time has proved it. The assessment rolls throughout that country will show it. There was nothing wrong in that; there is no hon. gentleman on this side of the House that objects to railways being subsidised. But what we do object to is that members of Parliament will come into this House and seek favors from the Government, which must inevitably handicap them, which must necessarily destroy the independence which they ought to have when they come here to represent their constituents. I say that is a thing which should be stamped out. It is a national disgrace that men should sit in this House who receive from the Government subsidies in money and lands for the construction of railways, who seek to get charters from this Parliament only for the purpose of trafficing in them. The evidence given is that this charter was obtained for that purpose only, and I must repeat the statement of my leader, that this House should stamp out this unclean thing, it should refuse to continue this charter. If the Government wish the construction of this road, they have the power to secure it. Let them do as they did when they gave a charter to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is not necessary that a Bill should be passed here; the Government has an inherent power to grant a charter by letters patent to any company they think proper. There is no difficulty in the way of constructing this road, and at

the same time Parliament can purge itself of this unrighteous act, and an act which degrades Parliament in the eyes of the public. Sir, it will afford me much pleasure to vote for the amendment, and I sincerely hope that it will be carried.

Mr. HESSON. About a year ago, it was my privilege to present petitions from Manitoba and the North-West in reference to the charter which is now under discussion in this House, calling upon the Government to assist a company which at that time were in possession of the charter, and to give them aid to enable them to make a contract to construct this road. The petition set forth the grievances under which the people suffered, the necessity there was that they should reach a market, and pointed out that they had been misled some years ago when the line of railway was diverted from the original survey, and that their circumstances were now such that unless some relief was granted them they would find it necessary to remove from the place they had settled in. I presented these petitions to the House, numerously signed by the old residents of my own county who had gone up to that new land. I took a deep interest in that matter, and the Government finally consented to give the same privileges to that road which they had given to the Manitoba and North-Western and to the Manitoba and South-Western. I understand in connection with the history of this road that in 1882 a charter was given to the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway, a contract was made and a certain amount of grading done from a place called Melbourne to Rapid City. The people were jubilant over the prospect of a railway, but for want of sufficient means the road was not constructed. The money that had been expended was lost, the work that had been done was not paid for, and the people were in a worse position than they had been before, from the contractors being unable to carry out the contract. The present company, the North-West Central, I understand, obtained a charter in 1884 and became possessors of the franchise of that road. In 1884 they were in the position of not having the same privileges, the same aid afforded them, that were afforded to other roads. The people, in Manitoba, therefore, had a perfect right to ask the Government to come to the assistance of this road, and I myself exerted my influence with the Government and members of this House, and presented petitions in favor of that project. I think one-third of my correspondence came from people in that region, urging me to use my influence in favor of that road. Now that was the policy of this Government and of this Parliament, and it was even supported by the leader of the Opposition and his friends. A deputation came down from Manitoba headed by the member from Minnedosa in the Local Legislature, and one or two other gentlemen of importance. That gentleman, Dr. Harrison, came here and remained some time endeavoring to induce the Government to get a free grant of land, as was done in the case of the other roads. But at that period it was impossible for the gentlemen holding the franchise to make a contract. It was impossible to get parties to undertake to build the railway. They required at least as good a foundation for raising money in the markets of the world as had other roads that were being constructed in that country. That free grant, I believe, was obtained sometime from the Government in the fall of 1885. It was charged against the member for West Toronto that he had not pushed sufficiently in the money market to obtain a contract for the construction of the road. It appears to me very plain that until he obtained the consent of the Government that they would put that road on the same footing as all other roads under construction in Manitoba and the North-West, he was absolutely incapacitated from obtaining parties to furnish money to carry out the work. He obtained from the Government an Order in Council for a free grant to be made to that company, except the expense of surveying. So far as I understand, the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), as president of the company, made every effort to obtain parties to enter into a contract to construct the road. It seems he made several trips to New York, and I think he crossed the Atlantic once or twice, and I am sure he has not been dilatory in the matter, but has always expressed himself most anxious to secure parties to build the railway. He was aware that the people of the North-West would not submit to any delay arising on his part, and feeling that he did all in his power I am not prepared to say that he has neglected any opportunity to make a contract for the construction of the road. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has taken a most peculiar course as the representative of that part of the country more specially interested. If the hon. gentleman was as anxious this year as he was last that the work should be constructed, that the line should be built rapi ly, he has taken a most peculiar position to-day in being prepared to grant only two weeks in order to allow the present company to establish the fact to the satisfaction of the Government that the present contractors are capable of carrying out the work and have means to complete it; but so strange is his conduct that he is yet in favor of voting for the three months' hoist, which will virtually kill the Bill. The hon. gentleman must have great confidence in the Government for he is willing that they should undertake the work and find a company that will construct it more rapidly than the company now under consideration, and yet within the next few days we may be assured the contractors will proceed with the work energetically and complete it at a much earlier period than the Government could do. It is not very long from now to the 1st of June, when, if the charter is extended to that time, the Government will by proclamation or otherwise, if satisfied of the ability of the contractors, give the charter effect. If not, we shall be in no worse position than we would be if the amendment of the member for Northumberland was adopted. I cannot believe the hon. member for Marquette is at all serious in his proposal. I am afraid he has made a very strange departure from the position he took in this House and the great efforts he made last year, if he seeks in any way to attempt or embarrass the Government in their desire to carry out this great work. I have such confidence in the Government—and the hon. gentleman has quite as much confidence, for he desired to give them full control of the work and put the present Bill aside—that I am satisfied to leave it to them to ascertain whether the contractors have sufficient means to carry out the work before they, the Government, complete the charter by issuing a proclamation. The Government have great responsibility resting upon them and I am prepared to trust them with that responsibility and am not disposed to interfere with the personal differences on the board of directors, and they should not be permitted to interfere with the success of this great enterprise. It is the imperative duty of the Government, understanding all the facts, not to be diverted by any personal disagreement on the board from what is their proper course towards this desirable road. I hope, therefore, in the interest of those for whom I speak, those from whom I have presented petitions and taken an interest in this matter and interviewed with other members of the Government from time to time asking them to place this company in the same position as other companies—and I claim I have a right to speak for those people—I hope the Government will take very good care that neither the quarrels with individual directors nor any other motive except that of the public interest will influence them in prosecuting and completing this important and necessary work at an early day.

Mr. FAIRBANK. The last three speakers on the opposite side of the House, namely, the member for Richmond

and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), the member for Wellington (Mr. Orton), and the member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), have evidently been endeavoring to place the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) in a position which he does not occupy. The arguments of those hon. gentlemen may have no weight in this Chamber, but they may have weight outside, where the question may not be thoroughly understood. They have endeavored to represent the member for Marquette as urging three months' delay. Such is not his position; such was not his position as a member of the Railway Committee. This proposition to renew the charter comes after a year's delay. No member in this Chamber, I venture to say, is more anxious for the railway, and feels that it will give the people who need it so much, and have waited for it so long, than the hon. member for Marquette. At the last session of the committee he asked if the promoter of the measure, the member for West Toronto, could not give satisfactory evidence of the ability of the company to do something within a short period. The Minister of Public Works informed the committee that they had not given such evidence. The member for Richmond and Wolfe has laid great stress upon the fact that a contract had been signed. Of the real metallic value of that contract we can form a pretty accurate estimation from the value which the Ministers themselves have placed upon it. So much value did they place upon it that the Minister of Public Works did not know who it was signed by, and had great difficulty in deciphering the names. This shows the value they themselves placed upon the contract, which the member for Richmond and Wolfe offers to this House as a voucher of their ability to do this work. This is not a matter of yesterday or of last week. The land subsidy has been a matter standing now for nearly one year. And I can well understand the objection of the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) in regard to this matter being put beyond the control of this Parliament absolutely. He has shown no indication of wishing to delay the matter, or even opposition to the present promoters of the road, but instead he has been anxious that the matter should not be indefinitely delayed. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) has well asked what the stock amounts to. Stock, indeed, in the hands of inexperienced men, stock that is not all paid for, amounts to very little so far as finishing the road is concerned, but it may amount to considerable, and it has been shown in this instance to amount to considerable, in blocking the railway. The air brake is a very useful thing indeed on a railway after it is constructed, but brakes and delays are very little use until the railway is constructed. If I heard rightly, an attempt has been made to intimate that the leader of the Opposition considered the grants to this railway too large. I understood him to say nothing of the kind. I believe he did offer some objection to the large bonding power, but not to the grant given to the railway, and what weight the argument of the Minister Public Works had in answer to the Leader of the Opposition, that much larger grants were given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I cannot understand. It is well within his knowledge, as it is within the knowledge of every hon. member of this House, that there are single miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway which cost more to construct than fifty miles of this road, because we have in the drawback against this undertaking, in the cost of the abandoned grade, an indication of the cost of grading, of about $2,000 a mile. It seems that during the enjoyment of these privileges and powers, absolutely nothing has been done by the company towards the construction of the railway. We were informed this afternoon that not a single shovel of earth has been turned over, and I think it is high time we should have some definite proof of the ability of the company to carry forward this most desirable undertaking, or failing that, we should put the charter in the hands of men who will build it.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There are one or two points to which I desire very briefly to call the attention of the House before the vote is taken. We have heard a great deal to night in relation to the disclosures which have been made. Hon. gentlemen opposite appear to have used that expression as if there was a certain state of facts established beyond the possibility of controversy. Now, let us look for a moment at what the disclosures—as they are called—happen to be in this case. The origin of all these disclosures, the first step in all these disclosures, was the statement by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), president, of the railway company, of which the hon. member for King's was a director, had not dealt fairly with him, that the understanding between those two gentlemen, as stated by the hon member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), was that out of the profits of this road, whatever they might be, the other members of the company were to get $50,000, and the balance, whatever it might be, was to be divided between those two gentlemen. That is the statement made by the hon member for King's (Mr. Woodworth). It implied, as you can readily understand, that these two gentlemen had entered into a conspiracy for the purpose of dividing a large share of the profits, after giving to their co directors a smaller share, whatever that might be. The best answer to this charge, so far as this particular debate is concerned, is to be found in the frank admission of the leader of the Opposition, who said after having heard what was stated in another place as well as here, that he came to the conclusion, which he frankly stated, that he saw nothing and had heard nothing which justified him in believing that the hon member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) was dealing unfairly or dishonorably by his colleagues on the board. The charge, if it meant anything, meant that he was so dealing dishonorably, and therefore, I think, we may take the statement of the leader of the Opposition as the best answer, so far as the evidence goes, to that statement made in the first instance. Then, Sir, the next statement we have is that the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) was waited upon by a couple of gentlemen—if one may use that term in referring to either of them—in relation to this matter, and that they offered a contract to the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) as president of this railway, and that he insisted as a condition precedent to anything being done that provision should be made for some $650,000 to go to him, who, in that letter, was described as "the boy." Now, Sir, these two gentlemen—these two persons—Mr. Pew, and his clerk, I believe, McConachie, who masqueraded for the moment in the character of a millionaire—these two persons, whose statement, if made in the most formal way against that hon. member or any hon. gentleman as a mere verbal statement, I venture to say no man in this House who knows them would take. Mr. Pew is well known by his connection with the Manitoba and South Western, and his conduct in connection with that road, the revelations made in the courts, and the expressions used toward him by the judges, all show that he is not a man upon whose statement, in relation to a matter of this kind, any gentleman should be put on his trial. And, Sir, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), after reading Mr. McConachie's letter in another place—and I may say we have been referring all evening not strictly within the rules of Parliament to what has been going on in another place—after reading this statement of Mr. McConachie, read what he said was going to be confirmatory evidence of that statement, in the form of a letter from Mr. Beaty himself. What was that letter? Certainly not a letter demanding any $650,000; not a letter demanding any advantage for himself or his company, but a distinct statement that the company should be kept distinct from the contractors—that the contractors should build the railway, and that the only object that he had

in view was the construction of the railway. That was the statement made in that letter, a reasonable letter—a letter which any president of a railway company might write to any person with the most perfect innocence and propriety—might write to any person proposing to become a contractor for the construction of a railway in which his company was interested. That was the evidence given in proof of this statement of Mr. Pew, sustained as it was by this Mr. McConachie. Well, Sir, that is one disclosure which we have heard to-night. Then we had another statement which was that the member for West Toronto, as president of this company, was willing to enter into a contract with Mr. Macdonald, who, I believe, was the contractor in the original Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway, and who is to-day, I believe, very properly a claimant under this particular arrangement for work done on some fifty miles of that railway in grading it. Well, Sir, that particular contract simply showed that Mr. Macdonald was to build the railway, and the company were to have out of the proceeds of the bonds and subsidies and grants given to them, $1,500 a mile which was to go to the ordinary operations of the company—not to the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty)—but to the ordinary operations of the company connected with the equipment of the road, the working and running of the road, and all the incidents which everyone knows are connected with a railway after it passes from the hands of the contractor into the hands of the company. Anyone who knows anything of railways knows that there are enormous expenses connected with the construction of railways after they have passed from the hands of the contractors into the hands of the company. That was the proposal made; what was there wrong in it? Nothing wrong of any kind—nothing justifying the expressions used by hon. gentlemen opposite about disclosures, as if there were something which had been proved against the hon. member for West Toronto which would not only justify the refusal of this charter to him, but justify his expulsion from this House, if these statements were exactly as they were put by hon. gentlemen opposite, rather by suggestion and insinuation, rather by the use of the expression "after the disclosures we have heard," than by any specific charge they have ventured to make. Now, Sir, these are the disclosures about which we have heard so much. Then, the hon. gentleman who has just sat down said that a form of contract had been submitted to the Railway Committee, but that it was so utterly insufficient, so utterly unworthy of credit, that the hon. gentleman who leads the House at this moment was unable to read the name attached to it. Well, I remember being up in West Northumberland, I think, when the first election took place of the hon. gentleman who now represents that constituency in this House. There were a number of my old friends there. I remember one of them showing me a letter written to him urging him strongly to support the liberal candidate, and asking me whom the letter came from. I said I could not make out the signature; the letter was then passed around the room, but no one could make it out; and then it came out that it was the signature of the hon. member for West Durham. Yet nobody would say for a moment that because there was a difficulty in making out his signature, therefore he is a most insignificant person, who is not to be considered in any matter in which he may be interested. That is the newest doctrine I have heard, that the difficulty of reading a signature is proof that the signer is unworthy of credit or consideration; and yet that is the argument put forth to prove that this form of contract submitted to the committee was unworthy of consideration. Then, Sir, we are told that it is unworthy of a member of Parliament to be connected with railways that receive subsidies from the Government. Well, Sir, that is a broad question, a large question, one that may fairly be dealt with on its merits. It has not been held to be unworthy in the past, at any rate, and no hon. gentleman has a right to charge any hon. member with unworthiness, with disgracing his position, or with bringing the character of Parliament in contempt, because he does that which members of Parliament, up to this time, have been doing with the most perfect impunity. I referred in another place to a remarkable illustration which we have at this moment before Parliament; I mean the Hudson Bay Railway Company, of which the hon. member for Selkirk, Mr. Sutherland, is the president. That hon. gentleman is in England at this moment promoting that railway. That railway has received large subsidies from the Government—larger subsidies, I am inclined to think, than any of the other branch railways—double the area in land of any other branch railway that has been subsidised in the North-West. Its president, who is a member of this House, is an hon. gentleman, who is not a friend of the Government, who was elected as an opponent to the Government. I made this statement in another place, and the hon. member for Northumberland thought he had me; in fact, he has told me two or three times, in his own good natured way, that he had a fair shot at me when he pointed out that Mr. Sutherland's conduct in the House indicated that he had been influenced somewhat by the fact that he was the president of a company which had been the recipient of a large subsidy from the Government. That hon. gentleman has not been in this House during this Session except two or three times; although, I venture to think, that his constituents feel that he is employed much more in their interests in England than if he were here. But he was in this House last Session at times. He did not vote very often, it is true; he was away a good deal, I believe, in connection with this enterprise. The only party vote I have been able to find at which he was present, on the 10th of April, was a direct vote of want of confidence in the Government in amendment to going into Committee of Supply, and the hon. gentleman on that occasion voted with the Opposition against the Government. That is the only vote he gave last Session of a party character. He voted two or three times on question on which the votes were scattered, members on both sides being so mixed up that one could not tell from their votes their party proclivities.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does not that rather sustain my position that he did not often vote against the Government.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He voted against the Government whenever he was here, except in connection with Pacific Railway matters; and if hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to say that Mr. Sutherland, whom they supported at the last election, whom they did their very best to elect, and upon whom when in power they lavished all kinds of favors, is a man who sold himself, prostituted his position and violated his pledges to his constituents, for the sake of a subsidy, let them say so; yet that record of last year remains. Well, Sir, what have we been doing? Have we been saying, in connection with the Hudson Bay Railway, that we regard it as something to be deprecated and opposed, that a member of Parliament should be a member of a railway company receiving subsidies from the Government? Why, Sir, so far from that, Mr. Sutherland has sent to this country from England a cablegram in which he asked certain amendments to be made to his charter in order that he may more successfully float his scheme—a scheme based upon those subsidies; and this House has actually suspended its rules in order that the petition in favor of those amendments may be received, and that the necessary Bill may be carried through, so little does this House consider it derogatory to a member of Parliament to be president of a railway company receiving a subsidy from the Government. I think, therefore, judging from the conduct of this Parliament, I may fairly say that there

is no ground for the attacks made on the hon. member for West Toronto.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, oh.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Not a bit of ground; and if the hon. gentleman whose pure soul I know is terribly horrified at the idea of a public man making the slightest use of his public position for his private objects—if the hon. gentleman says so, I am bound to accept his statement, but I would hardly have expected him to say so, from his general idea how public companies are organised and carried on.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a wonderful statement, I can scarcely grasp it. State it plainly.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If the hon. gentleman wants my reason, I will give it. An hon. gentleman who has sat in this House for sessions past, who has made use of his position in this House against a public corporation in this country, and who has openly avowed that he has done it because the manager of that corporation did not pay him the sum that he thought his services to that corporation were worth, it does not suit that hon. gentleman well to assume the high tone he has taken and exhibit the pure soul he has exhibited to-day.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad the hon. gentleman has got something specific. Go on, now.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Then, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was good enough to say what we had to guard against in this connection was the over-charging of these railways with capital account, and in consequence the imposing on the people too high tariffs in order to meet these charges. What is the fact? The first, the only fixed charge, practically, on these railway corporations, is the bonded debt. Parliament fixes the limitation of the amount of the bonded debt, and in this case, if I remember rightly, the bonded debt was limited to $20,000 a mile.

Mr. BLAKE. Put on another five.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Whether the amount be $20,000 or $25,000, the argument is precisely the same. The hon gentleman, as a member of this House, has, if I mistake not, not offered any opposition to this amount. It is quite true, the hon. gentleman is a member of the Railway Committee, but he has practically abdicated his function as a member of the committee, unless there is a party advantage to be gained, for we have never the advantage of seeing him at the meetings, except when an opportunity presents itself for party advantage, and then he always turns up. But it was his business to attend the meetings of the committee and oppose this amount being fixed, if he thought it was too high. It was not opposed, it was granted by the Railway Committee without opposition; it was assented to by Parliament without opposition, and therefore it is the limit fixed by Parliament, to which the fixed charges on that railway can be raised. It is therefore simply childish to talk about our having to be careful about the fixed charges, in view of the fact that they are within the purview of Parliament, that they have been fixed by Parliament, and may be guarded by Parliament in the future. Then, as to the grant of subsidy by the Government. There is not a dollar of subsidy granted by the Government or an acre of land, which is not dependent on the construction of the railway. Why do we give a grant? We give it that the people in that district may have the advantage of a railway running through it; and in this particular case we have declared that not an acre of land shall be given before fifty miles of the road are constructed, and then the balance of the subsidy shall only be given as the road is constructed, from time to time, on a fixed mileage. Under those circumstances, the subsidy which we give is one that must be earned before it can be received. It cannot be trafficked in, except upon the basis of the construction of the road; and the construction of the road is what is desired, when this Parliament gives a subsidy. Is there anyone opposed to the granting of a subsidy towards this road? Nobody, I have heard, has ventured to say the Government did not act wisely in granting the subsidy. Everybody admits the road runs through an important section of the country, and therefore deserves to be subsidised and assisted out of the public domain. We have had votes from the people of Manitoba, and from members of Parliament on both sides, in favor of granting a subsidy. There is no question whatever about that; and when we grant it in such a way that not one single acre will be given until fifty miles of the road are built, the only way in which trafficking can take place in reference to this charter is on the basis of the construction of the railway, thus giving the people the advantage of railway connection under the fixed charge agreed to by Parliament. We are told, however, that members of Parliament ought not in any way to be interested in railway charters. There are more ways than one in which a member of Parliament may be interested in a railway corporation. Suppose we declare that members shall not be so interested. I know there have been cases in which prominent members of Parliament were counsel for railway corporations. I know that presidents of important railway corporations in England have announced the opinions they had from counsel in Canada, members of Parliament, and even declared the amount, $2,000, which they paid for the opinion. That, of course, would not influence the particular gentleman who received it, in his parliamentary course, although it may be regarded as a somewhat significant fact that everything the corporation opposed in Parliament that hon. gentleman opposed as well. I do not say the two things are in any way connected, but if I were disposed to deal with the question in the spirit of hon. gentlemen opposite, I might assume that what is possible must be true. I might very well connect the two things together, and point out that a prominent member of this House could be connected with and influenced by a railway corporation just as easily and as well as if his name were in the charter and he was getting advantages as the result of his name being in the charter.

Mr. LANDERKIN. By printing contracts, for instance.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In this particular case what we have to do is to see, if possible, that this railway is built. I believe its construction would have been commenced before this, but for the preliminary charge against the road for the fifty miles of grading done on the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway. It is a serious matter to ask contractors or capitalists to enter upon an enterprise of this kind with a first charge upon it of $100,000 to $125,000 for which they received nothing, since it is not as if this road had been graded on the present line and the company were to get the advantage of the work done, but they have to pay the amount on a piece of road which they are not permitted to use at all. That has been one of the difficulties to be contended with. The Railway Committee properly determined that these people should be paid, and so reported to this House, and this House is now asked simply this: that certain negotiations having taken place, certain progress having been made in the negotiations for the construction of the road, we shall not interrupt those negotiations until, at any rate, a reasonable time has elapsed in which it may be shown that they are negotiations looking to the construction of the railway or that they are not of a serious character. If we find that the company are unable to construct the railway; if we find that the president is unable

to submit a substantial contract for its construction, the Government may be empowered to incorporate any other company that may undertake to build it. I wish most sincerely I could feel certain that in that event another corporation would come forward to build the railway.

Mr. MITCHELL. Amen.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I fear very much that the result of the defeat of this measure, whether it be defeated here or by the failure of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Beaty) to submit his contract to the Government by the 1st of June, will mean the postponement for a considerable time of the construction of that road, to the serious drawback to that part of the country. In the meantime we ought reasonably to give to the company the opportunity of submitting to the Government such a contract as will secure the construction of the road, and thus secure to the people of that section the advantage of its construction.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the motion is carried, I would like to make a few observations. I may say at the outset I am satisfied the practice of members of this House acting as presidents or contractors of railways, is contrary to the true spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act. I believe the time has arrived in the history of this country when such a state of things shall not be permitted longer to exist. The hon. the Minister of the Interior says, and he no doubt well knows, that it may be possible for members in the House, whose names do not appear as contractors in railway companies, to evade the law. He, I suppose, states of his own experience in connection with the *Gazette* Printing Company that it is possible for him not to appear as a member of that company, when every person in this country feels and believes that he is. He is but speaking his own experience that, while he is able to receive public money as sitting in this House, he is able to render nugatory the Independence of Parliament Act and draw large sums of money for work which he has never performed. Now, with that allusion to that hon. gentleman, I will proceed to state that the system pursued by the Government of Ontario in constructing the great network of railways that permeates every part of the Province of Ontario has been very different to that which has been pursued in regard to Manitoba. Is there any man in this House who has studied the railway system that was inaugurated by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in the year 1871, who will stand up to-day and state upon his reputation that the money that was then appropriated for railway aid was not judicious, and that it has not been well expended?

Mr. McCALLUM. For political purposes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to know if the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) can state one single instance where an appropriation has been made without its being submitted to Parliament. It has been in the public interest; it has been expended in the public interest; it has contributed to the development and to the welfare of the Province of Ontario very materially. There is scarcely a county that has not been aided, and with all the progress and the enterprise which has characterised the Administration in the Province of Ontario ever since the hon. the leader of the Opposition inaugurated that system, it has been marked by progress, and they have had railways built, long lines of railways stretching from one portion of the country to the other, which have received aid from the Province and have been a great benefit in developing it. I state here in my place in the House that I do not believe that the principle is right of allowing members of this House to act as directors of railways that approach this House for public aid. I do not believe that any gentleman in this House should be a member of any company, whether it is a railway company, a newspaper company or any other company, that receives public aid from this House. I believe the principle has a tendency to demoralisation. I do not say that it always produces such results, but I do say that it has the appearance of evil and should be shunned. It matters not to me whether some members on this side of the House in the last fifty years have chanced to be directors of a railway company. I do not admire the principle any more for that, and it is high time that the people of the country should know who are those in this House who are directors or presidents of railways. Fancy, for instance, the Minister of Railways being a president of a railway company, being a member of the Government, coming to the Government and asking them to aid that railway scheme. Why, in the noon-day of the nineteenth century, it would appear improbable that, in a British House, a member of the Government should be found so barefaced and so shameless as to come to Parliament, where he was a member of the Government, and ask for aid to a railway in where he was interested. The principle will lead to nothing but demoralisation. It will lead the people of this country to look at this House as being composed of placemen, who are sitting here and are maintained here by the public money. It is a position that is beneath the dignity of this House. Since this matter came up, a serious question has arisen in connection with it, and I have looked through the "Parliamentary Companion" and ascertained how the House is composed. It may not be a pleasing duty, it may be a disagreeable duty, but I feel it is a duty I owe to myself to state what is there stated by the members, I suppose, in giving their reports to the author of this book; and I find that we have in this House a great many who are connected with different railways in this country, and I regret to say there are a great many there who have come to this House and asked for public money to aid the railways with which they were connected. It is a direct blow, a direct violation of the independence of Parliament. It is as much so as the case of a member of a printing company or a newspaper company who manages to evade the Independence of Parliament Act by keeping his name out of the company, though he says it can be done. He knows it can be done, and the people of the country know it can be done, and know it has been done, and that public money has been paid to that gentleman and the firm to which he belongs, for work he never performed. Prices fourteen times higher than should have been paid, were paid to that member and his firm for printing on behalf of this House. I have looked through this list and I will let you know what I find. I find that the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) is a president of a railway company, and that that company has received a large grant of land from the Government of this country. I think that is indecent. Can it be said they have no railway men in Manitoba? Can it be said that, from one end to the other of this broad Dominion, there are no men capable of building a railway, that there are no railway contractors, that they have to go to West Toronto, and get a lawyer, who perhaps does not know a railway locomotive from a steamboat, to go there and construct their railway; and the Government find this a pressing emergency when this Bill cannot be delayed any longer, though I believe the charter was granted three years ago, and, in order to get this lawyer to teach the railway men how to build railways in the North-West, they grant him this money. He will be a pretty independent man. He will be most likely to vote against the motion of my hon. friend from Northumberland. He received 6,400 acres per mile for building this road. He has never built any of the road yet, although he is a lawyer and gets great credit for his efforts on behalf of this road, and we have it stated to-day that he had not put in one spade in the construction of this road. We find that he is associ-

ated with other members in this House. It is really an alarming state of things that railway men are so scarce in this country, and that there is not enough enterprise outside of this House, but that they are obliged to come into this House to get gentlemen to construct these railways. When they built the Canadian Pacific Railway, did they take members in this House to construct the railway? Did not that road go speedily enough to suit the country? Did they then plead that it was a necessity, that they could not get anyone outside of the House to build that railway? That great railway they gave to gentlemen outside this House, but in this instance they are obliged to act in the interests of Manitoba. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) spoke of the burning necessity of that road, and of the commendable enterprise manifested by the member for West Toronto in going up into the North-West and building that road for these people. They knew nothing, apparently, about building railways, and were obliged to come to the hon. member for West Toronto, to take a lawyer to construct the road. Now has it not a peculiar look about it?

Mr. MITCHELL. It looks funny.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member has associated with him the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Hay). Well, it is very nice to see the members for Toronto West and Centre united and pressing together so energetically in getting railway facilities for Manitoba. They have associated with them the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel), the member for Rimouski (Mr. Billy), and I believe the member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) is also on that board. Well, it is a gratifying thing to the people of Manitoba to know that there are such benevolent members in this House who are prepared to sacrifice their comforts to construct railways for the people of Manitoba, and who receive 6,400 acres of land per mile, when the construction of it, perhaps, is not worth more than 640. Why, in Ontario there were many railways where the engineering difficulty was very much greater, and where the obstacles were very much greater, as in the case of the Stratford and Lake Huron Railway, which was built for something like $3,000 a mile.

Mr. IVES. Tell us what the rails cost.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe will bear with me, I will come to him presently.

Mr. IVES. But tell us what the rails and the ties cost that were put on this $3,000 a mile railway?

Mr. MITCHELL. Dry up, Ives. Give him a chance.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will tell you just as much about rails and ties before I am done, as you will want to hear.

Mr. IVES. You don't know anything about it. You know more about physic.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman says I know nothing about it. The hon. member knows about cattle, because he has a ranche down in Texas. He is one of these patriots.

Mr. IVES. Now he is going to be amusing.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He is one of those patriots, one of those loyalists——

Mr. IVES. Who don't take up land in the North West.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I must condemn this. I do not care who the man is, I condemn that principle, I believe it tends to demoralise this Legislature; I believe it tends to degrade this Legislature. I find again that the hon. member for North Hastings, who is the Minister of Customs in this House, thought it not beneath him to approach this Legislature for a railway of which he was president, the North Hastings Railway which received from this House $1,500 a mile, or $10,500.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman should stick as near to the truth as possible. I was president of that road four or five years ago. I have had nothing to do with it for that length of time, neither do I own a single dollar's worth of stock at the present moment.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We may just as well take the statements as they fly.

Mr. BOWELL. I admit I was president of the road, but not when that application was made.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I get my information from the "Parliamentary Companion," and the hon. gentleman when he stands up——

Mr. BOWELL. I know the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. I stated that when that application was made to the Grand Trunk on behalf of that company for aid, in order to enable them to complete it, I had nothing whatever to do with that road, and have not had for some years. I think the "Parliamentary Companion" says I was, not that I am.

Mr. MITCHELL I notice you helped the Grand Trunk.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; and I will be glad to do so again.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I want to put this matter right. I do not want to be accused by any member of this House as standing up and making statements that are untrue. I do not care who the member is, I want him to understand I am not in the habit of doing so. I read my information from the "Parliamentary Companion:"

"He was for eight years Grand Master of the Provincial Grand Lodge of Orangemen, is president of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway, was editor and proprietor of the Belleville daily and weekly *Intelligencer* newspaper for a lengthened period."

But it appears that he has not discovered the way to utilise it like the Minister of the Interior, who was younger in the House, but older in the arts. Well, the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson) is a director of the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway. I see he is not in the House, but I would not fear to make the statement if he were here. I make it from the "Parliamentary Companion," and I presume he is responsible for the statements contained therein. That road received $3,200 per mile, or a total of $272,000. I would like to know how he votes. I understand that his father is a good Reformer, that his brother is a good Reformer, and I will leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, to this House and the country to say whether this has anything to do with the way he votes. The hon. gentleman for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) is President of the Caraquet Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. Gloucester.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He received $3,200, or a total of $76,800. Now, I do not say that this is all that has been voted to that railway, but that is all that was voted in one year. I see that the Secretary of State, the member for Terrebonne, is also director of a railway, and I presume that he will look after the interests of that railway.

Mr. MITCHILL. He is getting a pretty good slice of that railway.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I see that the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby)—and it is a strong sense of public duty that leads me to speak of this hon. member, for I

have the highest respect for him—I am sorry to see that he acts as a director of a railway that has received public aid, though, I will not say that the railway for which he is acting receives aid now, he is a director of the Massawippi Railway, and of the Waterloo and Magog Railway that have got public money, but I have not had time to search the railway subsidies all through, nor do I know that these railways are now getting aid. I find that my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) is president of the Massawippi Railway, and he is a director of the Quebec Central. I find that in 1884 this House voted to that railway $211,200.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is only an instalment.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think that the hon. member for Sherbrooke has since been more solid than he used to be. I find that the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Hay)—I have the greatest respect for that gentleman. He certainly should know better, because he was brought up a good Reformer, but when they get out of the ranks, how soon they get into ways that are dark—I see that he is a director of the Credit Valley Railway.

Mr. HAY. Ten years ago.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Now I will speak of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), he was a director, as stated in the "Parliamentary Companion," of the International Railway, and received a very modest amount. He received in a year only $170,000.

Mr. IVES. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentlemen's story, but I never was a director of the International Railway.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then you had better change the "Companion." You had better get out of that company altogether. I am very glad that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are in the Chair because I am going to refer to the Speaker of the House. The hon. member for Frontenac, I observe, is a director of the Kingston and Pembroke Railway, and received $3,200 per mile, amounting to $48,000. I see the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) is not left out. He is president of the Ottawa Colonisation Company and Gatineau Railway Company and has received $320,000.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I never got one dollar; I am sorry to say.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was voted to the hon. gentleman. It may be all spent by this time, and I will give the hon. gentleman credit for his statement that he has not a dollar of it now. I come now to the hon. member for Compton, the Minister of Railways. He is president of the International Railway, which runs from Montreal through the State of Maine. I wonder how the hon. member for North Perth and the hon. member for North Huron like the idea of our money being spent in the State of Maine, in order to make the Minister of Railways probably a millionaire. Those hon. gentlemen will go and talk to the farmers about how they are abused and about how they stood up for the farmers; nevertheless they assisted in granting that sum to the Minister of Railways and the member for Richmond and Wolfe. The member for Compton received in one year $156,000, no doubt principally to be expended in the State of Maine. In another year he had voted, and I believe both those hon. gentlemen voted for it, $170,000 a year for fifteen years, a total of $2,550,000.

Mr. HESSON. Did any hon. gentleman on the Opposition side of the House vote for that grant?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I pity them if they did. The Hudson Bay Railway has been spoken of by the Minister of the Interior. That appears to be a national railway. It is projected by a gentleman who lives in Manitoba; he has got the money, and I hope that hon. gentleman will not allow any grant that has been made to that railway to change his principles. He is doing a great work for the country, as the Minister of the Interior bears testimony, and I hope he will remain solid, although he gets aid to complete a national undertaking. I see the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Wallace), is director of the Albert Southern Railway. I do not suppose it had any influence upon him; he is generally pretty stable. I do not see the name of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) figuring in connection with railway companies, but he is president of the York Farmers' Colonisation Company, and I suppose that is something about as handsome as a railway grant. I see the member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) is director of the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway Company.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a fat thing.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He received $32,000 a mile or $272,000. He is generally pretty solid, and when the division bell rings he is on hand.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). What about the hon. member for Queen's.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have only given one instalment, and I will not take up the time by going through more names. The picture is a sad one to contemplate. If the people really understood the true inwardness of the working of Parliament they would come to the conclusion that the members elected come here to serve their own special interests, and neglect the general interests. It is contrary to the idea of representative government that on almost every page you find violations of the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act on the part of most of those who support the Government of the day, and it looks bad. If the Government felt their responsibility, and had a higher sense of the dignity and honor devolving on them, they would not allow their followers to be placed in such a position. The dignity and honor and the future of this country demand that this state of things should cease, and I hope when the people thoroughly and fully understand the matter they will put an end to this system, and that at the close of this Parliament.

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to acquit the hon. gentleman of any intention to misrepresent the position I hold in regard to any railways, because the "Parliamentary Companion," and that for 1885, states that I am connected with a railway; it says "is president of the Belleville and North Hastings Railway." If it had said "was" it would have been strictly correct. That railway now forms a part of the whole Midland system and has been owned by and in possession of the Grand Trunk Railway Company for some years, and I have had nothing to do with it directly or indirectly since, nor for some time before it passed into the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You got the money.

Mr. BOWELL. That is not the point. The Grand Trunk Company has not accepted the money. I exceedingly regret the company did not accept the money and complete the road, extending four or five miles, and connect the Ontario Central with the Midland system that has been built running south and east.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a personal explanation. The Minister of the Interior made some reference to me, in fact he slightly went out of his way, as I thought, to refer to my conduct in connection with the Grand Trunk, and those

to refer to a debate which I think is entirely out of place on this occasion. I may say to the hon. gentleman that if he wishes to attack me about my public acts or conduct he will find me ready to meet him at any time. That hon. gentleman has chosen to say that I have boasted that I brought before Parliament a private grievance and assailed the Grand Trunk because of that private grievance. I deny it; it is not true. I have never done so. I have never boasted in this Parliament that I brought the Grand Trunk before Parliament for the purpose of ventilating any private grievance I have had with them. That hon. gentleman, and those who are associated with him, and the tools of the Grand Trunk in this House and elsewhere——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. You shut up with your order. He has chosen to try to assail me because I had independence enough, when the Grand Trunk Company attempted to override this House, when the hon. gentleman presiding over what he professed to call the leading organ——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Where am I out of order? Let any of the hon. gentlemen who are cackling behind on the back benches state where I am out of order. I will keep in order, and I am in order when I say that the hon. gentleman who presided over what he called——

Mr. McCALLUM. I rise to order. I do not think the hon. gentleman is in order when he calls the members of this House tools of the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. He said that hon. gentleman behind him were cackling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to a personal explanation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, the hon. gentleman who poses in a public position——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL.—chose to step out of his way and attack me, who have occupied an independent position in this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. If I could get my eye on the fellow on those back benches who is calling order, I would deal with him. The hon. gentleman has chosen to attack me because he says I have introduced into the discussions of this House my personal grievances against a public company. I challenge him to point out where I have ever done so. I have known occasions where that gentleman and the like of him have attempted——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the explanation.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am giving the explanation, and I appeal to this House whether I am not justified in——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear; chair, chair.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not going to allow any man to attack me and impute motives to me, and assail my reputation and public character, a public character that stands as well as that of any man in this House. No man is going to do that with impunity, and the man who does it has to take what he gets. I say that while that gentleman, the Minister of the Interior, before he occupied that position, claimed, as he did, that he presided over the most important paper—the most important public journal in Quebec——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL—that that railway company——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is not a personal explanation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Excuse me, Sir, I am in my right.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order; chair, chair.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am in my right. I say that hon. gentleman has charged me ——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order; chair, chair.

Mr. MITCHELL. That hon. gentleman has charged me with assailing the Grand Trunk Company. He has imputed motives to me and, Sir, they are not true. He has charged me with doing in my public capacity what I have never done, but I will tell you what I have done and what he has not dared to do, because his bread and butter depended on it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. When the Grand Trunk Company through their president, their active manager, Mr. Hickson, wrote a letter threatening this Government and Parliament three years ago, that if they dared to give legislation to the Canadian Pacific Railway they would bring condign punishment on the Government, when the hon. member over there, the hon. gentleman who poses now as an independent man, as a member of the Cabinet, did he dare——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to see the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) who is calling order, come down here and face me himself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have asked the hon. gentleman to confine himself to a personal explanation.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am defending myself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think you are. That is the decision of the Chair, and I hope the hon. gentleman will accept it. If he has any personal explanation the House, I am sure, will listen to him, but he cannot go beyond it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am endeavoring to confine myself to a personal explanation.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I wish to say that I said nothing whatever, and while I quite agree with those who did call him to order, I did not myself call him to order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I accept the hon. gentleman's explanation—I was going to say apology, but I thought he was the hon. gentleman who made the noise. What the Minister of the Interior said was this, that I had made use of my position to assail the Grand Trunk Railway Company and to gratify personal grievances. He said I boasted in this House that I had done so. Now, Sir, I never boasted in this House that I had done so; and I tell that hon. gentleman that when he stated that, he stated what he knew was not correct, because I had never done so; whatever might be my private feelings, I had never boasted of it. I have the courage of the convictions I entertain; and, as I stated, when he imputes that motive to me, I state to this House, and I am in order in stating, some of the reasons which influenced him; and when Mr. Hickson openly threatened this House and Parliament, and this country; when he and his officers openly outraged this Parliament by stealing legislation

through it; when I assailed him and brought him almost to the bar of the House; and when the Government of the country had to put a notice on the paper to withdraw the legislation which he stole through Parliament, that hon. gentleman who occupies the position of Minister of the Interior did not dare to resent the insult which was thrown upon this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; order.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is out of order?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can make a personal explanation.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am making a personal explanation, and I am making a pretty stringent personal explanation, too. I wish to say one word more.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, order. The hon. gentleman will please sit down when the Chair rises. The hon. gentleman is entitled, as I said before, to make a personal explanation, but in doing so he is not entitled to make attacks on others.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) allow me to interpose for a moment? I might suggest to the hon. gentleman, upon whom certainly a severe attack has been made, that after the ruling of the Chair, it would perhaps be better that he should make his explanation on a motion for adjournment—I have no doubt any hon. gentleman will move the adjournment of the debate and give him the opportunity to reply.

Mr. MITCHELL. As, Sir, you have ruled that I can only confine myself to a personal explanation, as I thought I was only doing that, and as it seems to be the impression that I should not go as far as I am going, I will reserve my remarks for the present. I want to give this hon. Minister just a bit of my mind.

Mr. McCALLUM. I wish to make a few remarks with regard to some of the expressions which have been used by hon. gentlemen opposite. A good deal has been said about the independence of Parliament. I am a pretty old man, and I have lived a good while. I have got a good memory and I know, Sir, that from 1867 to 1872 these gentlemen on the other side were then, as they are now, always crying out for the independence of Parliament. It was one of the planks in their platform that they should keep the people's representatives free from favors from the Crown. But, Sir, when they crossed to the other side they forgot all their pledges; they scattered their principles to the four winds of heaven. When they talk about the independence of Parliament, the electors of the country know well what they mean. They know they are using that cry as the means of getting into power. No sooner did they get into office than they let contracts and gave employment to members of this House and members of the Government. They had a contract with the Speaker in the Chair, and he farmed it out. Now they tell us about the independence of Parliament, and that no man should be a director of a railway; and the member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) spoke to-night about the railway grants in the Province of Ontario. The hon. member for Grey spoke about the purity of the grants to railways in the Province of Ontario. I had the honor of a seat in that House at the time those grants were made, and they were made on a different principle from what the grants have been made here. I am sustained in the language I used in this House on former occasions by no less a gentleman than the present Prime Minister of Ontario in reference to those grants. How were those grants made? Sandfield Macdonald's Government was turned out of power because it gave as much as $1,500,000 to aid railways in the thinly settled districts of the Province; but when the hon. member for West Durham came into power, he found that that was not sufficient to control the House, and he added $400,000 more to it. He set up $2,000,000 as a bribe, as a railway fund, and he said: "Send a man to support me, and I will give him a railway grant." I can remember a few who went back on their party in order to get railway grants. Now, there was a difference between the hon. member for West Durham and myself last year, when I said that when he brought down the resolutions, we were to have five days time to consider them.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a question of order. What have we to do with all this ancient history of quarrels in Ontario ten years ago? I ask the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. The debate has wandered off a good deal to the question of the independence of Parliament. I hope the hon. gentleman will try to confine himself as much as possible to the question of the railway charter.

Mr. McCALLUM. I do not think any action of any member of this House in promoting a railway will affect his vote in the House. Does the hon. member for Grey mean to say that the hon. member for Pontiac, or the hon. member for West Toronto, has been influenced in their votes in this House by grants given to railways in which they have been interested? Does he mean to say that the action of the Government in giving lands to assist in the construction of railways in the North-West has anything to do with the way hon. members vote in this House? It is too ridiculous. If there is anything the so-called Reform party has admired the hon. member for West Durham for, it has been his action in reference to railway assistance, because it has had the effect of controlling the Province of Ontario to this day. They may talk about the independence of Parliament. If the House will permit me, I will read the words of the present Premier of Ontario at the London banquet, where the leader of the Opposition was called the uncrowned king. This is what Mr. Mowat said:

"We have been able to maintain the Liberal party in power for thirteen or fourteen years, and I rejoice to know that we are not ashamed of the record, and I do not forget, and the people of this country will not forget, during that time we have held the fort, and the Liberal party has been in power in Ontario, it is owing to our distinguished guest. He has fought the battle by which the Ontario Parliament has held power, and I am convinced has spared no effort to retain it. He entered upon that task under circumstances of great discouragement. Our friend was then a new man in parliamentary life. He had opposed to him an old parliamentarian. He had opposed to him the whole Tory party of this country, and likewise a large portion of the Reform. Mr. Mackenzie had the affection of a large number of the Reformers. Mr. Blake had to contend with those who had the support of the whole Conservative party, and a large section of our own party, but he struggled with a wisdom and ability that could not be surpassed, and after the first general election he changed condition with the parties, and he found himself with a majority in the first instance of one."

There is the point where the hon. member for West Durham and I disagree. I said that he made that into a majority of twenty-five with the railway swag, but he denied it and said it was nine.

Mr. BLAKE. Nineteen.

Mr. McCALLUM. I leave you and Mr. Mowat to settle it between you. Mr. Mowat added:

"But that majority soon became a wise majority under his management, and the result was a strong Government to which we have succeeded."

What does that mean? Does it not mean that the majority jumped to the side the corn was on? That is the way the so called Reform party in the Province of Ontario has been able to hold that Province for some time. But that is nothing new to those hon. gentlemen. When on that side of the House from 1867 to 1872 they talked about purity, but when they get over here it was corruption in many branches of the public service, and the electors of this country know it. They used to cry that the Conservative party of this country was corrupt, but when

the Grit Government went before the electors in 1878, they were soon turned out. When we come to the question before the House, I say the hon. member for West Toronto has been laboring hard in this matter; he has given two years of his valuable time, and spent some money, and what has he got in return? He has got $380,000 of the old stock, on which 10 per cent. has been paid. Can any man tell me of the first subscribed stock of any railway in this country, except the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is worth 2 cents on the $1 to-day. I do not know of one except the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) has spent two years of valuable time and some money in crossing to England, going to the United States several times, and working up this scheme to a certain point. Hon. gentlemen say he should not have an hour's delay, but that we should cut off his head at once. But, why this precipitated action? Have we not the authority of the Government that if he does not show his ability to go on with the work by the month of June, the Government will charter another company to construct the road? Should we not give the hon. gentleman another chance, now that it appears there is every probability of a company being secured by him who will build the road. I am not going to go back on the interests of that section, simply because there happens to be a difference of opinion between the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), and the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth). Let them settle their own difficulties, I have nothing to do with them. What I look to is the construction of this railway, and I intend to give my vote, in the interest of the country, in the way I think best calculated to secure its construction. Hon. gentlemen opposite raise the same cry to-day about the independence of Parliament and the purity of elections that they did formerly when in opposition, but they showed their hands afterwards, and they are at the same business now. The electors of the country know what they were before and what they may expect of them now, and have no confidence to-day any more than they had formerly, because these hon. gentlemen have been tried by the people and found wanting. I remember that hon. gentlemen opposite, when in opposition in former years, stated that they could not get through the corridors with contractors and expectant contractors, but the right hon. the First Minister, then member for Kingston, kept the contractors in the corridors. He did not do, as hon. gentlemen opposite did, take them into the House, and put a contractor in the Speaker's chair. That is the difference between the two parties.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). As this is an important question and the hour is late I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the debate is adjourned, I wish to make a few observations in relation to a personal matter, which I was prevented from making by the Deputy Speaker a few minutes ago. If I understood the Minister of Interior rightly, he went out of his way to make a personal attack on myself, by stating that I had made use of my position and boasted of it in this House, to punish the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company for a personal grievance. Whatever my motives may have been, that is a matter for myself, and not for the hon. gentleman who made a personal reference to me. I never boasted in this House of doing what the hon. gentleman stated I did. It is true that on one occasion, in the Railway Committee, that gentleman, aided and abetted by some others who were only too ready to help him, who were the partisans of the Grand Trunk Railway, and whom I charged at the time with being partisans of the Grand Trunk Railway, did try to fix upon me that my motives for attacking the Grand Trunk Railway policy were of a personal character.

Mr. POPE. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear."

Mr. POPE. And you have said it twenty times yourself.

Mr. MITCHELL. I tell the hon. gentleman, too, he may just as well keep quiet about me. Whatever my motive may have been that is for myself to consider. I have never denied, and I do not now deny that I have received from the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway treatment which is unjust and dishonest, and that I told him that I would have satisfaction out of him, and I have had it in many ways, but I have never boasted in the House that I would, in my position here, have satisfaction out of him. Whatever I may have done outside, I am responsible for not to this House, not to the Minister of the Interior, not to the Minister of Railways; and the Minister of Interior had no right to assail me in the way he did.

Mr. POPE. Yes, he had.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say he had not.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know people not to tell the truth some times.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think it was the place of the hon. the Minister of the Interior to attack me about my course towards the Grand Trunk. If he wanted to find reasons for my attacking the Grand Trunk Railway, he could very easily have found them. When the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway wrote a letter to this Government, three years ago, threatening the Government of the day, threatening the Parliament of Canada, threatening all Canada, that if they dared to pass a certain legislation, then under the consideration of the House, the vengeance of that company would come down upon them. Did the gallant and brave Minister of the Interior, who is so ready to air his eloquence, come out then in the defence of the Administration of which he has the honor to be a member? Did that hon. gentleman come out and defend the country against the attacks of the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway? No, Sir. I will not say why, but I will say this, that that champion newspaper, which they claim is the leading organ of public opinion defending the Administration of the day in the Province of Quebec, was the recipient of a very large amount of publishing and advertising patronage from the Grand Trunk Railway. Perhaps that had something to do with the silence of the hon. gentleman; perhaps it had not. Of that I leave the hon. gentleman to judge. When the honor of Parliament was attacked by Mr. Hickson, who, through his agents, smuggled legislation through the Senate of Canada, when that legislation was got through so surreptitiously, and when I brought the matter before this Parliament and arraigned the Grand Trunk Railway in so serious a manner that the First Minister felt it to be due to the honor of the Parliament of Canada that he should place a motion on the paper to recall that legislation, did we find the eloquent and hon. gentleman, the Minister of Interior, getting up and resenting an insult of that kind to the Parliament of Canada? No, Sir; the hon. gentleman, as characteristic of him, was on that occasion silent; it was probably his interest to be silent; I have not the slightest doubt it was. These are two or three instances in which I think the hon. gentleman, if he choses to compare his public conduct in Parliament with my own, might very fairly not claim to be the aggressor in an attack upon me. My public character in Parliament is not like that of the hon. gentleman. I have not been subservient, I have not been desirous to crawl into power by scratching anybody's back like the hon. gentleman, I have endeavored to pursue such a course as would command the respect of the country, I have endeavored to express my views independently and fear-

lessly, and I have done so. I am neither afraid of the hon. gentleman,——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL—nor of those on my left who are pulled up and down with a string,——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL—nor of those on the other side who frequently attack me. I am neither afraid of the one nor the other.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have said what I have got to say.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). You will not expect me, Sir, to make a serious reply to the speech of the hon. gentleman. The statement I made was simply this, that the hon. gentleman, who poses in this particular debate as the guardian of the honor of Parliament, as one whose pure soul is horrified at the idea of any member of Parliament using his position in Parliament to further his private ends, or feelings, or spite out of Parliament, was not altogether free from that offence, and I gave simply as one illustration that he had been opposed to the Grand Trunk Railway in Parliament in a very violent manner, in a manner so violent that the mention of "Grand Trunk" by him invariably created a burst of laughter from both sides of the House. It was looked upon as a matter of course that the hon. gentleman was opposed to the Grand Trunk Railway, and I said it was well known that the hon. gentleman had stated, not in the House, but out of the House, and that was my information, that, if Mr. Hickson would settle with him in a matter of $10,000 which he claimed Mr. Hickson owed him for service in getting the purchase of the Riviere du Loup Branch by the Government, he would cry quits with him.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not true; that is what I say.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I am bound in this House to accept that statement. It is the duty of a member of Parliament, and I do it promptly. I only say that I regret that so many people's ears should have deceived them outside of Parliament in a matter of that kind Of course their ears must have deceived them, because the hon. gentleman says so here. As to his attack upon me, I do not think it necessary to make any reply, not by any means that I do not think an attack from the hon. gentleman deserves a reply; because I would be sorry to say anything implying that disrespect for him; but because I do not think it necessary to interpose in this debate a controversy as to our relative actions in matters of this kind. As to the letter of Mr. Hickson, in relation to which he spoke, I may say that I did not vote in Parliament in accordance with the letter of Mr. Hickson, but against it.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman thinks it is not worth while replying to the hon. member's attack, I think he should have reflected before he made the attack which provoked the reply of the hon. gentleman. I am only surprised at the hon. member for Northumberland being provoked by an attack from the hon. gentleman. He ought to have remembered the hon. gentleman's code of political ethics, and should have reflected that political exigencies this evening are very overwhelming.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to explain. The hon. gentleman has renewed the attack upon me by making another statement, by stating that I had said that if Mr. Hickson—

Mr. SPEAKER. He has accepted the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, but I have a right——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is unfair to attempt to prevent my putting myself right. He has taken advantage of replying to me to make a fresh statement in regard to me, which is also untrue. I never said anything of the kind. There is no place in which I said so. What I did say was that Mr. Hickson cheated me out of $10,000, and I repeat it; I repeat that he cheated me, and it stands just in that way. What I might have done, if he had made an honest man of himself, is quite another thing.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, it is true at all events.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is on the question to adjourn the debate.

Mr. WATSON. As this opportunity presents itself, I should like to take the opportunity of explaining why I intend to vote for the amendment. Some of the members on the other side appear to think it very strange that I should pursue that course. I pursue the course which I think is the only consistent course I should pursue as a well-wisher of the citizens of that section of country through which this road is to be built. The member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) seemed to think it very strange that I should pursue this course; and he has quoted Dr. Harrison, the Local member for Minnedosa, as his authority for the needs of the people in that section. I call attention to the fact that Dr. Harrison, who he thinks knows the interests of the people there, and who must have the interest of that section at heart, for this road passes through his property, is the seconder of the resolution I read before six o'clock, in which it is stated:

"This House expresses the hope that, unless the present holders of the land grant satisfy the railway company to-morrow, the committee will advise the summary cancellation of the Order in Council granted them."

Now, I think that, with the confidence which the hon. gentleman has in Dr. Harrison as a wide-awake representative of that section of the country, and seeing that this is Dr. Harrison's resolution, and that it is his particular wish, he being on the ground, that the grant to Mr. Beaty's line should be cancelled, the hon. gentleman will vote as I vote for the amendment.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman will allow me to correct him. I stated that Dr. Harrison was the head of a deputation which was here last year to assist in carrying that free grant for the North-West Central Railway. I did not say what his feelings or views were now, but only that he was here promoting that grant, and was interested with many others in that matter.

Mr. WATSON. Dr. Harrison, as the Minister of Finance has well stated, was one of the deputation, and he also stated that I, as a member of this House, had repeatedly interviewed him and pressed upon him the importance of a land grant for this road; but a year has elapsed since Dr. Harrison and I asked him to give a free grant to this company, and they have done nothing, and Dr. Harrison as well as myself now thinks it should be taken out of the hands of the present company and placed in the hands of those who will build the road. I believe it is of such a character that it can be built for the grant. The member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), was also grieved at my inconsistent course. My course is quite consistent, and it is in the interests of the people of that section that I vote for the amendment. I may further state for the information of the member for North Perth that one of the directors of this company, the hon. John Norquay, Premier of the Province of Manitoba, was present in the House when this resolution was forwarded to Ottawa. I have sufficient confidence in the Government of the day to believe that, when they state they will see the road is built, when they know the House

is unanimous—I do not know a gentleman in this House who is opposed to the construction of the road or to the aid for the construction—they will see fit to place the franchise in the hands of those who will construct the road. Therefore, I consider my course is quite consistent. As the debate has continued to a great length I do not think it well to prolong it. I intended to refer to the different Orders in Council passed at different dates giving these aids, and to the opinions of the Minister of the Interior in asking Council to grant them, but, as the hour is late and members must be tired of this discussion, I will defer it for the present.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I would not give the vote I am about to give in favor of the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) if I thought it would retard for one hour the building of this road, but knowing the history of this charter since the president had control of the majority of the stock, I sincerely believe, and indeed I cannot see how any unprejudiced mind in this House can believe otherwise, that if the charter is granted him, there will be greater delays than if it is refused, for this reason—the present president of this road has, as I showed this afternoon, had two years in which to do something to this road besides talk, and he has done nothing. I think myself, if the Government takes power to themselves now to build this road, they can construct it. There are parties outside of this House, there are parties in Canada, there are parties in the United States, who are ready to build this road. Everybody knows it is going to be a paying road. I have heard statements made here this afternoon, for the first time, that it was not going to be a very paying road. We who know something about it, know it is to be a paying road, that for hundreds of miles it goes through places which are already settled, and therefore it will pay capitalists to build the road. If I thought that by my vote I would retard building the road, I would not give it. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), and several other hon. members, and notably the Minister of the Interior, thought that, if we voted for this amendment, it would retard the building of the road. Why, the best of evidence, in the hands of the Government, is that if the charter is extended, the same things will occur that have occurred in the past. The object has not been to build this road. I am sorry that this matter ever got here at all. I am sorry this dispute has arisen. I, Sir, did not seek it. If some hon. gentleman in this House who have spoken upon this subject had been as determined to see right and justice done, and this road built before this question got here, last spring, last fall, the first of this Session, as they have evinced in this House to-day, this question never would have got here at all. The Minister of Interior has stated that it was owing to some statement made by me that this dispute has arisen. He certainly does not remember the history of the way it got here. Did he not know that the member for West Toronto, was at the elbow and at the ear of nearly every member of this House, and especially of members opposed to the Government, giving them his version of the story, and showing them private letters? I am sure the Minister of Interior did know, he knows it now. He don't know? Has he not the papers in his office? He shakes his head. Then he did not consult the files of papers in his office on the North-West Central Railway, when he reported to the Council in favor of the extension of the land grant. Everybody knows that every head of a Department keeps his papers on any subject on a certain file; he has not them scattered all over the office, and he can place his hand upon that file by touching his bell at any moment, and if he did that he would really find there statements in regard to this matter which surely would have apprised him that there was something wrong about it. I say, then, that these members all know that the president of this road was seeking out members of Parliament to give them his version of the story, and it has come out in evidence, and never been disputed that the editor of the Winnipeg *Free Press*, the correspondent in this House, and the correspondent of the *Globe*, stated in letters to the leader of the Opposition, that the president of the board sought them out and voluntered these statements which have been published by the press. Mr. Beaty, a member of the Conservative party, a supporter of the Conservative Government, takes a private letter from a co-director, not only a co-director, but the promoter and the manager of the Bill through this Parliament and the Railway Committee in 1884, and goes quietly to the Toronto *Globe* correspondent, to the correspondent of the *Chronicle* of Halifax, Nova Scotia, to the correspondent of the Winnipeg *Free Press*, and he tells them, according to themselves, that he does not want to speak in Mr. Woodworth's presence. When Mr. Woodworth arrives in the building, while he is whispering to them, he takes them out into the corridor and talks to them there, and they herald all through the country—and they had a right to do it to make a point against a political opponent—the statements made by this loyal Conservative president of the North-West Central Railway in regard to a brother member in this House, who has been voting on the same side as he has. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) and other gentlemen have taken this immaculate being to their bosom. They have no words of condemnation for him. The hon. member for North Perth knows, for he told me so, that he (Mr. Beaty) went to him with a letter last spring, and he has not a word to say about this—he, the staunch, steadfast, iron-bound, copper-fastened Liberal-Conservative in this House, the man who never was known to flinch in any dark hours of the Government's necessity, he, knowing that this, in a battalion, would, on the field of battle, entail death on the man who did it, knowing that it was an act as disloyal as anything that could be done in the world, as black, as indecent, as could be done—he has taken him to his bosom, he has surrounded him, and some of his friends with him, with their arms of love. And the member for Monck (Mr. McCallum), for whom everybody entertains a great respect on account of his age and experience, and his good common sense, did not see anything wrong. He says: What has the poor man done for two years? He had not a word to say about the violation of the principles of party fealty, of party fidelity, that has been winked out of sight. I am the aggressor, says the Minister of the Interior. Through what spectacles does the Minister of Interior look? Whose spectacles is he holding? Well, all I have got to say is, I hope they will become him better when he is older as a Minister than they do to-night. What kind of scales, what kind of weights, has he been using that he could not see no beam in the president's eye, but that he could see the mote in mine? I cannot understand such measure being meted out. I tell the Conservative Government here, I tell them now to their faces, there are fourteen of them, that, if such party infidelity, if such party treason, is not only condoned but is made much of, is commended, if the perpetrator is patted on the back, they will have very little party left and very little respect in this country or elsewhere. Does not everybody know it? Had I been guilty of that heinous offence that has been committed here in the light of day and not denied, Sir, there would not have been any punishment too great to be meted out to me, but, I, who have fought their battles on many a dark day, and many a dark night, in the hours of their darkest trial, when I gave all my profession, all the little ability that God has given me, what little strength God had given me, and with industry that knew no tiring, I gave all to them when they were on their backs and could not help themselves; and the reward I get from them is this reward here to-night. Sir, all the presidents of the north-western railways that could fill this

House, with the meanness, the avarice and cupidity of a certain member of a certain company, could not and would not, if they had the will to do it, have helped the Conservative party one tithe as much as I helped them, and they know it, and my reward has been such as it is to-night. Now, Sir, so much for that. The only member who had the manliness —I won't say that—who had the kindness of heart, to stand upon his feet and give one grain of comfort to me, was the member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), and he, steadfast and loyal as he is, thought that it was a little too much when he found the Minister of the Interior and the members of the House supporting the Conservative party, having nothing but dry herbs, vinegar and the sponge for the member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), while they have honey and wine and everything nice for the president of the North-Western Railway. Sir, I did not intend to go into this matter. But I am prepared to go into it at any moment. I do not have to go to the Library to search any books. On the tablet of my memory are written indelibly that which I can collect in a moment. I do not wish to go into altercations of that kind. But I tell the Minister of the Interior here, and his Government, that when they think that by any side issue, by any slight, or by any intended insult, they can place me in a false position for one week, they are very much mistaken, they are much mistaken indeed. The member for West Toronto made a speech here this afternoon. His speech was not thought sufficient, however, and hon. gentlemen have rushed to his rescue The member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) made a nice mess of it. He spoke like a lawyer who had got the wrong brief. Some one had given him some statements and he sought to make the best use of them. Everybody knows he is clever, but he did not understand the subject. Among other statements he made was one that he would like to know how the president got the capital stock. He said his brother directors gave him the stock in order to give him control. Did he know anything about his co-directors having no stock except what they got from the great Mikado of the whole thing? Where did he get the stock? Did the hon. gentleman not know he was talking nonsense? Where did the president of the railway get the stock? He got not a cent and not a piece of paper from his co-directors. He gave them what he liked. He got the old Souris and Rocky Mountain stock. The member for West Toronto did something with that stock. I stated in the committee that he sold some of the stock. I stated that upon information received by me. I said I had understood such to be the case, and I invited that gentleman to deny it. To this hour he has never denied it. I said that the amount was in the thousands; I did not know the exact figures. This is my answer to the question—what did he get after two years? He got the Souris and Rocky Mountain stock —but not from his brother director—amounting to $386,000, 10 per cent. paid up, and the statement has been made in the presence of the president of the North-West Central that he had sold the stock and pocketed the money and had been living on it for two years. That statement has been made. Has it been denied? No. The Minister of the Interior has said there is not the slightest charge against the hon. member for West Toronto. If that were done in England—if before ever a spade was put into the ground, before a level was ran, one man got hold of the stock and put the money in his pocket and did nothing for two years, how long would be retain his seat in Parliament? How long would he sit as an alderman, or as town clerk, or in some more humble position? Not one hour. Yet the Minister of the Interior, who can make a specious and plausible speech on almost any subject, told the House, told you, Mr. Speaker, and told me to my face, that there was not one word or tittle of a charge against the great and good president of the North-West Central Railway. Let them answer that one charge and see if it is true, for it has never been denied and it has been made over and over again by me. If it is said that it is not true, I say that I am informed and believe that I can produce witnesses to swear to it, and I believe the witnesses are in this city to-day. If it is true, what about the Minister of the Interior's white-washing of the president of the North-West Central Railway? What is the good of his brush; what is the good of his wash? The Minister of the Interior has really come to the rescue and made the best defence put forward to-night. It is a cunning, clear and plausible defence; but it lacks the essential element: he has left out of sight certain facts and put other facts very prominently forward, and on the whole he made a plausible and good case. But the hon. gentleman said: What is the evidence? The evidence is that he (Mr. Beaty) attempted to get $675,000 for the charter. We all know that companies pay contractors to build railways and contractors do not pay companies. Did it ever occur to the Minister that it is an unusual thing for companies to receive money from contractors to build a railway? I always thought a company paid contractors and got them to build a railway. But they have reversed this in the new order of things. But what is the evidence, says the Minister of the Interior. There is the evidence of a man by the name of Pew, of New York, whom the Minister says he will not believe, and he is cheered in that statement by the member of North Perth and some more of the friends. But I said there was a man by the name of McConachie. He says he will swear that he was present at the time. But the Minister of the Interior will not accept him. You can get plenty of men to swear against a member of this House for $5,000. You can get men, if they be men, that wear clothes and look like men, to swear against other men they hate. I do not know anything about McConachie, but I would see that a negro had fair play in this House, even if I did not know it. I do not know anything about McConachie, as I have said, but he cannot be condemned because some men say they will not believe him. That is no proof against him.

Mr. KIRK. Where are the letters?

Mr. WOODWORTH. But Mr. Beaty—I forgot the rules in naming him, but the debate has taken that turn—has been with Mr. Pew, and yet he denounces him now. He was worthy of being talked to, worthy of being negotiated with, but all at once he is a man not to be believed. I have here a letter from McConachie. The Minister of the Interior says that he knows that a man of that name is in the case; but he says McConachie masqueraded as a millionaire. How did he know? He did not tell the House he heard it. I never saw that man in my life; but the Minister, speaking *ex cathedra*, as Ministers always speak, said he masqueraded as a millionaire. How did he hear that, except from the president of the North-Western Central Railway? Is it thus men's characters are to be bandied about without a tittle of evidence being forth coming. Let me read McConachie's letter, and let hon. members say if he is not a man capable of writing a good letter, and from all we know is a reliable man. It is said that he had something to do with Mr. Pew, and that therefore he is bad. Yet Mr. Pew has had to do with thousands of men, and you will find hundreds of persons ready to say he is a fair man; of course he has his friends and his enemies. But Mr. McConachie was said to have been a clerk—I do not know whether he was a clerk or not. Why should he not be believed? Is it because he referred to the conduct of the member for West Toronto? I say as a member of this House that when an hon. member makes a statement I am prepared to accept it in preference to a statement made by a person outside of this House, but at the same time I am prepared to give other men fair play. If they were members of this House their word would be taken without abuse of this kind. They did not happen to be members of the

House, but yet they were men. This is the letter. It is dated Hamilton, 29th April, 1886, and is addressed to me. It reads:

"SIR,—Since my name has been freely mentioned in connection with the North-West Central Railway matter, at present under discussion, it is reasonable for me to state the facts so far as I am concerned.

"During the summer of last year I was in conference with certain capitalists, prominent among whom was Jesse Farewell, Esq., of Detroit, in reference to procuring the contract to build said railway, and the terms having been fully agreed upon, I was authorised to visit Toronto and submit a proposition for building said road to the president, James Beaty, M.P. In consequence of this understanding, I went to Toronto on 16th September last, for the purpose of interviewing Mr. Beaty in the premises, and if possible to procure the contract to build the road. I met with E. A. C. Pew, Esq., in Toronto, and that gentleman accompanied me to Mr. Beaty's office and introduced me to Mr. Beaty. I at once stated the object of my visit to Mr. Beaty. A general conversation ensued, during which I submitted to Mr. Beaty, for his consideration, a type-written form of contract and particulars, which had been agreed upon between myself and friends. After engaging to submit said contract to such of the board of directors as were then in Toronto, he made an appointment to meet me at his office again. Subsequently, upon the same day, I called at Mr. Beaty's office and submitted to him my proposition in writing, definitely stating what I was prepared to do in respect to building the road (a copy of said proposition is attached hereto). Mr. Pew was present at the time I submitted said proposition to Mr. Beaty. Mr. Beaty read the said proposition carefully and then said: 'This is all very good, but you see there is nothing in it for the boy.' He then told an anecdote which was apparently intended to illustrate his remarks and give me to understand that 'the boy' represented himself, and possibly his associates on the board of directors. I then understood Mr. Beaty's personal intentions. Mr. Beaty then demanded $1,500 cash bonus per mile, together with all municipal bonuses which might be granted in favor of the board, and also he (Mr. Beaty) must retain the management by holding a majority of the stock of the company. To this I was not prepared to assent, &c."

And I have a letter here showing that Mr. Beaty was introduced as a member of the Government, and he did not deny it, and at another time he said he expected to be sworn in Minister of Justice right away. That, of course, has nothing to do with the question, but the president of the North-West Central Railway says this letter is not true. I am going to accept his statement as a member of Parliament, but I am also going to give fair play to the men who made these statements, whoever they are. Mr. Pew's letter is in print, in which he states: Mr. Beaty demanded $1,500 a mile, and that there was nothing for "the boy." Mr. Pew makes that statement, and says he is prepared to swear to it, and this man McConachie winds up his letter by stating this:

"You may consider the foregoing to be my sworn testimony, and make any proper use of it you think necessary."

Mr. Pew does the same, and he writes from New York, and this man writes from Hamilton. So much for those two. I said: "Well, you are selling a charter." The Minister of Interior, who comes to the rescue, says there is not a word—I took down his language—not a bit of ground for the attack of the member for West Toronto; not the head of a pin—nothing. Now, Sir, the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) says Mr. Pew and Mr. McConachie are both perjurers, and the Minister of Interior says the same. But I have got now a statement to which I am sure the Minister of Interior made no reference, although I alluded to it this afternoon. He made no reference to it; whether he thought I had forgotten it, or that I had spoken once and could not speak again, I do not know; but, at any rate, he did not allude to it, after declaring that these men were perjurers, following in the wake of the hon. member for West Toronto. I read this afternoon a document which the member for West Toronto signed by his own sign manual: "James Beaty."

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Is that the Macdonald contract.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Yes.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I referred to it.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I was listening to him; I accept his correction, but he must have made a very slight reference to it. That Macdonald will allow the rate of $1,600 per mile to be deducted each monthly estimate. They would not allow him to go six weeks, or five weeks, or even four weeks and one day. No, Sir; monthly estimates, and they must have their tithe—$1,600 per mile, which shall be paid over by the company. I beg the pardon of the Minister of the Interior; I find he did allude to this as I have it in my notes. He says this money will go to the ordinary expenditure. He says what about the rolling stock? Everybody knows that $1,600 per mile will put on the rolling stock and build every car and engine. I know it. I know the locality, and I know what they are built for. The grading of that road will not cost over $3,000 per mile. Where is the rest of that $12,000 for rolling stock, and how could the Minister of the Interior make this statement, except by doing like the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), only a little more speciously—"by rushing in where angels fear to tread." All I can say is I never want him to make for me a defence like that. Do you suppose this company—do you suppose this open-hearted, generous, large minded president, who is always known amongst his fellows and everywhere as an open-hearted man, as a great philanthropist, as a sort of John Howard—do you suppose he would take that money for anything else than put in his pocket? He is the company; he controls the company. His friends said that he had a right to control it. They did not call him by his christian name, but they said: "You keep it." He said: "I want $1,500 put in the bank," but he never thought of saying what others said for him, he never dreamed of saying—it was the ingenious man, the old veteran who has fought many a well fought field, that found out the specious excuse. Why, said the Minister of Interior, this was for expenditure on roads and things. I know the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) felt like going and hugging him—if it had been parliamentary—for making such an excuse, which he did not think of himself, for the hon. gentleman is not fertile in expedients. Well it was not to pay the interest on the bonds but what else?

"And will pay one-quarter of the company's old indebtedness for work done on the old grade. Macdonald will pay for working up bonuses in all places but Brandon. He will also locate and pay for laying out the town sites. Macdonald will furnish a bank guarantee for the interest for the whole of the bonds for two years from the date of their issue."

Well, if I calculate aright, if they built 200 miles at $1,600 a mile, they will have $320,000, and in two years they could have had that done. That is what they were promising; they were backward at first, but they were going to rush things. They were going to have $320,000 right away—for expenses and things. Now, I would like to know what legal mind in this House will defend the action of the hon. member for West Toronto. The Minister of Justice has a subtle legal mind; but he has gone out; he has not wrestled with this subject. Only the Minister of the Interior has wrestled with it; no other Minister dared to touch it; but he took it up, turned it around, and looked at it, and excited the envy of everyone who heard him, and the undying admiration and love of the hon. member for West Toronto. I have shown that "the boy" wanted $1,600 a mile, and that he never pretended that he wanted it for things, or for anything but himself; but, said the Minister of the Interior, won't the company be liable for all time? Where is the company when he gets $320,000, and puts it into his pocket? Why, it was thought necessary to put a clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter to bind the company to operate the railway for ten years for fear they would back out. But where is the clause to say that the hon. member for West Toronto shall stay in the company one hour more than he wants to? Yet the Minister of the Interior talking to men with more experience in railway matters than I have, deliberately told them, with all the oratorical and graceful flourishes that he is capable of, that the bonds are not on the company, but on the road,

and that therefore nobody can touch them; and yet the men now in the company can kick the road and go to heaven if they like. The Minister of the Interior knows that, or he is not the man to give free grants to railways; but he seems to be very much in love with this subject; and he will excuse me if I read the recommendation he made to the Council. I know how hurriedly he made it, how his bedroom was infested with these people, almost alive with them, and a short hand reporter took his thoughts down and put them into good English. This is a copy of a report of a Committee of the Honorable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council on the 27th of November, 1885; and the Minister of the Interior said this:

"The Minister further submits an application from the company that the time for the construction and equipment of the first fifty miles of the railroad be extended to the 1st October, 1886, and he, the Minister, recognising the beneficial results likely to arise from the speedy construction of a line of railway through the district traversed by the proposed location of the North-West Central Railway, and being satisfied of the intention of this company, in good faith, to prosecute their undertaking, recommends as follows."

And yet for two years the president had never been in the country, or did the first earthly thing, except attempt to sell this charter, and the Minister, without any logical premises or deductions being laid before him, extended that land grant to the men whose charter had run out. He knew that this was the last of November; he new that in that country you cannot get a spade into the soil at that period, the 10th of November being the usual time for the frosts to come, and when it freezes it freezes quickly and hard and fast; and before his eyes at that time in the *Canada Gazette*, were the notices of two companies that wished to be incorporated to build this very road. I suppose he will say, as about other papers, that he didn't see them; but Ministers are Argus-eyed, they are supposed to see everything, and these two notices were before his eyes. And yet this president who had left those people in misery, who had never tried to pay them a dollar for their oats and barley and hay, or for the work they had put in there—I understand that some of them were without the necessaries of life—was running around with a silk hat and polished boots, carrying around and selling the stock of the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway, living on it and travelling over Europe on it. And yet the hon. Minister of the Interior signs that recommendation, and says he is satisfied that they are going on in good faith to build the road. I cannot understand it; if the Minister can explain it, I suppose he can explain anything; and I have asked that the rules of the House be suspended to allow him to explain it. Now, I think I have proved my case. I have taken as my text what the Minister has said, that there was not one bit of a charge against the hon. member for West Toronto. I have shown that Mr. Pew and Mr. McConachie said that he wanted $1,500 a mile for "the boy;" that is denied. Then I hold up Mr Beaty's own written contract with Mr. Macdonald stipulating that he should receive $1,600 a mile, to be paid monthly. I want to know whether there is any bit of a charge about that. I want to know if they can go back on their signatures. I do not like a fight, but when I get into it, I am there for all day; and when I made the statement in the committee, the Minister charged me with altering it, but I repudiated the charge, and I will prove that I did not alter a word in sense. I stated in the committee that Mr. Beaty agreed with me, as the old Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company was dead and buried, that we should resuscitate it, under a new name; and after making certain stipulations as to certain payments, if there was anything in it—I did not know—it was the first charter I had anything to do with—we should divide the profits equally between us; and I said that Mr. Beaty agreed to that. I was met with a flat denial. The Minister of the Interior has told the House that my charge in this matter is not borne out by the facts. Another meeting took place in the committee at

which I produced the letter of the Minister of Finance. I will read to you, Sir, my own letter to that hon. gentleman and his reply:

"OTTAWA, 5th April, 1886.

"Hon. A. W. McLELAN,
Finance Minister.

"DEAR SIR,—Soon after the prorogation of the past Parliament I gave into your hand five or six letters addressed to me by Mr. James Beaty, Q.C., M.P., upon the subject of the North-West Central Railway and in his handwriting, for the purpose of your perusal. I am informed that you cannot find them. They are very necessary to me just now. I have not seen them since I gave them to you, but I remember their purport perfectly well—but this is not enough. I am very anxious to have the letters so that they can speak for themselves. If you cannot find them please give me a letter stating the facts and what your recollection of the contents of the letters of Mr. Beaty is.

"I have the honor to be,
"Yours truly,
(Signed) "D. B. WOODWORTH."

This is the answer:

"MY DEAR SIR,—I am in receipt of yours of the 5th, again asking for the return of Mr. Beaty's letters to you *in re* North-West Central Railway. I have had another and diligent search made for them but without success. In the removal of my papers from Marine and Fisheries Department they have, I presume, been mislaid. I will have the search continued as I fancy that they are now to you an additional importance, owing to the position in which that question stands before the Railway Committee. My recollection of all the contents is indistinct, but my impression from reading them was that you and Mr. Beaty[—not 'is' as the hon. member for East Grey says, but 'was,' at the time of reading them—] were the original promoters of that road, with equal interests in all that was connected therewith.

"I am, yours, very truly,
"A. W. McLELAN."

What had the hon. member for West Toronto to say to that? He said there was not a word of truth in it, and he said, according to the report in the *Citizen*, which cannot be accused of any great friendship towards me at least:

"He never wrote any letter which came under the observation of Mr. McLelan that would prove such negotiations had taken place, and that gentleman could not therefore produce any such letters. He asked for a delay of two weeks."

Well, I did not get the letters. I know the hon. Minister of Finance had not them. I know that in this matter the Minister of Finance has acted as he always has, ever since I have known him, honorably and fairly, but he took no particular interest in this matter, and I gave him the letters to read because Mr. Beaty was making the same statements he had made to the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) to Mr. Gorman, of the *Globe*, and Mr. McNee, of the Winnipeg *Free Press*. When I gave the letters to Mr. McLelan —I beg his pardon for mentioning his name—I asked him, shortly after he had read them, if they bore out my contentions. He said they did, and he knows what my contention was, as I made it in the committee. And what does the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) say in reply to my contention. He says there is not a word of truth, either in my statement or in that of the Minister of Finance, who declared my statement to be true, yet the Minister of the Interior, the colleague of the Minister of Finance, says that there is no foundation for the charge against the member for West Toronto. Let the Minister of the Interior put himself in my place for a few moments. Let him imagine that he has made a statement, which is corroborated by a member of the Cabinet; let him then imagine that he made other statements, in support of which he produced letters from Mr. Pew and Mr. McConachie, and then that he was told by another member of the Cabinet that there was not a particle of proof for any of his assertions. The hon. gentleman would never forget it; and yet, for what reason I do not know, what Egyptian darkness has come over his mind I cannot conceive, he has allowed himself to become as blind and as obtuse to the real facts as though their recollection had entirely departed from his memory. I think I am making a case in which there is sufficient proof, and I am content to let

this go upon *Hansard*, as I know my case cannot be answered. Mr. Beaty says he never sold the charter, he says he is as innocent as a butterfly; yes, as a little butterfly. He says he has been very much maligned. Why, he says: "I could have sold it, but I did not; I would not do such a thing." Well, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) is not unknown to fame, as the hon. Minister of the Interior knows, who had something to do with writing about the Pacific scandal, so-called, and who was said to be not very consistent, no doubt, by some ungenerous, uncharitable people—people who charged him with writing at one time against it and with saying at another time it was all right. But, of course, they are very uncharitable and unfair people. As I have said, the member for West Toronto was not unknown to fame. He did not sell the charter. Why? He says he is an innocent man, who, in his own town, never blushed. I do not suppose he did, nor do I suppose anybody ever charged him with blushing. He says he was never known to have the blush of shame brought to his face; no one denies that. He says: "I could have sold the charter, but did not;" and his friends back him up. He was a good man; he was mayor of his town; he placed himself upon record as a man who had great aims in life, and always did the right and proper thing; he had a large grasp of affairs, and he would not do it. But I have again, not Mr. Pew, not Mr. McConachie, not any of the witnesses who can be called perjurers here, because members of Parliament are protected by their privilege, but I have Mr. Beaty's own letters to people in the United States, written and signed by himself, and I think upon that occasion the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) called Mr. Beaty the minor villain of the plot. That shows he is not the quiet, inoffensive, little butterfly man you would suppose him to be who did everything in the light of day. Let us see for a moment. I have a confidential communication, which was written on 17th July, 1881, by Mr. James Beaty, member for West Toronto.

Mr. SPEAKER. That has nothing to do with the question.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I beg your pardon, I am ready for that question of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it has.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I will hear your decision, Sir, and reply to it. It has been charged here by Mr. Beaty and his friends that he has been telling what was absolutely true about this while I have not.

Mr. SPEAKER. Oh, no.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I beg your pardon. It has been insinuated and almost in so many words stated. Hon. gentlemen have taken the character of Mr. Beaty for probity and honor, and made it the pivot upon which the whole case turns, and I say if I can establish that Mr. Beaty was not the innocent man he is represented to be—I know it is hard, but who brought this case up? Who took the man to their bosom because it was brought up? I am in order in doing this. I am not to be denied the right to reply, the right of showing that I can sweep away the whole cobweb of sophistry which has been wound round this case.

Mr. SPEAKER. You cannot go back to 1881 to show anything connected with the chartering of this road.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I beg your pardon, I can, if I can connect it with this subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I know the rules of debate, and am ready to abide by them. I have been in Parliament before, and gentlemen have no need to call me to order. I wish to reiterate and amplify what I have already said. I have made a statement here which has been denied by the hon. member of West Toronto, on the ground of character, and the Minister of the Interior and some of his friends have come to the rescue of Mr. Beaty by declaring that he was incapable of doing a wrong act. That he would not think of such a thing, that he would not sell the charter, that he was interested in this road for the purpose of building it; and I say that, if I can prove that he offered to take $100,000 from New York men to buy a charter, the same man can sell one. I say it is fair reasoning. I say it would be fair reasoning in a court of justice, and your Honor would not shut me out from doing what I can do in a court of justice. The rules of this House are not more stringent than the rules of a court of justice, and, if the question of character comes here, I can prove that the hon. gentleman who says he was incapable of selling a charter, was willing to buy one if he had $100,000 deposited in the Bank of Toronto in his name. Now, I find: "Some"——

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope that is not the letter. I have ruled on that.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Then I appeal from your Honor's decision to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is in order to read anything of that kind.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Your Honor has not been in this House while the debate has been going on. I think it is unfair, when there is a dual Speaker here, when your Honor is out, that your Honor shall come in here and shut me off from debate. I appeal to the sense of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will accept my ruling. We are not trying the characters of hon. members here, and I do not think a letter written in 1881 can be brought in to prove anything in connection with this charge, or can have anything to do with whether this Act should be put through Parliament now or this day three months. I hope the hon. gentleman will accept my ruling. He has stated a great deal of the letter.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The last thing I wish to do is to dissent obtrusively or obstinately from the ruling of the Speaker. I recognise that order and decorum are necessary in a Parliament like this, and I would be the last to refuse to accept a decision, even if I thought the Speaker was a little wrong, which I confess I do just now. I will abide by your decision, and it will go very hard with me if I cannot get it in some other time. Perhaps I will not, because I do not like this business, and I shall not refer to it again if I can help it, but, if I find it necessary, I shall refer to it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member might hand it to the reporter as did the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The member for West Toronto has made one statement, and it has been reiterated in a modified form by some of his friends. How he got them as friends I do not know. They look pleasant and modest, and virtuous and kind, but how they got here as friends I do not know. Perhaps it is an illustration of the old couplet:

> "Vice is a monster of such frightful mien,
> That to be hated needs but to be seen;
> But, seen too oft, familiar with his face,
> We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

The member for West Toronto said, and he has been industriously circulating this among the members, for I have heard him: "How absurd, how could I, without the consent of the other directors, make an agreement with Mr. Woodworth?" The member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) took it up: "Look at the other directors; he could not do it behind their back." Did not the member for West Toronto know that, when the charter was issued here, there was not a man's name in it at all?

Does he not know that we proceeded to the Library and stated who the directors should be? Does he not know that the agreement was made before the charter was introduced into the House at all? And, then, where was the member for Pictou; where was the member for Toronto Centre, and the other gentlemen, whose names are here, that I forget just now, and the brother of the member for West Toronto, in Toronto? Where were they then? In this charter? No. The member for West Toronto knows that he went into the Library with me after we made the agreement, and we sat down and said who the directors should be. I want to know, if that be true, what the statement reiterated with such gusto by the Minister of the Interior and other members of the House, following in the wake of the member for West Toronto, is worth? The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel) said in committee that the other directors had to be consulted. Why, he was not in existence, he was not spoken of until we were in the Library. That is as true as anything I have read out of these papers, and I ask intelligent members of this House, I would ask any intelligent jury, what becomes of the statement that this agreement between us could not be and was not made, because the other directors would stand in the way, when they were not in existence? That is as plain, I presume, as I can make it. That is true. That is correct. I hated to make a second speech; I hated to make the first. It is a very unpleasant subject. I did not introduce it until I found myself hounded by this Conservative member of the House, and, when I find that the Government has taken him under their shield, when I have done as faithfully as I have, I say it was unfair treatment to me. The world will say so; the Province from which I come will say so; any Province will say so, where I have been and spoken, and where I intend to speak again. It was unfair treatment. It was not fair treatment between two members of the same party. One had been guilty of gross violation of fealty and party fidelity, and had taken advantage of the other, and the Ministry had no word of condemnation, they and their supporters. I do not blame some of them; they can hardly help it; but it was unfair and unjust, and I feel it most keenly. It was not a very pleasant subject when I got up in that committee, knowing that the wings of the press would take it almost over the four corners of the globe, at all events, would take it all over Canada and over part of the United States as well, when I got up and had to make this charge, when they came with this Bill before the committee, striking out every clause for the protection of the workingmen. There was the Bill that was sought to be introduced, and what does it say:

"The said Act 47 Vic., Chap. 72, and the said several Acts therein mentioned are hereby continued in full force and effect of law, except the 7th section of the said first cited act, which is hereby repealed."

What was the 7th section which was to be repealed:

"The existing liabilities of the company for work done for the said company shall be a first charge on the undertaking."

What did the member for West Toronto tell the committee? He told them he did not know how the clause got there originally. He told the House to-night: "Did I not protect the workingman and have in the Bill a clause protecting him such as is mentioned there?" And yet it was I who introduced that clause, and the member for West Toronto told the Committee on Railways and Canals that he did not know how it got there, and he took credit to-night for having put it there. Now, the 5th clause that the member for West Toronto introduced into this Bill, when we first went before the committee, was this:

"The mortgage and bonds authorised by the said Act to be executed and issued shall be the first preferential charge and lien, and shall have priority as such, on the railway and lands and assets of the said North-West Central Railway Company, as described and charged in the said mortgage."

Mr. WOODWORTH.

Then, with the $25,000 bonds they were going to issue, as I have proved, where would the working people have got their pay, putting in this clause and striking out the other clause? And yet, in a letter signed by Mr. Beaty's hand, which I read in the committee, directed to William Eccles, and dated the 13th March, 1885, he says:

"The Act does not throw upon the North-West Central Railway Company any obligations of the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company. They are not revived."

And yet he knew they were revived, and, since, he has come into the committee and into this House to wipe out all the clauses, so that the workmen would never get their pay. I understand that there was some members of the company who did not want that done and others who did want it done, and I have their names. I think it was a most unfair thing for the workingman, and if it had not been for the revelations made in that committee, this clause would not have been struck out, and we would not have the Bill as it is now, merely extending the charter. Mr. Beaty was forced to abandon his prey on that occasion. Unpleasant as the subject is, I had to stand in that Committee and protest against that Bill. I say that after the revelations made by me, which I have proved, this House should reject this Bill and let the Government take the power, as they can without the delay of a week, and build this road. There are men ready and willing to build this road. I know they are ready to do it for the grant that you have so generously given, and are only waiting the opportunity. I know this for a fact. The hon. member for Monck says: "Give them another chance." I say this company has had that chance, and having failed to take the opportunity afforded them by Parliament and the terms of their charter, they cannot come to this Parliament and ask for a continuance of it. Every hon. member who votes for the amendment, is voting for a precedent, by which members hereafter who take charters from this Parliament, will, at least, honestly try to execute their provisions; but if you pass this Act as it is now, after these revelations of delay, and of the attempts to sell the charter for the purpose of putting money into the pockets of the president, you will have established a precedent for all time, that everybody can come and do likewise, and they have only to get some friends to surround them and it will be carried through Parliament. It is a dangerous precedent. Sir, what is the object of punishing crime? Not to punish the criminal, but to deter others from committing a like offence. This is an offence; it is an offence against the people out there; it is an offence in the attempt of parties to put money in their pockets at the expense of the country. Teach these parties a lesson by relegating them back to where they were before they got this extension of the land grant, and a company will be here at the doors of Parliament in a week. They are now asking for permission to build this road, having all the capital they want. I am sorry I have had to detain the House, but it was a matter in which I got mixed up myself. I have got abused where I did not deserve it. As I said before, I have committed no violation of my independence as a member of Parliament, I have got nothing from the Government that was a concession. I am as independent as the day I entered Parliament. Certainly I owe the Government nothing but that respect which is due from subjects to lords and masters. Having made the explanation that I desired, I hope the Government will consider anew this subject, and come to a different conclusion from that which was intimated here this afternoon.

Amendment to the amendment, to adjourn debate, negatived.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mitchell.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Desaulniers (Mask'gé),	Mills,
Amyot,	Edgar,	Mitchell,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Béchard,	Gaudet,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Gillmor,	Ray,
Bernier,	Glen,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Guay,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Scriver,
Burpee,	Harley,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jackson,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd)	King,	Trow,
Casey,	Kirk,	Vail,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Watson,
Charlton,	Lister,	Weldon,
Cockburn,	McCraney,	Wilson,
Cook,	McIntyre,	Woodworth.—59.
Davies,	McMullen,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	O'Brien,
Barker,	Gault,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gordon,	Paint,
Bell,	Grandbois,	Reid,
Benoit,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Bergin,	Hall,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Blondeau,	Hay,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hesson,	Royal,
Burnham,	Hickey,	Scott,
Burns,	Hilliard,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Shanly,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Small,
Carling,	Ives,	Sproule,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jamieson,	Stairs,
Chapleau,	Jenkins,	Taschereau,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Kinney,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Kranz,	Temple,
Curran,	Landry (Kent),	Thompson,
Cuthbert,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Townshend,
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Tyrwhitt,
Dawson,	Macmaster,	Wallace (Albert),
Dickinson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wallace (York),
Dodd,	McCallum,	Ward,
Dundas,	McDougall (C. Breton),	White (Cardwell),
Everett,	McGreevy,	Wigle,
Farrow,	McLelan,	Wood (Brockville),
Ferguson (Welland),	McNeill,	Wood (Westm'nd).—86.
Fortin,	Moffat,	

Mr. CASEY. I observe that the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Riopel) has voted. I wish to ask whether he is a director of this company that is asking for a grant?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member has no direct pecuniary interest in the passage of the Bill, he has a right to vote. If he has an immediate interest in the passage of the Bill, he ought not to vote.

Mr. BLAKE. He is a director of the company.

Mr. SPEAKER. Has the hon. member a direct pecuniary interest in the passage of the Bill?

Mr. RIOPEL. I am a director in that company, but I have no direct pecuniary interest in it.

Mr. CASEY. I observed the hon. gentleman for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), has not voted. I would like to ask why he has not voted.

Mr. BEATY. I just wish to be excused, that is all. I ask to be allowed not to vote.

Mr. SPEAKER. He can ask to be excused; the rule is that no person who has a direct pecuniary interest in the passage of the Bill is entitled to vote. If he votes, his vote is disallowed; but if a member is doubtful as to whether he has that interest he may ask to be excused.

Mr. CASEY. I object to his being excused unless he states that he has a direct pecuniary interest in the passage of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. On what ground does the hon. gentleman ask to be excused?

Mr. BEATY. In consequence of the peculiar nature of this case, and the fact that I am president of the company, and a shareholder. And, of course, it is possible that some time or other, notwithstanding what has been said, I may have a pecuniary interest.

On the main motion,

Mr. MULOCK. During the progress of this debate, certain statements have been made by hon. members from their places in this House which, if established before the passage of this Bill, would, I think, materially affect the action of this House in dealing with this measure. The hon. member for King's, N. S. (Mr. Woodworth), in the course of his address at the opening of the debate, and during the progress of the debate, stated, if I may summarise his statements, to the following effect: He said that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) had never made any honest attempt to build one foot of the line, had simply been endeavoring to sell the charter, and that this was still his sole and only object. He further stated that there was an agreement that the sum of $50,000 was to be divided between certain of the directors of the road. He further stated that the member for West Toronto had endeavored to sell this charter, or to make a contract whereby the member for West Toronto might be able to place in his own pocket the sum of $1,500 for every mile of road, or in all, the sum of $675,000. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) also intimated that he had received information of a private character which disclosed to him matters that he intimated were of a very improper nature, and that, were an investigation had, evidence would be supplied whereby the judgment of this House in dealing with this measure would be very materially affected. Under these circumstances I would suggest whether we are not proceeding prematurely to-night in deciding finally how we will deal with this charter before disposing of those various charges. Hon. gentlemen have argued as if we had conclusive evidence, all the possible evidence as to those various charges. I ask the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) what would his judgment be if those charges were established? I ask the Minister of the Interior, the trustee of the domain of Canada, what would his judgment be if those charges were established? If it is true that a large portion of the money that is to be the outcome of this public aid is to go into the pockets of members of the House, if the Government were aware of that fact before agreeing to the passage of this bill. I do not know the nature of the disclosures which the member for Northumberland is likely to make, but still it is due I think to an hon. member when he makes a grave charge of this kind that he should have an opportunity of making it good or having it displaced by evidence. I am surprised, and I express my surprise with the utmost regret, that of all Ministers of the Crown, the Minister of the Interior, who is specially charged with the custody of the public money and public property proposed to be transferred on this occasion, should be the first during the progress of this discussion to permit the handing over of this vast amount of property without proper investigation, when there is grave doubt cast on the *bonâ fides* of the whole transaction. The hon. member for West Toronto stated that recently a change in the directorate had taken place; that in the summer of 1885 several members of this House were placed on the directorate. If we look at the proceedings of the Government during the summer of 1885, what do we find? We find that on 29th July, 1885, an Order in Council was passed handing over to this company 2,880,000 acres of land belonging to the people of Canada for the purpose of constructing this road. We find that later on, in August, another Order in Council was passed on

the recommendation of the then Minister of the Interior, now the Minister of Finance, confirming that grant with certain modifications; and later on we find that the present Minister of the Interior, in November, 1885, recommended the Governor in Council to pass, and the Governor in Council did pass, an Order in Council granting further modifications, all to the advantage of this company. Now, to-day we find these grave charges made against the *personnel* comprising and controlling this company; and it appears to me, that as trustees of the property of the people of Canada, we are not justified in handing over the property to this particular company, until these grave charges are investigated and disproved, and if not disproved, then in not refusing to make such a grant. The member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), stated that he did not desire to be the first to suffer by a stringent rule. Is there any rule clearer and better understood by men of honor, than that a trustee must not commit a breach of trust? Who are the people's representatives and trustees of the public wealth of Canada, but the Parliament of Canada? The hon. member for West Toronto is one of those trustees. He says: Introduce a Bill, and say it shall be unlawful hereafter for members to commit breaches of trust, so that hereafter it will be unlawful for me to commit a fraud on those I represent here, and I will vote for such a measure. But the hon. gentleman says, you have not shown me such a measure in black and white as being on the Statute-book, and therefore I insist on retaining for the present the fruits of this breach of trust. I would deplore it if public opinion in Canada should ever become so degraded that we would find it necessary to pass an Act of Parliament declaring that members shall not be guilty of—shall I say stealing the public property. I would ask those hon. gentlemen why did we not have this investigation before the Bill was passed in the House to its present stage? When it was before the Railway Committee an investigation was moved for by the hon. member for Northumberland, and had that motion been carried the charges made would have been investigated, and if proved untrue—and I would be glad if they could be proved untrue—then we would have had no difficulty in dealing with this case to-day, for there would have been no conflict of testimony on the subject. But now if called on to vote on this measure these charges remain unproved or uncontradicted, and we are doing what clearly we have no right to do, because we have due notice from two hon. members that there are circumstances in connection with the transaction which, if their statements are true, should make us refuse to give this grant. Under these circumstances it appears to me that we have but one course open to us. If we propose to carefully guard the public domain we should investigate these charges. We should give those hon. gentlemen an opportunity to make good their charges. If we cannot make them good it will be to the advantage of those who are at present affected by them. I am surprised the Government is not the first to ask for the investigation. I was amazed that the Government, when the matter was brought before them in the Railway Committee, voted against an investigation. I was surprised that hon. gentlemen whose characters are affected by these insinuations and charges did not rise in their places with indignation and demand an investigation before progress was made with the measure. But Sir, they have not done so. They have had every opportunity, and late as it is, I would be glad to give way on this occasion and allow the Government to adopt the suggestion I am about to make, and have the Bill referred to committee for the purpose of enquiring into these matters. But, Sir, should the Government not see fit to do so, I beg leave to move the following motion. I may say if you refer to the Bill which is before the House, you will find in section 3 the names of the directors, and as has been stated before, amongst those names are the names of four

Mr. MULOCK.

members of this House. If these charges are true, if those hon. members are parties to those charges, they are not to be trusted with this land. The Minister of the Interior, with sophistry, said he thought they could do no harm with this land. But, Sir, if these charges are true, they can do harm with this land. If these charges are true they could lock up or misapply the proceeds of this land. These charges are that these gentlemen are not engaged in a *bonâ fide* enterprise in building the railway, but for the purpose of speculating in the grant which is proposed to be given. Supposing those hon. gentlemen were to stand up and admit the truth of those charges, would the House grant that land? If it would not grant it then, it cannot grant it if the charges are true in spite of the admissions. Would the House grant that aid if those hon. gentlemen should stand up and admit that they were to receive a bonus of $50,000 amongst themselves? They have not admitted it; I hope it cannot be proved, but if it were proved would the House still grant public money with which to pay such bonuses? If, as the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) says, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) still stipulates that they were to be paid $675,000 to be derived from the land which is proposed to be given, would under these circumstances, Parliament grant this land for such a purpose? If any such charge can be proved, the House would not be justified in making such a grant. I take no responsibility in connection with these charges. I know nothing about whether they are true or not. I have doubts as to whether some of them can be established; but having been made by some hon. members it is the duty of the House to hold those hon. gentlemen responsible for those charges and give them an opportunity of proving them before a proper committee under the control of this House. Therefore, I submit that before passing to the final stage of dealing with this Bill, we should have the charges thoroughly sifted and investigated, and then, and not till then, will the House be in a position to pass a proper judgment on the merits of this measure. I, therefore, move:

That the Bill be not now considered in Committee of the Whole, but that it be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, having regard to the Orders in Council for grants of land to the company, to enquire into the relations of certain alleged directors of the company, being members of this House, namely: James Beaty, member for West Toronto; L. A. Billy, member for Rimouski; C. H. Tupper, member for Pictou; L. J. Riopel, member for Bonaventure—to the company, and into any provisional contract which may have been entered into for the construction of the road, or any portion thereof.

In conclusion, I can only add that I hope the Government will see their way in adopting a motion to the effect of the one I have just read, to have a proper investigation made. Nothing will afford me greater pleasure than to withdraw my motion in favor of such a motion by the Government.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mulock.

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Allen,	Edgar,	Mitchell,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Béchard,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Glen,	Ray,
Bernier,	Guay,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Harley,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bourassa,	Innes,	Scriver,
Burpee,	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant)
Cameron (Huron),	Jackson,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	King,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright (Sir Richard)	Landerkin,	Trow,
Casey,	Lister,	Vail,
Casgrain,	McCraney,	Watson,
Charlton,	McIntyre,	Weldon,
Cockburn,	McMullen,	Wilson,
Cook,	Mills,	Woodworth.—55.
Davies,		

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Bain (Soulanges),	Fortin,	O'Brien,
Barker,	Foster,	Orton,
Barnard,	Gault,	Paint,
Bell,	Gordon,	Reid,
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergin,	Guillet,	Robertson (Hastings),
Blondeau,	Hall,	Royal,
Bowell,	Hay,	Scott,
Burnham,	Hesson,	Shakespeare,
Burns,	Hickey,	Shanly,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hilliard,	Small,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Sproule,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Stairs,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Ives,	Taschereau,
Chapleau,	Jamieson,	Tassé,
Cochrane,	Jenkins,	Taylor,
Costigan,	Kilvert,	Temple,
Coughlin,	Kranz,	Thompson,
Curran,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Townshend,
Cuthbert,	Mackintosh,	Tyrwhitt,
Daly,	Macmaster,	Wallace (Albert),
Dawson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wallace (York),
Dickinson,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Ward,
Dodd,	McGreevy,	White (Cardwell),
Dundas,	McLelan,	Wigle,
Everett,	McNeil,	Wood (Brockville),
Farrow,	Moffatt,	Wood (Westm'nd).—82.
Ferguson (Welland),		

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CASEY. It has been already held, on the admission of the hon. member for West Toronto himself, that he had a direct pecuniary interest in this motion, and that he could not vote upon it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman does not make that admission, I insist on his voting.

Mr. SPEAKER. What is the question of order?

Mr. CASEY. The question of order is this: If the hon. gentleman is not capable of voting on this motion, is he capable of moving it?

Mr. SPEAKER:

"A member interested in a Bill may take part in a debate thereon, or propose a motion or an amendment in relation thereto."

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Mr. WATSON. I move that a clause be added as clause 5 to insert the words in section 1, of 47 Vic., chap. 72, "not farther west than Brandon." That simply places the starting point of this road at a point not farther west than Brandon. As the House is aware, it started at Melbourne, but the Government have seen fit to make the land grant start from Brandon. I wish also to add after the word "council" in the ninth line of the 1st section the words, "and from thence to the town of Rapid City, in the Province of Manitoba." I understood from some members of the Government, and from the promoter of this Bill, that there are no objections to these amendments.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost.

Mr. WATSON. I hope the Government will accept these amendments. If they will not, I would like to know the reason why. Hon. members may laugh, but this is a serious matter. This road was started at Melbourne, and was to be run to Rapid City. The road is graded to Rapid City, and I simply want this provision to make sure that the road will run to that town. It has bonused the road, and it has been waiting for five or six years to get it; and if the Government intend to do what is right for the settlers along that line of railway, they will adopt these amendments. I think the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), who knows that country, should use his influence in favor of them. I understood from the promoter of the Bill that if the members of the Government had no objection to them, he had none; and I interviewed the hon. Minister of the Interior, the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Railways this afternoon, and none of them appeared to give any reason why these amendments should not be made, and I took it for granted that they were favorable to them.

Mr. HESSON. Had the hon. gentleman been with the deputation at the time they visited the Government, he would have learned that the Government determined that the land grant could not be made from Melbourne for the reason that the line ran parallel to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and would be a competitor for at least 20 miles, and therefore it must start from Brandon or some point west. As the hon. gentleman who has just proposed this motion had the audacity or the courage to vote against the Bill altogether, it is rather a strong point for him now to dictate to the Government. I prefer that the matter should be left in the hands of the Government to deal with. I think it is perfectly safe with them.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member's remarks are quite uncalled for. If I had the audacity to vote for the three months' hoist, I was simply acting on the resolution passed unanimously by the Legislature of Manitoba; and if the hon. gentleman had seen fit to act upon the sentiments of the hon. member of that House who seconded the resolution, he ought to support these provisions I propose. I have no doubt as to what my duty was here to-night; my duty was clear and straight, and I acted upon it. I only hope the present company, seeing the Government has determined to stand by them, will be able to construct the road, and I had hoped from the statements of the hon. Minister of Public Works, as chairman of the Railway Committee, that he would have seen that the present company was in a position to do so before he extended the time.

Amendment negatived.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

REPRESENTATION OF THE N. W. T.—ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that this House do concur in the address of the Senate to His Excellency the Governor General by filling up the blank therein with the word "Commons."

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honors that the House will agree to the address to His Excellency the Governor General praying him to submit the joint address to Her Majesty the Queen, in relation to the representation in the Parliament of Canada of the several Te ritories forming part thereof, but not included within the limits of any Province.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:55 a.m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 4th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 128) to incorporate the Northumberland Straits Tunnel Co.—(Mr. Hackett.)

RELIEF OF FLORA BIRRELL.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) moved the first reading of Bill (No. 129) for the relief of Flora Birrell.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not ask for a division on this motion, but will ask it on the second reading, so that you will be kind enough to declare it now carried on a division.

Motion agreed to on a division, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that, for the remainder of the Session, Government business shall have precedence on Wednesday after routine proceedings.

Mr. BLAKE. This motion is based upon that which I have ventured to object to at an earlier period of the Session —that the late period at which the Government has called us together renders it almost unavoidable that more time than ought to be taken at this period should be taken from private members' business and devoted to the business of the Government. On the whole, having regard to the general business of the Session, I believe that less public evil will be caused by our devoting that time to the Government business, and to that extent depriving private members of their advantages, than by adopting any other course. In that point of view it is not my intention to resist the motion, although, as I say, private members have not had this Session the advantages they ought to have had, owing to the character of the circumstances at the beginning of the Session, and the lateness at which the House was called together. I would submit, however, that questions ought to be allowed to precede, as on former occasions, on Wednesdays. I would also make this suggestion, which indeed, I may say, is a result of a conference I had with the hon. gentleman, whether it would not be for the convenience of the House and the discharge of private business that we should adopt as part of this motion that the order of business on Mondays should be for the future Wednesday's order, which will give private members an opportunity of dealing with motions up to six o'clock, and public Bills and orders after six o'clock, instead of absorbing the whole time with motions. There are some important Bills on the paper—several with reference to the question on Temperance, and so forth—and probably it would be more important to give an opportunity for them to be dealt with than to deal with the other motions. I think, however, that we should have another opportunity of clearing the paper of the undisputed notices, and we might take a part of the first Wednesday for this work. I propose, permanently, that we should have questions on Wednesdays, and that on Mondays, after private Bills, the Order of the Day should be the order of Wednesdays.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman speaks of the lateness of the Session. This Session was certainly called later than usual; but the hon. gentleman should not forget that instead of ending the Session in May last year, we ended it about the 20th of July. Therefore it was foreseen that the House could not be called so early this year as it was in previous years. However, I do not think the business in the hands of private members has suffered much. On the contrary, during the two months that have elapsed I think private members have had every opportunity to bring their measures before the House; and we have done, during these two months, a great deal more work than is generally done during the first two months of the Session. However, I have no objection, if the House agrees to my motion, that on Wednesday questions by members should come first, and that on the first Wednesday we should go over the list of notices of motions and adopt those that are unopposed. Then, as to Monday, I think the suggestion about which the hon. gentleman had spoken to me, as he says, would meet the views of the members generally. That would give hon. gentlemen on Monday from three to six, first for questions and then for notices of motions, and after 8 o'clock private Bills for an hour, and then public Bills, thus covering the different classes of work in the hands of the ordinary members of the House. If the House will allow me, I will modify my motion accordingly.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must say I do not at all agree with the hon. the acting leader of the Government in this matter. I do not think the opportunity for carrying on private business has been given to members, as he states. It will be in the recollection of the House that while the debate on the North-West matter was going on, about four weeks ago, I suggested that the unopposed motions should be taken up and gone through with, in order that gentlemen who desired papers to be prepared should have an opportunity of getting them brought down in time to be available when they wished to make use of them. Now, we have only one day in the week left for private business, although there are notices standing on the paper, some of which have been there for a month, and hon. gentlemen are unable to obtain the papers for which they desired to move. When I made the suggestion to which I refer, the acting leader of the Government intimated that he would be prepared to consider the suggestion, I thought to consider it favorably; but it has passed over, and the private members have not had the chance of getting the papers and correspondence which they desire. However, we must endeavor to remedy the difficulty as best we can, and if the unopposed motions are taken up, that in part meets the difficulty, though late in the day. I also opposed the Government taking all the private days for the Riel debate, instead of allowing papers to be moved for and brought down. However, we have to deal with matters as we find them; and next Session, if we are here, we should pursue a different course, and get the motions for papers put through at an early stage of the Session, so that the papers may be brought down in time for members to deal with them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken about the promise I made that on a certain day, with the consent of the House, we should go over the notices of motions, and adopt those that were unopposed. It is not so late in the day as the hon. gentleman says. I am afraid that on that day he was not here when the proceedings commenced, but that was not our fault. He may be assured that the promise made by me was fulfilled to the letter.

Mr. MITCHELL. Though I was not here, as important business kept me away that day, I had placed my business in the hands of an hon. gentleman who was here, and he informed me that that course was not pursued; and when I came back, I found the Order paper full.

Mr. BLAKE. I must corroborate the hon. Minister's statement. My hon. friend's informant was in error. It is quite true that the hon. Minister of Public Works rigidly observed the arrangement that was made; but that was of less advantage than it would have been, because very few members were here to avail themselves of it, which was not, of course, the Minister's fault. I would suggest that private Bills should be the first order after questions on Mondays. You might have such a dispute about a private Bill as you had yesterday, and it might require the whole day to get through with it; so that if you only gave an hour for private Bills after recess, all a man would have to do to defeat a Bill would be to talk for the hour.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no objection to providing in the motion that private Bills shall be first.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

SUPREME COURT—NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

1st. That it is expedient further to amend the law respecting the North-West Territories, to provide for the repeal of the enactments now in force respecting Stipendiary Magistrates therein, and for the establishment of a Supreme Court of civil and criminal jurisdiction in and for the said Territories, to consist of five judges.

2nd. That it is expedient to provide for the payment to each of the said judges, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, of a yearly salary of four thousand dollars, with travelling allowances, to be fixed by the Governor in Council, and a retiring annuity equal to two-thirds of such salary, on conditions similar to those applicable to like cases in the Provinces of the Dominion.

3rd. That it is expedient to empower the Governor in Council to divide the said Territories into five judicial districts, and to appoint for each a sheriff and a clerk of the said court. Each sheriff to be paid out of the said Consolidated Revenue Fund a yearly salary of five hundred dollars and to receive such fees as the Lieutenant-Governor prescribes. Each such clerk to be paid by fees to be fixed in like manner.

4th. That the mover have leave to bring in a Bill founded on the foregoing resolutions, and to come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation under an Order of the Governor in Council.

Motion agreed to.

REAL PROPERTY—NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

That it is expedient to provide in Committee of the Whole, under Bill No. 10 of this Session intituled: "An Act respecting Real Property in the North-West Territories":

1. That the salaries of Registrars, Deputy Registrars and other necessary officers, and such incidental expenses of carrying the said Act into effect as are sanctioned by the Governor in Council, shall be paid out of moneys to be provided by Parliament for the purpose.

2. That a proper building may, under orders of the Governor in Council, be provided and maintained at the public expense in each registration district for the deposit and safe-keeping of documents connected with the registration of titles under the Act.

3. That the Governor in Council may, from time to time, provide the necessary books and forms, provide any additional forms he deems necessary, and make such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry into effect the provisions of the said Act, and make such rules and regulations as to him appear necessary for giving effect to the Act, in cases unprovided for, according to its true intent and purpose.

4. That all fees payable under the said Act or in connection therewith shall be settled by tariff made by the Governor in Council.

5. That the Registrar may demand and receive the fees so settled, and perform the duties for which they are made payable, on payment thereof, and shall keep a correct account of all moneys received by him under the said Act and pay over the same to the Minister of Finance and Receiver-General, as shall be directed by the Governor in Council.

Motion agreed to.

HALDIMAND—ISSUE OF WRIT.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to direct the attention of the Government to a motion I made a week ago with reference to the issue of a writ for the electoral district of Haldimand. To-day I called upon the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and ascertained that the warrant had been received by him, but that the writ had not been issued, owing to the fact that the Government had not nominated a returning officer. I would ask if the Government have decided on a returning officer, and when the writ will be issued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government has not yet appointed a returning officer.

PROTECTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved the third reading of Bill (No. 96) respecting the protection of navigable waters.

Mr. DAVIES. In view of the provisions which the Bill contains relating to fisheries, I think we should amend the title. The title is "protection of navigable waters" alone, and there are provisions in the Bill referring to the protection of fisheries in waters not navigable. In view of the fact that there are serious doubts raised as to the constitutionality of the Bill, the title should be made sufficient to cover all the purposes of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. The title is that of the law at present existing, and although the Bill goes a little further, its purpose is really to protect navigable waters into which the other flow. The provisions with reference to fishery clauses is not an essential part of the Bill, as far as the enactments go, but simply provides that the officers shall have power to enforce the Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. POPE moved the third reading of Bill (No. 105) to amend the Act to provide for the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, Limited.

Motion agreed to on a division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 108) to amend the Adulteration Act.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Bill (No. 109) in further amendment of the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. Costigan.)

Bill (No. 110) an Act respecting Commissions to Public Officers of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)

LAND SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 117) to amend an Act to authorise the granting of subsidies in land to certain railway companies.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not able to be present when the Bill was discussed in its earlier stages, but I observe some provisions in it which, it seems to me, require some consideration. The proposal is that the principle of township grants instead of alternate sections shall be or may be adopted in the grant of subsidies to railways, but the arrangement is conditional upon an arrangement for the Hudson's Bay Company's reservation being first of all settled. Now, of course, we could not propose to take the township and, with the Hudson's Bay Company's reservation unsettled, hand it over, but it does not seem to me that the proposal, if it is one advantageous to the public in-

terests, is at all necessarily dependent upon an arrangement being made with the Hudson's Bay Company, because the alternative power might be granted to the Government to give the township subject to the Hudson's Bay Company's lot, or after arrangements were made with the Hudson's Bay Company for the exchange of the lot, else the whole policy of the measure is made dependent on the bargain which may be made with the Hudson's Bay Company, because you cannot grant the townships at all unless you can make an arrangement with them as to their property. The substance of the proposal can be carried out, though not perhaps so effectually, by granting the township exclusive of the Hudson's Bay Company's lot. That is the first observation I have to make. The second one is that this proposal is in its terms susceptible of being carried out with reference to lands wherever they may be granted in the North-West Territory as railway aid, and therefore in that portion of the country which is suitable for settlement —I mean for agricultural settlement as distinguished from ranche and pasture lands—and yet the provision is that:

"The grants of land so made shall include the statutory allowance for roads between sections in the townships and fractional parts of townships so granted, but shall be subject to a reserve of one acre out of every one hundred acres for the establishment of trails, with convenient watering places, for the purpose of driving and watering cattle."

Well, that is a proposal that there shall be a departure from the general system of survey and such advantages as may belong to the adjoining townships through the North-West Territories from the continuous system of roads. The railway company is given the benefit of all the allowances, and only one acre in one hundred is to be reserved for trails. You may find, therefore, applied as extensively as this provision may be applied, provisions which in their terms would appear to me to be applicable only to ranching and grazing districts, and not at all to districts which are capable of being settled; I do not mean those districts which are now used as ranching and grazing districts, for I am told of many of them it is said they are quite capable of being settled; and therefore I go beyond those districts which are now used for ranching and grazing, and I say that, instead of this being confined to these lands, it is extended to lands which are suitable for agricultural settlement. Well, if it be an advantage, if it be in the public interest that lands which are susceptible of being settled in the ordinary way in the North-West should be utilised by abolishing the system of the road allowances and granting the road allowances to a private corporation, substituting only a reservation for trails, I want to know why it is not adopted generally, why it is good for the blocks of land granted to the railway company and not for the general public? But you do not propose to extend it generally, and therefore you acknowledge that it is not good for the general public, and, if it is not, it should not be done to benefit the railway company. These observations occurred to me, and it is possible some of them may have been explained by the hon. gentleman and the force of them removed during my unavoidable absence from the House, but, not having heard such explanations, I thought it was not right that the Bill should pass without having ventured to submit them.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As to the first objection of the hon. gentleman, that with regard to the Hudson's Bay Company's sections, if I understand the Bill the provision is that the Hudson's Bay Company shall be consenting parties to the grant of a whole township in lieu of the sections they are entitled to. Under the existing law, they take substantially two sections out of each township. Under the particular case through which this arose, the railway ordinarily known as the Galt Railway, running from Dunmore to Lethbridge, they are consenting parties to it, and have agreed to take their lands in a distinct block. So much for that principle in regard to the Hudson's Bay sections. Then, with regard to the other suggestion of the hon. gentleman, the particular district through which this railway runs is peculiarly adapted for ranching purposes, and the railway company desire to use it for ranching purposes in the meantime, and I believe they are proposing to lease their lands for those purposes at the same rate as the Government are leasing their lands, that is at 2 cents an acre, so that ranchemen who choose to get their lands from the Government may have the adjoining lands also from the company. The road allowance belongs to them in that way, reserving the right for tracks; but, if the land is fit for settlement, it is clear that it would be more valuable to a railway company of that kind to have settlers there than to have ranchemen; and, inasmuch as the survey has been made, which is not at all altered by the proposal now made, they have their road allowances if they choose to use them, and I think the company may be safely trusted to look after their own interests in that matter. So far as the alternate blocks belonging to the Government are concerned, there is no interference with them. They are reserved for settlement in the usual way, if settlers choose to go upon them.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; but does not the hon. gentleman see that if there be a township belonging to the public on which there are ordinary settlers, and then a railway company's block, and then another township with settlers beyond, the means of communication to the settlers in the two townships are going to be seriously interfered with if only a trail is to be reserved for the purposes of driving and watering cattle, instead of the present highway arrangements.

Mr. MILLS. I do not see why there should be a provision of this sort at all. The Hudson's Bay Company are entitled to one-twentieth of the lands in the North-West set out for settlement for fifty years—that is, up to the year 1920. If lands are set out for settlement after that period they will not be entitled to share in them. By a subsequent arrangement with the company, to which they assented at the time the first Dominion Lands Act was carried, they agreed to take certain specific sections in each township set out for settlement, two sections in most of the townships. I do not see why the hon. gentleman wants to interfere with that arrangement at all. Suppose a township is reserved for a railway company, that you grant alternate townships instead of alternate sections, the company would take those townships, subject to the deduction of the school lands and the lands which are set out to which the Hudson Company would be entitled, just the same as if no special provision was made on the subject. The hon. gentleman will find this to be the case by making a provision of this sort in the Bill, that he enormously increases the difficulty of administration. If the law is allowed to operate, the railway company know, when they receive a particular township, that there are two sections to come out of that township for the Hudson's Bay Company and two others that are reserved for school purposes. They go on these sections, and the moment the township is subdivided and set out for settlement, the company take thirty-two out of thirty-six sections. The quarter-sections are reserved in this particular way. Now, if the hon. gentleman proposes to provide that the whole township may pass to the railway company, and that the Hudson's Bay Company may be satisfied with lands given elsewhere, he will find that in every instance the company will insist on having lands which are at least as good as those which they have surrendered to the Government for the use of the railway company that is to receive a particular township, and there will always be a difficulty in satisfying the company that the lands you propose to give them elsewhere are of equal value

to the lands you have taken from them to hand over to the railway corporation. You will have endless difficulties, negotiations and delays in settlement of the land claimed by the company that will fall into the hands of the actual settlers; then the settlers will require to be dealt with, and so the work of the Department will practically fall behind the necessities of the case. Now, I think the hon. gentleman will not interfere at all with the chance of effectively aiding railways, if he reserves to the Hudson's Bay Company the lands they are actually entitled to under the existing arrangements. The hon. gentleman knows that under the law, as it now stands, the legal titles to these particular sections are vested in the company, not by the patent of the Crown, but by operation of Statute. You may, for the purpose of convenience, issue a patent to the Hudson's Bay Company, but the legal title is vested in them the moment the lands are set out for settlement, by operation of law. Then, why undertake to divest them of that title by a provision of this sort? If the hon. gentleman will allow the law to operate, will amend this law, so as to protect the school sections and the Hudson Bay sections, he will greatly lessen the difficulties of the Department, and he will confer quite as great a service upon the railway corporation.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It is a little singular to find the hon. gentleman who has for years past been urging a system of alternate blocks rather than alternate sections, because of the injury done to settlement by these sections within townships, separating the settlers one from another, now objecting to the principle by which that may be avoided. As a matter of fact, no arrangement of this kind can be made without the consent of the Hudson's Bay Company. They have to be assenting parties to the taking of their land away out of the township and accepting land elsewhere. Therefore the two things must go together, the section of the land which they will receive at the moment these lands are taken from them, and the giving them to the railway company. Therefore I do not think there can be any possible difficulty in relation to that, and by no other means could we adopt the principle that is sought to be adopted in this Bill.

Mr. IVES. So far as the ranching companies are concerned, it is no doubt very important to provide facilities for the company to control the whole block, without having small portions here and there dotted through it which are not under their control. Many of the difficulties which have arisen in the United States between ranching companies and others, has resulted from the plan of railway companies receiving lands in alternate sections while the remaining sections of school lands were open for settlement. Now, these sections of school lands, although not fit for cultivation, are in many cases taken up, and settled upon, and homesteaded by people who did not intend to farm, but who went there for the purpose merely of taking up a section and turning on a larger number of cattle than their homestead will sustain, more than could be maintained upon their own sections, and trusting to the grass on the adjoining lands. The result is that the railway company's lessees, to protect themselves against these small homesteaders on the school section, have been obliged to fence around their own sections at their own expense. That forced the party who had the school section, and who had a great many more cattle than he could keep upon it, and who expected to pirate upon other lands that did not belong to him, to cut the fence, and that has led to innumerable difficulties. Of course, I am speaking of lands that are not fit for settlement but are simply fit for grazing purposes. I think it would be desirable that these lands should be made valuable as fast as possible, and I am quite sure that they would be made more valuable by giving to whoever owned the bulk of the land the control of the whole quantity. It does seem to me, however, that the provision which enables a railway company that receives a grant, to acquire the Hudson Bay sections, could be brought about by agreement without this Statute as well as with it. There can be no possible objection to the provision however. When it comes to the road allowance there is a serious objection. I do not see why the road allowance might not be left, instead of the provision as proposed. It is certain that nobody will go there and make roads unless they are needed. There will only be the ordinary trail through such a country as that, such a trail as the necessities of the ranchmen, and perhaps the settlers, may require. But I think the idea which is evidently aimed at in the Bill is a good one, that of putting the ranching country in such a shape that the whole of it may be utilised. I am quite sure that you will find in future, if the country is stocked with cattle, that you will avoid a great deal of difficulty by removing it from the power of people to go and homestead on sections that are within a large block of grazing country, because I am sure the same thing will happen here that has taken place in the United States—people going there, not to farm, but to turn out great numbers of cattle, and in that way seek, by paying a very small amount, to obtain the grant of a large amount of useful land, and you will have trouble and difficulty, as they have had in various States.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY—RELEASE OF BONDS.

Mr. McLELAN moved:

That the House resolve itself into committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (page 913) respecting the release to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the amount of $5,000,000 in bonds under the provisions of the construction contract as security for the operation of the railway.

He said: It is proposed to ask the House to give the Government this power, so that when the road is built and in running order and when the Government shall be satisfied thereof, and that it is likely to continue, they shall have the power to release $5,000,000 worth of bonds now held by the Government as security.

Mr. BLAKE. This power of releasing this security at present, of course, pertains to Parliament. The security is by the contract made permanent, unless and until Parliament thinks fit to release it. This is a proposal that the whole matter shall be handed over to the Government and they shall have authority on their own judgment to decide when the securities shall be handed over. I think no inconvenience whatever can arise from our forming a judgment ourselves as to the circumstances under which, if at all, it may be expedient to release this security. We meet once a year, and if in a year it be the opinion of the Government that Parliament may properly be called upon to agree that the security be released, a proposal can be laid before Parliament and its decision can be obtained. There is serious objection to handing this power over to the Government, and I interpret the meaning of the proposal to be this: before we meet next year the security will be released.

Motion agreed to, on a division, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think, before asking us to place in the hands of the Government the power to release the security, we ought to know something as to when the Government themselves expect the road to be in complete running order, and, also, we ought to obtain some estimate of the exact condition and working of the road.

Under the returns which have been brought down to the House, we remain in blessed ignorance of what is doing, or even what is expected to be done, by the company on that very important section of the road running from Callander station to Port Moody. The returns brought down contain a number of details, which, I suppose, are accurate in a sense, but they do not show in the least what is the amount of traffic, what is the condition of the road along the 2,400 or 2,500 miles which form the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not think the House could be asked to pronounce on that important question in more utter and sublime ignorance of the traffic and condition of the 2,400 miles than we are in. We have obtained some information as to what are the receipts and expenditures over the Canadian Pacific Railway system, covering the Ontario and Quebec lines, the lines they have acquired from the Province of Quebec and the lines in western Ontario; but as to the present condition, the present prospects of the main line, we positively know nothing—at all events, we know nothing on this side of the House; the Government may be better informed. We were told, when the railway was in process of construction, that one reason for giving those extraordinary bonuses was that it was going to be a very difficult thing, and a very costly thing to work the main line; and as the House, I hope, will meet within seven or eight months, in January, or at least in February next, it will be utterly impossible for the Government to have had the experience of even a single year's working of the whole line of the railway. I must say that I think, before we are asked to consider the present proposal, the Government should place us in the position, or cause the company to place us in the position, of having fuller details about the main line of railway than we now possess. I do not know whether the Government have them, but certainly the House is not in possession of any of those details.

Mr. McLELAN. I gave the House an estimate that had been prepared by the engineers of the cost of completing the line on the central and eastern sections. I have not obtained full figures respecting the working of the road upon each particular section. The company and the Government thought it desirable that in the public interest there should be at as early a date as possible a final settlement, or, as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) called it, a final finality, between Parliament and the company; and we concluded to ask Parliament to give us power that, when the road shall have been completed and in good running order, and we are satisfied that it will be continued to be operated, we shall have power, without coming to Parliament, without raising a Canadian Pacific Railway discussion in the House, to release those bonds. It will, no doubt, be desirable in the interests of the company to do so to enable them to raise money upon the land that remains to them. They represent that with that extent of road on their hands and in order to complete the connections, it will be desirable, in their interest and in the interest of the country, that they should be able to raise a considerable amount of money. On all railways when contracts are considered to be completed and the road to be in perfect running order, there are always additions to be made and additional amounts expended on capital account. There is hardly a road on this continent but where there is a continual increase of capital account for the purpose of extending and improving the road, the rolling stock and connections, and the Canadian Pacific Railway will, no doubt, desire, indeed they will be compelled, in order to keep up with the progress of the railways of the continent, to raise a very large amount to complete the connections and continue the road in perfect order. It will be desirable for them as well as for the country that the company should have the means of raising money upon the lands on the best terms. After the road has been completed, after it is in perfect running order, to the entire satisfaction of the public and the Government, it is desirable at the earliest possible day that the company should be released as regards those bonds, because so long as they remain on the road after it is in perfect running order and satisfactory to the public, they will be considered by capitalists and investors as showing that there is still a dread on the part of the Government that the whole thing may collapse and break down. If it is possible to obtain some figures before the final stage, I will submit them; I have not got them at present.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman seems to think that it is bad policy now to retain the security which it was good policy to obtain originally. A great deal was said when the contract was made of the circumstance that the Government was going to have good security for the road being completed and operated. The hon. gentleman's statement now is that as soon as the Government are satisfied that the road is in running order the security should be released.

Mr. McLELAN. And that it will continue.

Mr. BLAKE. How are we going to be satisfied that it is to be continued? Is it to be by the result of one year's traffic? I do not believe the hon. gentleman is going to wait for the year's traffic. He says it might be better for the company and the country too, to place the question of releasing the security in the hands of the Government, in order to prevent another Canadian Pacific Railway discussion in Parliament. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to one of the motives which the Minister offers as a reason for this action—that it would be better to prevent another Canadian Pacific Railway discussion in Parliament, which would be necessary if the question had to be decided by Parliament—and so, in order to prevent Parliament from discharging its duty and coming to the conclusion upon that which at present belongs to it, that it is better that Parliament should abdicate its functions and place them in the hands of the Government, where the Canadian Pacific Railway discussion will take place between the thirteen or fourteen gentlemen representing the Government—not in open day, not with the benefit of publicity, but in secret conclave, and under the sanction of an oath as to the silence and secrecy which is to prevail in those deliberations. That is the alternative which the hon. gentleman presents to Parliament as superior to the exercise by them of their proper functions. Now, there should be no inconvenience to a Canadian Pacific Railway discussion on this question in Parliament, if it were not that the hon. gentleman thought it was possible that the Government might propose to deal with the power which is to be handed to it, on grounds which would not be agreeable to Parliament or to the public. Then the hon. gentleman says it is well to do it at once. It is well to do it as soon as possible, after the road is thoroughly completed, after the road is throughout equipped and opened—as soon as we are satisfied that they are going to continue. Now, when we made the contract we said: We are going to assure the continuance of the operation of this road, so far as security goes, by taking a security of $5,000,000. Now the hon. gentleman says, in effect, I propose to alter that—to abandon that proposition. Well, this is not a novel view on the part of the company. They took this view, and presented it to the hon. gentleman, somewhat in the terms he has used to-day, two or three years ago. In their statement they told him it was damaging to the prospects of the company, that the country should continue to retain the security for the operation which the country had stipulated for, and they asked the Government to agree that the security should be surren-

dered. The Government declined; they said: We are determined to keep the security just as it was—not to modify it even by saying that we ask Parliament to give us power to surrender it at the time we are satisfied that it is no longer required; but we will keep it just as it was, without change or alteration. That was the position in which they invited us to modify, once or twice, the arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway. This has remained undisposed of; it was one of those things which was to be disposed of, I suppose, as soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway wished—at a more convenient season. It was to be taken by degrees—one thing at one Session, another at another Session, and the third at the next Session after that. They thought that was the best way—that the people could be induced to take by degrees a proposition which, taken altogether, would be of a startling character. Now, I heartily agree with that part of the remarks of the hon. member for Huron in which he spoke of the utter absence of information as to the working of the road, the character of the road and the prospects of the road. We should have reports on these subjects. Last Session, before calling for a statement of the grades and curves on the Canadian Pacific Railway, I found that the table which is customarily made in all railway enterprises of this description had not been made, but I got a considerable amount of information from the Minister of Railways, and certain plans and profiles from which, with considerable difficulty and the use of experts to assist, I obtained a certain amount of information as to the grades and curves on certain portions of the line. Later on, I enquired whether the Government had obtained—as they ought to have obtained, as was obtained before the final location of that portion of the route selected by my hon. friend for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) through the mountains, as are published in our blue books—the tables of grades and curvatures. I asked whether they had obtained it. Mark you, the location of my hon. friend was established on such principles that he brought down to Parliament contemporaneously with the location of which he asked approval—he brought down the evidence, in the form of these tables of grades and curves, showing the character of the road. But after the hon. gentleman had approved the thing, after the work had to a large extent been completed—to the extent, at any rate, of the rails being laid in great part and the location fixed throughout—the Government had not up to that time got before them the tables of grades and curves which would give them that information. The hon. gentleman said they were in course of preparation, and now to-day we are told that connection has been made, that the road is to be opened in a few days, and the Government has not yet thought fit to bring down to us the tables of grades and curves which would show the condition of things with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Mr. Chairman, I made a statement last Session with reference to the results of an imperfect examination, of the imperfect information which was given to me. That statement was not challenged in this House, but a considerable time afterwards, when the measure came before the other branch of the Legislature, it was challenged to a certain extent, and obviously on information supplied by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in another place by the leader of the other branch of the Legislature, on behalf of the Government, and different views were expressed from those which I had stated. But I say the information which will enable us to see how far either of us was correct, and which will enable us to do what is far more important in a question of this kind—to see what really the standard of this road is, particularly through the mountains, and over the north shore of Lake Superior—the common customary arrangements, the arrangements you will find with reference to any of the principal lines and many of the inferior lines given to the public—is not yet communicated to the people of the country, and that in the case of a road on which we had certain stipulations as to the character of that road. Now, there is nothing which will do more to remove the false impressions—if they be false impressions—which have been created with reference to the character of the grades and curves on the Canadian Pacific Railway, than just the plain production of the table of grades and curves as they are on the road. Yet, in the absence of the information and the other information referred to by the hon. member for South Huron, we are asked to pass this measure, which, if we do pass it, means practically that Parliament assents to this security being released before next Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think even the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat believes that the road is not going to be run for ten years, or for many years. We can all remember that at the time this precautionary measure was taken of preserving the security, it was considered very doubtful after its completion that it should be put in operation after it was finished. That doubt was felt very generally, and it was said especially, even after the completion of the road to the north of Lake Superior, that it would never be run—that the traffic would not pay the grease on the wheels of the locomotives. That feeling has all disappeared. Everybody knows that the road is practically finished, and will be in operation during the course of this month or next, from sea to sea, running as a completed road. No one can suppose for any moment that, under the present circumstances, that road will not be run. Such a thing as the abandonment of the road, or any portion of it, and the forfeiture of their charter, any such an abandonment is out of the question. There are $65,000,000 of stock held, both in Europe and America; there is $35,000,000 of bonds, making $100,000,000 of money held by capitalists in both hemispheres who would run the risk of losing all their investment, if there was a failure of the contract made between the Dominion of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. So that it is certainly not for any useful purpose that these five millions are reserved and locked up; and, therefore, being of no value, there being no possibility really of the road being abandoned or stopped, or not put into operation and kept in operation for ten years, then why keep this reservation, which is not needed as security for the people of Canada, while it is important to the company that this $5,000,000 should be released? While the company have performed their contract in their wonderful way and in an unprecedentedly short period, we know that a road of that description must require continual addition to its capital for very many years. The hon. gentleman says that my hon. friend, in speaking of this resolution, has stated that it is advisable to avoid further discussions on the Canadian Pacific Railway in this House, and that that proposition plainly means that the $5,000,000 will be given up before another Session. Well, Mr. Speaker, I may say for one that I hope it will be so. I hope the company will immediately give such satisfactory proof to the Government of Canada that the road is finished, that they will feel themselves justified in giving up these $5,000,000. The power certainly is conferred upon the Government; but the Government in all circumstances must *ex necessitate* as an executive having the confidence of Parliament, decide when the company have faithfully performed their contract; therefore, if they must have that power *ex necessitate*, there can be no objection to their having the further power of saying when and for what it is desirable that this security of $5,000,000 should be given up. And why, it will be asked, do the company desire to get the control of this $5,000,000? Because they want further capital immediately. They require it for the development of the road, for the increase of their rolling stock, for the

purpose of completing those portions of other roads connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway which are necessary to perfect it in all its great purposes. They will require capital, for instance, to assist in completing the short line to Halifax; they will require it for the purpose of aiding in connecting England and Canada on the Atlantic, and Canada and China on the Pacific. They will require all the money they can get, and much more in the course of a few years—much more than they will be able to raise upon the security of their lands; and they want to raise that money at once. It is the peculiar credit and glory of this company that they have finished the road so speedily. They are now carrying out the same policy. They desire to finish it in all its dimensions, so far as they can generate capital, as speedily as possible. They want to make the termini of the line, as has been stated already several times, Liverpool and Hong Kong. They desire to assist in all the branch lines which will aid in the carrying out of the great design. They will go into the market with their lands. They will say: We wish to borrow so much upon those lands. Well, what do you want for the lands, and what amount of bonds are to be issued? will be asked by the capitalists of Europe. They will be obliged to say: There are $5,000,000 of those bonds held back by the Canadian Government; and why are they held back? Because the Canadian Government and Parliament and people do not think there is sufficient security that the road will be run for ten years. The very distrust created by this reservation of $5,000,000 of bonds will greatly diminish the company's chances of disposing of the remainder of the bonds. It is evident that the question must be asked: What is the total issue of bonds? what is the total acreage secured on those bonds? why are these $5,000,000 held back by the Government of Canada? you have performed your contract with Canada; you have finished the road; Canada admits that the road is finished, and that the company have performed their contract; and why do they hold back these $5,000,000? Oh, Canada is afraid that the road won't be run for ten years. That must be the answer that they will honestly have to give; and what will be the consequence of that answer? The consequence will be that it will lessen the value of the bonds, and greatly diminish the chances of those bonds being put on the market. We will have all those other enterprises kept back and impeded, the capital diminished, the means of the company to carry out their grand projects, if not altogether destroyed, greatly injured; and why should we want that, unless we honestly and conscientiously believe that the road will not be run for ten years? But if we know, as we all know, that the road will be run for ten years, that there is not the remotest chance of failure in that, why should we injure the company by this distrust, for which there is no reason? Just the same common-sense caution which induced the Parliament of Canada to insist on this security in the inception of the road, and in the doubtful stage of its successful completion, should influence us now, when the company come forward after all they have done, and say: Give us all these bonds; you do not want to hold them locked up for ten years; let us have the advantage of them; we will spend that money in the development of this great Canadian road. And mind you, this resolution is not compulsory; it is optional with the Government; and the Government will insist, as they have done before, that the company will show them the purposes for which the $5,000,000 will be expended. These are the reasons why the Government come forward and ask the House to avoid crippling or injuring the chances of the company going into the English market and making a successful loan upon the security of the lands which they still retain, when we know that the Government will insist on that money being expended on the railway or in the development of its communications with the various parts of the country or with other parts of the world.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman suggested that as the Government must have the confidence of Parliament, therefore, it was not much more to say that the Government should have the power of doing this without the consent of Parliament. On the same principle the hon. gentleman had better let us pass an Act to allow him to legislate for us and to spend all our money; as the Government must have the confidence of Parliament, it is not much more to allow the Government to do everything else at their own sweet will. These are the constitutional doctrines which the hon. gentleman as leader of this House sets up. These are the relations which he proposes should subsist between the Executive and the Administration and a free and independent Parliament, if that is the proper term to apply to this Parliament, at this time of day. The next thing he said is that there is no doubt the road will be run. Well, there are all sorts of ways of operating railways. A portion of this railway is operated at present three times a week, a portion every second day, a portion once a week, and the security we have is security for the efficient operation of the railway, with such number of trains as the public convenience might require, although it might not pay well, because the expectation was that in the early period of the enterprise its operation would be accompanied by an inordinate expense compared with the traffic. That was the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite; they said the large price was mainly because the company was going to operate the road at a considerable expense in the early period. It is easy for the company to save expense at considerable inconvenience and determent to the development of the country, by diminishing the frequency of the trains, and I do not think much of that railway accommodation, which is to be obtained three times or once a week, as a very efficient agent for the development of the trade or passenger traffic of the country. Therefore, it is important for us to have a practical leverage which will enable us to insist, under a considerable penalty, upon, not merely the road being kept open, but also upon its being efficiently operated as we consider the public interests require it to be operated, although that may involve more frequent running of trains than the interests of the company would suggest. The hon. gentlemen says it is just as much a piece of plain common sense and prudence that we should surrender the security now as that we should take it when the bargain was made. When the bargain was made, we thought it necessary to take security for the efficient operation of the road for ten years. Having done so, and the road being quite completed, the hon. gentleman says it is quite as cautious and as prudent and as long-headed that we should surrender the security just when the road is about to be operated in its whole extent, as that we should take the security when the contract was made. Then the hon. gentleman says, if we do not surrender the security, it will interfere with the sale of the bonds, because the first thing people will say is: "Oh, they are only using so many bonds, what about the other bonds?" and they will come to the conclusion that the Government of Canada hold these other bonds because, as the hon. gentleman put it in his extravagant fashion, they are doubtful whether the road will be kept open. No; the only conclusion that can be come to is that which appears on the face of the transaction, namely, that the Parliament required the security for the efficent operation of the road for ten years. The company can answer well by saying: "When we made the contract with the Government, the Government and Parliament made it a condition that we should give $5,000,000 security for the efficient operation of the road for ten years. That was a part of our bargain; we have

built the road, and we do not propose to ask the Government and Parliament to give up that security, which we agreed to give and did give, until the time arrives when, under the terms of our contract, we will be entitled to demand it. If the company said that they would stand in a stronger position than they will by going across and saying: Yes, there was a bargain of that kind, but we told the Government and the people of Canada that you would distrust very much the enterprise and the value of our land if they continued to hold us to our bargain, and we asked the Government and Parliament, as a mark of confidence in us, and to prevent that feeling of distrust being created, to give up the security. This they consented to do, and having shown their confidence in us in that marked manner, we ask you to treat us with the same confidence, and buy our bonds at a higher rate." The hon. gentleman says again that the money is wanted, and he hopes this will be done before next Session. What he has power to do and hopes will be done will, no doubt, be accomplished, and, as I said, when he moved the Speaker out of the Chair, that was equivalent to its being actually done. There are many things, he says, for which this money is wanted. It is wanted to span the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans with steamers; it is wanted to build a short line and branch railways. All or some of these objects may be highly praiseworthy, but mark you, Sir, all of them are increasing the capital account of the Canadian Pacific Railway, on which, so long as this monopoly exists, the interest or profit must, in some shape, be paid at the expense of the people; and while I am not averse to the expenditure of further capital prudently, I say that in the interests of the people, both of the North-West and the older parts of Canada, we ought to consider what those expenditures are which are increasing that capital account, and how far it may turn out afterwards that the cost of those expenditures will be taken out of the pockets of the people of the North-West in exchange for very inferior and inadequate service. Parliament, while asked to carry out this operation, which is a part of the larger operation which the hon gentleman proposed in the other resolution, is asked to consent to a large increase of the capital account of the company. This is a dangerous business. You find the First Minister coming down and telling us, before the road is opened, that there is capital money outstanding now to the extent of $100,000,000, invested by capitalists in the bonds and stock of the railway. That is the statement of the hon. gentleman. It goes forth as the word of the leader of the Government, which the hon. gentleman says has so much the confidence of Parliament that we may surrender, and ought to surrender, to it our proper functions. He says there is a hundred millions of money invested. What is the fact? The fact is that there were $29,500,000 cash invested for the $65,000,000 of stock which the hon. gentleman counts as if it were all solid cash. Add the $35,000,000 bonds, and you find the amount invested to be $64,500,000. From that deduct the $21,000,000 paid and appropriated in dividends already, and you have $43,500,000 as the net amount which is said to have gone into the road, instead of $100,000,000. This is important, because the power of the company, with its monopoly powers, to raise tariffs, the obligations in which we have engaged not to diminish the tariffs, are all largely dependent on the question of capital account; and it is therefore unfortunate that the hon. gentleman should, contrary to former statements made by him, when he differed from Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways, should now declare that there are a hundred million dollars invested in the road, when we all know the most is $64,500,000, from which may be fairly deducted the very considerable proportion that went and are going into the pockets of the shareholders as dividends, and did not go into the road at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another important consideration. Neither of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken has given the slightest idea as to whether the Government have had any information as to the condition or working of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That road was to be furnished according to a certain standard, and I do not observe that either the Minister of Finance or the First Minister intimated that the Government engineers had as yet examined this road from end to end, and were satisfied it was completed in accordance with the standard. We are in such ignorance about these matters that we are not even prepared to say it was not according to the standard, although, if the statements put forward in the newspapers be correct, more especially as regards the Columbia section, a great deal has to be done in that quarter, at any rate, before the road can be considered as having at all approximated to or equalled the standard provided. Apparently the Government do not know anything more than we do as to the main line. The papers they have brought down do not make any distinction or give any practical information at all. We know perfectly well that when a road is in the process of construction, it is a very easy thing to manipulate accounts and make them show a profit which does not really exist; and the least the Government and the company may do, when they come to the representatives of the people, after having just received a gift, practically, of $10,000,000 money more, because our accepting $20,000,000 in place of the $30,000,000 the company promised to return us, is, to all intents and purposes, very nearly a free gift. I say that they ought to have given the House, that they ought to have put the Government in possession of very much fuller details on this subject than they have chosen to do, and it is making the reference to this House a farce to take the course which the First Minister has done. As my hon. friend remarked very justly, it would be better at once to pass an Act throwing the responsibility of all legislation on the First Minister and his colleagues, and not trouble ourselves to come here and spend our time at all in discussing these matters.

Mr. MILLS. I am sure the House could not help being struck with the observations made by the First Minister, who informed us that it was prudent to require this security in the first instance, a security that has no force and can have no force until the road is completed; and yet, without the House being informed as to the progress of the work and the present state of the road, the right hon. gentleman proposes that the security shall be given up. Well, if his present position is right, certainly the Government were altogether wrong in demanding any security of this sort. The hon. gentleman says, at the very moment that this security is to have any force at all, that it must be abandoned. Now, I do not think the House is possessed of information to know how far the company are likely to operate the road, as the hon. gentleman says. I believe that the Government were to construct a very considerable section of road in British Columbia, and when it was completed to hand it over to the company. There was a contract between the Government and the company as to the character of the work to be done by the Government on behalf of the company. I understand that that work has proved to be very much more heavy and more serious than was at first contemplated, and that the present contractors who have been performing that work for the Government claim at least a million and a half for the extra work done on that particular section. I have been informed also that the company are of opinion that the character of this work is not at all such as it really was to be, that in fact the Government have built a section of road which by the terms of the con-

tract they are to hand over to the company, and that that road is altogether inferior to the road the Government contracted to build on behalf of the company, and that the railway company estimate that it will require a sum in the neighborhood of two and a-half millions of dollars to make this a section of road such as the road was to be. If this be so, it will require at least $4,000,000 of further expenditure on the part of the public to complete that section of road and make it such as the Government contracted it should be when it became the property of the company. We have no information on that subject. Let me suppose for a moment that a dispute should arise between the Government and the company, as to the section of the road which was to be built by the Government, on behalf of the company in British Columbia. Suppose the company were to say the grades are heavier and the curves are shorter than the road the Government were to construct, that it is impossible to operate this road profitably; that, until the Government put the road in such a condition as to make it conform to their contract with the company, the company will not feel bound to operate the road. What security have the Government that the road will be operated when they abandon these $5,000,000 of bonds? Why, I believe that the road constructed by the Government through British Columbia, as far as I can ascertain, is not such as the company were to build, that it is a road of altogether inferior character, that it will be exceedingly difficult to operate, and, so far as we are yet able to learn, there is nothing to show that a serious loss will not be entailed upon the company in the operation of that road. Now, every member who now sits in this House, who was here in 1881, when this contract was entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, knows that the right hon. gentleman told the House that we were giving to the company a very large subsidy, larger than they would actually require to enable them to go forward with the construction of the road; that a part of this subsidy was paid to them to cover anticipated losses that would arise from the operation of the road. Does anyone suppose that this company will be prepared to sustain these losses, if by any possibility they can be avoided? Is this company going to incur the serious losses which the hon. gentleman assured Parliament would certainly arise for some time after the completion if by any possibility they can get rid of the burdens which will be entailed upon them beyond their earnings? No one can for a moment suppose that will be the case, and yet the hon. gentleman proposes that Parliament shall give up to the company the only security it has for the due fulfilment of the company's obligations. Now, I am not complaining of what I believe the company will do if the opportunity occurs to them. They will carry on the operation on commercial principles. They will economise as far as they can; they will not incur losses for the mere purpose of affording accommodation to the public on grounds of public policy, and not on grounds of commercial advantage to the rail way corporation; and the Government, as trustees of the people, as guardians of the people's interests, after having called upon Parliament and induced Parliament on behalf of the public, to pay to the company first a large sum in the form of subsidy to aid in the construction of the road, and a further sum to cover any losses the company might sustain in the operation of the road after it was completed, propose to abandon the only security they have for the payment of this additional sum. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the western terminus of this road being at Hong Kong and the eastern terminus at Liverpool. Everyone knows, while that may be a very fine and magniloquent term to use, that it is a myth. The hon. gentleman knows that there is no such thing as an Asiatic traffic. I will do the hon. gentleman the credit to say that I do not believe he thinks for a moment there can be anything like an extensive traffic carried on over this road between Asia and Europe. There was a railway constructed from San Francisco to New York which might have had a monopoly of that traffic, if there had been a traffic of that kind. It was in operation for years without a rival railway across this continent; and I would like the hon. gentleman to inform the House how much that railway carried from San Francisco to New York that was on its way to Liverpool. Why, the whole of the supplies from Asia and India which are consumed in the United States reach New York and the United States by way of the Suez Canal; they do not come by San Francisco. We know, as far as the trade of the American railways are concerned, that it is trade which springs up along the line of the railway; it is trade which is due to the industry of the population settled along the line of railway; it is the traffic and the travel of the population along the section of country the railway is to accommodate. The hon. gentleman knows there will be no such traffic. If a line of steamers were put on between Hong Kong and Victoria or New Westminster, there would be nothing for them to do. A steamer that would carry 5,000 or 6,000 tons would perhaps carry all the Asiatic traffic that this road would have an opportunity of carrying during twelve months in the year. We are bound to look at the circumstances of the country and the condition of the railway itself. The hon. gentleman has not given us the information that we are entitled to in regard to the present condition of this road. We do not know anything about its grades and curves. We have no opportunity of comparing the actual condition of the road at the present time with the terms of the contract into which the Government on behalf of the country entered. I say that we are entitled to it, and until we have information to show that there is a fair and reasonable prospect that this road will do a business that will at least pay its running expenses, we are guilty of a breach of trust to the people of this country in abandoning the security we have. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman told us that this road would not pay, that it could not pay, for many years, that it would be run at a serious loss. Has he changed his views on this question?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Entirely.

Mr. MILLS. He was mistaken.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was mistaken.

Mr. MILLS. He has had more light.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. More light.

Mr. MILLS. Well, Sir, I hope the hon. gentleman will illuminate this House, for he has so far not succeeded in giving us that light which has wrought such a radical change in the hon. gentleman's own views.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not a radical change but a complete change.

Mr. MILLS. Is it the increased population of British Columbia that has wrought that change? Is it the increased population west of Calgary? What is it that has transpired to show that this railway, which the hon. gentleman formerly supposed would be run at a loss, has now so far improved its position that it is going to be run at a profit, and that, therefore, the House may safely abandon its security and give up the control it has at this moment?

Resolution to be reported.

SUPPLY—HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

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

Mr. BLAKE. I rise for a moment to intercept that question, in order to bring before the House another, in which the last House showed a deep concern—I mean the Irish question. In 1880, I spoke my views upon this subject, and expressed my belief and hope that we should at no distant day see a measure of Home Rule granted to Ireland. In the year 1882, the question was moved on the other side of this House. At that time we, on this side, heartily co-operated in order to give the greatest possible weight to the proposed action. Then I spoke at length my opinions upon the whole question, which saves me from the necessity of trespassing now upon the time of this House, and since that time, to the best of my humble power, here and elsewhere, I have aided in the advancement of that cause. Since then a new Canadian House of Commons has been elected, which House has not yet spoken upon the question. Since then great events have transpired in the United Kingdom itself. The people, both of Ireland and Great Britain, have received for the first time a very full measure of representation in Parliament. The Irish people, under that measure of representation, have, by an enormous, an overwhelming majority, pronounced in favor of Home Rule, and the great statesman who leads Her Majesty's Government has recognised the vital necessity of grappling at once with the question; and Her Majesty's Government have, as I ventured to suggest on a former occasion, seen the propriety of themselves formulating a plan for the settlement of that question. Now, Sir, a controversy has arisen on some of the more important details of that measure. I do not, myself, admire all those details. For example, admitting the great difficulties, I should yet prefer, to the present plan for the exclusion of Ireland from the management of Imperial affairs in which she is interested, her continued representation for those Imperial purposes in an Imperial Parliamen—I should prefer the plan, notwithstanding its great difficulty, of her retaining that share of control. But it needs not to discuss this or any other matters of detail, because it has been expressly and authoritatively stated that none of these points are considered in any way vital to the question which is now before England and before the world. The vital principle now at stake is that of self-government for Ireland in local affairs. This was stated by Mr. Gladstone in his reply to the criticisms on the first reading of the Bill, and he has further and authoritatively declared it by his recent manifesto, which was transmitted to us only yesterday. In that manifesto, he thus speaks:

"As for the means we take the establishment in Dublin of a legislative body, empowered to make laws for Irish, as contra-distinguished from Imperial, affairs. It is with this that we are now busied, and not with details and particulars; their time will come."

He adds:

"We are not debating the amount of Irish contributions to the Empire, of the composition of the legislative body, or the maintenance of representative connection with Westminster. On these questions and many more we may and we may not be at odds, but what we are at this moment debating is the large and far larger question which includes, and I think absorbs, them all—the question whether you will or will not have regard to the prayer of Ireland for the management by herself of affairs specifically and exclusively her own. This and no other is the matter which the House of Commons has at once to decide. If on this matter it speaks with a clear and intelligible voice, I feel the strongest assurance that the others, difficult as some of them are, will, nevertheless, with the aid of full discussion and with the aid of a wise and conciliatory spirit, be found capable of a rational and tolerable settlement."

Now, Sir, that Bill to which this manifesto refers, stands for a second reading in a few days, and then that vital question is to be decided. A great excitement has arisen; the Empire has been aroused, not merely the Kingdom, but the Empire. The emotion has passed beyond the seas; it has passed beyond the Empire; the English speaking people outside the bounds of the Empire have been aroused, nay more, the free nations all over the world have been moved. Every eye is at this moment bent on Westminister, and every ear is strained to catch the echoes when they come of the great debate, and to learn the issue of the mighty struggle from beyond. Under these circumstances, marks of sympathy and of admiration have been cabled to the First Minister, and he has responded to them in such a sort as proves conclusively that he regards them, as they must be, helpful to him in the enormous task he has undertaken. We know as well as if we had received it already, what the tone of the reply will be to any such communication as we have on a former occasion addressed, or as other large bodies have addressed, upon this subject. The circumstances are, of course, changed; they are changed since the day we addressed Her Majesty; they are changed as to the position of the question; but they are changed in this particular also, to which I call your special attention. At that time we assumed—and I suppose we are not now prepared to resile; I am not, at any rate, prepared to resile from the assumption of our right respectfully to approach the Throne with a view to tender our humble advice and hopes upon a subject of such vital importance to the whole Empire, and to Canada as a part of the Empire. But, Sir, at this time, not merely in other particulars are the circumstances changed, but they are changed in this: That whereas when we were asked to accede to the view that we should assume the responsibility of respectfully tendering that advice and opinion to Her Majesty's Government, that Government had not acted; now we can say that Her Majesty's Government, whether upon that advice or not, have acted in accordance with the spirit of that advice, and that we are no longer called upon by any sense of duty, and it is unnecessary that we should tender them any advice; what we are called upon now to do, under the present circumstance, is to assist them, so far as we can, by giving them our moral support in furtherance of the views which they have expressed, and in the adoption of the principle of the scheme now before Parliament. The answers which have been given to the communications which have been received show their helpfulness. To the Speaker of the Quebec Assembly, in response to their resolution, Mr. Gladstone writes:

"I am deeply grateful at the resolution adopted by your honorable body. It is my belief that the people of England, who have partial responsibility for the old misdeeds of the British Government, and the people of Ireland who have really none, will concur in the wise and liberal view entertained by the Quebec Assembly."

To the Mayor of Boston, in answer to the resolution of the city, he cabled:

"I feel that American opinion, allied as it is with a regard and affection for the Old Country, affords Her Majesty's Government a powerful moral support."

Then, shall we be slack to-day? Shall we be silent now who spoke before? I say, no. We are bound to speak and to speak now. Else it will be said of us: "You spoke ere the question was ripe, when your words embarrassed; now that it is near, even at the doors, you withhold your help." Else it will be inferred that we have changed our minds, and that no longer does the House of Commons approve of local self-government for Ireland. Our silence to-day will be as positively hurtful as our speech to-day would be helpful. It was but yesterday that we were, in effect, appealed to. Listen to the words of Mr. Gladstone's manifesto. He appeals, indeed, directly, in the words which I am about to read, to the masses of the population of Great Britain; and this is what he says:

"Watching from day to day the movement of the currents of opinion during the present conflict, more and more I find it vital to observe the point at which the dividing lines are drawn on the side adverse to the Government. They are found, as I sorrowfully admit, in profuse abundance, in station, title, wealth, social influence and the professions, and the large majority of them in the world, spirit and power of class. These are the main body of the opposing host. Nor is this all. As

knights of old had squires, so in the great army of class each enrolled soldier has a roll of dependents. The adverse host, then, consists of class and dependents of class; but this formidable army is the bulk of its constituents, part of the same, though now enriched at our cost, with a valuable contingent of recruits that has fought in every Government the greatest political battles of the last sixty years, and has been defeated. We have a great aim. For us now it is to restore your parliamentary efficiency, by dividing and by removing obstacles to its work, to treat the Irish question with due regard to its specialties, but with the same thoroughness of method by which we have solved colonial problems, that fifty years back were hardly, if at all, less formidable. To give heed to the voice of the people speaking in tones of moderation, by the mouth of the vast majority of those whom we ourselves have made its constitutional representatives, and thus to strengthen and consolidate the Empire on the basis of mutual benefit and hearty loyalty."

I ask whether we, too, though that appeal is not a direct appeal to us, we too, a democratic people, kinsmen of those he addresses, of that very mass of the population to which Mr. Gladstone speaks, shall not echo and further his appeal. He describes in the same manifesto the response from the world. Thus he speaks:

"Never have I known an occasion when a parliamentary event so rang through the world as the introduction of this Bill, under the auspices of the British Government. From public meetings and from the highest authorities in the Colonies, from capitals such as Washington, Cincinnati, Boston, Quebec, and from the remotest districts lying beyond the reach of all ordinary political excitement, I receive the conclusive assurance that kindred people regard it with warm and fraternal sympathy. Our present effort is to settle, on an adequate scale, and once for all, the long-vexed and troubled relations between England and Ireland, which exhibit to us the one and only conspicuous failure of the political genius of our race, to confront and master a difficulty, and to obtain in a reasonable degree the main ends of civilised life."

I ask, under those circumstances, and when the highest testimony is given to those resolutions from various quarters, and their utility, shall Canada, who was earliest in the field, be dumb to-day? Shall her voice, so loud before, be silent now? Shall we not listen to that mute appeal and cause our names to be enrolled amongst those who constitute the forces of the great public opinion throughout the world, giving an added impulse to the progress of this great measure? I dare not be silent longer. I do not bring this as a party question. I have waited till the last moment, hoping that some one on the other side of the House would move. That hope I have been obliged to abandon. I see that the Minister of Inland Revenue has declined to move, and has cabled for himself and for the Irish representatives in Parliament the assurance of his and their adhesion to the address of 1882. I do not undervalue his assurance. But it is not the assurance required. What is required is the assurance, not of one, but of all classes; not of a section, but of the people; not of a Minister of the Crown, but of the Commons of Canada; not of the Irish Catholic members, but of the French and English, Scotch, Irish and German, of all creeds and of all nationalities. To substitute the hon. gentleman's assurance for our voice would be to acknowledge that we do not choose now to speak in the sense in which we spoke then, and in which he declares his own readiness to speak again. I therefore speak, but not as a Reformer, or as a party leader; I speak as a Canadian and citizen of the Empire to brother Canadians and fellow-citizens of the Empire. This is not a Protestant or a Catholic question; they are enemies of their country who would make it so. It should not be, in Canada at all events, a Conservative or a Reform measure. I regard those as the enemies of their country who would try to make it so. I hope that we may, by our own action this day, show ourselves united in the redress of wrongs and in the advancement of the cause of liberty. For my part I should feel myself nothing less than a coward and a criminal should we, without any effort of mine, stand passive to-day and fail to lend our help at this critical moment to the cause of freedom and local self-government for the Irish people. I, therefore, move to leave out all the words after "that" and insert the following:—

Mr. BLAKE.

An humble address be presented to Her Majesty to respectfully assure Her Majesty that the interest and concern felt by the Commons of Canada, and the people whom they represent, in the condition of Ireland, and their desire that some means may be found of meeting the expressed wishes of so many of Her Majesty's Irish subjects for the grant to Ireland of a measure of local self-government still continue as warm and earnest as in the year 1882, when they were humbly signified to Her Majesty by an address to the terms to which this House affirms its abiding adhesion.

Humbly to inform Her Majesty that this House hails with joy the submission by Her Majesty's Government to the Parliament of the United Kingdom of a measure recognising the principle of local self-government for Ireland."

And humbly to express to Her Majesty the earnest hope of this House that the principle of the said measure may be affirmed, and that it may form the basis for such a settlement of this great question as shall conduce to the peace, happiness and prosperity of the Empire.

Sir JOHN A. MACDNALD. I wish to say only a few words on the motion which the hon. gentleman has made. The hon. gentleman stated that he has not moved in this matter from any political consideration. He does not speak as a partisan—no, not he; he does not speak as a Reformer—no, not he. He speaks from the fullness of his heart, and because he had committed himself with the rest of the members of this House in the last Parliament on this question. But if it is not to be considered a political matter, why did he wait so long? Why did he say that he expected somebody to speak on this side? Why did he expect that such a motion must come from the Conservative party, and that only on the failure of the Ministry to bring in such a motion, did he at the last moment—the other side, the other party, having failed in their duty—did he feel it to be his duty—not as a party man, not in any way as a party man—to make this motion? All I have to say about this matter is this, if the hon. gentleman is sincere—I do not doubt his sincerity—but if he is sincere why is it that he has taken the course least likely to aid in the cause which he has so much at heart, by moving his motion on going into Supply? If the hon. gentleman desired to bring this up he should have moved it after full notice; he should have given this House an opportunity of considering what his motion was, what he wished to convey, what he wished this House to agree to. He should not have done it without full notice, so that every man in this House would come fully charged with the meaning, the intention and the scope of every sentence of the hon. gentleman's motion, so that they would all have come ready to give their opinions, according to their several and individual consciences, as to what was the best course in the interest of Ireland, in the interest of the Empire, and in the interests of Canada. By moving it in this way as a matter of surprise—for it is nothing more nor less than a matter of surprise—he has taken a course which compels me to say to him that I will not vote for his resolution now, but that if he will give notice or take this as a notice—we will give him a day, we will set aside all Government business, we will set aside everything, as this question is brought up and is before us—we will give him any day he chooses between now and prorogation, when we will discuss the question fully and fairly, and vote after fully considering the scope, meaning and intention of the speech of the hon. gentleman. I therefore ask this House to vote against this resolution, and at the same time I tell the hon. gentleman that we will discuss it—not to-morrow, because we must have more than one night—but next day, or any day afterwards he likes, and we will discuss it fully and fairly and come to such a conclusion as we think best for the great interests involved—the interests, as I have already said, not only of the United Kingdom, not only of Ireland, but also of the Empire and of this Dominion of Canada.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I feel very much pleased at the announcement made by the leader of the Government. In the first place it is my duty to refer shortly to some of the remarks made by the hon. member who has moved the resolution now before the House. That hon. gentleman has

stated that he felt it to be his duty, that he would have felt himself to be a coward and criminal if he had not moved such a motion, that he waited until he found there was no sign of a movement of the kind on this side of the House, in order to spring this motion on the House in the manner he did. Mr. Speaker, on a former occasion, when this same subject was discussed before this Parliament, no man who sat in this Chamber, and listened to the hon. gentleman when he spoke on that occasion, admired him more sincerely than I did, or was more ready to congratulate him upon the very able speech he delivered on that occasion. But I wish to recall to the House the course pursued on that occasion, and contrast it with the course pursued on this occasion. If my hon. friend, bursting with enthusiasm for the old sod, for the people who are struggling for self-government in that country, if he had a feeling of anxiety to strengthen the hands of those who are fighting the battle in that country, he might have solicited the opinions and advice, perhaps—if it would not be saying too much—but at least the opinions of those who might be supposed to partake in some small degree, if not so eminently and so interestedly as the hon. gentleman can, in a feeling of that kind; he might have remembered that there were other Irishmen in this House who, perhaps, felt as deep an interest as he felt in that question. What was my course when I was called upon by Liberal and Conservative Irishmen in the city of Ottawa on a former occasion, to act in this matter? They came to me representing both sides of politics in this country. They asked my opinion as to whether such a motion would meet with success in the Parliament of Canada. They admitted the difficulties; they had grave doubts as to whether it would receive any considerable support, and I am free to confess that no man at that time believed that it would get the support of a majority of this Parliament; but they believed it would get such a support as would attract the attention of public men on the other side of the water, and I was asked if I would move in the matter. I said that I would willingly undertake the task, no matter what the consequences might be; but that before doing so, I must be placed in the position of being free from the accusation of acting the part of a demagogue. I said, communicate with the different Irish societies throughout Canada, and if they say that in their opinion a motion of this kind should be brought forward, and that I should do it, I shall be willing to undertake the duty, and devote to it what ability God has given me, honestly and faithfully. They did so communicate with the different Irish societies throughout the Dominion. Most of the societies responded, expressing in plain and unqualified terms their opinion that such a motion should be proposed before Parliament, and hoping that Parliament would receive it favorably. I did not then spring my motion on the House. I made it my duty to call together all the Irishmen in this Parliament, except the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. leader of the Government; we left those two hon. gentlemen out because they were the leaders, but we invited every Irish gentleman in this House and in the other Chamber to a meeting to discuss what resolutions might be submitted to Parliament. We had a meeting, at which it was thought proper to appoint a committee to draft the resolutions. I was appointed chairman of that committee, and as I thought it desirable that the hon. Mr. Anglin, then a very prominent member of this House, should be on the committee, and as unfortunately he and I were not on speaking terms, I suggested to one of my friends, who I dare say would have done it of his own accord, to propose Mr. Anglin as a member of this committee. He did so, but Mr. Anglin declined to act. I tried to show a desire to meet him in as friendly a way on that occasion as I could, and I expressed the hope that he would consent to act on the committee, as he could render very great service from his intimate knowledge of Irish history, as well as from his attainments as an educated man. Still he declined to act, although I refused to place any person in his stead. That committee met and framed resolutions which were moved in this House by myself; and as I stated before, the hon. gentleman who has moved the present amendment seconded my efforts in a very able speech, one of the ablest speeches, I think, which he has delivered in this Parliament. This House unanimously adopted the resolutions; and the other Chamber adopted them almost unanimously, a very small minority dissenting. An address based on the resolutions was sent home to the Imperial Government. What was the result? This is the reply which was sent to the Marquis of Lorne:

"My Lord,—I have received and laid before the Queen the address to Her Majesty from the Senate and House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, which was transmitted in your Lordship's despatch of the 16th of May.

"I am commanded by Her Majesty to request that you will convey to the Senate and House of Commons her appreciation of the renewed expression of their unswerving loyalty and devotion to Her Majesty's person and Government.

"Her Majesty will always gladly receive the advice of the Parliament of Canada on all matters relating to the Dominion and the administration of its affairs; but with respect to the questions referred to in the address, Her Majesty will, in accordance with the constitution of this country, have regard to the advice of the Imperial Parliament and Ministers, to which all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain."

This is signed by the Earl of Kimberley, who I believe was a member of the Gladstone Government at that time. That reply did not change my opinion at all. I agree with the hon. gentleman in thinking that we had a perfect right to send the address we did send. It was couched in respectful language; it was moderate in its tone; it covered the principle involved; and as we took the ground that the question affected our interests in this country, we felt that we were acting within our clear right. But I am now showing the view that was taken of our act by that Government, to which the hon. gentleman thinks the changed circumstances would now justify us in sending another address. I have no right to impute wrong motives to the hon. gentleman, or to question his sincerity, and I will not do so. I do not wish to introduce into this debate anything that he or any one else might consider unpleasant. I think it is a very important subject—a subject that touches very deeply the sympathies of a large portion of the people of this and every other civilised country in the world—and I am as thoroughly in sympathy with the movement in favor of Home Rule as ever I was, and as honestly convinced of the righteousness of the cause that has been pleaded by the able leader of the Irish people in the British Parliament, Mr. Parnell. I do question the propriety of the present motion, and that is what I wish to come to. I am glad the right. hon. leader of the Government has made the proposition he has, because I would much prefer that this motion should not be voted on at all. I would prefer that the hon. gentleman should withdraw this motion, having received from the First Minister the assurance that every opportunity will be afforded him to move the resolution in a regular way. The only plea for moving the resolution in the manner in which the hon. gentleman has now moved it is that he might not have an opportunity later of doing so; but after the assurance of the hon. First Minister that that opportunity will be given, I do not think he should press it now. Of course, it is in amendment to going into Supply, without any arrangement with the Government, and without any notice having been given. Therefore I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw it. Then there would be an opportunity given to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who, he thinks, have been lax in their duty, to consult with him. We do not claim that anything we may say will influence his views; we do not pretend to hope that; but I think we are entitled to say to

him that, feeling as much interest as he possibly can in this question, it might be possible for us to agree upon a motion that would be passed unanimously by this House. We might possibly agree upon a motion to be submitted to the House and passed unanimously, and I am sure the hon. gentleman will agree with me that such a motion would be of more value than one which necessitated a division. I am not here to discuss what changes we might ask for; that could be discussed among those specially interested, and to whom the matter might be referred. If the hon. gentleman thinks that would at all meet his views, and that we could come to such an understanding, I will not continue my remarks; but if he thinks my request is one he cannot entertain, I will have to crave the indulgence of the House while I make further remarks on this subject.

Mr. BLAKE. I rose at the time the hon gentleman rose in order to defer to the hon. First Minister's proposition. I have no right to answer any of the observations of the hon. gentleman other than just so far as they relate to the question. After the statement the First Minister made, though I think it might have been made in a better spirit, and after the statement of the Minister of Inland Revenue, though I think it might have been made in a little better spirit, I may at once say I am quite willing that whatever time is reasonable and consistent with the object of the resolution should be given at once to carry out the suggestion of those hon. gentlemen. My object is just what the hon. gentleman's is, to procure a unanimous motion; and because he tells me he expects, by the course he proposes, to produce such a result, I am all the more ready to agree to that course. I do not, however, agree that we should, without considering the circumstances, postpone taking action any longer than to-morrow, because, as far as I can learn, the second reading of the Bill is fixed for Thursday, and that is why I call this the last moment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is fixed for the 10th.

Mr. BLAKE. No, for the 6th.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been altered to the 10th, because on the 6th a tragic event took place in Dublin.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has, no doubt, later information than I. I took mine from the statement in to-day's papers, contained in Mr. Justin McCarthy's letter; but after the statement of the hon. gentleman, I will take Thursday instead of Wednesday. As to the form of the motion, I, too, shall take just the same opportunity as the hon. gentleman took, when he moved his motion; that is, the opportunity of the House going into Supply. In the meantime, as to the form in which the motion shall be presented, I shall only be too glad to meet the hon. gentleman, or any other hon. member, with the view of settling that point.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman says he will take the same course as that which I took on a former occasion. It is impossible for the hon. gentleman to take that course.

Mr. BLAKE I did not say I will take the same course; I said I would take the same opportunity, which is the motion to go into Supply.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman has taken that opportunity, but not in the same way. He knows that the opportunity I took, in moving my resolution as an amendment to the motion to go into Supply, was taken after consultation with both sides of the House, and with the consent of the Government that it should be moved in that particular way, just as the hon. gentleman now agrees to a particular day. We knew what the motion was; hon. members had seen it and were prepared to deal with it.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman put his notice on the paper. I came that day prepared to discuss that notice, and the motion of the hon. gentleman was different altogether from the notice on the paper. It was a motion of which we had no notice, except those whom the hon. gentleman may have privately consulted. The majority of members had not heard of it, and we were called on to dispose of it without having been given any opportunity of making any suggestion as to its form or its terms.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I will give my version, and let the hon. gentleman's version stand.

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

After Recess.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know that I have a great deal to say in addition to the few words I said before recess. If the proposition made by the First Minister meets with no favor from the mover of the amendment before the House, I think the only course will be, as a matter of self respect, so far as I am personally concerned, to indicate to the hon. the leader of the Opposition that I protest against his constituting himself the sole judge of what course we should take.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! Oh!

Mr. COSTIGAN. Hon. gentlemen opposite may not approve of what I say; I do not expect they will. I have made a fair proposition; the First Minister has made a fair proposition.

Mr. BLAKE. Which is accepted.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Well, it will be accepted, perhaps, before a great while, and it may be accepted by every reasonably-minded man that both suggestions were fair and reasonable. What can be the object of moving a resolution of this kind? Is it to strengthen the hands of the First Minister of the Imperial Government? If that be the case, the stronger the vote the better, the stronger the expression from this House the better; and whether the suggestion comes from one side of the House or the other, there are grounds, perhaps, upon which we can unite, and the suggestion that we should agree on a resolution, is worthy of fair consideration.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. COSTIGAN. And I think that the hon. gentleman who refuses that must assume considerable responsibility, if the vote is not as large as it might be made by a fair discussion of our views on the subject.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but he has stated he does not agree with the proposition of the First Minister or the suggestion of myself, and insists upon adhering to his right to move his resolution as an amendment to the motion to go into Supply. There is no reason or excuse for the hon. member moving for a vote, which he professes himself is not of a political character; to which he wishes distinctly to be understood, he does not give a political character at all, as a vote of want of confidence.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Why move it in that shape?

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The only justification the hon. gentleman could have for moving it in that shape would be that at this late stage of the Session, he might be afraid he could not move it in any other way; but he cannot consistently say, after the proposition that has been made to him, that he has no political motive in proposing this motion as an amendment to Supply.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Hon. gentlemen opposite may cheer, but what is the haste in moving this motion?

Mr. LISTER. Because you would not move it?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Why should not the proposition I have made be accepted? Is it because hon. gentlemen opposite have seen in the *Citizen* that a message has been sent on behalf of Irish representatives, and do they wish to repudiate it or the authority from which it emanated? The Minister of Inland Revenue sent the telegram across the water, not on his own responsibility, but after meeting Irishmen and the descendants of Irishmen in this Parliament, who are equally responsible for it, and desired to repeat, as far as they could, the sentiments expressed in the resolution passed by this Parliament in 1882. The hon. gentleman says that has no force. If he says so on this side of the water perhaps his authority will be considered on the other side as weakening, whatever value it was intended the message should have. The hon. gentleman quoted also the address of the leader of the present Government, whose serious attention is now called to this question, and what does that indicate? Mr. Gladstone refers to the congratulations and the suggestions he has received from the old capital of Quebec, and from several municipal authorities all through the United States. Has he forgotten that the Parliament of Canada, before any of these bodies took up the question at all, sent to his Government their opinion and the opinion of the Canadian people expressed through them in reference to the benefit of the system of Government for which the Irish people are asking? Had he forgotten that, or might he not have included at that time the Parliament of Canada as well as the Legislature of Quebec? But perhaps he thought he could not very well make a reference to the Parliament of Canada after the snubs he had administered to us for the respectful address he was forwarded. I do not intend to follow up the discussion now, as I expect to have another opportunity of speaking more fully upon it. I assume the responsibility of the position I take, and I expect every hon. gentleman to assume the responsibility of his course. I take a share of the credit with the other hon. gentlemen who are interested in the question for having obtained from the Parliament of Canada a unanimous expression in favor of the principle which is now under discussion. The Parliament of Canada having given that opinion, I do not think that an address should be asked for now to repeat that opinion in the same direction in which it was given before, without some indication that Parliament has changed his policy or the people of this country had changed their views since that time. The hon. gentleman himself in his motion perhaps would create a necessity, so far as asking the Parliament to reaffirm its principles, because he doubts the rights of the Irish representatives in Parliament and myself, quoting that last decision of Parliament in his speech to-night. That is the only argument in favor of asking this House to reaffirm what it had already passed. The hon. gentleman thinks a day could not be lost. What is the great haste for a day or two, that is considering that the First Minister had assured the hon. gentleman and this House that he will see that the time and opportunity are allowed him to move that resolution and to have a full discussion on it? Is it possible that some of the hon. gentleman's friends, having read the *Citizen* this morning, having seen that this cablegram had gone forth, having seen that, notwithstanding the misrepresentations which were made of myself and of my friends on the question, as well as on every other question which can be turned to political account, thought that this would meet the reasonable wishes and expectation of our friends, and would perhaps remove from those who are seeking to find fault with us any just cause of complaint, and that the only thing to do in order to counteract that good effect was to raise anew the discussion here in the House of Commons. Perhaps that may have been one of the grounds which influenced some of the gentlemen who are so anxious to have this discussion now. I stated before, and I repeat now that, so far as that principle is concerned, the hon. gentleman knows that there is no change on my part or on the part of my friends. We believe now, as we believed then, in the principles we voted for, in the principles which we supported then and which we are prepared to support now, but, unless the hon. gentleman will consent to the offer made to him to-night, I will accept the offer of the leader of the Government, and will find an opportunity, if not through myself, through some of the Irish representatives in this House, who feel as deep an interest in this matter as the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and will ask the House to express its opinion on a substantive motion, not moved as a vote of want of confidence, but in such a way as to give everyone a fair opportunity of expressing his views, and then I may have something more to say about it.

Mr. CASEY. I do not intend, any more than the hon. Minister who has just sat down to discuss the question of Home Rule. I merely have a few remarks to make as to what has fallen from that hon. Minister and from the hon. the Premier. I am sorry to find that, on this occasion as on others, the Premier appears to consider the sneering and flippant tone which he used towards the leader of the Opposition the proper tone and the proper manner in which to discuss great and important questions. He sneered at the assurance given by the hon. the leader of the Opposition that he was not moved by political motives. He said: "Oh, no, he is not moved by political motives; of course not; no one would think that of him!" and went on in that tone, and charged that hon gentleman with having possibly injured the cause of Home Rule by the manner in which he had brought forward this motion. Now, the fallacy of that charge I hope to make plain a little later on, but I think it is very clear that the statement he uses in a mistaken manner, to say the least of it, in regard to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, is a true statement in regard to his own remarks. For, if anything could injure the prospects that this resolution, or some similar resolution, would be unanimously adopted by the House, it was the tone and the substance of those remarks—the tone of his remarks, in the first place, as indicating a possibility of political difference on a matter where no such possibility had before been suggested; the substance of his remarks, in that he threw some doubt, by asking for delay, by declaring that he could not now vote for the motion, on the likelihood of this motion being accepted in principle by the whole House. There was no reason for this in the wording of the motion itself; there has been no reason in any expression of public opinion in Canada to cause any doubt to exist that this House is as unanimous now in favor of Home Rule as it was in 1882. There was no hint of such a thing until that hint was given by the leader of the House himself; and, if any utterance could be more calculated to throw cold water on the resolution and encourage people to find difficulties in the way of passing it than the language of the First Minister, I cannot imagine it, short indeed of a direct refusal to allow such a motion to pass. He urged that this motion should not come up as an amendment on going into Supply. The hon. the

Minister who has just spoken has strongly concurred in that objection. Without arguing the question as to the propriety of bringing it up in that manner, I wish to quote a precedent or two—one precedent at least which I think ought to be conclusive and satisfactory to the leader of the House, whether it be satisfactory or not to his follower, who has sometimes been known to differ from him. I refer to the authority of the hon. the Premier of the House himself, and the occasion was the motion he proposed in regard to Mr. Letellier de St. Just, then Lieutenant Governor of Quebec. That resolution was proposed in the Session of 1878. The hon. gentleman, then leader of the Opposition as he is now leader of the House, did give a general notice that he was going to bring up a motion of that sort, and offered to communicate with the leader of the House about it. He said on 9th April, 1878:

"Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to state to the House and the hon. Minister at the head of the Government—as I have already done to him privately—that it is my intention to move, on going into Supply, at an early date, a motion, in order to bring under the attention of the House the late occurrence in Quebec. The resolution which I intend to move, I shall, in the course of the afternoon, communicate to the hon. gentleman at the head of Government. I would like a day fixed for the purpose of discussing this very important question. I would suppose that the hon. gentleman would allow it, by general consent, to be brought out upon going into Supply on Thursday, and I shall then move my resolution on the motion that the Speaker do now leave the Chair. I intend to bring up the constitutional question, as much as possible on its own merits, and try to raise the question out of the slough of party."

Exactly what has been proposed in regard to this resolution—that it should be discussed on its merits, and not be allowed to drop into the slough of party. The then leader of the House suggested what could be done, he said:

"I think that the proper course for the hon. gentleman would be to bring it up as a substantive motion, and I shall afford every facility for doing so on Thursday. If it is intended, however, to move an amendment, of course the hon. gentleman will see that he is confining it in such a position that it is quite impossible to avoid the conclusion that there is something political in it."

Exactly the same sort of argument that has been urged to-night in a stronger form. To that the then leader of the Opposition replied:

"I would have no objection to this proposition, but for this fact: I desire to make a certain proposition to this House and to have it discussed on its own merits, but if I make a separate and independent motion it can always be avoided by a motion for the previous question, or a motion in amendment, giving the go-by to the principle laid down in the resolution, and passing to the order of the day. Anything of this kind can be done; and, therefore, as it is a well known principle that a motion which in no way affects the Government of the day in its terms, as it is not a vote of want of confidence, or censure from any point of view."

I think that description will apply to the present resolution also.

"It is a grievance that should be made on going into Supply, which is the proper constitutional period for making such a motion. I shall then be obliged to move it. I will communicate this resolution to the hon gentleman, and if he makes any suggestion to alter and amend it, on which we can agree, I shall be most happy to settle the resolution, so that we can have it discussed on its own merits."

Just what the leader of the Opposition is offering to do now in regard to this motion of the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not at all.

Mr. CASEY. Oh yes. The hon. gentleman's ears are at fault. The leader of the Opposition did offer to consult with him in regard to the terms of this resolution.

"But the hon. gentleman cannot engage for the House that no amendment will be made, even if he and I agree upon a proposition. He cannot control the House, and any member can make a motion which will prevent or intercept the consideration of the constitutional proposition which I desire to make. I, therefore, feel myself bound to move it on going into Supply."

Now, Sir, I fancy my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, is in the same situation as was the then leader of the Opposition, that in order to prevent the possibility of

intercepting the consideration of the constitutional proposition which he is about to make, he must make it upon going into Committee of Supply. It was contended, at that time, by the present leader of the Government, and no doubt will be contended by him still, that such a motion was not necessarily one of want of confidence. Perhaps a point will be made by him, as was attempted by the Minister of Inland Revenue, out of the notice that was given of the latter's resolution in 1882, and the notice that was given in the Letellier case. Now, Sir, I have quoted the leader of the Government against himself, and I intend to quote the Minister of Inland Revenue against himself. He did give notice of a resolution in 1882, and he did, as he stated this afternoon, obtain the advice of other representative Irishmen in preparing that resolution. He did not follow their advice in every particular, but he did ask the advice of many, and obtained the advice of some; and with their assistance he prepared the resolution, but when it came to be moved in the House we found that it varied materially from the resolution of which he had given notice, and we were just so much worse off instead of being better prepared for the consideration of the question by having had notice of a resolution which was not the one actually proposed. We were not allowed to discuss the notice which had appeared on the paper, but were compelled to discuss another resolution different in many vital particulars. To show you how different they were, I will read a few extracts from both. I have here a volume of the Votes and Proceedings for 1882, and also of the Journals of that year. The first two or three paragraphs do not differ materially, except for the omission of certain words from the third paragraph, casting the responsibility for the existing state of affairs in Ireland upon the Imperial Government. But in the 5th paragraph we found the following words in the notice of motion:

"We should most respectfully pray, may it please Your Majesty that some such form of local self-government may be extended to Ireland, as is now enjoyed by the Provinces comprising this Dominion of Canada, and under which your Majesty's Canadian subjects have prospered exceedingly so that Ireland may become a source of strength to your Majesty's Empire, and that your Majesty's Empire and that your Majesty's Irish subjects, at home and abroad, may feel the same pride in the greatness of your Majesty's Empire, the same veneration for the justice of your Majesty's rule and the same devotion to, and affection for your common flag which are now felt by all classes of your Majesty's loyal subjects in the Dominion."

Substituted for that clause, which was settled with the advice and consent of representative Irishmen in the House, was the following, when the Minister of Inland Revenue came to make his motion:—

"We desire to respectfully to suggest to your Majesty, that Canada and its inhabitants have prospered exceedingly under a Federal system, allowing to each Province of the Dominion considerable powers of self-government, and would venture to express a hope that if consistent with the integrity and well-being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority are fully protected and secured, some means may be found of meeting the express desire of so many of your Irish subjects in that regard, so that Ireland may become a source of strength to your Majesty's Empire, and that your Majesty's Irish subjects, at home and abroad, may feel the same pride in the greatness of your Majesty's Empire."

and so on. Now, there is a great difference between these two. The original clause, which was wast these gentlemen who consulted with the hon. member expected he would introduce, asked for the granting of some sort of Federal Oovernment to Ireland; the other merely called attention to the success of Federal Government in Canada, and made a very namby-pamby, weak, wishy-washy suggestion of some concessions to the Irish. Then further. At that time there were certain persons in custody in Ireland under the suspension of *Habeas Corpus*, or the Coercion Act, and the representative Irishmen who consulted with the hon. member agreed that he should propose this:

"We would further respectfully pray that your Majesty would be graciously pleased to take into your Majesty's favorable consideration the cases of those persons who are now suffering imprisonment in

Ireland charged with political offences, with a view to extending to them your Most Gracious Majesty's royal clemency, so that with their release, the inestimable blessings of civil liberty may be once more restored to all parts of your Majesty's Empire."

Clearly this last prayer for the restoration of civil liberty to Ireland was a prayer for the suspension or repeal of the Coercion Act. Now, Sir, in the motion that was actually proposed, we find this:

"We would further express the hope that the time has come when Your Majesty's clemency may, without injury to the interests of the United Kingdom, be extended to those persons who are now imprisoned in Ireland charged with political offences only, and the inestimable blessings of personal liberty restored to them."

This was merely a request that Her Majesty would be pleased to exercise clemency to those individuals who were imprisoned, and justly so, so far as you could infer from the words of the motion itself. The leader of the Opposition objected to these changes of wording. He said:

"Now, I heard the hon. gentleman's resolution with some regret, for one reason that I find it emasculated. I find it very much weaker than the resolution which he put on the paper in the first instance. In some particulars it does not legislatively suit my view. He has fallen into something like the error ascribed to Mr. Gladstone, and not willing myself to repeat that error, I would prefer to vote for the best resolution we can get. Yet, I will vote with reluctance for the measure which hypothetically refers to the grant of a measure of self-government to Ireland. The hon. gentleman says, in his altered resolution:

"'And we would venture to express a hope that if consistent with the integrity and well-being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority are fully protected and secured, sure means may be found of meeting the express desire of so many of your Irish subjects in that regard.

"'We would further express a hope that the time has come when Your Majesty's clemency may, without injury to the interests of the United Kingdom, be extended to those persons who are now imprisoned in Ireland, charged with political offences only, and the inestimable blessing of personal liberty restored to them."

"We have no idea that the rights and interests of the minority will be other than fully protected and secured. I believe that its best security is to be found in a united Irish people, managing their own affairs. I say that the possession of such a measure is essential to the maintenance of the Empire. There ought to be no ifs or ands in the expression of the views of the Canadian people upon this most important subject. It is only upon the theory, only upon the strong view that the possession of such a law is essential to the integrity of the Empire that we can agitate or act with effect in dealing with this matter. I am not disposed to deal with this question with ifs and ands. I am willing to advise conciliatory measures and ample justice to Ireland. I should like the Canadian people, through their representatives in Parliament, to say to the Imperial Government politely, that in their opinion, as four millions of British subjects, they believe that the integrity of the Empire demands self-government for Ireland."

So much in reference to the people who were imprisoned. The leader of the Opposition objected to acting hypothetically in regard to them, urging that the right of *habeas corpus* should be recognised by this House. I have proven by the authority of the leader of the House, that a motion to go into Committee of Supply is not a proper occasion to bring up a motion of this kind. I have proven, by the authority of the Minister of Inland Revenue, that it is proper to propose to this House, not only a motion of which no notice has been given, but still more, a motion different from that of which notice had been given, and therefore a much greater surprise to the House than a totally new motion could be. But then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) has declared that this motion is brought up for political purposes. If the Minister of Inland Revenue will admit that he was moved by political motives when he introduced his resolution in 1882, then he may agree that we have political motives in bringing up this question now. If the hon. gentleman is not willing to admit that he cannot charge anyone on this side with that offence, for it is absurd to say such a motion must necessarily be made for political purposes. This is not a party question, it is not a national question; it is a question just as vital to the people of Canada, just as germane to their interests as to those of the people of Ireland, and it is just as natural for a motion in regard to it to come from a Canadian as from an Irishman. It is not an Irish motion. The Minister of Inland Revenue has tried to make it an Irish motion, and has endeavored to constitute himself the head and front of the movement in favor of Home Rule in Ireland, and he considers it should be necessarily conducted and supported by Irishmen. It is a Canadian national movement; it is just as much a Canadian movement as an Irish movement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CASEY. I notice a few hon. members on the other side of the House make remarks suggesting dissent from what I say. If they wish to say they are not in favor of Home Rule, I deny their right to call themselves loyal Canadians. I deny the right of any man in Canada who is not in favor of Home Rule to call himself a loyal Canadian.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CASEY. Some hon. gentlemen are again making dulcet noises, but the only inference I can draw is, that they do not think Home Rule is a necessary belief for a Canadian. I hope they will prove my mistake in that respect on a later occasion, if I have made a mistake. I cannot resume my seat without referring to a statement made by the Minister of Inland Revenue in regard to his telegram. He said by that telegram he had made every Irishman in the House responsible for and as giving their adhesion to and re-endorsation of his former resolution. What Irishmen on this side did he consult about that telegram? He never consulted me.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not say that I made every hon. gentleman responsible. I said I presumed to act on the authority of every Irishman.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman had no right to presume to act for any Irishman he had not consulted. I have declared, and I will declare on Thursday, my endorsation of the resolution; but I dispute the right of any hon. gentleman to speak for all Irishmen as to the terms in which a message of that kind is conveyed until the hon. gentleman has consulted those members. No doubt he consulted with his friends on that side of the House as to the terms of that telegram. Why didn't he ask those whom he had asked to advise on the former resolution, to advise him in framing the terms of that telegram, and advise as to whether such a telegram should be sent? I argue that an expression of this House, composed of men of all nationalities, will have infinitely greater weight than even the representations of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and that the telegram of any individual Minister, is not the sort of manifesto that we should send to the representatives of the people of England. I argue that a motion is a better way of acting than by telegram. He wants to know what was the great haste. He suggests that it is because of his telegram that we are in such a hurry to take up this matter. Well, I am afraid that he is attaching too much importance in his own mind to that telegram. I have no doubt the minds of these members of the Liberal party who intended to support a motion of this kind was made up long before they heard of that telegram.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Then if it was not a political move, why were we not informed of it, if you made up your minds long ago?

Mr. CASEY. I did not say that we had made up our minds long ago to propose a resolution. I said that the minds of the members of the Liberal party were quite as clearly made up to support a motion of this kind as they were to-day, and it is quite as evident that the hon. gentleman's mind is not as clear with reference to this matter just now as it was some time ago. He says there is no change in him since 1882, but it looks as if there was. He was then eager to rush into the fray, to ask the advice of hon. gentlemen on both sides, and I do him the credit that he did ask the advice: he was eager to have a motion passed on this subject. Is there no change

in the mind of a man who was then so eager to have a motion of this kind proposed, and who now refuses to propose such a motion? I believe the hon. gentleman is unchanged in his adherence to the principle of Home Rule, though he has lost his courage. I hope matters will be so arranged that we will have a full, free and untrammelled discussion of the proposition we have before us on a subsequent and early day. There is need for haste, even although the Bill should not come up in the English House of Commons until the 10th, as the Premier says. We cannot expect that a resolution of this kind will take effect immediately; there should be some time for it to sink into the minds of the English House of Commons, and affect them, as we hope it will, and, therefore, the day on which we are to discuss this question should be as early as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say to remove any misapprehension that my proposition was a plain and simple one, and it was this, that if this motion was withdrawn we would give the hon. gentleman an early opportunity—any day after to-morrow he chooses—to move it as a substantive motion.

M. BLAKE. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that. I understood the hon. gentleman's only objection to be the fact that he had not notice. I naturally supposed after his making a statement of the kind he has made here, after his making it in that clear manner, that this motion should be moved in the same manner and under the same circumstances in which the motion was made in 1882, with his approval and consent and in the same manner and circumstances under which he moved his motion on the grave constitutional question in the Letellier case on going into Supply, with the object which the hon. gentleman clearly stated in answer to the hon. member for East York, as a reason why it was preferable to take that course. My hon. friend from Elgin has read the First Minister's statement of those reasons which he smiles at now, though he then thought, and I still think, they were very good and fair reasons. I could hardly have supposed, having regard to these two important precedents, the one of the hon. gentleman himself when leader of the Opposition, and the other of the hon. member for Victoria, the Minister of Inland Revenue, under his auspices and with his assent as the leader of the Government, that he was objecting to the same form of discussion in the same circumstances. I certainly understood him to be proposing that I should have the same opportunity as I have to-night, on Thursday or on any day but Wednesday. It now turns out that there was a misunderstanding and that the hon. gentleman's proposal was that this motion should be exposed to the perils which he described so graphically on the occasion of his refusal to submit his motion to similar perils in the Letellier case. I am placed therefore in an awkward position, having, as I say, a very great deal of respect for the reasons and the views he then pressed. But I have to add to the consideration of the case the magnitude of this cause, the great importance of it and the earnest desire which I entertain that that result will be accomplished which the Minister of Inland Revenue foreshadowed as possible, of obtaining a unanimous vote, and that cause being dearer to me than any other thing, I am determined to encounter all those risks and disasters, and therefore I accept the hon. gentleman's proposal, and with the leave of the House, will withdraw my motion, on the understanding that it stands as a notice of motion, to be the first notice for Thursday, the day the hon. gentleman fixed; and I add to that, in response to the statement of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and to the suggestion rather than the statement of the First Minister, that if there be any opportunity in the meantime to accommodate members with reference to the form of expression of that motion, I shall be only too glad to facilitate such a happy result.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad the hon. gentleman has taken my advice in the matter, and has agreed to withdraw his motion. But I do not like the hon. gentleman. I am rather surprised at the hon. gentleman's statement that he did not gather from me that I desired that it should be withdrawn for the purpose of its being made a substantive motion, for if I did not use plain words on that occasion then I never used plain words. I used the word substantive, and I said if the hon. gentleman will move it any day he likes, or give notice, or will accept notice now—for that purpose I will agree as leader of the Government to set aside every Government measure; and if that is so, he could not move it on going into Supply.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If it is not out of order I wish to say a few words. Whatever difference of opinion may exist between the hon. gentleman and myself, I feel much pleased that he has taken this course, as I think it is the wisest course and one calculated to bring about, if possible, a solution of this question. I am glad the hon. gentleman has taken the course he has.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose that on the adjournment the hon. gentleman will make a motion that this shall stand as the first order on Thursday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Amendment withdrawn.

TIMBER LICENSES, &c., IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you leave the Chair I desire to place in your hands a resolution expressing regret that the independence of this Parliament has been impaired by the conduct of the Government in various respects, in its administration of the public trusts of this country. A government, Sir, under free institutions, rules by the consent of the governed. The members of the administration of a country are the stewards of the people, and as stewards should discharge their trust with an eye to the interest of the whole body of the people. As agents they are not entitled to embezzle or misappropriate the public funds or public property, but they are bound to conserve the interests of their principals, and administer their trusts honestly, and in the interest of the people. For instance, the duty of a government with regard to levying taxes is to require from the people, the payment of so much money as may be necessary for the economical and efficient administration of the public affairs of the country. When this limit is exceeded and when larger sums are wrung from the people in the form of taxation, and the money so paid by the people is expended recklessly, extravagantly or corruptly, then the government fails to discharge its duty as the public steward, and is guilty of an act that should receive the condemnation of the people. So, Sir, with regard to public property, the government is the custodian of a great variety of interests. The Government of this country, in addition to its functions in levying taxes, is in possession of a great public domain. It administers the landed estates of this nation, one of the greatest public domains possessed by any people in the world, it administers the timber domains of this country; and these various trusts which are entrusted to the care of the Government, should be dealt with by it in a spirit of honesty, in a spirit designed to secure the advantage, not of favorites or friends of the Government, but the advantage of the whole people to whom this property belongs, and for whom the Government is administering it. The stewards who embezzle for their own benefit, and in their own behalf, the public property, will not be likely to raise objections to the embezzlement of public property by others. If a member of Parliament accepts for himself an unjust advantage, the cost of that unjust advantage in his own case is a loss to the

country: for, having accepted himself, he is not in a position to raise the voice of protest, though every man in the House should be a transgressor in the same line. For this reason the people's interest demands that their representatives in Parliament should be truly independent men. It has been found in the history of free governments that the importance of having independent members of Parliament, members free from the control of the government, members honest in the discharge of their duties, cannot be overestimated. In fact, Sir, without an independent Parliament, it is impossible to maintain free institutions. The fact that a Parliament is under corrupting influences is a menace to the liberties of the people whose interests are in the hands of that Parliament. But, Sir, a corrupt government cannot carry on its operations with a free and independent Parliament; it is essential to a corrupt government that it should be supported by a servile Parliament; and for that reason all corrupt governments have found it necessary, in order to carry on their operations, to debase and corrupt Parliament, to impair its independence by the use of corrupting measures and means. Now, when this policy is adopted, the country adopting it has at once yawning before it an immeasurable abyss of concession and demand—of concession on the part of the government for the purpose of debauching Parliament, and of demand on the part of corrupted members for favors from the government. If we look back for a moment over past history, we shall find that the disregard of the people's rights in England ought to possess for us at this juncture great interest. When Charles I sought to subvert the liberties of England, he strove to get along without the use of a Parliament at all. Under Strafford, with his policy of Thorough, the attempt was made to organise and maintain a standing army, and to raise the revenue necessary for this purpose without calling on Parliament to impose taxes. Various schemes and devices were resorted to to raise taxes without the intervention of Parliament, such as ship money. When John Hampden resisted the payment of a few shillings of unjust taxes, and carried his case to the highest courts of England, and spent thousands of pounds in fighting the king and his unjust exactions, he was thought by Strafford to be a fanatic, and Strafford expressed a desire that all individuals like Hampden should be whipped into a sense of their duty. The result of this struggle was that Parliament triumphed; the attempt to rule England without a Parliament was a failure; Strafford was executed, Archbishop Laud met with a fate that is a warning to all prelates of his character, and Charles I was himself brought to the block; and the right of Parliament in England to levy taxes, and to exercise its functions within its own legitimate sphere, was vindicated and maintained. Then, Sir, more refined methods were resorted to. Charles II, surrounded by worthless men and more worthless women, resorted to the policy of corrupting Parliament by direct bribes to members of money and offices of profit. This evil went on increasing until, after the revolution of 1690, a great popular ferment broke out in consequence of placemen being in Parliament, in consequence of corruption, in consequence of the House of Commons becoming a mere junto to record the decrees of the court. In 1695 an investigation was demanded. A parliamentary committee, headed by Thomas Wharton, investigated the affairs of Parliament. Sir John Trevor was expelled for receiving money, not to promote Bills in his own behalf, as is done in this Parliament, but for receiving money to promote Bills for others. The Duke of Leeds was impeached, and died in disgrace for exercising similar tactics to those that have been exercised since nearer to us, I venture to say, than the British House of Commons. After that came the corruption that existed in the days of Walpole and in the days of Newcastle; and at last an Independence of Parliament Act was passed which forbade any members of the House of Commons receiving emoluments from the Crown except as a Minister of the Crown. We have an Independence of Parliament Act of the same character. We have an Act on our Statute-book which provides that any member of this House entering into a contract with the Crown and receiving emoluments from the Crown, shall be liable to a fine of $2,000 for every day he sits and votes in this House. Will any man of this House venture to say that the spirit of that Independence Act is not daily violated in this House? Will any member venture to say that infractions of the spirit of that law are not of daily occurrence, and that hon. members who occupy seats here are not guilty of greater infractions of that law in its spirit than if they had contracts with the Government for public works. Will we be told that the member who receives a timber limit, that the member who receives a colonisation grant, that the member who receives a coal land lease, that the member who receives a pasture land lease, that the member who receives a railway charter, and then goes hawking that charter about, seeking parties who will build the road and pay him a handsome price for his influence and his charter—will any member say that these men are not guilty of violations of the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act, and that members of Parliament can be guilty of these acts and at the same time retain a spirit of independence and act as independent members of Parliament? We have in this House, I will not venture to say how many members who are interested in railway subsidies, or in railways that have received subsidies, and who have voted for these subsidies.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

M. CHARLTON. You will have the names in good time. There are Ministers of the Crown in this House, there are private members here, who are interested in railways that have received government bonuses; millions of dollars have been voted, which are devoted to advancing the interests of members of this House, associated with other individuals in promoting railway enterprises. We have members here forming railway companies; we have had recently transactions revealed in regard to a road, of which the president, and every member of the directorate, is a member of this House, in which there is not a dollar of capital invested, of which the stock is bogus stock, placed in the hands of the president to enable him to manipulate the concern. These members received a charter from the Government, carrying with it a land grant of 6,400 acres per mile. Was that not engaging in a contract with the Government more nefarious than if they had made a contract to perform a public work? This case is but a type of many others. Members of this House are engaged in procuring speculative charters, without the intention or the purpose or the ability to construct one mile of road, and placing these charters upon the market, hawking them about, resorting to the usual low, disreputable methods connected with railway steals. There is not a greater depth of infamy in business transactions in America than the infamy connected with railway construction, and members of this House are engaged in railway brokerage of a nature as infamous as any in the history of railway manipulations.

An hon. MEMBER. Steel rails.

Mr. CHARLTON. And we have had here very recently the open washing of dirty linen. We have had exposed a quarrel over the subsidies connected with one of these railway corporations; and we have had what is worse. We have had the Government taking part in this quarrel, giving sanction to this crime, selecting its favorites out of the number of those engaged in the quarrel, and carrying his interest through this House upon a division. The spectacle of the Government of this country sullying its reputa-

tion by associating itself with a transaction of this kind, is indeed a most lamentable spectacle. It is said in Holy Writ——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not wonder that any reference to Holy Writ should provoke derisive cheers and laughter from the other side.

An hon. MEMBER. Coming from that source.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is said in Holy Writ that "wherever the carcase is, thither will the eagles be gathered." It is the nation that is the prey in this case, around which the eagles are gathered. What are they engaged in doing? They are engaged in squandering millions of public money; they are engaged in piling up a gigantic debt which reaches to-day at least $250,000,000, or double that of the United States per capita, a debt that has increased 250 per cent. since the Confederation of the Provinces, while our population has increased but 38 per cent.; they have been engaged in running up the expenditure of the country from $13,000,000 to $35,000,000, or an increase of 250 per cent. against an increase in population of 38 per cent. And while we have a deficit staring us in the face of many millions, these gentlemen have imposed on the country a measure which will cost annually from $500,000 to $750,000 for the purpose of so arranging the electoral list of the country so as to retain themselves in power. They have spent millions in railway subsidies, granted mainly to their favorites; they have granted pasture land leases at one cent an acre; they have granted coal land leases and monopolies to their favorites, following the train of which will be dear fuel for the settler, and large dividends for their friends; they have made colonisation grants at half price, practically, to their friends, while the settler is required to pay the full price; and they have granted timber limits, year after year, without competition. The applicants for timber limits have come in swarms; they have flown like doves to the window from which the favors of the Government have been dispensed. Members of Parliament, brothers of members of Parliament, sons of members of Parliament, nephews of members of Parliament, cousins of members of Parliament—the faithful and deserving of every kind, every station, and every degree, have been the recipients of those favors at the hands of the Government; and hundreds, I had almost said thousands, of limits have been granted to the faithful without competition. In secret an empire has been bartered away, a great trust placed in the hands of the Administration has been squandered for political purposes and bestowed upon political favorites. These gentlemen have an eagle eye for the prey, and the nation's property, I repeat, is the carcase about which the eagles are gathered. The honor of the country, even quotations from Holy Writ, are the laughing stock of these gentlemen; and it is but natural such should be the case. Now, in every part of the Government's policy—in its policy with regard to timber limits; in its policy with regard to railway bonuses granted to members; in its policy with regard to pasture land leases; in its policy with regard to coal land leases, to colonisation grants—in all these things the policy of the Government will be defended. The Minister of the Interior will rise in his place ere long, and defend the Government in all these things; others upon that side will defend them. I wonder if Solomon, long ago, with his prophetic eye, had our Parliament in view when he penned that memorable phrase: "Such is the way with the adulterous woman; she eateth and wipeth her mouth, and sayeth I have done no wickedness." So with these hon. gentlemen. They will eat the substance of the nation, they will wipe their mouth and get up in the House of Commons and say we have done no wickedness.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. You will. They believe the apathy of the nation is so great that they can outrage decency in any manner they please. The scenes that transpired here last night would seem to indicate that they believe the nation cannot be aroused, that they can venture to do anything, and their followers will follow them with blind devotion. Yes, Sir, they imagine that the nation is dead, dead under the beaks of the eagles that are gathered together to the prey; and I often wonder may not this be the case? Will neither shame for the shameless conduct of this Government, nor interest in our own behalf as a people, interest in having our property preserved for us and our rights respected, nor regard for the glorious past through which our ancestors have vindicated their right to be a free people, nor hope for the future that lies before us; will none of these things induce the people of Canada to rouse themselves from their lethargy, to rouse themselves from their apathy, and rebuke the men who have for years, in this House of Commons, in administering the affairs of this country, done despite to every principle of justice and to every principle of decency in the management of public affairs. Now, in dealing with the timber limit question, it will be charged, no doubt——

Mr. ORTON. Give some instances?

Mr. CHARLTON. I will give some instances, and the name of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Orton) will figure among the instances; they are coming. It will be charged, no doubt, that the Mackenzie Government gave licenses without competition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I heard that responded to by the "hear, hear" on the opposite side. Well, we must bear in mind, in examining this question, that the circumstances of the case between 1874 and 1878 and the circumstances of the case at the present day in the North-West differ widely. The policy of granting timber limits in the North-West under the Mackenzie Government was avowedly a temporary policy, and it was resorted to because competition could not be obtained. The propriety of competition was fully recognised by the Mackenzie Government, it was attempted to obtain competition, and the licenses granted by that Government were strictly limited to the needs of the country, and were granted only to those who were prepared to produce lumber for the settlers of the North-West. Not a speculative license was granted, not one. The licenses, I repeat, were *bonâ fide* licenses, granted to individuals who wished to commence the production of lumber for the settlers of the North-West. But, when railways reached the North-West, when the settlement of that country had fairly commenced, the conditions of the country, it is obvious to any hon. gentleman in this House, were changed, and, with the opening up of the country, with the change of government, the policy of making grants of timber licenses or limits was no longer confined, as under the Mackenzie Administration, to the actual requirements of the country. In place of limiting the licenses granted to men who actually designed entering upon the business of producing lumber, licenses were granted to speculators, knowingly granted to speculators. The Government knew it was granting licenses and Orders in Council, in ten instances at least, to speculators, where it was issuing licenses to produce lumber in one instance. It knew that its friends were coming to it in hundreds, in order to obtain Orders in Council without the intention of erecting mills or producing lumber. Now, if we had been left without action on the part of the Reform party during the interim between Mr. Mackenzie's retirement from the Government and the present day, the plea might be set up with great

plausibility. I admit, that the course of the Mackenzie Government gave a precedent to this Government for the course it has adopted; but the Reform party in his House and in this country took a position that left no doubt of their policy upon this question. The leader of this party, with characteristic prescience, in March, 1832, as will be found recorded in the Votes and Proceedings of 1782, page 278, introduced into this House the following resolution:—

"Moved by Mr. Blake, that in the opinion of this House the existing system of granting timber limits is liable to result in gross abuse, and in the cession of valuable interests in the public domain for inadequate consideration to favored individuals; that it is expedient to apply the just principle of public competition to the granting of timber limits."

This motion was moved on the 27th March, 1832. The time had come, in the opinion of the leader of the Opposition in this House, to define what the Reform party considered to be the true and proper policy with regard to timber limits. The Reform party took the proper ground. They took that ground whenever the evil became apparent that there was a speculative movement in timber limits. The Tory party also deliberately chose its own position. It did not accord with the principles of the Reform party, as formulated by this resolution of its leader, but it opposed this resolution, and voted it down by a strict party vote. There are clearly laid down the respective principles of the two parties: the principle of the Reform party, embodied in the resolution of its leader, and the principle of the Tory party, embodied in its action in voting down that resolution by a strict party vote. Since that action, no question can be raised as to the respective principles of these two parties. Since that resolution was moved in the House of Commons in 1882, the Reform party stands squarely and broadly on the principle that public competition should be invited in all cases where the public domain or timber limits are to be dealt with.

In parcelling out these timber limits, the Government, after the disputed territory had been awarded to the Province of Ontario, divided up and parcelled out the entire area of that disputed territory to its favorites, and the most of this plunder for you can characterise it by no other name, was granted after Mr. Blake's motion in 1882. It was the evident, and in fact the avowed design of this Government to deprive the people of Ontario of their property; not only to adopt a policy which would rob the people at large of a large portion of their property in timber, but also to rob one of the Provinces of this Dominion of its right to a property which had been awarded to it. Sir John A. Macdonald said not a stick of that timber should go to Ontario, said this after the award, after he knew that this public domain belonged to Ontario; and the design of the Government was clearly evinced and acted upon to give that property, the timber resources of Ontario, so far as they pertained to the disputed territory, to its own favorites, and rob the Province of Ontario of it.

This mad policy of squandering this portion of the public domain has continued from the day this Government took office to the present moment, and, down to the year 1885—we have no returns of a later period than February, 1885, though one was promised this Session which has not come down yet—in round numbers 25,000 square miles of the timber area of this Dominion had been granted to the favorites of this Government without competition; and this had been done in spite of and in the face of the continued remonstrance of the Reformers in this House and in this country. At every step the Government has taken in this matter, the Liberal party in this House has protested against its action and has pointed out the evil results which would flow from this betrayal of its trusts. Yet the party persists in its course. Now I suppose my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior will lay stress upon the fact that there has been competition, that there has been private competition, that in cases where two or more friends of the Government applied for the same limit, the Government has permitted these applicants to have a private shake amongst themselves, to see which would give the most for the limit, in order to placate its friends and settle the question amicably. Well, that is a kind of competition that does not fill the bill. Three or four men apply for the same limit, and arrange among themselves who may have it. I find, in looking at the bonuses for limits granted under such circumstances, that they are usually insignificant, perhaps a dollar a mile, and in some case rising to $5 a mile; and the only case in which respectable bonuses have been given, so far as I have noticed, were some nine or ten limits in the Bow River district, taken by Americans. As they did not belong to the family compact, they were permitted to pay something like $110 or $120 a mile, but wherever the bidding was between friends of the Government, they were enabled to secure these limits at very little cost.

It will also be urged, I have no doubt, that the Government regulations with regard to timber limits, are much more favorable to the country than the regulations of either Quebec or Ontario; that the ground rent is higher; that while the ground rent in Ontario and Quebec is $2 per mile, the Dominion licenses are $5 per mile. It will also be urged that the Crown dues are higher, that 5 per cent. upon the value of the lumber produced is more than 75 cents or $1 per thousand specific due. Now, the question is not what the regulations are, no fault has been found with the regulations. The issue is: Ought the Government—as has been done by the Governments of Ontario and Quebec, having fixed regulations that apply to these timber limits—to have put these limits upon the market subject to these regulations, and ask competition, and for the highest bidder, for these limits? Ought it to have invited public competition, or ought it to have distributed these limits, as it has done, upon private application from its friends? I maintain that these limits ought, as in the case of Ontario, to have been put up at public auction; the regulations applied uniformly to all limits granted, whatever their location or advantages. One would probably be worth more than another; one would have a greater amount of timber than another; one would have a more favorable situation than another; one limit might fetch but a small bonus, and another might fetch a large bonus, and the Government in refusing to place these limits at competition, has deprived itself of a large revenue. Have we any proofs of that? I think we have. We have the case of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), who obtained a limit, as he says for friends, in the Cypress Hills, for $250, and straightway sold it for $100,000. If that limit had been put up at auction the Government, in place of receiving $250 would have received $100,000. We have the case of some limits on Hunter's Island that were sold to Chicago parties for $650,000, and that cost the holders $7,500. I think we have a case in which the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) is interested in some limits on Red Deer River, where one of the confederates received a power of attorney to sell these limits, four I believe in number, and did sell them, as is reported, for $100,000, and put the proceeds in his own pocket, and a suit is now pending, it is said, in the courts of Minnesota in which the members for Middlesex (Mr. Macmillan) and Victoria are plaintiffs, and their confederate, a gentleman by the name of Dawes, is the respondent. Whether this is true or not, I do not know. Now, I have in my hand a return brought down this Session consisting of about 12,000 pages of foolscap, mostly correspondence in connection with the granting of timber licenses. It is rather larger than the one the hon. gentleman for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) piled on my seat last Session—about four times as large. I have gone through it carefully, and some of the results of that investigation I will give to the House later on. But with regard to the assignment of leases, with regard to the question as to whether the Government, in refusing to put these limits up at competition, has neglected the interests of the country and

lost revenue, I call attention to some statements made in this return. Here are the names of a few assigners and assignors, with the consideration granted:

Assignor.	Assignee.	Consideration.
Donald Gunne.	E. P. Leacock.	$ 4,300 00
E. P. Leacock.	Thomas Renwick.	25,000 00
James Kent.	H. S. Strathy.	not given
Joseph Shareman.	A. W. Ross.	300 00
E. P. Leacock.	Thomas Renwick.	25,000 00
A. W. Ross.	H. S. Strathy.	75,000 00
D. McFadden.	Germyn & Bolton.	9,000 00
Thomas Wells.	H. B. Beard.	8,000 00
Jos. G. Dawes.	Andrew R. Potter.	8,000 00
John Taylor, Smith & Muir.	Wm. J. Bishopp.	10,000 00
	Keewatin Lumbering and Manufacturing Company, Limited.	1,000 00

There are a lot of transactions where the licenses were transferred for $1 and "other valuable considerations." That is the character of most of these returns, the probability being that these gentlemen thought it expedient to conceal the amount received or paid, consequently making their entry of the assignment as if for $1 "and other valuable considerations." Here are cases, one for $75,000, two for $25,000, one for $11,960, for $9,000, for $8,000 in two cases, and so on. These cases are contained in this one return where limits granted by the Government at $5 per mile have changed hands for these large sums. There is the case I have referred to of the member for Lincoln getting a $100,000 limit for $250; the case on Hunter's Island, a limit worth $650,000 being got for $7,500. In most cases the character and amount paid in these transactions are concealed, but these glimpses we are permitted to have are enough to convince this House, if it is open to conviction, are enough to convince this country, that the policy of the Government with regard to timber limits has not been in the public interest, and has not been an honest policy. Now, Sir, look for a moment at the contrast between the policy of this Government and that of the Province of Ontario Since 1870 that Province has placed 7,986 miles of timber territory under license, and it has received bonuses on those transactions as follows: In 1871, 467 miles brought bonuses of $117,000; in 1872, 4,592 miles brought bonuses of $531,000; in 1877, 438 miles brought bonuses of $78,136; in 1881, 1,412 miles brought $730,000; in 1885, 1,057 miles brought $326,000, or 7,986 miles brought bonuses of $1,785,000. Under Orders in Council this Dominion has placed under license over three times that amount of land, and has received bonuses scarcely amounting practically to nothing. This is a sufficient commentary upon the failure of hon. gentlemen opposite to discharge their trust properly, in refusing the demand of the motion made by the leader of the Opposition in this House, in March, 1882, when he declared that the policy of granting timber limits without competition was a vicious one and ought to be abandoned. Now, Sir, my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. Orton), a few moments ago, wanted to know some of the names. As I do not desire to place a whole return in *Hansard* I have prepared a short statement containing a few of the entries for timber limits, amounting to 600, that I have culled from three returns, and there is yet one year to be heard from, and that, probably, one of the worst years, namely, from February, 1885, to February, 1886:

Members of House of Commons and Senate who have received Timber Limits by Order in Council for themselves.

HYP. MONTPLAISIR, M.P.—
Order in Council for self, N. Saskatchewan, 50 miles. O. C. for self, Rainy Lake, 50 miles, Dec. 17, 1883.

C. C. COLBY, M.P.—
O. C. for self, 50 miles, Jan. 3, 1883.

HON. G. W. HOWLAN—
O. C. for self, 50 miles, Woody River, March 23, 1883. O. C. for self, 50 miles, Birch River, April 29, 1883.

M. K. DICKINSON, M.P.—
O. C. for self, Little Swan River, July 24, 1882.

JOHN WHITE, M.P.—
O. C. for self, Smoky Lake, 50 miles, March 23, 1883. O. C. for self, N. Saskatchewan, 50 miles, April 29, 1884.

HON. WM. MUIRHEAD—
O. C. for self, 50 miles, Woody River, Man., Oct. 3, 1882. O. C. for self, 50 miles, Porcupine Hills, April 30, 1884.

JOHN ROCHESTER, M.P. (application when a member)—
O. C. for self, 50 miles, Manitoba, June 30, 1882.

L. MCCALLUM, M.P.—
O. C. for self, 50 miles, Birch Lake, Alberta, May 15, 1884.

DUNCAN MACMILLAN, M.P.—
O. C. for self, 50 miles, Waskeu Bay, Man., April 17, 1882.

J. B. DAOUST, M.P. (letter to Sir John, April 18, 1882, asking for support)—
O. C. for J. B. Daoust & Co., 50 miles, Pigeon River, May 3, 1883.

H. A. WARD, M.P.—
O. C. for self, 50 miles, Red Deer River, Nov. 1, 1883.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He was not a member at that time.

Mr. CHARLTON. He was not, but he was a prospective member, and was treated by the Government to favors for their good boys. Many of those names I shall read.

C. E. HICKEY, M.P. (co-applicant with Wm. Brodeur)—
O. C. for self and partner, 50 miles, Lake Kogwankok, Man., April 30, 1884.

WM. ELLIOTT, ex-M.P.—
O. C. for self, 50 miles, Jackfish River, April 24, 1883.

HON. A. W. OGILVIE—
O. C. for self, 50 miles, May 9, 1883.

OSCAR FULTON, ex-M.P.—
O. C. 50 miles, N. Saskatchewan, March 24, 1884.

When I spoke in Milton last January I referred to Mr. Blain in this connection, and he denounced me as a liar for having said that he had obtained an Order in Council. I find, however, as follows:—

DAVID BLAIN, ex-M.P.—
Application for self, March 12, 1885. O. C. for self, 50 miles, Hunter's Island, Aug. 1, 1885. License issued to Blain, Oct. 24, 1884. Recorded in Liber A, folio 127 and 128.

L. H. MASSUE, M.P.—
O.C. for self, 50 miles, Lake Dauphin, Man., Feb. 3, 1883.

Here are eighteen members of the House of Commons who have Orders in Council—honest members of the House who have had the honesty to face the music themselves, who made application and got their Order in Council like little men. There are others who have used stool pigeons and obtained orders in other names. I have traced one or two, and I am satisfied there are a good many more. We now come to—

Members of Local Legislatures who have received Orders in Council for themselves.

H. ROBILLARD, M.P.P.—
O.C for self, 50 miles, Keewatin, Aug. 24, 1883.

LOUIS DUHAMEL, M.P.P., Hull, Que.—
O.C. for self, Sturgeon River, 50 miles, Mar. 18, 1880.

G. W. MONCK, M.P.P.—
O.C. for self, 50 miles, Manitoba, May 21, 1884.

LOUIS TELLIER, M.P.P., Quebec—
O.C., 50 miles, Dauphin River, Man.

HENRI G. MALHIOT, M.P.P., Quebec—
O.C, 50 miles, West Shore Lake, Winnipeg.

H. MONTPLAISIR, M.P.P., Quebec—
O.C., 50 miles, Dec. 17, 1883.

A. T. ROSS, M.P.P., Cornwall—
O.C., 50 miles, Keewatin, for self and brother, Mar. 14, 1882.

Then there is a long list—

Members of the House of Commons and Senate who have applied for Limits successfully in behalf of friends.

S. R. HESSON, M.P.—
Application for H. Symons (son-in-law), June 23, 1882. O.C. to H. Symons, 50 miles, July, 28, 1882. Application for James Robb (editor local paper) O.C. to James Robb, 50 miles, Nov. 22, 1882. Application for S. S Fuller (Stratford), April 14, 1882. O.C. to S. S. Fuller, 48 miles, Manitoba, Dec. 15, 1882. Application for J. Graydon Smith (Stratford). July 23, 1883. O.C. to J. Graydon Smith, 50 miles, Keewatin, Aug. 11, 1883. Application for Wm. Morton (Wellesly, Ont), May 10, 1883. O.C. to Wm. Morton, 50 miles, Sturgeon River, June 7, 1883. Application for James T. Woods (Stratford), Mar. 15, 1883. O.C. to James T. Woods, 50 miles, Keewatin, Aug. 11, 1883.

C. H. MACKINTOSH, M.P.—
Application for Henry Large (Ottawa), May 9, 1882. O.C. to Henry La-ge, 50 miles, Beaver River.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Was I a member of the House when I made that recommendation.

Mr. CHARLTON. The application was dated 9th May, 1882.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I was not even nominated then. I would not do it now.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am quite willing to give the hon. gentleman credit for having seen the error of his ways and turned to a better course. That is one of the most severe rebukes the Government have received this Session.

HECTOR CAMERON, M.P.—
Promoted application of P. A. McLean (Toronto). O. C. to P. A. McLean, 50 miles, Lake Winnipegoosis, Jan. 12, 1883. Promoted application of John Bain (Toronto), telegram, Dec. 22, 1883. O. C. to John Bain, 50 miles, Manitoba, Dec. 21, 1883. Application for Wm. McKenzie (Kirkfield, Ont.), Feb. 6, 1883. O. C. to Wm. McKenzie, 50 miles, Red Deer River, Feb. 12, 1883.

J. C. PATTERSON, M.P.—
Application for Stephen Knight, June 8, 1880. O. C. to Stephen Knight, 50 miles, April 17, 1882.

L. MCCALLUM, M.P.—
Application, telegram for McDonald, Latimer *et al*, Dunnville, Jan. 15, 1883. O. C. to A. McDonald, R. G. Latimore and Arch. McDonald, 50 miles, March 6, 1883. Care of correspondence for John Murphy (Stromness, Ont.), April 7, 1884. O. C. to John Murphy, 50 miles, Buck Lake Creek, May 15, 1884. Care of correspondence for W. H. Montague, M.D. (Welland), April 7, 1884. O. C. to W. H. Montague, M.D., 50 miles, Buck Lake Creek, May 15, 1884.

C. C. COLBY, M.P.—
Letter promoting application of J. S. McEwan, Winnipeg, and asking that O. C. notice be sent to him, Dec. 14, 1882. O. C. to J. S. McEwan, 50 miles, Battle River, Dec. 26, 1882.

HON. J. ROYAL, M.P.—
Application for Robt. and Peter George. O. C. to Robt. and Peter George, 50 miles, Jan. 29, 1883. Applications for Chas. de Cazes and Jas. Taillefer, July 15 and 31, and Aug. 18, 1882. O. C. to de Cazes and Taillefer, Oct. 3, 1882.

Mr. ROYAL. Where is the wrong?

Mr. CHARLTON. I don't suppose the hon. gentleman sees it.

J. C. RYKERT, M.P.—
Application for James Murray (St. Catharines). O. C. to James Murray, 50 miles, Swan River, July 5, 1882.

HON. JOHN COSTIGAN, M.P.—
Applies for extension of Major John Lewis permit, Feb. 21, 1882. Permit extended. Application, permit to cut ties, telegram, Feb. 6, 1882, letter May 15, 1882. Permit granted. Application for Hyp. Montplaisir, M.P., Oct. 18, 1883. O. C. to Hyp. Montplaisir, Dec. 17, 1883, 50 miles, Rainy Lake.

HON. GEO. W. HOWLAN—
Application for E. J. Dwyer (Kingston), April 24, 1883. O. C. to E. J. Dwyer, 50 miles, Swan Lake, June 5, 1883.

I believe that Dwyer is his wife's brother.

Mr. BERGIN. I may as well give the hon. gentleman the information that Mrs. Howlan's name was not Dwyer.

Mr. CHARLTON. Was it McGilvary?

Mr. BERGIN. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then I suppose that he had not that reason for making the application. I will hand in the dates of these applications, &c., to the *Hansard* reporters without reading them all.

HON. GEO. W. HOWLAN—
Application for Joseph McGilvary (Kingston), April 24, 1883. O.C. to Joseph McGilvary, 50 miles, Swan Lake, June 4, 1883. Application for Hon. W. Muirhead, Jan. 11, 1884. O.C. to Hon. W. Muirhead, 50 miles, Porcupine Hills, April 30, 1884.

M. K. DICKINSON, M.P.—
Application for G. L. Dickinson (his son), May 16, 1882. O.C. to G. L. Dickinson, 50 miles, Berens River, July 12, 1882. Application for W. B. Dickinson. O.C. to W. B. Dickinson, 50 miles, Peevie River, Dec. 24, 1883. Application for J. J. Burrows (Winnipeg), 56 Islands, May 7, 1883. O.C. to J. J. Burrows, 56 Islands, Lake Winnipeg, Oct. 27, 1883.

JOHN WHITE, M.P.—
Application for E. Rathbun. O.C. to E. Rathbun, 50 miles, Smoky Lake. Application for Shell River Colonisation Co O.C. to Shell River Colonization Co., 48 miles, Manitoba, Feb. 3, 1883. Care of application, E. A. de Bellefeuille, St. Eustache, Que. O.C. to E. A. de Bellefeuille, 50 miles, N. Saskatchewan, April 30, 1884. Transfer of limit from self to Joseph Green (Hamilton) O.C. to Joseph Green, 50 miles, Smoky Lake, April 30, 1884. Care application for James Elliott (Roslin, Ont.,) April 16, 1884. O.C. to James Elliott, 50 miles, N. Saskatchewan, April 30, 1884. Application for A. Forbes (Trenton), April 29, 1884. O.C. to A. Forbes, 50 miles, N. Saskatchewan, May 23, 1884.

T. S. SPROULE, M.P.—
Application for G. & J. N. Andrews, May 4, 1882. O.C. to G. & J. N. Andrews, 50 miles, May 11, 1882. Application for John C. Sproule, Aug. 23, 1882. O.C. to John C. Sproule, April 2, 1883.

Mr. COOK. Who is John C. Sproule?

Mr. CHARLTON. He is his brother.

DUNCAN MACMILLAN, M.P.—
Application for Thomas Wells, Ingersoll, letter, Nov. 27; telegram, Dec. 1, 1882. O.C. to Thomas Wells, 50 miles, Red Deer River, Oct. 3, 1883. Application for John Taylor (his partner), March 2, 1882. O.C. to John Taylor, 50 miles, Red Deer River, Oct. 3, 1883. Application for Joseph G. Dawes, Oct. 10, 1882. O.C. to Joseph G. Dawes, 50 miles, Red Deer River, Feb. 12, 1883. Application for Wm. McKenzie, Aug. 4, 1883. O.C. to Wm. McKenzie, 50 miles, in lieu of previous grant. Application for John G. McDonald (Hyde Park), April 16, 1884. O.C. to John G. McDonald, 50 miles, Red Deer River, April 3, 1884. Application for Joseph G. Dawes, and directions to send survey instructions to him, Feb. 20, 1883. O.C. to Joseph G. Dawes, 50 miles, Red Deer River, Aug. 4, 1883.

GEO. P. ORTON, M.P.—
Application for George D. Farmer, (Ancaster), Aug. 1, 1881. O.C. to Geo. D. Farmer, 50 miles, Swan River, July 12, 1882. Application for James Reynolds (Elora). O. C. to James Reynolds, 50 miles, N. Saskatchewan, May 10, 1882. Application for James Reynolds, April 27, 1883. O.C. to James Reynolds, 50 miles, Nut Lake, May 4, 1883. Application for George D. Farmer, April 2, 1884. O.C. to George D. Farmer, 50 miles, Rainy Lake, April 29, 1884. Application for R. G. Brett, Feb. 4, 1884. O.C. to R. G. Brett, 50 miles, Rainy Lake, April 29, 1884.

J. B. DAOUST, M.P.—
Application for Théophile Viau, Hull, Que. O.C. to Théophile Viau, 50 miles, Rainy Lake, May 23, 1884.

F. VANASSE, M.P.—
Application and recommending D. W. Smith as one of his supporters, July, 1882. O.C. to W. D. Smith (La Baie, Que.), 50 miles, Nov. 24, 1882. Application for J. M. Duguay. O.C. for J. M. Duguay, 50 miles, May 25, 1883.

HON MR. POPE, M.P.—
Sends his Private Secretary, May 11, 1882, to enquire if the application of (his nephew) W. W. Bailey, of Cookshire, Que., has been granted. O.C. to W. W. Bailey, 50 miles, Salt River, Man., Jan. 5, 1883.

THOS. SCOTT, M.P.—
Application for permit, for J. G. Hargrave, to cut wood, by numerous letters and telegrams. Permit to cut wood granted, Jan. 29, 1883.

HON. JOHN CARLING, M.P.
Care of application, J. R. Menhenick. O.C. to J. R. Menhenick, 50 miles, Alberta, May 10, 1883. Care of application, John Geary (London). O.C. to John Geary, 50 miles, Lake St. Anne, April 26, 1883. Application, A. W. Porte (London), Aug. 24, 1883. O.C. to A. W. Porte, 50 miles, Crooked Pine Creek, Oct. 27, 1883. Care of application, W. T. R. Street (London). O.C. to W. L. R. Street, 50 miles, Lake Ste. Anne, April, 17, 1883.

A. BOULTBEE, ex-M.P.—
Application for Aaron Squires (Rat Portage), July 12, 1883. O.C. to Aaron Squires, 50 miles, Eagle Lake, Dec. 1, 1883. Application for W. E. Cornell (Toronto), March 5, 1884 O.C. to W. E. Cornell, 50 miles, Rainy Lake, March, 1884. Application for E. J. Chauncey (Toronto), March 5, 1884. O.C. to E. J. Chauncey, 50 miles, Rainy Lake, March 20, 1884.

JOSEPH TASSÉ, M.P.—
Application for Pierre Durocher, Hull, Que. O.C. to Pierre Durocher, 50 miles, Pine Creek, Feb. 9, 1884. Care of application, Eugène Lecourt (Ottawa). O.C. to Eugène Lecourt, 50 miles, Hunter's Island, Oct. 27, 1883. Application for Raphael Longton. O.C. to Raphael Longton, 60 miles, Hunter's Island, Oct. 27, 1883.

F. E KILVERT, M.P.—
Application for H. D. Cameron, Hamilton, May 17, 1883. O.C. to H. D. Cameron, 50 miles N. Saskatchewan, May 30, 1883. Application for C. R. Smith and John Muir. O.C. to C. R. Smith and John Muir, 50 miles, Keewatin, Oct. 27, 1883. Application and care of correspondence for Robert Evans, Hamilton. O.C. to Robert Evans, 50 miles, Clearwater River, May 28, 1883. Care

of application of W. E. Sanford, Hamilton. O. C. to W. C. Sanford, 50 miles, Smoky River, March 6, 1883. Application for Jas. M Lotteridge, Hamilton, May 17, 1883. O. C. to Jas. M. Lotteridge, 50 miles, Clearwater River, May 30, 1883.

H. A. WARD, M.P.—
Application for Henry A. Reid. O. C. to Henry A. Reid, 50 miles, Carrot River, March 24, 1884. Care of application for W. R. Smith, Port Hope. O. C. to W. R Smith, 50 miles, Sturgeon River, Nov. 8, 1883. Care of application for Mrs. Herman Clark. O. C. to Mrs. Herman Clark, 50 miles, Carrot River, Mar. 24, 1884.

JOHN BRYSON, M.P.—
Application for C. A. McCool, Mattawan, Feb. 6, 1884. O. C. to C. A. McColl, 50 miles, White Mouth River, Feb. 25, 1884. Application for Michael Coughlin. O. C. to Michael Coughlin, 50 miles, Oct. 10, 1883.

R. TYRWHITT, M.P.—
Application for Henry Grove (Lefroy), May 14 and Sept. 7, 1884. O. C. to Henry Grove, 50 miles, Swan River, Sept. 29, 1884.

HUGO KRANZ, M.P.—
Reference for Wm. Morton (Wellesley, Ont.), May 10, 1883. O. C. to Wm. Morton, 50 miles, Swan River, June 7, 1883.

DALTON MCCARTHY, M.P.—
Application for John W. Astley, "An old friend of mine," p. 109. O.C. to John J. Astley, 50 miles, Sandy Lake, Alberta, May 17, 1884. Letter of enquiry about his friend Kirkland's application, July 21, 1883. O. C. to A. S. Kirkland (Duntroon), 50 miles, High River, Aug. 29, 1883.

SIR ADOLPHE CARON, M.P.—
Application for Wm. Sharples, Quebec (brother-in-law), March, 22, 1883. Says; "Hurry up Order in Council." O.C to Wm. Sharples, 50 miles, Red Deer River, March 17, 1883.

JOHN HAGGART, M.P.—
Application and plan sent. O.C. to Peter McLaren and others, 15 miles, Turtle Lake, May 20, 1884.

J. S. MCCUAIG, EX-M-P.—
Application for Edward Rathbun, March 7, 1882. O.C. to Edward Rathbun, 50 miles, Alberta, May 23, 1883.

I believe the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Farrow) was very indignant when, in a speech I delivered, I coupled his name with timber transactions, and denied having his hands soiled at all.

THOMAS FARROW, M.P.—
Application for Joseph Leech (Bluevale, Ont.) received March 8, 1883. O.C. to Joseph Leech, 50 miles, Alberta, April 29, 1884. Care of application, Asher Farrow (Bluevale, Ont.). O.C. to Asher Farrow, 50 miles, Alberta, June 9, 1883. Application for Geo. Lesson (Brandon, Man.), May 25, 1883. O.C. to Geo. Lesson, 50 miles, Alberta, June 7, 1883.

JOHN SMALL, M.P.—
Application for C. C. Small, his brother, March 10, 1883. O.C. to C. C. Small (Toronto), 50 miles, Hunter's Island, Aug. 11, 1883. Application for John Ginty. O.C. to John Ginty, 50 miles, Aug 11, 1883.

S. J. DAWSON, M.P.—
Application for T. McRae (Port Arthur), May 3, 1884. O.C. to T. McRae, 50 miles, Rainy Lake, May 17, 1884.

HON. THOS. WHITE, M.P.—
Recommendation for T. H. Schneider, Feb. 12, 1883. O.C. to T. H. Schneider, 50 miles.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD, M.P.—
Recommendation for Underdonk, contractor, July 17, 1883, and orders license to issue immediately.

These are the successful applications made by members of Parliament on behalf of their friends and themselves. I shall now read a list of applications for timber limits made by members of the Senate and the House of Commons for friends or themselves, and not granted, for the reason that the areas applied for were previously granted, or covered by pasture leases, &c.:

C. H. MACKINTOSH, M.P.—
Application for W. Bradbury, Sept. 19, 1882.

J. C. PATTERSON, M.P.—
Application for Geo. Campbell, April 15, 1882; Matthew Campbell May 13, 1882.

HECTOR CAMERON, M.P.—
Application for Masson, Boyd Timber Limit and Cattle Ranche, March 11, 1882; James Anderson.

L. MCCALLUM, M.P.—
Application for Samuel McCallum, April 11, 1883.

HYP. MONTPLAISIR, M.P.—
Application for self, Oct. 1, 1883.

HON. GEO. W. HOWLAN—
Application for G. R. Jones, Jan. 11, 1884; S. Holmes, Jan. 11, 1884; J. W. McKinnon, Jan. 11, 1884; T. D. Doran, April 24, 1883; self, Jan. 17, 1884.

JOHN WHITE, M.P.—
Application for Philip Star, Feb. 26, 1884; Henry Gill, July 11, 1883; Neil McLeod, Curran & Co., Feb. 24, 1883.

T. S. SPROULE, M.P.—
Application for R. J. Sproule, Aug. 23, 1882; Augustin & Kendall, Dec. 9, 1884; Neil Strachan, March 9, 1883; Almond Graham, March 15, 1883; W. M Glen, Oct 14, 1883; Matthew Spinks, Oct. 15, 1883.

GEO. T. ORTON, M.P.—
Application for self, Oct. 21, 1884; Reynolds, Dobie & Morrow, Feb. 13, 1883; J. C. Morrow, Dec. 3, 1883; Jas. Reynolds, May 1, 1883.

J. B. DAOUST, M.P.—
Application for G. Brown, May 22, 1884; self, April 9, 1883; John Paisley, April 9, 1883.

F. VANASSE, M.P.—
Application for self, March 28, 1884; G. W. Wittle, March 28, 1884, A. Charlebois, March 28, 1884.

THOMAS SCOTT, M.P.—
Application for J. G. Rowe, Oct. 2, 1882; Waller & Kelloch, Oct. 2, 1882; George Beers, Sept. 12, 1882; John W. Coleleugh and Thos Scott, Aug. 18, 1882; W. B. Thibaudeau, May 30, 1884; T. Murray, Feb. 13, 1883.

HON. JOHN CARLING, M.P.—
Application for Wm. Hudson, May 12, 1882.

A. BOULTBEE, EX-M.P.—
Application for S. Hughes; Jas. A. Deacon, Aug. 6, 1884; D. L. Sprague, June 28, 1883.

F. E. KILVERT, M.P.—
Application for Jas. Walker, May 14, 1883; Geo. Roach, Aug. 9; Richard Guller, Aug. 9; W. W. Duffield, Aug. 9; S. Aikins, Aug. 9; Joseph Green, Aug. 9; Adam Brown, Aug. 9, 1883.

H. A. WARD, M.P.—
Application for Mr. Smith, Oct. 4, 1883; 2 others, names not given, Oct. 4, 1883.

GEO. GUILLET, M.P.—
Application for self, March 23, 1883.

R. TYRWHITT, M.P.—
Application for Samuel Maneer, May 14, 1884.

DALTON MCCARTHY, M.P.—
Application for Wesley Orr, Jan. 11, 1883; Ed. J. Walsh, Feb. 19, 1883; E. T. Walsh, May 4, 1883.

HUGO KRANZ, M.P.—
Application for Otto J. Klotz, of Preston.

S. J. DAWSON, M.P.—
Application for Thos. Marks, March 18, 1882; Walter Ross, April 19, 1884.

JAMES BEATY, M.P.—
Application for H. M. Wells, May 2, 1882; G. M. Wilson, May 2, 1882.

P. VALIN, M.P.—
Application for Ferdinand Sampson, April 25, 1882; Didas Dion, April 25, 1882; Frank Ross, April 25, 1882; D. C. Thompson, April 25, 1882; Jas. G. Ross, April 25, 1882; Wm. Sharples, May 1, 1882.

C. F. FERGUSON, M.P.—
Application for E. Erratt & Co., May 12, 1882.

D. B. WOODWORTH, M.P.—
Application for C. Porter, Sept. 20, 1882; W. H. McMillan, May 14, 1883; Jos. E. Eaton, May 14, 1883; D. H. McMillan, May 14, 1883; E. B. Harris, May 14, 1883.

ROBERT DOULL, ex-M.P.—
Application for self, June 26, 1882.

WM. BANNERMAN, ex-M.P.—
Application for self, Dec. 4, 1882.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER, M.P.—
Application for self, April 25, 1886; John Sadler, April 25, 1886; Henry Muirhead, April 25, 1886.

JOHN POUPORE, ex-M.P.—
Application for John G. Poupore, April 26, 1883.

HON. M A. GIRARD—
Application for friends.

DARBY BERGIN, M.P.—
Application for friends.

GEORGE TAYLOR, M.P.—
Application for a friend; Townships 39, 40 and 41, Ranges 18, 19 and 20, west; Oct. 3, 1882.

That is the list of the members of Parliament, brought down to February, 1885—nothing is known of the transactions

which have taken place since that time—and including members of the last Parliament. Now I will read a summary of the results:

Number of members of Senate and House of Commons who received Orders in Council for Timber Limits to themselves, 17.

Number of members of Senate and House of Commons who secured Orders in Council for themselves and for friends, 45.

Total number of members of Senate and House of Commons who applied for lands for themselves and friends, 56.

Total number of Orders in Council passed upon recommendation of members of the Senate and House of Commons, so far as made public by the records, 115.

Number of applications made by members of the Senate and House of Commons, for timber lands, and refused for the reason that pasture leases, previous Orders in Council, &c., covered the areas applied for, 86.

Total number of timber limits applied for by members of the Senate and House of Commons for themselves and friends, 201.

Here is a list of deserving Tories, not members of the House of Commons or Senate, who have received Orders in Council for themselves:

NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN. O. C., 50 miles, North Saskatchewan, Dec. 15, 1882.

EDWARD FARRAR, Toronto *Mail*. O. C., 50 miles, North Saskatchewan, Dec. 15, 1882.

JOSEPH GIBSON, Tory candidate, South Oxford. O. C. 50 miles, Turtle Lake, April 25, 1882.

R. S. WHITE, Editor Montreal *Gazette*. O. C., 50 miles, Montagoo River, Lake Winnipeg.

FRED. W. GIBBS, son of Hon. G. W. Gibbs. O. C., 40 miles, N.W.T.

CHAS. J. CAMPBELL, brother of Sir Alexander. O. C., 50 miles, Hunter's Island.

COL. DAVID TISDALE, defeated Tory candidate in North Norfolk. O. C., 50 miles, Dec. 6, 1883.

JAMES MCKNIGHT, defeated Tory candidate, local, North Norfolk, O. C., 50 miles, Lake Mennitakie, Jan. 29, 1884.

WM. WILSON, defeated Tory candidate, local, North Norfolk. O. C., 50 miles, Aug. 18, 1883.

JOHN WILSON, M.D., President Conservative Association, North Norfolk. O. C., 50 miles, Jan. 4, 1883.

ALEXANDER MCCOLL, expects to be Tory candidate for South Norfolk. O. C., 50 miles, Dec. 6, 1883.

JAS. CRAIG BOYD (Simcoe), Tory election agent, 50 miles, Dec. 6, 1883.

W. H. TESTER, North Norfolk, Tory leader. O. C., 50 miles.

FREDERICK COPE (Simcoe), Tory worker. O. C., 50 miles, Sept. 28, 1883.

JAMES ROBB (Simcoe), partner Col. Tisdale, Tory. Care of Col. Tisdale. O. C., 50 miles, Alberta, April 29, 1884.

CHAS. P. YOUNG (Vittoria), active Tory. Care of Col. Tisdale. O. C., 50 miles, Alberta, April 30, 1884.

R. T. LIVINGSTONE (Simcoe), since appointed Judge of Norfolk. O. C., 50 miles, April 30, 1884.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Are you reading the list of those who have got timber limits?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, but I would not have time, if I devoted to-day and to-morrow to it, to read the names of all who got timber limits much less those who applied.

W. P. PAGE, Toronto—O. C. April 4, 1883, 50 miles.

HENRY O'BRIAN, Toronto—O. C., 50 miles, Hunter's Island, Aug. 11, 1883.

L. K. O'BRIAN, Toronto—O. C., 50 miles, Hunter's Island, Aug. 11, 1883.

J. C. JAMIESON, Belleville—O. C., 50 miles, March 10, 1883.

THOS. SHORTISS, Toronto—O. C., 50 miles, Hunter's Island, Aug. 11, 1883.

J. S. AIKINS, son of Governor Aikins—O. C., 50 miles, Manitoba, Aug. 11, 1883.

HUGH MACDONALD, Toronto—O. C., 50 miles, Hunter's Island, Aug. 11, 1883.

J. J. MACDONALD, Toronto, connected with John Shields—O. C., 50 miles, Hunter's Island, Aug. 11, 1883.

MICHAEL STARRS, Ottawa—O. C., 50 miles, April 30, 1883.

MARK ARNOLDI, Toronto, Tory lawyer—O. C., 50 miles, Hunter's Island, Aug. 11, 1883.

WM. RICHARDSON, Seely Bay, ex-Tory M.P.P.—O. C., 50 miles, Sept. 28, 1883.

ROBERT EVANS, Hamilton, Tory boss—O. C., 50 miles, May 28, 1883.

ONDERDONK, contractor—O. C. for limit, 1,200 acres, July 17, 1883. Sir John endorses his application, and directs that license shall issue without delay.

WM. SHIELDS, Toronto, brother of John Shields—O. C., 50 miles, Nov. 29, 1883.

JAS. G. D. BLACK, Montreal, city treasurer—O. C., 50 miles, Dec. 19, 1883.

PETER MCLAREN, Ottawa—50 miles, March 16, 1883.

JOHN M. GARROW, Bluevale, Ont.—O. C., 50 miles, June 9, 1883.

JOHN SHIELDS, Rat Portage, contractor, &c.—O. C., 50 miles, Dec. 21, 1883.

H. M. STAUNTON, Rat Portage—Telegraph operator, stole the telegrams Mr. Meredith read in the House at Toronto. O. C., 50 miles.

JOSEPH FOSTER, Rat Portage, assistant telegram purloiner—O. C., 50 miles.

W. R. GOUIN, Ottawa—50 miles, Jan. 28, 1884.

JOHN H. BEATY, Toronto—50 miles, Jan. 9, 1884.

W. B. SCARTH, Toronto—O.C., 50 miles, Sept. 11, 1883.

THOS. BIRKETT, Ottawa—O.C., 50 miles, Jan. 23, 1884.

JOHN H. BEATY, Toronto, cousin of M.P.—O.C. 50 miles, Dec. 6, 1883.

C. R. CHURCH, M.D., Ottawa—O.C., 50 miles, July 7, 1883.

T. G. BLACKSTOCK, Toronto, defeated Tory candidate—O.C., 50 miles, Dec. 6, 1883.

JOSEPH S. SMITH, Port Hope—O.C., 50 miles, Dec. 1, 1883.

ROBERT A. BELL, Toronto—O.C., 50 miles, Red Deer River, Jan. 11, 1883.

ROBERT SKEAD, Ottawa, son of Senator—O.C., 50 miles, Lake Winnipeg, Jan. 19, 1883.

EDWARD MCGILLIVRY, Ottawa—O. C., 50 miles, Lake Winnipeg, Feb. 2, 1883.

GEORGE SKEAD, Ottawa, son of Senator—O.C., 50 miles, Lake Winnipeg, Jan. 29, 1883.

WM. PRATT, Ottawa—O.C., 50 miles, Blood River, April 2, 1883.

D. O'CONNOR, Ottawa, President Tory Association—O C., 50 miles, English River, April, 17, 1883.

HENRY LARGE, Ottawa, friend of Mackintosh—O C., 50 miles, Beaver River, May 23, 1882.

CHARLES H. CARRIER, Ottawa—O.C., 50 miles, North Saskatchewan, July, 29, 1882.

P. MCARTHUR, Winnipeg—O.C., 50 miles, Duck River, Nov. 22, 1883.

K. N. MACFEE, Montreal, friend of C. C. Colby, M.P.—O.C., 50 miles, Battle River, Feb. 11, 1883.

PETER WHELAN, Ottawa, Tory alderman—O.C., 48 miles, May 12, 1882.

P. A. MCLEAN, Toronto, Old Kirk Tory—O.C., 50 miles, Lake Winnipegoosis, Jan 12, 1883.

MCLEOD STEWART, Ottawa—O.C., 50 miles, North Saskatchewan, May 23, 1883.

H. K. EGAN, Ottawa—O.C., 50 miles, Manitoba, May 23, 1883.

FRANK J. CLARK, Winnipeg, Secretary Tory Association—O.C., 50 miles, Sturgeon Bay, Dec. 4, 1882.

EDWARD B. BLACK, Montreal—O.C., 50 miles, Warpath River, Nov. 22, 1882.

P. E. NORMAND, Three Rivers, Que., leading Tory—O.C., 50 miles, Limestone Bay, May 6, 1882.

CHARLES MAGEE, Ottawa, leading Tory—O.C., 50 miles, Mar. 4, 1882.

JAMES MURRAY, St. Catharines, testimonial subscriber—O.C., 50 miles Swan River, July 5, 1882.

T. B. VANASSE, Three Rivers, Que, leading Tory—O.C., 50 miles, Lake Winnipeg, Mar 1, 1882.

FERGUS O'CONNOR, Billings' Bridge—O.C., 50 miles, English River, March 8, 1882.

JACOB ERRATT, Ottawa, Tory alderman—O.C., 50 miles, Lake Winnipeg, Nov. 24, 1882.

JOHN RIORDAN AND COSGRAVE & Co (Riordan of *Mail*)—O.C., 50 miles, Jumping River.

G. F. BRISEBOIS, Minnedosa, Man, Tory Registrar—O.C., 50 miles, Valley River, Man., Oct. 3, 1882.

H. A. D. ARMSTRONG, Civil Engineer, Tory—O.C., 50 miles, Red Deer River, Dec. 6, 1882.

THOS. J. WALLACE & Co, Woodbridge, Ont., supposed a brother of Wallace, M.P.—O.C., 50 miles, Lake Winnipeg, April 6, 1882.

R. C. W. MACQUAIG, Ottawa, Tory, brother of ex-M.P.—O.C., 50 miles, Black River, Dec. 22, 1882.

ALFRED WATTS, Brantford—License, 20 miles, Manitoba, Jan. 10, 1881.

GEO. A. HUGHES, Montreal—O.C., 50 miles, Fisher River, March 14, 1882.

H. V. NOEL, Ottawa—O.C., 50 miles, Lake Winnipeg, Nov. 22, 1882.

A. J. CHRISTIE, Ottawa—O.C., 50 miles, Manatagoo River, Dec. 21, 1882.

J. W. MONTAGUE, Braeman, Ont.—O.C., 50 miles, Manitoba, April 3, 1884.

THOS. HIGGINSON, Ottawa—O.C., 50 miles, High River, Alberta, Feb. 11, 1884.

STEWART MULVEY, Winnipeg, defeated Tory candidate—O.C., 50 miles, Shawendola Lake, April 30, 1884.

W. H. PLUMMER, Sault Ste. Marie, defeated Tory candidate—O.C. 33 miles, Lac des Mille Lacs, Oct. 9, 1884.

H. H. SMITH, Peterboro'—O.C., 50 miles, Alberta, April 30, 1884.

R. A. MORROW, Peterboro'—O.C., 50 miles, High River, May 23, 1884.

CAPT. ALEX. BOWIE, Ottawa—O.C., 50 miles, Lake Winnipeg. $5 bonus, June 4, 1883.

G. R. KINGSMILL, Ottawa, immigration agent and Toronto *Mail* employé—O.C., 50 miles, Lake Winnipeg, $1 bonus, Feb. 5, 1884.

N. F. PATTERSON, Port Perry, Ont., Tory ex-candidate—O.C., 50 miles, Lake of the Woods, Dec. 21, 1883.

JAMES QUINN, Orillia, ex-Tory candidate—O.C., 50 miles, Alberta, May 15, 1884.

GEORGE GOODWIN, Ottawa, Tory contractor—O. C., 50 miles, Winnipeg River, March 15, 1883.

ALEXANDER MCINNES, Hamilton—O. C., 50 miles, English River, Feb. 9, 1885.

J. W. MCRAE, Ottawa—O. C., 50 miles, Kogasikok, Man., April 1, 1884.

HENRY BULMER, jun., Montreal—O. C., 50 miles, Keewatin, Dec. 1, 1883.

T. W. CURRIER, Ottawa—O. C., 50 miles, Quetico River, Man., April 12, 1884.

MICHAEL COUGHLAN, Ottawa—O. C., 50 miles, Winnipeg River, June 11, 1884.

W. B. SCARTH, Toronto, Tory man-of-all-work—O. C., 50 miles, Hunter's Island, Aug. 11, 1883. License issued, Oct. 24, 1884.

L. OLIVER, Barrie—O. C., 50 miles, Hunter's Island, Aug. 11, 1883.

W. MCKAY, Ottawa—O. C., 50 miles, Rainy Lake, Feb. 5, 1884.

G. D'ARCY BOULTON, Toronto, Tory lawyer—O C., 50 miles, Red Deer River, April 1, 1884.

JOHN B. SPRAGUE, Winnipeg, Tory worker—O. C., 50 miles, Rainy Lake, Jan. 23, 1884.

R. M. CARROLL, Ottawa, relative of Hon. W. G. Howlan—O. C., 50 miles, Porcupine Hills, Jan. 23, 1884.

JOHN STEWART, Ottawa—O. C., 50 miles, Assiniboine River, April 1, 1884

J. S MCCRACKEN, Ottawa—O. C., 50 miles, Lake Laurence, May 23, 1884.

THOS. BIRKETT, Ottawa—O. C., 50 miles, Sturgeon Lake, Man., Jan. 23, 1884.

WM. WILSON, Montreal—O. C., 50 miles, War Path River, Dec. 27, 1883.

A. T. MCCORD, Toronto, lieutenant of A. Boultbee—O. C., 50 miles, Lac Seul, Keewatin, March 14, 1882.

Now, these are a few only of the names. The total number of Orders in Council granting limits, to February, 1885, was 550, so far as I have examined the records. The number not given in foregoing list is 338. The total number of square miles granted to February, 1885, is 25,300, and the total number of acres, 16,192,200, making a quantity two-thirds as great as the total amount of the cultivated land in the Dominion in 1881; and it is possible, if we had last year's record, from February, 1885, to the present time, we would find the Government had issued Orders in Council covering an area of timber limits equal to the entire amount of cultivated land in the Dominion in 1881.

Mr. ORTON. How much money was received?

Mr. CHARLTON. $5 a mile.

An hon. MEMBER. How much did you expect to receive?

Mr. CHARLTON. I can give you a little correspondence, but I shall not read it all. Here is the correspondence of Mr. Royal. I do not know that he wants to have it read, nor does the House care. There is nothing very important in it. In one place, he says, 17th November, 1882:

"Referring to your favor, No. 4,194, of 30th ultimo, I beg to state that the applications in question, so strongly and so justly recommended by me, was filed with the agent of the Timber office here."

I suppose these gentlemen found it necessary they should be strongly recommended.

Mr. ROYAL. Whose application is that?

Mr. CHARLTON. The Order in Council following this is to Robert and Peter George.

Mr. ROYAL. Two Grits.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman is a very disinterested member of Parliament, no doubt. Here is a telegram from the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), dated Ottawa, 5th July, 1882:

"Will you please push through Order in Council for coal licenses and that limit for Orr?"

(Signed) "J. C. RYKERT."

There is another letter from the hon. member for Lincoln urging that a certain supporter of my hon. friend for Monck, should receive timber limits; Mr. James Mitchell, of Castorville, is anxious to get a limit to cut timber in the North-West.

Mr. MCCALLUM. He is not in my county at all.

Mr. CHARLTON. I said that Mr. James Mitchell, of Castorville, a friend and supporter of Mr. McCallum, is anxious to get a permit to cut timber in the North-West. The letter is signed, J. C. Rykert.

Mr. MCCALLUM. I have lots of friends in this country.

Mr. BLAKE. Have they all got timber limits?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No, nor harbor contracts either.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it usual to get them at the price?

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Pope, the Minister of Agriculture, sends his private secretary to obtain an answer to the following memorandum to the Hon. D. L. Macpherson:—

"1st. T. P. Buck applies for timber berth on Porcupine Hill near Fort McLeod. Can he obtain it?

"2nd. H. Bailey applies for a timber permit in the disputed territory. What answer can Mr. Pope give him?

"3rd. A. Herme & Co., of Galt, ask a free grant of land on which to erect flouring mills. Would the Minister of Interior accord this?"

This was signed by Mr. Lindsay Russell. We have here correspondence from Mr. McMillen with relation to J. G. Dawes; correspondence from Dr. Orton, M.P., with an application for George D. Farmer; correspondence from D. Macmillan, M.P., making an application for himself; correspondence from Thomas Scott, M.P., and Joseph Tassé, M.P., supporting George H. Bradbury, a strong supporter of the Government; correspondence from Adolphe Caron, M.P.:

"DEAR MR. MACPHERSON,—May I ask you to hurry up the granting of the license applied for by Mr. William Sharples on the Red Deer River."

And it was hurried up, and Mr. Sharples, who is a brother-in-law of Sir Adolphe, got his license. Correspondence from S. R. Hesson, for his son-in-law, Mr. Symons:

"Some time ago I wrote you on behalf of Harry Symons, Esq., of Toronto, for timber limits on the Saskatchewan. Your reply was that a previous application was in for same. Will you now do me the favor of changing that application to Cedar Lake, as Mr. Symons is the only applicant now for that place. I hope you will enter his name at once, and he will complete the application forthwith. As Mr. S. is a particular friend of mine, I hope you will see to this at once."

Mr. HESSON. Anything wrong about that?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think not. I think that was very paternal. Here is also an application from Mr. Hesson for Mr. James Robb, setting forth that he had been editor of a local paper, and that, if he got the limit, he would not be ungrateful. Here is an application from S. R. Hesson for J. P. Woods; an application from Mr. Hesson for J. Grayson Smith; an application from T. N. Gibbs and S. R. Hesson for T. H. Tuller; an application from Mr. H. Cameron for reputed partner of his, Mr. William Mackenzie. I shall not trouble the House with any further reference to this correspondences, as the hour is growing late.

Mr. HESSON. Give us a little history from Michigan.

Mr. CHARLTON. I might. People who obtain timber limits in Michigan pay for them like honest men, and obtain them in competition with other men, they will not get a paternal Government to give them a limit for $250 which they can sell for $100,000.

I now propose to refer briefly to ranche companies and to the policy of the Government in placing pasture lands under lease at one cent an acre, without competition, receiving at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum on 16 cents an acre for pasture lands; and the only limitation has been that no friend of the Government could receive more than 100,000 acres. These lands, as this return will show, have been leased far in advance of the requirements of stock owners. I find, by the return which was laid on the Table of the House a few days ago, which brings down the statistics in regard to the ranche companies to the 1st March, 1886, that the number of acres under lease was 2,452,610; acres having cattle on them, 1,592,290; acres without cattle 860,320; number of companies who have cattle on ranches, 38; number without cattle, 20; number of companies having more than 1,000 animals on ranche, 15; total revenue from grazing lands up to 1st March, 1886, $66,255.50 for this enormous area of land; total number of cattle, horses and sheep on all these ranches, 63,714, or one horse, sheep, or cow or animal to each thirty-eight acres. Thirty-eight acres for one animal! Nothing could show more strikingly than this fact that these lands have been leased far in advance of the requirments of stock growers. It cost so little, only $1 annually for a farm of 100 acres, or $10 for a 1,000 acres These leases have been granted to friends in advance of the requirements of the trade, in advance of the requirements of those who had stock to put on them. These men have acquired these 2,450,000 acres, this vast quantity of land, and they have only 63,714 head of cattle on them. The amount of the annual rental if paid, is $24,526, amounting, as I said before, at one cent an acre, to the interest at 6 per cent. on 16 cents an acre. There is something wrong in this. So much land ought not to have been leased, land put under lease without competition, which, after the system has been in operation for four years, carries one head of cattle for thirty-eight acres. Who knows, if this land had been put up to competition and bids had been invited, that it might not have brought 10 cents an acre. The Government were bound, if they were governed by considerations of the public interest and not by the interest of their friends, to offer these lands to the competition of the public and to secure the highest price they could for them, instead of passing them round to their friends with no limitation whatever except that no good boy should receive more than 100,000 acres. And the policy with regard to coal lands has been equally reprehensible. I have here a summary of a return brought down to February, 1883, which shows that 449 applications have been made for coal leases, and the following members of Parliament had made applications: J. C. Patterson, M.P., four applications; C. C. Colby, M.P., seven applications; John Haggart, M.P., one application; A. Boultbee, M.P., one application; Thos. Scott, M.P, three applications; Hon. T. N. Gibbs, M.P., one application; Hon. John Ogilvie, one application.

Mr. HAGGART. An application that I made? For what?

Mr. CHARLTON. A coal lease.

Mr. HAGGART. No, I did not.

Mr. CHARLTON. I found your name in the returns.

Mr. HAGGART. No, you did not.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, we will hunt it up. Hector Cameron, M.P., one application; J. G. Blanchet, M.P., one application; Dalton McCarthy, M.P., one application.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. J. C. Rykert, M.P., one application; R. Doull, M.P., one application; Robert Hay, M.P., one application; George Hilliard, M.P., one application; Sir A. T. Galt—he is not a member—two applications; Hon. John Norquay, two applications; Nicholas Flood Davin, one application; Edward Farrer, one application. Now, these are all friends of the Government, no competition was invited for these leases. These applications, if granted, were granted without competition and on certain fixed terms.

Mr. McCARTHY. Do you say they were granted?

Mr. CHARLTON. The policy of the Government with regard to the coal lands of the North-West was not one in the interest of the settler. It was not to the interest of the settler that a coal mining monopoly should be granted, and that the Government should second efforts to take the coal lands of the North-West and put them in a few hands who might monopolise the business of mining and compel the people to pay so much more for their fuel, which is so necessary in a cold climate like that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the hon. gentleman say these were granted?

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not. I say they were applications.

Mr. BOWELL. How could they be monopolies?

Mr. CHARLTON. No return has been brought down in reference to coal leases subsequent to 1883, and what number of these applications were favorably acted upon I am unable to say, but I give the applications.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no application from me anyway.

Mr. McCARTHY. Nor from me.

Mr. CHARLTON. Coming to other parts of the Government policy, I refer to colonisation plan No. 1. That plan was adopted on 23rd December, 1881. It was adopted just upon the eve of a dissolution of this House. Whether it was adopted expressly for the purpose of attaching to the Government a large speculative interest, I am unable to say, but whatever might have been the intention of the Government, the result was to attach to the interest of the Government a very great and powerful speculative interest in land. The results, of course, of these investments in colonisation lands have not been as favorable as those who invested anticipated. This has been largely due, perhaps, to the fact that the Government granted these lands to speculators. Nothing perhaps has had a more unfavorable influence upon the settlement of the North-West than the fact that the Government acted upon applications for blocks of land which were to be given to speculators, if they conformed to the conditions, at half the price the settler had to pay for the land. The rush under this plan No. 1 was something phenominal. The order was issued on the 23rd of December, 1881. I see by returns that on the 1st January, 1883, one year and eight days after that order had been issued, after the colonisation plan had been made, and the number of applications made during that time was 251, and they covered 2,295 townships of land. The members who applied for colonisation land in that brief period were as follows:—

Robert Hay, M.P.,		applied for	6½	Townships.
Robert Hay, M.P.,		do	2	do
Robert Hay and associates,		do	2	do
Robert Hay,		do	5	do
Col. Williams, M.P.,		do	6	do
Geo. A. Drew, M.P.,		do	4	do
C. H. Mackintosh, M.P., & associates		do	7	do
John White, M.P.,	do	do	4	do
Geo. Guillet, M.P.,	do	do	10	do
Geo. Guillet, M.P.,	do	do	3	do
C. F. Ferguson, M.P.,		do	3	do
Hugo Krantz, M.P.,		do	5	do

T. Valin, M.P., and G. Ross,	do	2	do
Thos. Arkell, M.P., and associates,	do	6	do
Wm. Elliott, M.P.,	do	5	do
M. H. Gault,	do	2	do

Mr. GAULT. No, Sir, my name is found nowhere on the books.

Mr. CHARLTON. This is taken from the Sessional Papers of 1883, Volume 16, No. 12, Return No. 84.

Mr. GAULT. I never spent one cent, and had nothing to do with any territory in the North-West. I went up there to buy land, but I saw so much of it that I came away.

Mr. CHARLTON. This refers to the applications. I will read on:

Robt. Doull, M.P.,	applied for	4	Townships.
Geo. P. Orton, M.P.,	do	6	do
C.F.Ferguson,M.P.,and associates,	do	6	do
P. Valin, M.P.,	do	1	do
J. C. Patterson and associates,	do	7	do
J. S. McCuaig, M.P.,	do	1	do
James Beaty, M.P.,	do	1	do
J. B. Daoust, M.P.,	do	6	do
Charles Wallace, M.P., and associates,	do	6	do
C. C. Colby, M.P., and others,	do	6	do
Senator Almon and others,	do	12½	do
D. Macmillan, M.P.,	do	6	do

Here are the names of twenty-one members of Parliament making applications for land to the Government, to be received on conditions so favorable that they expected to secure these lands at half price, or $1 an acre. In addition, Sir A. T. Galt applied for fifty townships, and that gentleman was allowed $1,500 from the Treasury of Canada to pay his expenses while he went to the North-West to select his land. Here are other names:

Wm. Sharples,	applied for	2	Townships.
Robt. Henry and others,	do	4	do
H. Symmes,	do	6	do
D. Tisdale,	do	6	do
A. T. Drummond,	do	17	do
Thos. Long and George Moberly,	do	15	do
A. Ferguson,	do	39	do
D. Tisdale,	do	6	do

Now, Sir, these applications, made in the space of one year and eight days, covered 2,295 townships in the North-West; and the effect, I repeat, of this scheme upon the elections of 1882, was very marked indeed. Every speculator who embarked in this speculation, covering this vast area, was a friend of the Government; it was in his interest that the Government should be maintained, that the regulations by which he was to receive land at half price, should not be rescinded by another Government adopting an honest policy; and for that reason no more potent factor in the elections of 1882 exerted its influence upon that result, than the policy of the Government with regard to the colonisation plan No 1, so called. And the Government, now that that the result has hardly been as those gentlemen anticipated, are adopting a plan to let them out as easily as possible; those who have taken blocks of townships and have made partial payments, are to be permitted to consolidate their interest, to select such parts of the township as they may choose—and, of course, they will select the cream of the thing - and the payments made covering the whole tract are permitted to be concentrated upon the best portions of the township, and they will receive land in accordance with the payments made, be it more or less, and their interests so far as the Government can care for them, will be carefully guarded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken rather longer than I anticipated. Fearing that the list I had got would not go into the *Hansard*, I have read the most of it. I have but to recapitulate, I have to say that the policy of this Government, first, with regard to railway bonuses, voting away here in one Session the sum of $8,000,000 to bribe members of this House, and voting $22,500,000 more for another

purpose; these bonuses in the aggregate amounted to over $8,000,000, a large proportion of this sum being granted to railway corporations in which members of this House had a direct pecuniary interest; and if the truth could be known a considerable number of the members of this House did, in effect, in sustaining and supporting that resolution with regard to railway bonuses, put money into their own pockets. It was an infringement on the independence of Parliament. Any member interested in a road that received aid from the Government in that scheme, was not in a condition to exercise the function of an independent member of Parliament. With regard to timber limits, I have shown the enormous areas granted without competition. The Government granted them to their own favorites, to their own supporters in this House; granted them without adequate consideration, and we have seen vast gains accruing to friends of the Government, to the loss of the country to whom the land belongs. We have had pasture leases to the extent of 2,500,000 acres granted at 1 cent an acre without competition, granted in advance of the requirements of the public, so that to-day, after years have elapsed since the policy was inaugurated, there is not one head of cattle to 38 acres upon that land grant, and granted to speculators, in a great number of instances without competition, and presumably to favorites of the Government. We find again the Government favoring its friends in the matter of coal land leases, making the path to fortune easy to them, and acting in a way which they must have known would result in fortune to their friends and indear coal to the people of the North-West. We find colonisation land applications pouring in upon the Government for 2,300 townships in one year, grants made to their friends wherever the grants do not conflict with each other, and a middleman class created by the Government, that curse of the settler and of the pioneer—a middleman class created by the Government, receiving his land for half price, and placed in a position where he could turn and sell to the settler, under some circumstances, land for ten times the price he paid for it. Did the Government, in adopting this policy, have an eye to the interest of the settlers who are looking to the North-West? Was it governed by that principle that has governed the policy upon this side of the House—the land for the people and the people for the land? No, Sir; and when we lament the condition of the North-West, the slow movement of the population into that country, the development of that country retarded by various causes, we may attribute nearly all the results which we have to deplore in the North-West to the policy of the Government.

In all these matters to which I have referred members of this House have had the inside track. They have had the ear of the Government; they have known what the Government plans were. They could go to the various Departments and lay their case before the Government, and they always found in those Departments friends willing to oblige them. They were in point of fact invited to ask favors of the Government, and they never came to the Government and asked a favor in vain. Mr. Speaker, I have approached this subject with personal regret. Whether hon. gentlemen opposite will believe me or not, it is not a task congenial to me to probe this matter and expose these irregularities upon the part of the Government. The task has fallen upon me, and I have endeavored to discharge it in a spirit of fairness and as temperately as possible. No doubt many hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, probably all hon. gentlemen opposite, feel they have pursued a proper course in these matters, and do not see anything irregular in receiving bonuses from the Government for their private aims and purposes, in receiving timber limits from the Government for themselves and their friends without the limits being put up to competition, and in making $100,000 out of $250 in one extreme

case. They may have such peculiar views about political and moral ethics as to see nothing wrong in these transactions. But I am unable to agree with them, and I conceive it to be part of my duty as an independent member of Parliament, who desires the good of his country, to denounce such conduct. The whole system is subversive of the independence of Parliament. It is incompatible with a nice sense of political honor; it is calculated to control action and conciliate support by the use of corrupt methods, and it is a system that should excite alarm in the breast of every member of this House and every citizen of Canada for the future of this country. I beg to move in amendment thereto to leave out all the words after the word "that," and add the following instead thereof:—

The practice of members of the House applying for and becoming personally interested in the disposal by the Crown of those public resources, which are dealt with by the Executive, or by Parliament on its recommendation, has grown to alarming proportions, is in its nature liable to abuse, has in fact been abused, and should be checked, in order to avoid lasting injury to the public interest and to restore and maintain the independence of this House.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Mr. Speaker, before I venture very briefly to refer to the speech which the hon. gentleman has just delivered I desire to call his attention to what seems to me to have been a breach of arrangement of which he has been guilty. I owe him the duty of saying that last week he was kind enough to intimate to me that he intended to bring up this general question to-night, and it was understood at that time that we would endeavor to get into Supply at as early an hour as possible in order that he might make his speech and that the reply might come within a reasonable hour at all events, and if possible a vote be had on the same evening. I know the hon. gentleman was engaged to-day in connection with a duty in which he takes a great deal of interest in connection with his own church, and this afternoon I received from him the following note, which I had torn up never imagining it was necessary to keep anything of that kind, but the pieces of which have been picked up since, after the manner of picking up another famous document that had some influence in public matters in olden times, and put together.

Mr. COOK. Spittoon.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I shall deal with the hon. member for Simcoe before I get through with my speech—I promise him that. The note is to this effect:

"THURSDAY, 4th May, 1886.

"MY DEAR MR. WHITE,—I shall be unable to leave my committee this afternoon, as it would be deemed a lack of courtesy to its members, and neglect of my own duty in the premises. I hope this will make no difference to you, and that we shall be able to proceed with the matter to-morrow.

"Yours truly,

"JOHN CHARLTON."

I got that note this afternoon. A number of hon. members asked me whether this question was coming up to-day—gentlemen whose names have been mentioned by the hon. gentleman in speeches out of this House, and by another hon. gentleman in speeches out of this House—and I told them it was not. After dinner I saw the hon. gentleman again. I spoke to him about the matter. It was then agreed that this debate should come up to-morrow, and not to-day. I had left the Chamber, and was engaged in other duties when, to my astonishment, a page was sent to tell me that Mr. Charlton had commenced his arraignment of the Government.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to make a personal explanation. When I sent the hon. gentleman a note from Knox's Church, I did not anticipate being here this afternoon, and I considered, as a matter of course, that no opportunity would occur to go on with the question until to-morrow. There is a misunderstanding between the hon. gentleman and myself as to what passed between us after dinner. I understood the hon. gentleman to express a preference to go on with the question to-morrow. The debate on the Home Rule matter was then in progress, and I did not anticipate myself there would be any opportunity to go into this subject, to-night; but I asked the hon. gentleman what was his preference, but I made, as I understood, no statement of my own. I should have preferred going on with the question to-morrow, but certain circumstances render it desirable that I should leave the city. My father is very ill, and I have been detained here against my will and am anxious to leave; and for that reason, believing it would make no difference to the Minister of the Interior, not knowing that the matter could go on, when a conclusion was unexpectedly reached to the debate on Home Rule, I took the floor.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). All I can say is that I have very great sympathy with the hon. gentleman in the cause which is likely to lead him to leave town. But I am very glad indeed that the matter of the arrangement as to the first part is in writing, because after I had spoken to him, and it was perfectly understood since dinner that this subject would not come up to-day, the hon. gentleman approached the leader of the Opposition and spoke to him, whether on this subject or another I cannot say, but the probability is that the leader of the Opposition told him to go on to-night. That is briefly what really occurred, notwithstanding the arrangement to which I have referred.

Mr. CHARLTON. I propose a solution of the difficulty by the hon. gentleman adjourning the House, and he can go on to-morrow.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I propose to do nothing of the kind. I have no objection to going on, and I would just as readily have gone on to-night if the hon. gentleman had frankly said so when he returned, because I took the trouble to go and speak to him. The only thing I object to is that, when arrangements are made between hon. gentlemen on both sides they should be broken; the question of whether or not arrangements at all should be made is within the option of either side. In view of the fact that this is a question affecting the personal character of a number of members of this House, who had a right to some information as to when it was to be brought up, I think it was hardly fair on the part of the hon. gentleman, after having made the arrangement, that he should have gone on with the matter to-night. That is, however, a matter of no great consequence affecting the question itself. The hon. gentleman commenced his speech by referring to what he feared was the condition of public sentiment in this country. He feared very much that the public conscience was being blunted, and that the public estimate of wrong-doing was becoming lessened in consequence of the general corruption which prevailed in our public life. All I have to say to the hon. gentleman is this, that if that is the case in any way whatever, it is just such speeches as he delivered to-night that is producing that result. When the public find that the charges which are hurled against hon. gentlemen on this side have no better foundation than the mere fact that they write a letter to the Department asking for something for a friend which that friend had a right, under the law, to get, when the hon. gentleman lays it down as a sin, as a corrupt act, as something to be denounced, and in relation to which the public conscience should be roused, that such letters as he quoted to-night are offences against propriety, I do not wonder that the public conscience becomes indifferent to the charges which come from that side of the House, and that there is danger, as undoubtedly there is, of the public conscience becoming blunted in regard to even more serious matters. Sir, I recognise as much as anybody can do the importance of the public conscience in relation to the conduct of public men. I recognise as much as anyone

can do the importance of every public man feeling that upon his personal character must depend the confidence in which he will be held by the people outside; and I deplore as much as anyone can do that by the system which the hon. gentlemen opposite are pursuing, and of which to-night we had a notable example, the public character, the characters of public men are becoming of no account whatever, and that the only test of merit is the side of the House upon which an hon. gentleman may happen to sit. There is no more dangerous condition of things than that, and when the hon. gentleman reads us, as he has read to-night, the letters of members of Parliament whose only offence is that they have done what I know hon. gentlemen on that side are doing with the most perfect propriety, writing to the Department of the Interior in relation to the interests of friends who may be affected by the Department, when he reads a list of names and charges that the gentlemen who wrote the letters are guilty of corruption and are to be condemned, he simply attempts to make an offence out of what every honest man, every man of common sense, knows is no offence, and he lessens to that extent the public sense of the enormity of serious charges, when serious charges may be made against gentlemen on either side. Sir, it is no trifling matter, looked at in the character of our public life, that this kind of charges should be made, and that the mere incidents of our public position, the fact that we represent constituencies and that we have to write to the Departments in relation to matters in which our constituents or our friends may be interested—that these are to be held to be offences to be punished by the censure of Parliament, and pronounced to be acts which are blunting the public conscience and rendering the public life of the country corrupt. Now, what are the charges which the hon. gentleman has made, and what has been the policy of this Government in relation to the several subjects to which he has referred? He referred in the first instance to the question of timber limits, and he declared that the policy of this Government in relation to timber limits had been a policy of corruption, a policy of giving away the public domain for the benefit of the supporters of the Government and that it had been a policy subversive of the duty of the Government to husband the resources of the country, and get from those resources the largest possible return that can be obtained for them from the people. Now, will you allow me for a moment to state what has been the policy of the two parties respectively in relation to timber limits. In the Session of 1872 the Conservative Government then in power introduced into Parliament and passed into law an Act of which the following is section 50:—

"The right of cutting timber on such timber limits shall be put up at a bonus per square mile, varying according to the situation and value of the limit and sold to the highest bidder by competition either by tender or at public auction."

That was the law passed in the year 1872, when the Conservative party began to deal with matters in the North-West after we had acquired that territory. The Liberal party came into power in the fall of 1873, and in their very first Session they repealed that section and substituted in the stead of it this:

"Provided further, that in cases where application may be made for limits on which to cut timber in unsurveyed territory, the Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Minister of the Interior, authorise the same to be leased for such bonus as may be deemed fair and reasonable, such leases to be subject nevertheless to the foregoing conditions in this section, except as to that part of sub-section 1, which provides for the erection of mills, which provision in respect to limits in unsurveyed territories, may, if considered expedient by the Minister of the Interior, be dispensed with."

So that at the very first Session of Parliament after they came into power they repealed the Act which they found on the Statute-book, which required the timber limits of the North-West to be given by public competition, and assumed the right to give these timber limits by mere Orders in Council; and they went so far in unsurveyed territory—which at that time included practically the whole of the Territory—that even the condition that a mill should be built might be dispensed with by the Governor in Council. During the time those hon. gentlemen were in office some 605 square miles in all were granted, and not a single rood was let by public competition. Every single acre of that land was given by Order in Council, and given to gentlemen who certainly were not political opponents of theirs, whatever their politics may have been. Now, Sir, since this Government came into power what has been the result? The result has been that one-third of all the territory for which timber licenses have been granted, was put up and disposed of at public auction, the policy being that whenever there were two applicants for the same territory, it would be put up at public competition, and the highest bidder would get the grant. Now, Sir, let me point out another fact. The hon. gentleman says—and he is right— that the duty of the Government is to husband the resources of the country, and to obtain for the people the largest amount that can be obtained. Well, Sir, during the five years his friends were in office, while they had given timber limits for 605 square miles, all the money they received for dues, ground rents, bonuses—no, there were no bonuses, because they put up nothing at public competition—was $6,160; while, during the last five years, this Government has received from timber limits in the North-West for ground rents, bonuses, dues and royalties, no less a sum than $539,433. And yet the hon. gentleman tells us that the policy of this party bears an unfavorable contrast, forsooth, to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite; because, after the law had been altered, after they had taken advantage of it for five years, and after they found themselves again in the cold shades of opposition, they moved a resolution that the policy of 1872 was after all the best policy—a resolution practically of censure on themselves for having repealed the Act, and in a favor of a policy which would have continued to be the policy if they had never occupied seats on the Treasury benches. The hon. gentleman has talked of this granting of timber limits as a matter of party advantage, used by this Government for corrupt purposes, in order that their friends might be advantaged, in return for their support. Why, Sir, after they were beaten at the polls—I have referred to it before, but it is worth referring to again—when they had no longer a right to deal with the public domain, on the 7th of October, 1878, the very day before they resigned the seals of office, they passed an Order in Council granting, without competition, without the suggestion of competition, but simply as a favor, to Messrs. Cook & Sutherland, gentlemen who certainly were not Tories, whatever else they were, no less than 200 square miles, not all in one block, but in areas of twenty square miles, wherever they might select them all over the northern part of the Territories. And yet Sir, these hon. gentlemen rise in their places here and charge this Government, forsooth, with having used the public domain for political purposes, when their last act before leaving office—done, I suppose, on the principle on which governments in England are supposed to create peerages for their friends before they leave office, although they have been beaten—was the act I have described. Yes, and they gave these gentlemen, as my hon. friend suggests to me, in the Order in Council three years within which to make the selections of the twenty-mile blocks, without any undertaking to cut timber, without in fact any obligation except to make all the money they could out of the timber limits they thus obtained.

Mr. COOK. Your statement is not true, Sir.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). So much for the general question of the policy of the two parties. Now, let me point out to you for a moment what has really been the operation connected with the sale of timber limits with this Government. It is quite true that there were a large number of applications. The regulations fixed the terms upon which applications could be made, and under which grants could be given. The law fixed the lines which had been considered by hon. gentlemen opposite the proper lines on which people could obtain limits; and surely it was not an offence for anyone to make an application for a timber limit under regulations open to the world, known to everybody, and under which everybody had the opportunity of making an application. If the hon. gentleman could point out a case in which a Liberal applied for a timber limit, and a Conservative applied for the same timber limit, and the Liberal's application was set aside, and the timber limit was given to the Conservative without competition, then he would have a case; but in that speech of his—which exceeded somewhat his own limits of what should be a proper speech, for, I believe, he enjoined the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright) to give him a gentle reminder when he went beyond an hour and six minutes—in that speech, he never ventured to make a suggestion, among all the charges he had to make, that the Government had in any one case given a Conservative a timber limit without competition for which a Liberal had applied or was applying; but, on the contrary, wherever there were two applications, the limit was given to the highest bidder, and where there was only one applicant, it was given to him on condition of his fulfilling the conditions required, whether he was a Liberal or a Conservative. Let the hon. gentleman put his hand upon a single case of a Liberal having been, because of his politics, refused a timber limit by this Government. Now, Sir, what has been the practical result? There were no less than 2,029 applications for licenses; the time of boom brought numerous applications. But, Sir, an application was not of any value; it gave no one anything except the privilege of making it, and the trouble to the Department of filing it; there was no money in the application, that is quite certain. I am speaking now of the applications up to the 1st of May of this year; and out of the 2,029 applications there were 568 Orders in Council authorising licenses to issue. But, Sir, the Order in Council did nothing; it did not authorise anyone except under permit to cut timber. In four cases in all, I believe persons have been permitted to cut timber under Order in Council. A license was required before anyone could cut timber; and, Sir, we find that, before the licenses were issued, after the mere passage of the Orders in Council, the result has been no profit to the people who applied, but this remarkble fact, that for ground rents alone, which did not give anyone a right to cut one stick of timber, the country received $24,062.27. Did that look like favoritism to anyone? Now, let us see what the country received for bonuses under this system under which we are told the Government gave away these timber limits in order to provide for their friends. In these cases, recollect, where no licenses were ever issued, the country received $21,226.25 from persons who were competing for the right to obtain licenses; and for royalties, in the four cases to which I have referred, in which timber was permitted to be cut, we received $8,587.92, so that for these cases where Orders in Council were passed, but no licenses were issued, the country received $54,176.44; and only in relation to $8,500 of that was there a right, on the part of a single person paying the money, to cut a single stick of timber. Yet that was the kind of favoritism and corruption bestowed on our friends—the corruption of letting them apply for licenses and giving them Orders in Council compelling them to pay the ground rent; and if they did not go further, if they did not make a survey, if they did not put up a mill and get out a license, they got nothing else and the country got the money. Now the total number of yearly licenses issued altogether was 96 and the total number of twenty-one years leases, and of these more than one-half, I believe, were got after public competition, was eleven. So that of leases of every kind, the total number issued, of yearly licenses and twenty-one years leases, was 107. The hon. gentleman has made the statement that Orders in Council were passed in favor of certain members of Parliament who applied for limits. Let me say that the question as to whether a gentleman, who is a member of Parliament, may apply to the Department for that which is open to the world to apply for, which is embodied in public regulations, which everyone can take advantage of, is one, perhaps, open to discussion, but certainly not open to the denunciation in which the hon. gentleman indulged. Then, he tells us, there were 17 altogether, members of the Senate and House of Commons, in whose behalf Orders in Council were passed. I presume that the $250, the first year's rental, was paid in every one of these cases, but I know, as a matter of fact, there were only three persons to whom leases were actually granted, and who, therefore, in virtue of those leases, were in a position to cut timber. These were, Mr. M. K. Dickinson, who is a lumberman, and whose business is to cut timber. Are we to be told that a lumber merchant, because he is in this Parliament, is to be deprived of the privilege of applying to Parliament to get that which any man can get? If it be shown that advantages were given to him which were not given to others, there might be some question as to his treatment, but in Ontario nobody ever objects to members of the Local Legislature getting timber limits from the Province of Ontario.

Mr. COOK. Does that apply to other lumbermen besides Mr. Dickinson?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Does what apply?

Mr. COOK. That he is a lumberman and has a right to get timber limits?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not know what the hon. gentleman is talking about. Mr. Dickinson was one, the other was Mr. Rykert, not acting for himself at all but as a trustee for Mr. John Adam; and the third was Mr. Hugh Sutherland, who is certainly, as I said on a former occasion, not a friend of this Government, who is certainly a member of the party opposite, but who took the same advantage everybody could take by applying for a timber berth and operating it in the way required by the regulations. There was, undoubtedly, a large number of permits issued, and a good deal has been made of their issue. No less than 6,837 permits were issued, but when I tell you that 4,581 of those were free permits, issued to settlers under the regulations of settlement, to enable them to obtain cordwood, it will be said that, at any rate, was not an act of corruption on the part of the Government. I say 4,581 were issued to settlers free of charge. Then the number of permits issued to cut timber for railway construction purposes, by promoters and others, amounted to 25. Then to cut cordwood upon berths along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, east of Monmouth Station, 30 miles east of Winnipeg, about 33 permits were issued, and everyone was obtained after public competition. Then there were permits for the cutting of logs and manufacturing them into lumber, under a policy which enabled the person to get a permit instead of a license. There were 43 of these permits, out of which the holders of only about 13 cut a large quantity. Of the remainder of those 6,837 permits, 2,000 were given to settlers and others to cut cordwood, house logs, &c., when they required more than they could obtain under the ordinary free permits given to homesteaders. That is the whole history of these timber limits, these licenses and permits; and I will ask hon. gentle-

men in this House to contrast the actual facts, as given to me by the officers of the Department to-date, to the first of May, with the arraignment of the hon. gentleman. He has been good enough to refer to letters, and to one written by myself, which I confess, had passed out of my mind until I heard it quoted either by the hon. gentleman himself or his coadjutor in this work, the member from Huron. It was a letter written on behalf of Mr. T. H. Schneider, who was formerly a resident of Montreal. Now, to show how little politics there was in this application, I may say that Mr. Schneider was the gentleman in whose office was held the caucus, at which the late Mr. Holton presided, when I was a candidate for Montreal West against Mr. Mackenzie, and at which the arrangement was made that I was to be beaten, by Mr. Mackenzie being made the temperance candidate. Mr. Schneider was the gentleman who went round Argenteuil, carrying, although he was a temperance advocate, the jar which went round for the benefit of the late Mr. Cushing at the time he defeated Mr. Abbott, and who was afterwards disqualified for eight years for the conduct chiefly of Mr. Schneider who was a prominent Liberal. My connection with him arose through the friendship which springs up very often in such cases. He and I were brother vestrymen of the same church in Montreal, St. George's Church, of which he was a prominent member, and when he removed to Winnipeg he wrote to me saying he was applying to the Department in connection with some timber limits, and he wanted something done, and asked me to write to the Department to urge action. That feeling of friendship, notwithstanding our political differences, induced me to send the letter referred to. I never knew what was done in that matter until somebody else intervened, and that was done which my letter failed to do. Among other names was that of Mr. R. S. White, who, I am told, got a timber limit in the North-West, and who is said to be editor of the Montreal *Gazette*. I was astonished to hear this. I know Mr. R. S. White as well as most people, and the last thing I ever dreamed of his going into, was timber limits or anything else outside his ordinary business. He sticks to his desk and attends to his work, and does not bother his head very much about matters outside. I dropped him a line to the gallery to know if he had a timber limit—it was an astonishing revelation to me—and I had this letter in return:

"Magee asked me in 1882 to apply for timber limit for him. The application was granted, but not a cent was paid thereon, and the whole thing lapsed. I had no interest good, bad, or indifferent in it, and had no intention otherwise than that of promoting his object. I was informed by a notice from the Department, a year or thereabouts after the application, that some money was due on the limit and tore up the paper at once. I never had a word of intercourse with any member of the Government on the subject, and no interest direct or remote in the matter."

Now, that is the result of that letter. Then he gave other letters, but surely hon. gentlemen opposite are not going to say that the writing of a letter to a Minister is an offence which is to be condemned, an offence which is to justify the passage of a resolution such as that which has been put in your hands. Who does not remember the very famous letter, which I have no doubt the gentleman who wrote it was very indignant to think got on to the file, as private letters sometimes do, the famous letter addressed to the late Premier by the leader of the Opposition, in which it was announced that "my friend Moore" wanted a contract for the Goderich harbor, and which recommended "my friend Moore" to the favorable consideration of the Minister. Now, in that particular case there was this difference. No one has pretended to say, the hon. gentleman has not pretended to say that anyone of these letters which he has recited here produced any result, that is to say, that it secured for the applicant anything which under the law he was not entitled to as applying for it; but in that case we know what did occur, the giving of the contract to the person in whose interest the hon. the leader of the Opposition wrote this timely and private letter, at a very much higher price than a good contractor had offered to do the work for.

Mr. McCALLUM. $30,000.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Oh, no; surely not $30,000.

An hon. MEMBER. $29,000.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think that was about it—$29,000 lost to the country as the result of a private letter written by the leader of this hon. gentleman, who is horrified that anything of this kind should happen, that members should write letters to a Department in matters of this kind. So much for this matter. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the subject of grazing leases; and he told us that we had given away an enormous area of land at 1 cent an acre, which he said was 6 per cent. on 16 cents an acre for grazing purposes in the North-West; and he hinted, although curiously enough he did not name the people in this case, that these must all have been given to friends of the Government. All I know is, that all the recent applications, or the great majority of the applications that I have seen, are from Montana ranchemen, who are going to move their herds over to our side of the line, because they believe that our side is, on the whole, better suited for ranching than theirs. Some of them are from persons who are driven off the United States ranches in consequence of the recent action of President Cleveland in connection with Indian reserves, and they are coming over and bringing their herds to establish their ranche business on our side. But the hon. gentleman says we have given lands far in advance of the requirements of the country. The applications which we are receiving from ranchemen, from Americans who have nothing whatever to do with our politics, who do not care anything for our politics, are of a character which indicate that we are not going in advance of the wants of the country, or of those who are disposed to establish that business in the North-West. He tells us that we have to-day cattle only to the extent of one for every 38 acres. That, perhaps, as a general statement, may appear to be an extraordinary fact, but, when you know that the rule is that there shall be one for every 10 acres, that it requires 10 acres of ranche country for the grazing of a single animal, I think you will agree with me that, in view of the fact that many of these leases have been granted within the last year or two years, and that these people have three years within which to complete the filling up of their ranches, tolerable progress has been made in connection with them. We have adopted the plan now, in consequence of the numerous applications which are being received, not from Canadians but from Americans who are coming over to our side and bringing their herds, of charging two cents, and the greatest possible pressure is being brought to bear on the Department by interests that are intimately connected with the North-West, not in any sense political, but connected with the ranche business, representing that we are charging too much, and ought to revert to the one cent an acre. For myself, I do not think we ought, and I believe it is the intention of the Government to adhere to the policy we have adopted of charging two cents. But the hon. gentleman says we have sold these lands—that is practically the statement—at 16 cents an acre, the one cent rental being 6 per cent. on that. What do we give these people? We give them the right to graze their cattle upon a certain area of land, but we reserve to the settler the right of going into that country; and every even-numbered section in that whole ranche country is as open to-day for settlement as if there were no cattle grazing upon it. These people run the risk, therefore, if they get a good ranche, with a good deal of bottom lands upon it, of having settlers

crowding in upon them; and, after they get their cattle there, they may find the settlers crowding in to such an extent that they are seriously inconvenienced in the work they have specially set for themselves. So that we have not locked up the land from settlement, but on the contrary have reserved for the settler, that being the first consideration, the right to go in there and settle. We have received already on account of these ranche lands, an amount which would not have been received at all, of which we would not have seen a dollar, of $76,53 .29. But that is not all. What is the result in another sense? As the result of this ranche business, as the result of encouraging people to come in here and bring their herds and raise cattle in the country, we are able to supply our Mounted Police and our Indians at a far lower price than we could have done otherwise. In connection with the North-West Mounted Police we have the cost of beef supplied during the last three years, $95,540, and, under the contract we are just letting in the Indian Department to persons within the country and whose cattle are within the country, we would at their prices get the same supply for $54,917.52, or about $41,000 of a saving upon the three years' operations in connection with the beef supply of the North-West Mounted Police. Then I find that, with regard to the Indian supply, taking the supply of last year at the price we paid for it and taking that same quantity at the price for which we are now letting contracts as the result of this ranche business being carried on within the country, the saving to the country would be $ 0,500, or on these two items alone over $120,000, which may fairly be added in the meantime to the amount we have received for the ranches themselves as showing what the advantage to the country has been. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that we should not have adopted the ranche principle? Does he pretend to say that we should not have encouraged the herding of cattle in our North-Western prairies, which are so well adapted for grazing purposes, so well adapted that they are attracting at this moment the attention of Americans who are bringing their cattle over from the other side? No, Sir; I venture to say that if we had not done this, if we had allowed this land to lie fallow, and made no effort to utilise it to the public advantage, while not interfering with the settlement of the country, the first person to attack us would have been the hon. gentleman opposite, who would have pointed out that we were recreant to our duty in not securing the revenue to the country from this land which a wise policy would have enabled us to realise. In the United States they do not adopt this plan. There, a ranchman and a number of his cow-boys take up homesteads near together, they get four, or five, or six thousand acres in a block in that way. They make that their headquarters, it is their own land; they get it under the ordinary homestead and pre-emption system that prevails in the United States, and then their cattle graze over the whole country without their paying to the Government a sixpence of rental of any kind whatever. It seems to me we have adopted a wiser principle in dealing with ranches. Then the hon. gentleman tells us that we are giving coal areas to people; but he did not name the people who had got the coal areas. He made the extraordinary statement that the result of our policy was to make fuel dearer to the people of the North West. Why, the hon. gentleman has never been in the North-West, I believe? The hon. gentleman who seconds his motion has been there, and has made considerable profit out of the North-West. He is one of those land speculators, one of those men, who, at the moment when a system was adopted by which land was given at $1 an acre with a payment of 10 cents down, rushed in and took some 60,000 acres of land which he holds now, and which makes him a millionaire, and makes him better able to carry his election the next time on the same principle on which he has carried his elections in the past. But the hon. gentleman who moved this motion, I suppose, has never been in the North-West, and he did not know, therefore, much about the question of fuel. I believe I am right in saying that the result of opening up those coal areas under the policy adopted by the Government, has been to reduce the price of coal in Winnipeg from $17 to $7 a ton. Therefore, if it be true that we have given these coal areas, even if it be to friends, we have at least the satisfaction of knowing that we have made fuel cheaper to the settlers of the North-West, that we had, in fact, reduced the price by considerably more than one-half, because, as you go further west and get nearer the coal areas, you will find that the price now is, I have no hesitation in saying, at least one-third what it was before. Now, with regard to these coal areas, we have adopted precisely the same policy as that adopted by the United States; and I confess I was rather astonished when, in the one particular in which we have slavishly followed the American system, after the hon. gentleman has been parading the American system, has been calling upon us every Session, to take a leaf out of the book of our friends on the other side of the border, yet, when we have done it in this particular case, still the hon. gentleman is not pleased, still he thinks we should have adopted some other plan. He says we ought to offer these to public competition. Why, Sir, how could we offer them to public competition? Coal underlies the whole North-West, and you can hardly tell where it may not be found. The policy we adopted is, that where there is a coal area we fix the price, as they do in the United States under similar conditions, at $10 an acre, or, if it be anthracite coal, such as is found in the mountains, where the price was formerly $20 an acre, we have reduced it down to $12.50, upon the representation of the Inspector of Mines, that the cost of mining was so great that it was better to reduce it to $12.50 in order to ensure the development of the anthracite mines to be found in the mountains. Now, any one can go in and get a coal area if he knows where to select it. He comes to the Department and pays his $10 an acre, and then he can go back and open the seam and supply the people with coal, and so ensure cheap fuel for the people of the North-West. Then again, with regard to this matter of grazing lands, the hon. gentleman has been dealing considerably with the question of members of Parliament being interested in this matter. If I may refer to a previous debate which took place last night—although I know it is not in order—a member of this House was attacked because he had ranches in Texas. But what is he to do? If he had taken a ranche in Canada and put his cattle upon it in exactly the same way, he would have been attacked just the same, because it would then have been said that he was a mere pensioner upon the Government and could not therefore give an independent vote. When he goes to Texas he is attacked because he has gone away from the country and established a ranche in a foreign country. Now, Sir, as to this question of competition; the hon. gentleman has referred to an alleged fact—although it is not a fact—that some of these timber limits were sold by their holders at enormous prices to outside people. Now, there is not one of these outside people who could not have applied for his timber limit and who could not have obtained it by ordinary competition, if there were two persons who wanted it. But, Sir, we are to be told that the fact that people outside will sometimes purchase from a man who gets possession of a limit, is an evidence that the man in the first instance has got it improperly? What shall we say, then, of a celebrated lumber company with which, if I mistake not, that gentleman from Simcoe has something to do? What are we to say of that company? It is quite true that the unfortunate people which put their money into it did not find that it was quite as valuable as they were led to

believe when they invested. But, Mr. Speaker, they could have come to Canada if they had thought proper under this magnificent Ontario system, they could have got their timber limits in the ordinary way; but they seemed to have preferred to purchase from the hon. gentleman opposite, on his representations, though God knows what there was in him to commend him to them. They seemed to prefer to take his recommendation, and they gave him an enormous sum of money for the limits he controlled. Now that was a transaction where the money really passed.

Mr. COOK. I just wish to correct the hon. gentleman. The statement that he is making is false.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Well, Mr. Speaker, I will not answer that. The hon. gentleman's business matters are not matters that concern me; but I do not think his statement that that is false will go down outside this House—of course here it must be accepted. Then finally we had the colonisation companies referred to. We were told those companies were an enormous source of corruption in connection with this Government, and the extraordinary thing is that we were told that those companies had actually obstructed settlement in the North West. The hon. gentleman ought to have known, and could have known if he had made enquiries or had visited the country, that but for the colonisation companies the settlers to be found on those tracts never would have been there. The result in connection with those companies has been this: In that case, as in the case of the timber limits, there were a large number of applications for colonisation companies, a large number of applicants for the privilege—for that is all they obtained—of placing settlers in the North-West, and obtaining payment for doing that by a grant of land at a lower price than the ordinary price. Let me say this—that hon. gentlemen opposite adopted this principle; they recognised the importance of securing outside influence in settling the country to such an extent that they actually passed an Order in Council by which they gave to people 80 acres of land for every settler they brought into the North-West and put upon a homestead. That is the policy they adopted; that is to say, taking the land at $2 an acre, they gave $160 for every settler brought into the North-West. There were, as I have said, a large number of applications for colonisation companies, no less than 260 applications, of which only 117 were authorised by Order in Council. But, as in the case of the timber licenses and timber limits, the Order in Council did nothing. It required before anything was done that a contract should be signed by the company under which they undertook to perform the duties imposed on them; and the number of contracts entered into, that is the number of colonisation companies which actually went into operation, was 28 out of 260 applications. I do not think those gentlemen ought to be charged with anything wrong in having applied for the privilege of colonising the North-West. That certainly is not the ground of complaint made against them. The number of contracts, I say, is 28, and the number of members of the House of Commons whose names appear as incorporators or shareholders of those companies is, so far as the records of the Department show, six; and curiously enough they are equally divided between the two sides of the House, three to each. And if my friends on this side will not consider that I reflect unduly on them, I venture to say that the great influence was on the other side of the House. I find that one of those members was Hon. Alexander Mackenzie; and yet the hon. gentleman not satisfied with having turned the hon. member for East York out of the leadership, not satisfied with having brought him down to sorrow and to what I fear is very nearly his grave, he insults him in this House to-night by intimating that his joining a colonisation company was an act of corruption of which no public man should be guilty. Who is the next? A gentleman who is held in the highest respect by both sides of the House, an intimate friend of your own, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gunn, of Kingston. The third was a gentleman who, I am bound to say, turns up in pretty nearly everything, Mr. Hugh Sutherland. On this side of the House we had Mr. Small, Mr. Wallace (York), and another gentleman whose name I cannot distinctly make out as it is written in a very small hand. These are the only members of the House in connection with the colonisation companies.

Mr. McMULLEN. Are there any in connection with printing companies?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There were five Senators. They were, the late colleague of the hon. gentleman opposite, and present leader of the Liberal party in the Senate, Hon. R. W. Scott, Hon. Mr. Reesor, Hon. Thomas Ryan, Hon. A. W. Ogilvie and the late Mr. Gibbs. So altogether there were eleven members of Parliament, Senate and Commons, and of those six were Conservatives and five Reformers, including among the Reformers the leader of the late Government and the leader in the Senate of the late Government. That is perhaps the best answer that can be given to the charge that being connected with a colonisation company unfits a man for a seat in Parliament, and lays him open to the suspicion of being influenced by corrupt motives. Those colonisation companies, moreover, did not simply get their contracts and do nothing. The Government received from those companies $760,253 in hard cash, evidence, I think, and pretty strong evidence of the good spirit with which they went in to complete the work they had undertaken when they entered into the contract. One company alone, the Saskatchewan Homestead Company, paid $156,000 to the Government. In addition to that we have the sworn statement of their auditors, after an examination of their books, that the company had expended in securing settlement, in aiding settlers, in putting them upon the land, in erecting mills in some cases, in building roads, in supplying the settlers with seed grain and in assisting them in every possible way, not less than $367,932, in addition to the amount paid to the Government. Yet we are to be told that the policy which induced numbers of persons, men outside Parliament altogether, for the number of members of Parliament was infinitesimally small, to undertake the colonisation of the North-West, is to be denounced by hon. gentlemen opposite as if it was a violation of the duty of the Government and reflected in some way upon the character of members of this House. I do not think it is necessary I should say more in relation to the arraignment of the Government by the hon. gentleman opposite. I have dealt with the several points to which he referred. I have shown you, Sir, that as to the timber limits any man could come in and get them under the regulations; that the policy of competition is now the absolute policy, and that as to one-third of the cases where limits were given since 1878, they were let by public competition. As to the coal areas, I have shown that they are open to anyone to go in and take a coal area, by paying his $10, and that the result has been largely to reduce the price of fuel. I have shown that as to the grazing lands, we have received an enormous amount in actual cash, and that we have the advantage of a lower price for the food supplied to the Indians and the Mounted Police. I have shown as to the colonisation companies that we have secured through their instrumentality and the work they have done, important settlements in the North-West country which would not have been there to-day without their exertions; that the country has received a large sum of money—over $750,000; that there has been received in connection with the settlement of the North-West $365,000 outside of that; and that all that has been done under the operation of a policy open to everybody, which everybody can take advantage of, and that in rela-

tion to it not a single member on that side has ventured to say that a Liberal was refused what a Conservative was given; but that any man on either side can get what could be got under the ordinary public regulations of the Department, adopted with a view to the development of the North-West Territories. Under these circumstances, I believe the House will reject the resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask for information if those colonisation companies were all outside the present limits of Manitoba?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No, all of them are not—I think the Shell River Company is not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The bulk of them are?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, I think so.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman appeared to be apprehensive in his opening remarks, that the tone of public morality would be lowered.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am not surprised that hon. gentlemen howl. They have had a good deal to howl about for the last few days, and they shall have a good deal more to howl about before this Parliament is over, and therefore it does not surprise me that they howl now. I say that the hon. gentleman appeared in his opening remarks to be apprehensive that the tone of public morality would be lowered, because the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) charged that members of Parliament had been in the constant habit of communicating with the Government on behalf of their political friends, and asking favors at the hands of the Government for their political friends. Now, Sir, I do not understand that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) charges it as a crime against the Government, or against members of Parliament, that they had so communicated with the Government. Had the hon. gentleman done so I for one am free to confess that I would not have agreed with my hon. friend for North Norfolk. The Government have enough sins to answer for without being responsible for the sin, if it is one, of members of Parliament, or the public generally, communicating with them upon matters relating to public affairs. Had the matter ended with communications from members of Parliament, as far as I am concerned, at all events, I would have made no complaint. The complaint is not that members of Parliament have communicated with the Government, seeking favors at the hands of the Government for their friends, but the complaint is and the charge is that the Government have yielded to those demands, not only when made by members of Parliament for themselves, but when made by members of Parliament for their friends. The charge is that members of Parliament have used their political power and influence in Parliament for the purpose of securing these advantages, and the charge is that not only have members of Parliament done so but that members of the Administration, gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches, have so done. When we find that one Minister of the Crown, while he was a Minister of the Crown, secured a large bonus for a railway of which he was the head, the middle and the tail; when we find that the Minister of Railways appeals to the Minister of Railways, and the Minister of Railways appeals to the Government of the country to secure a bonus on behalf of his own railway, and secures it; when we find that the Secretary of State appeals to the Government of which he is a member, in order that a bonus should be granted of the people's money to the railway in which he has a controlling interest and secures it; when we find that a member of Parliament, who is now a Minister of the Crown, secures of the public domain a very considerable slice for himself and his family, when we find that a member of Parliament, who controlled a leading newspaper supporting the Administration, converted that newspaper into a joint-stock company, to evade the Independence of Parliament Act, and when he became a Minister of the Crown, nominally severed his connection with that newspaper, and when we find that that newspaper received public money, to the extent of $18,000 to $20,000 a year—when we find these things, one is not surprised that public morality should be considerably lowered; one is not surprised, when such things are done by Ministers of the Crown, that members of Parliament think they have the right to do the same thing. Now, Sir, the defence of the hon. gentleman, in my judgment, is an extraordinary defence. He first states that the policy of the Conservative Government, before the Liberals assumed office in 1873, was that the public domain should be disposed of by public competition; that the Liberals changed that, and that their policy has continued since, as the Liberals created it after they assumed office. All I can say is, and I am prepared to establish it by the blue-books I hold in my hand, that whatever the law may have been on this subject, the policy of the Conservative Government, before 1873 and in 1873, before the Liberals assumed office, was to grant the public domain, without tender and without competition; and before I resume my seat, I shall establish that fact without peradventure, notwithstanding the statements of the Minister of the Interior. The hon. gentleman complains that while the Liberal Administration were in power they granted of timber limits 605 square miles. Sir, if that is a ground of complaint what shall be said of this Administration which have granted of the public domain to their political friends, in Parliament and out of Parliament, not less than 25,000 square miles of the public domain in the short period of seven years? The hon. gentleman says: Can it be shown that any Liberal in Parliament or out of Parliament applied for a timber limit, and that the timber limit was refused to him and given to a Conservative? I am not prepared to say, but on reference to the Sessional Papers I find is one of the returns brought down some very extraordinary comments and remarks made by the deputy, or whoever prepared the return. For instance you will find this state of things. A. B. makes application for a timber limit. The answer is you cannot have it—reserved. C. D. makes application for a timber limit. The answer is you cannot have it—already granted. E. F. makes application for a timber limit, and the answer is cannot have it; it is embraced within another limit, and so on, until in one return you find some 40 or 50 cases of that kind. And singularly enough, if you will read them over, you will find that many of those applicants so treated are Liberals. Now, in regard to this timber limit business, if everybody was placed on the same footing, if the Liberals were dealt with as the Conservatives were dealt with, it is extraordinary that out of the hundreds of applications that have been granted, both in the North-West Territories and in what is called the disputed territory, not more than half a dozen were granted to men who, in so far as I can discover, can be claimed as Liberals All the grants of the public domain which have been made by this Administration have been made to supporters of themselves, either in or out of Parliament. But, Sir, that does not make the matter any better or any worse. What the Liberal party has always complained of is that the public domain should be given away without notice and without competition to favorites of the Government or to those whom they expected to seduce into allegiance. The country suffers all the same, whether the grant is made to a Liberal or a Conservative. The hon. gentleman further thinks to justify the position of the Government by reference to a matter which he has brought up in the House a score of times—a letter written by the hon. member for West Durham to a person of the name of Moore, by which he alleges that some $29,000 was lost to the Dominion of Can-

ada; but he says not a word about the contract on the Canadian Pacific Railway which was given to the second lowest tenderer, by the late Minister of Railways, on the ground that the cheque sent in by the lowest tenderer as security for the completion of the contract was irregular, although in one hour he could have found out whether it was good or not by communicating with the Bank of Montreal, and although as a matter of fact, the Secretary of the Minister of Railways had notice from the Bank of Montreal that the cheque was perfectly good, by which transaction $214,000 of public money was stolen out of the public exchequer. The hon. gentleman forgot that another noted friend of the Administration, Mr. Onderdonk, who was not the lowest tenderer, got another contract on the Canadian Pacific Railway at a sum $209,000 above the lowest tenderer. The hon. gentleman forgot to mention that on the Carillon Canal the second lowest tenderer got a contract at an advance of $49,000 over the lowest. Then the hon. gentleman undertook to justify the Government by an allusion to a small speculation I made in the North-West. He said the hon. member for West Huron rushed to the North-West when he could get land at $1 an acre, bought it, and sold it at a profit. I bought nothing from the Government of Mr. Mackenzie; what I bought was while the Tory Government was in power; but I bought little from the Government; the greater portion of the land I bought was from a son of the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba and his friends, a late colleague of hon. gentlemen opposite. If hon. gentlemen can make any capital out of that, they are entirely welcome to do it, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. FARROW. You made money out of it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Yes, I made money, but I did not use my influence as you did to get offices and land from the Government for your brother and your friends.

Mr. COOK. What have you to say to that?

Mr. FARROW. I will tell you if you let me.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You will have a chance when I get through. The hon. member who spoke referred especially to the disposal by the Government of the public domain in the North-West Territories. I discussed, not so much the disposal of that as the disposal of the public domain in the disputed territory. The hon. Minister of the Interior and myself have not exactly agreed upon the facts. To-night I propose to do as I have done elsewhere, prove from the blue-books every statement I make. In the month of December last, I charged this Administration with having partitioned a large portion of the timber limits in the disputed territory, pending the settlement of the northern and western boundary of Ontario, among their camp followers in Parliament and their party hacks out of it, and I gave the names of thirty-three followers of this Administration who were so favored by them. Now, Sir, as it is important that the names of these beneficiaries of this benevolent Administration should reach the public, not simply to the limited extent that my speech made in December last reached them, but should reach every portion of the wide Dominion, I propose to-night to repeat every name I gave in that speech. I charge that the following corporations and individuals obtained limits in the disputed territory, all of them friends of the Administration:—

	Acres.
The St. Catharines Milling & Lumbering Company, President of the Co., Capt. Murray, of St. Catharines, who is also President of the Conservative Association for the County of Lincoln; P. H. Chabot, an Ottawa Tory heeler; J. C. Gouin, the Tory Postmaster at Ottawa, and H A. Costigan, a son of the Minister of Inland Revenue, are all corporators of this Company which obtained of Ontario timber limits	32,000
C. J. Campbell of Toronto, the Tory brother of the Tory Postmaster General	32,000
Hugh Macdonald, a Toronto Tory	32,000
Henry O'Brien, the Tory brother of the Tory member for Muskoka, obtained	32,000
C. J. Small, the Tory brother of the Tory member for East Toronto, got	32,000
F. C. Campbell, a relative of the Postmarter-General, secured	32,000
W. B. Scarth, a Tory hanger-on and wire-puller, and manager of the North-West Land Company, obtained	32,000
H. C. St. George, a Toronto liquor dealer who supplied the frozen whiskey to John Shields—(laughter) got	32,000
Frank Arnoldi, a Tory lawyer in Toronto, brother-in-law of the unseated and disqualified Tory member for Muskoka, licensee for	32,000
J. S. Aikens, the Tory son of the Tory Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, and late colleague of Sir John A. Macdonald, managed to get	32,000
David Blain, who was once a Liberal, but who could not get his own way with the party, and so settled down among the Tories, has been rewarded for his unfaithfulness to his party with	32,000
L R. O'Brien, a relative to the Tory member for Muskoka, got.	32,000
John Ginty, a Tory, formerly a partner of John Shields, got	32,000
John Shields, a notorious Tory political tramp, and the hero of the frozen whiskey, as a reward for his political frauds, secured	32,000
H. Montplaisir, Tory member for Champlain, Quebec, secured.	32,000
H. Robillard, Tory M.P.P. for Russell, obtained	32,000
G. W. Monk, Tory M. P.P. for Carleton	32,000
T. G. Blackstock, Toronto, the Tory brother of the twice defeated Tory candidate for Lennox, is down for	32,000
N. F. Paterson, a Tory lawyer, and the defeated Tory candidate for one of the Victorias	32,000
John Bain, a Toronto Tory lawyer, and a defeated Tory candidate for East York, is licensee for	32,000
F. T. Bulmer, the Tory partner of the Tory nephew of the Tory Minister of Railways, got	32,000
Thomas Birkett, a Tory ex-alderman of Ottawa, always on the "make," got	32,000
H Chabot, a French Canadian Tory alderman, Ottawa, secured	32,000
David Tisdale, a Tory lawyer of Simcoe, and defeated Tory candidate for North Norfolk, to recompense him for his valuable service to the Tory party, got	32,000
James Murray, St. Catharines, President of the Conservative Association of Lincoln, to recompense him for his services to J. C. Rykert, secured	32,000
J. W. McRae, Tory wire-puller of Ottawa, who works for the party when the party pays him, and the party pays him by a steal of	32,000
J. J. Macdonald, the Tory partner of the notorious John Shields	32,000
Stuart Mulvey, a Winnipeg Tory, defeated Tory candidate for Selkirk, secured	32,000
W. J. McAuley—this man used to be a Liberal, but went over to the Tories—gets a double share of the spoils because he proved a traitor to Ontario interests, and so he gets	64,000
The Keewatin Lumber Company, the leading spirits in which are Mr. Fuller, a leading Tory of Hamilton, John Dennis, a Weston Tory, and John and R W. Mather, Ottawa Tories, secured	32,000
H. H. Bailey, the Tory nephew of the Tory Minister of Railways, through the influence of Uncle John, grabs	32,000
H. Bulmer, Tory partner of Hon J H. Pope's Tory nephew, secured	32,000
Thomas Shortiss, a Toronto Tory, obtained	32,000

Hon. John Costigan, Minister of Inland Revenue, did not think it inconsistent to secure for himself 50 square miles, and so he promptly makes the haul.

I observe that in the whole list, there is just one mistake as to the politics of the individuals. I refer to Mr. John Mather and his son, and I tender my humble apologies to them for placing them in such company. In that list, every single man, except the Mathers, is a Conservative. Of these names, few, if any, are in the list of my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) though some of them have obtained limits, not only in the North-West Territories but in the disputed territories as well, so that their names appear twice, they having obtained Orders in Council twice. I at once admit that the charges I have made elsewhere, and that I make here, are grave and serious charges to formulate against this or any Administration, and that such charges should not be made unless well founded. No public man, in or out of Parliament, ought to frame these charges against this or any other Administration unless upon evidence sufficiently clear to establish the truth of his charges. I admit at once the responsibility any public man assumes when he charges the Government with wholesale plundering of the public domain, and especially when that public domain does not belong to the Government. If the charges I have made against the Administration to-night are true, and if the charges made by my hon. friend from North Norfolk are true, the Government deserve at the hands of Parliament the severest condemna-

tion ; on the other hand, if the indictment preferred by the hon. member for North Norfolk and myself be untrue we both deserve to be censured by the people. A member of the Government, out of Parliament, undertook to challenge the correctness of the statements which I have made out of Parliament, and which are practically those I have made in Parliament to-night. He challenged me to formulate these charges upon the floor of Parliament, and promised that if I did he would meet them fully. I appeal to any intelligent man, who is not completely encrusted in party prejudice, to say if the answer made by the Minister of the Interior to-night is satisfactory.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I know it is satisfactory to everybody who has got a timber limit, to every hon. member who has got a railway bonus, to every one who has got a printing contract, but these are not independent men and ought not to be called on as jurors to decide whether this Government is guilty or not of the high crimes and misdemeanors with which the hon. member for North Norfolk has charged it. The hon. the Minister of the Interior, at Dunnville, on the 28th January, 1886, in reply to the charges I made against his Administration, said :

"It is charged that members of Parliament have been interested in these limits. My answer to that is that in the great majority of cases cited by Mr. Cameron there is not a word of truth in the charge."

And further :

"Members of Parliament, at the request of their constituents and others, frequently write letters to the Department in regard to timber limits as well as in regard to any other matters of business in which their constituents may be interested, and it is a new doctrine that they are to be assumed to have a personal interest because they do write. But if they were all interested, and obtained their limits under the regulations, they are entirely within their rights and are not to be condemned."

I made no charges against the Administration, because members of Parliament have written to the Government making demands on the Government. The charge I make against them is that they are guilty, because they have parcelled out the public domain among their own followers. The Minister of the Interior, in a speech delivered at St. Thomas, on the 8th of January, 1886, as reported in the *Daily Times* of the 9th of January, 1886, said :

"Mr. Cameron said that thirty-four of the Premier's friends had each been awarded fifty square miles of timber limits, and besides that thirty-two permits had been issued, in addition to these thirty-four special licenses. It is true that there were permits issued to parties to cut firewood and to take out railroad ties, and there were permits issued during Mr. Mackenzie's *regime* as well. It was alleged by Mr. Cameron that the Hon. John Costigan secured from the Government fifty square miles of these timber limits. As a matter of fact Mr. Costigan never applied for and never received one mile of timber limits in the disputed territory. This strikes off only thirty-four and leaves thirty-three remaining. Of this latter number eleven never had a license, never applied for permits, and could not cut timber. Sixteen of the other licenses expired a year ago, so that there are just six licenses in existence at the present time." (Cheers.)

Now, I observe that these statements of the Minister of the Interior were lustily cheered by his admirers at St. Thomas and elsewhere. If the Minister's answers were true then I admit that the Tories were fairly entitled to the enjoyment of this crumb of comfort. But were they true ? Let us see whether they are true or not. Bear in mind that the charge I levelled against the Administration then and which I make against them now is that, pending the settlement of the western and north-western boundary of Ontario, this Administration parcelled out among their camp followers, thirty three of them, a large portion of the timber limits in the disputed territory. I gave their names upon the occasion I referred to, and I have given them again to-night. I further charged that thirty-three others whose names I did not give shared in the spoils this Government placed at their disposal. Now, it must not be forgotten that the award—and I am now dealing entirely with the disputed territory, some of my friends will deal with the balance of the answer of the Minister of the Interior—was executed by the arbitrators on the 3rd August, 1878. Bear also in mind—and it is an important element in discussing and considering how far this Administration is responsible to the charge I made against them—that the judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council affirming, the boundary fixed by the arbitrators, was delivered on the 11th August, 1884. I know, as my hon. friend said, that this is not a very gracious task. I know that, when you begin to touch members of Parliament in Parliament, and the friends of members of Parliament, there is a howl on the other side of the House and there is a howl in the country; but my sense of public duty will never prevent me, by the howls of the hon. gentlemen or the squealings of hon. gentlemen, from discharging my duties in Parliament and out of Parliament. I know an hon. member in this House the other night declared that :

"The hon. member for West Huron has indulged on former occasions as well as upon the present in such wild extravagance of statement and such violence of language as to place himself beyond the pale of that intercourse which should exist between one member and another."

That to me was not, as the hon. gentleman intended it should be, a terrible infliction. I can stand it. I think I can bear it. The sentence passed upon me of perpetual exclusion from the social Tory circle, is a sentence that does not affect me very seriously; and I can say that it shall not deter me from exposing what I conceive to be the maladministration of the Department of the Interior, in Parliament and out of Parliament; and it shall never prevent me from exposing what I believe to be the misconduct of this Administration, either upon the floors of Parliament or outside of Parliament. All the same, it will not prevent me from so doing, fearful and terrible as the consequences may be to myself of perpetual exclusion from the Tory social circle. Now, I have already proved out of Parliament, I shall prove to-night in Parliament, every single charge I made against this Administration in the speech I made at Bruceville, which was commented on so vigorously by the Minister of the Interior. I charged that, pending the settlement of the western boundary of Ontario, this Administration granted to their political friends and followers, in and out of Parliament, a large portion of the timber limits in the disputed territory. I shall prove it out of the mouth of the Minister of the Interior, I shall prove it by the returns brought down to Parliament, I shall prove it by the blue-books that are within my control here. My charge was that the Government has parcelled out among sixty-seven of their camp followers a large portion of the timber limits of the disputed territory. Why, the hon. Minister of the Interior, in reply to a question put to the Government by the member for West York admitted that, between the date of the award fixing the western boundary of Ontario and the date of the judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council affirming that boundary, this Government passed no less than 111 Orders in Council disposing of timber limits in the disputed territory. He also admitted that, since 1881, the Government had granted sixty-three permits to sixty-three different individuals to cut timber in the disputed territory. In other words, the Minister of the Interior, although out of Parliament and on the public platform stated that the charges I made against the Government were, in the great majority of cases, incorrect and untrue, in his own place in Parliament, with the documents before him and better informed on the subject had to admit that, after the boundary award was made, this Administration has granted by Orders in Council and by permits the right to cut timber in the disputed territory in 174 different cases.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Nothing of the kind.

Mr. FARROW. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Who says "nothing of the kind?"

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do.

Mr. FARROW. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. COOK. What do you know about it?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I will show it is so. I will prove it. I have the documents, and I will prove it before I sit down.

Mr. FARROW. Prove it now. Your tongue goes too fast.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). In some of the cases the Orders in Council authorised the issue of licenses; in others permits were granted without Orders in Council; but, so far as the public are concerned, or so far as the public interest is concerned, it makes no kind of difference whether the right to cut timber is obtained by an Order in Council, a license or a permit; the country suffers all the same. I, with extreme moderation, only placed the number at 67. The Minister of the Interior puts both classes at 174. Does he still adhere to the statement he made which I quoted from——

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The statement he made at St. Thomas that, in the great majority of cases cited by Mr. Cameron, there is not a word of truth?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). He does adhere to it, does he? Then, if he does, I desire to quote the Minister of the Interior in the House against the Hon. Mr. White out of the House, and I shall do so in a few minutes. But, in case the people of this country—I do not mean this House; I do not know that any arguments any man could use in the House would affect members in this House; it is not in the nature of things that you could expect that hon. gentlemen who have been sharing in these spoils are in a position to give an independent opinion—as the hon. the Minister of the Interior out of Parliament and in Parliament may not be considered a very reliable witness, even when he gives evidence in support of an Administration of which he is so distinguished a member, I intend not to take the words of the Minister of the Interior, but to refer to the returns brought down to Parliament and the blue-books submitted to Parliament. I will take the Sessional Papers of 1882, No. 30.

Mr. COOK. Yell now, why don't you?

Mr. FARROW. Two hundred square miles.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You will find in this Sessional Paper a return submitted on the 8th March, 1882. In that Sessional Paper you will find the name of Turner & Co., of Germain & Co., of J. Bergin & Co.—perhaps the hon. member for Cornwall knows something of that—who received each a yearly license to cut timber in the disputed territory. You will also find in the same return the name of Joseph Whitehead, of W. J. Macaulay, of Stephen H. Fowler, of R. Fuller & Co., of Macaulay, Ginty & Sprague, each of whom obtained a license to cut timber for twenty-one years in the disputed territory. You will find in the Sessional Papers for 1883, No. 118, another return submitted to Parliament, and this return is entitled as follows:—

"Permits granted on lands within the territory now in dispute with Ontario from August, 1878, to March, 1883."

In that return there are the names of thirty-five individuals, each of whom obtained permits to cut timber in this disputed territory. The list embraces the following names:—R. J. Short, who was a partner of the Hon. John Costigan, now Minister of Inland Revenue. R. J. Short obtained a second and third permit. Costigan & Short, the Minister of Inland Revenue and his Conservative partner, also obtained a permit to cut timber in the disputed territory. So did John Lewis, a friend of the Minister of Inland Revenue—as you will find in the correspondence here in my hand, letters from John Costigan, addressed to the Department begging the Department to give his friend Lewis a permit to cut timber. You will find H. Bulmer, a partner of the nephew of the Minister of Railways, got a permit, and John Lewis got a second permit.

An hon. MEMBER. Why not?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does the hon. Minister deny it? He stated at St. Thomas that the statements made by me were not true. I am within the mark when I say that I did not give one-third of the names of parties who had permits from this Administration to cut timber in the disputed territory. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company that rules this Government, had a permit. Patrick Macdonald had a permit, and so on through the list of 35 individuals, and I venture to state that in the whole list there are not four individuals who ever pretended to be Liberals. In the first list I read there are the names of seven who obtained permits to cut timber, and in the next list there were 35 persons who obtained permits to cut timber after the boundary award was executed by the arbitrators. I hold in my hands a statement the original of which was prepared in the Department of the Interior, and I challenge the hon. gentleman as to its correctness. It is a statement of the permits granted by this Administration to their political friends after the boundary award was made. That statement is entitled:

Schedule showing the names of persons who cut timber under permits in that part of the Dominion of Canada declared by an Order of the Queen's Council to be within the Province of Ontario.

That list of names is as follows:—

"R. J. Short, Jno. Lewis, J. W. Macdonald, R. J. Short, Costigan & Short, H. H. Bailey, H. Bulmer, jr., John Lewis, H. R. McDonald, R. J. Short, Clifford Lewis, W. L. Baker, Frank Gardner, Mrs. J. Genaghty, P. MacDonald, D. Carmichael, A. D. MacDonald, Jas. Baston, N. D. Coates, John Culbert, Jno. Short, Geo. Munroe, Geo. Myers, Wm McKinnon, E. A. Sharpe, C. Kobold, A. Mulligan, J. Hennessy, Jno. Ward, E. M. Ridout, Jno. O. Miller, R. H. Bunting, R. J. Short, Angus MacDonald, Jacob Rose, Dick, Banning & Co., Jno. McLeod, C. W. Chadwick, Mrs. McKenna, Ste. Catharines Lumber Co. Rainy Lake Lumber Co, W. Cameron, T. W. Dobbie, Jacob Smith, Jno W. Colcleugh, Robt. Bunting. C. S. Hoare, Frank Gardner, Julius Colombe, Geo. Gagnon, Pat. Fitzgerald, Thompson & Palmer J. W. P. Witten. Chas. Ward, Frank Ward. Jos. McCracken, Wm. Zippell, Jno. Ward, A. E. Mulligan, John Thompson, M. Ritchie."

Most of these names are perfectly familiar to hon. gentlemen in this House, especially familiar to members of the Administration. Now, Sir, the Minister of the Interior, at St. Thomas, told the electors there a further story to which I wish to refer. He said permits were given to parties to cut firewood and railway ties, and the impression he left upon the audience, the impression he intended to leave upon the audience, was that the Government gave permits in the disputed territory for no other purposes, except to cut firewood and railway ties. I say that is not correct. A reference to the returns I have referred to, shows that in eight different cases, the Government gave permits to cut poles, ties, lumber and square timber. The Minister went further, and in undertaking to answer the charges that had been made against this Administration, said that permits to cut timber were issued during Mr. Mackenzie's *regime*—and bear in mind he was then discussing the timber limits in the disputed territory, and that only. He was attempting to answer the charge I had made in December last against the Administration. I say it is not true that Mr. Mackenzie, during his *regime*, granted permits to cut timber in the disputed territory. No permits appear during that period in the returns submitted to Parliament; no permits appear in the blue-book during that period; no permit existed anywhere, except in the fertile brain of the Minister of the Interior; and I will prove that out of his

own mouth. He said, in reply to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), not long ago, that no permits were issued to cut timber in this territory prior to the year 1881. Then, if that is the case, how could the hon. gentleman at St. Thomas say that the Mackenzie Administration granted permits likewise?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman is so reported in the Tory organ, and he now takes the convenient way of denying the correctness of the report.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman had referred, in a speech which he made, to 34 cases in which licenses were granted. I dealt simply with those 34 cases, and nothing more. I pointed out that as to those cases, two or three of them, I forget which, were issued by Orders in Council, passed in the Mackenzie Administration.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I know the hon. gentleman was dealing with my charges against the Government for parcelling out timber limits in the disputed territory, and in order to justify his Administration he said the Mackenzie Government had likewise granted permits to cut timber in that territory. He is so reported in the St. Thomas *Times*, and I have no doubt the hon. gentleman did say so, and would admit it, if he would only charge his recollections with it. If he said so, the statement is utterly incorrect. The hon. gentleman at St. Thomas stated further:

"Now, as to the last charge, I may say that some permits were issued to settlers to cut fire wood and to persons to get out ties for railways. But the last permit expired on 1st May, 1884, nearly two years ago, three months before the judgment of the Privy Council, and no permit has since been granted."

I do not object to a Minister of the Crown travelling round the country and making public speeches; it is his duty to do so; it is in the interest of the public, and the public will always be delighted to hear him. But what I do object to is, that a Minister should not adhere to the facts contained in returns brought down to Parliament and to the blue-books of his own Departments when he undertakes to instruct the free and independent electors of the country; and what I charge is, that the hon. gentleman did not, in his speech at St. Thomas, adhere to the record when he made those statements. The hon. gentleman said that the last permit expired on 1st May, 1884. The returns of his own Department and his own blue-books show that he is a year astray. The last permit expired on 1st May, 1885. If the hon. gentleman will refer to his own Department, to his deputy and clerks, he will find that the last permit expired only a short time before he made the speech. The hon. gentleman declared that no permit had been granted since 1st May, 1884. The hon. gentleman was again astray. A Minister of the Crown, with all the responsibility of a Minister resting upon his shoulders misled—I do not say intentionally, but all the same he misled—the electors of that section of the country and the electors all over the Dominion, because that speech was published and scattered broadcast throughout the country. The Government granted eight permits after the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had settled the western boundary of Ontario. It is an extraordinary circumstance. The hon. gentleman must have had the books before him—his speech was evidently carefully prepared, he had figures and dates, and it is extraordinary that the hon. gentleman should have been so far astray, for it appears that the Government of which he is a member granted eight permits two months after the Government were aware that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had finally settled the western boundary of Ontario. On the other hand, the hon. gentleman wanted the people to believe that no permit had been granted for two years before he delivered that speech at St. Thomas. I go a step further. I find by a statement which I hold in my hand, the original of which was prepared in the Department of the Interior and of which this is a true copy, that 111 Orders in Council were passed by the Administration after the arbitrators had made their award settling the western boundary of Ontario—and that in each of the 111 Orders 32,000 acres of timber lands were granted in the disputed territory. The statement is as follows:—

STATEMENT of Licenses Granted by the Dominion Government in North-Western Ontario.

Licenses granted prior to Boundary Award.

Area in Acres.	Authority for License and Date.	To whom Granted.	Address.	——
32,000	Order in Council, Oct. 23, 1873	S. H. Fowler.....	Rat Portage.....	A Conservative.
32,000	do Nov. 3, 1873	do	do	do
38,400	do Feb. 17, 1873	Fuller & Co.....	Keewatin.....	Leading Tories, Hamilton.
32,000	do Apr. 18, 1878	W. J. Macaulay.....	do	Once a Liberal now a Tory.
	Licenses granted subsequent to Boundary Award.			
32,000	Order in Council, Apr. 5, 1880	W. J. Macaulay.....	Rat Portage.....	At one time a Liberal, now a Tory.

Mr. McCALLUM. He showed his sense.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You know it is an easy matter for some people to change their politics and become prominent Conservatives if they are well paid for it. It is an easy matter for some people who get well paid for—what?

Mr. McMULLEN. Old scows.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). To support the Administration.

15,760	Order in Council Dec. 14, 1882	Keewatin Lumber Co.	Keewatin.....	Controlled by Mr. Fuller—a leading Hamilton Tory.
32,000	do Aug. 11, 1883	Jno. Macdonald.....	Toronto.....	The Tory partner of the notorious John Shields.
32,000	do do ...	L. Oliver.....	Barrie.....	Tory.
32,000	do do ...	Hugh Macdonald.	Toronto.....	A Toronto Tory.
32,000	do do ...	Thos. Shortiss.....	do	Another Toronto Tory.
32,000	do do ...	C. J. Campbell.....	do	Tory brother of Tory Postmaster General.
32,000	do do ..	C. O. Smalr.....	do	A Tory—a relative of M.P. East Toronto.
32,000	do do ...	W. B. Scarth.....	Winnipeg.....	A Conservative wirepuller and manager of N.-W. Land Co.
32,000	do do ...	H. Quetton St. George	Toronto.....	A Conservative liquor dealer in Toronto.
32,000	do do ...	Frank Arnoldi.....	do	A Tory lawyer and brother-in-law of unseated and disqualified Tory M.P.P., Muskoka.

STATEMENT of Licenses Granted by the Dominion Government in North-Western Ontario—*Continued.*

Area in Acres.	Authority for License and Date.	To whom Granted.	Address.	——
32,000	Order in Council, Aug. 11, 1883	J. S. Atkins	Toronto	A son of the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba—Conservative.
32,000	do do	David Blain	do	Formerly Liberal, now a sound Conservative, for a consideration.
32,000	do do	F. C. Campbell	do	A relative of the Conservative P.M.G.
32,000	do do	Henry O'Brien	do	A brother of the Conservative M.P. for Muskoka.
32,000	do do	L R O'Brien	do	A relative of the Conservative M P. for Muskoka.
32,000	do do	Jno. Ginty	do	Formerly a partner of frozen whiskey Shields.
32,000	do Oct. 27, 1883	R. Longtine	do	No such men in Toronto—stool pigeons for some friend of the Government whose name is concealed.
32,000	do do	E. Lecourt	do	do do
32,000	do Aug. 29, 1883	Jos. Riopelle	Winnipeg	Politics unknown.
32,000	do do	Alex. Moffatt	do	Associated with Sir John's and Sir Charles' sons in timber limits.
32,000	do do	H. Robilliard	Ottawa	The Tory M P.P for Russel, one of reasons why he thinks Government justified in hanging Riel.
32,000	do Oct. 27, 1883.	Smith & Muir	Hamilton	One, I believe, Secretary Conservative Association, the other a Tory lawyer, Hamilton.
32,000	do Nov. 1, 1883.	St. Cath. Milling Co.	Ottawa	Controlled by Capt Murray, President Conservative Association, Quebec.
23,200	do do	F. F. Bulmer	Rat Portage	Partner of nephew of Minister of Railways.
32,000	do Nov. 24, 1883	F. M. Quigley	Winnipeg	An employee of Tory contractors Manning, Shields & Macdonald
32,000	do do	Alex. Michaud	Rat Portage	An employee of Tory contractors Manning, Shields & Macdonald, a friend of Minister of Public Works.
32,000	do Nov. 29, 188	R. T. Sutton	Hamilton	A Tory commercial traveller.
32,000	do Nov. 29, 1883	Joseph Kavanagh	Ottawa	A Tory grocer, Ottawa.
32,000	do do 29, 1883	T. S. Kennedy	Rat Portage	Both politics and man unknown.
32,000	do do 29, 1883	H. H. Bailey	Cookshire, Q.	Nephew of Conservative Minister of Railways.
32,000	do do 29, 1883	J. R. Macdonald	Rat Portage	A sub-contractor under Manning, Shields & Macdonald ; a stool pigeon for them.
32,000	do do 29, 1883	J. J. Macdonald	do	Tory partner of John Shields.
32,000	do Dec. 21, 1883	John Shields	Toronto	Notorious as hero of frozen whiskey exploits.
32,000	do Nov. 29, 1883	Hugh Smiley	Rat Portage	Politics and man unknown.
32,000	do do 29, 1883	Wm. McCarthy	do	A Tory brother-in-law of Tory J. J. McDonald, Ottawa.
32,000	do do 29, 1883	Wm. Shields	Toronto	A second license to the man of frozen whiskey fame.
32,000	do Dec. 1, 1883	R. C. Throop	Ottawa }	These men unknown ; believed to be stool pigeons for some Ottawa Tories.
32,000	do do 1, 1883	James McKnight	do }	
32,000	do do 1, 1883	Henry Bulmer, jun	Montreal	Another of the Bulmer family who fare well owing to business relations with Minister of Railways' nephew.
32,000	do do 1, 1883	Aaron Squires		Unknown.
32,000	do do 6, 1883	John H. Beatty	Toronto	A Tory agent of rubber goods.
32,000	do do 6, 1883	David Tisdale	Simcoe	The defeated Tory candidate for North Norfolk.
32,000	do do 6, 1883	T. G. Blackstock	Toronto	A brother of the twice defeated Tory candidate for Lennox.
32,000	do do 19, 1883	H. Montplaisir	Cap de la Magdelene, Q.	The Conservative member in this House for Champlain.
32,000	do do 21, 1883	N. F. Patterson	Port Perry	A Conservative lawyer and defeated candidate for North Ontario
32,000	do do 21, 1883	John Bain	Toronto	do do Conservative candidate for East York.
32,000	do do 21, 1883	Bain & Patterson	Toronto & Port Perry	Conservative lawyers, Toronto.
32,000	do do 21, 1883	Oliver, Isbester & Gibbons	Rat Portage	
32,000	do do 21, 1883	G. F. Hart	Montreal	Believed to be a Liberal.
32,000	do do 21, 1883	Wm. McCarthy	Rat Portage	Brother-in-law J. J. McDonald.
32,000	do do 21, 1883	J. Stewart	Chelsea, Q.	
32,000	do Jan. 23, 1884	Thomas Birkett	Ottawa	A Conservative ex-alderman, Ottawa.
32,000	do do 23, 1884	W. Moon	Winnipeg	
32,000	do do 23, 1884	E. E. Sprague	do	These men are both Tories, who are stool pigeons of Alfred Boultbee, ex-Tory M.P., East York.
32,000	do do 23, 1884	J. B. Sprague	do	
32,000	do do 23, 1884	S. C. Saunders	do	One of the same class.
32,000	do Feb. 5, 1884	H. Bulmer, jun	Montreal	Still another of the Bulmer's ; Tory favorites of the Tory Government.
32,000	do do 5, 1884	Wm. Mackay	Ottawa	An Ottawa Tory.
32,000	do do 5, 1884	A. C. Williamson	Montreal	
32,000	do do 18, 1884	Thomas Marks	Port Arthur	A leading Tory, and strong friend of the Government.
32,000	do do 8, 1884	Chabot & Co	Ottawa	Leading French Tories.
32,000	do Mar. 12, 1884	John Ross	Homer	
32,000	do Mar. 14, 1884	H. G. Scott	Toronto	Tory.
32,000	do do 18, 1884	J. D. Foreman	Winnipeg	This man's politics unknown.
32,000	do do 20, 1884	G. J. Chauncey	Toronto	This man's name does not appear in Toronto directory.
32,000	do do 24, 1884	Frank Thompson	Rat Portage	Unknown at Rat Portage.
32,000	do do 24, 1884	W. E. Cornell	Toronto	Tory land speculator, Toronto.
32,000	do Apr. 1, 1884	J. W McRae	Ottawa	A leading Tory wire-puller.
32,000	do do 12, 1884	T. W. Currier	do	Tory, Ottawa ; cousin to late M.P.
32,000	do do 17, 1884	Hiram Robertson	do	Tory ; book-keeper from Hamilton ; Ottawa.
32,000	do do 17, 1884	Ed. Morgan	Winnipeg	This man described as of Winnipeg ; is said to be the junior Judge and R.O. of East York.
32,000	do do 29, 1884	R. J. Brett	do	This man lived in Toronto ; a broker ; Tory ; is a stool pigeon.
32,000	do do 30, 1884	W. B. Beveridge	Appleton, Wis., U.S.	This Yankee's politics are "to do all and keep all."
32,000	do do 30, 1884	Wm. Scott	Winnipeg	This man unknown ; the member for Winnipeg may know of him.
32,000	do do 30, 1884	Wm. Broder	Morrisburg'	Brother of Tory M.P.P., Dundas, and Tory Government contractor.
32,000	do do 30, 1884	A. J. J. Jackson	Orangeville	Unknown.
32,000	do do 30, 1884	F. A. Beveridge	Appleton, Wis., U.S.	Another American Beveridge, who raids Ontario territory for the benefit of some Canadian Tory.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron),

Statement of Licenses Granted by the Dominion Government in North Western Ontario—*Concluded.*

Area of Acres.	Authority for License and Date.	To whom Granted.	Address.	——
32,000	Order in Council, Apr. 30, 1884	Sergeant R. Brock	River Desert, Que	Unknown.
32,000	do May 15, 1884	H. M. Staunton	Rat Portage	A clerk in employ of Manning, Shields & Macdonald.
32,000	do do 15, 1884	J. J. Foster	do	Unknown.
32,000	do do 16, 1884	McArthur, Boyle & Campbell	Winnipeg	Prominent Conservatives of Winnipeg.
32,000	do do 17, 1884	P. McRae	Port Arthur	Of Renfrew; a Tory wire-puller.
32,000	do do 21, 1884	G. W. Monk	March, Co. Carleton, Ont	Conservative M.P.P., Carleton.
32,000	do do 21, 1884	Théophile Viau	Hull, Que	Said to be a Conservative.
32,000	do do 21, 1884	Thos. Smith	Ottawa	A Conservative of this city.
32,000	do do 21, 1884	J. S. McCracken	do	
32,000	do do 9, 1884	T. N. Scripture	Port Arthur	Can't trace this man.
32,000	do Oct 9, 1884	S. Mulvey	Winnipeg	The defeated Tory candidate for Selkirk.
32,000	do do 9, 1884	Jno. Paisley	do	Don't know this man's politics.
32,000	do do 9, 1884	Jno Murray	St. Catherines	President of Conservative Association, St. Catharines.
32,000	do do 9, 1884	N. Tétreau	Hull	An advocate living in Hull; a Tory and friend of Tassé, M.P.
32,000	do do 9, 1884	Jno. Bourke	Port Arthur	This man unknown at Port Arthur.
32,000	do do 9, 1884	A. B. Meeker	do	do do
2,880	do do 9, 1884	F. T. Bulmer		Partner of the Minister of Railways nephew.
32,000	do do 9, 1884	G. T. Ware	Rat Portage	This man unknown.
32,000	do do 9, 1884	Robt. Laird	do	do
32,000	do do 9, 1884	W. H. Plummer	Sault Ste. Marie.	Defeated Tory candidate, Algoma.
32,000	do do 9, 1884	Seymour Coleman	Port Arthur	Unknown. } If these men are *bonâ fide* applicants, their resi-
32,000	do do 9, 1884	A. J. Parsons	Rat Portage	do } dence is fictitious, as no trace of them can be
32,000	do do 9, 1884	R. J. Edwards	Port Arthur	do } found.
32,000	do do 9, 1884	McCaul & McDougall	Ottawa	No such firm in Ottawa.
32,000	do do 9, 1884	Joseph McCoy	Montreal	
32,000	do do 9, 1884	A. J. Lafaive	do	Was employed on C.P.R. A runner-in of Tory bogus voters in local election of 1883.
32,000	do do 9, 1884	N. Kingsmill	Toronto	
32,000	do do 9, 1884	Thos. Cahill	Peterboro'	One of the John Shields' Tory gang, who overran Muskoka in '83
32,000	do Oct. 21, 1884	Geo. D. Farmer	Ancaster	Brother-in-law of Dr. Orton, Tory M.P., Centre Wellington.
32,000	do do 21, 1884	J. F. MacIntosh	Toronto	No such name in the Toronto directory.
32,000	do do 21, 1884	T. T. W. Bradey	Winnipeg	
32,000	do Jan. 28, 1884	E. W. Nesbitt	Woodstock	A Liberal.
32,000	do Oct. 9, 1884	E. L. Knapper	Port Arthur	No such man can be found.
32,000	do do 9, 1884	W. J. McCaulay	St. Paul, Minn., U.S.	A convert to Toryism, rewarded by timber limits.

Now, Sir, of these 115 applicants for timber limits in the disputed territories who obtained Orders in Council after the boundary award was made, I venture to say that there are not more than five or six of them who can be claimed to be Liberals. The Minister of the Interior told us that the Government were not open to blame because the timber limits were open to Liberals as well as Conservatives, but it is an extraordinary thing that in the whole list of returns to Parliament and in the blue books, I am within the mark when I say that nineteen-twentieths are pronounced Conservatives and friends of the present Administration. I say that every man I mention in the list from which I have just read, except three or four, obtained permission from this Administration to cut timber each on 32,000 acres in the disputed territory. The Minister takes credit to himself and the Government for the fact, that under these Orders in Council only twenty-three licenses had been taken out. Well, Sir, that is an extraordinary defence. Whose fault is it that they were not taken out? The Government put in the power of these men to avail themselves of these limits for their own purposes; they passed Orders in Council; they gave these 111 individuals permission to obtain licenses for 111 holdings, and if they did not take them out it was not the fault of the Administration. And besides all that, this Administration, after the judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee on the boundary award was pronounced, passed twenty Orders in Council disposing of the timber limits in the disputed territory to their own favorites. I say that the Administration deliberately and coolly set to work, with full knowledge of the fact that the timber they were granting to their friends was not the property of the Government of Canada to grant; they coolly set to work and partitioned amongst their camp followers, in Parliament and out of it, a large portion of the timber in the disputed territory, and they take credit to themselves because their friends did not avail themselves of the opportunity which was given to them and despoil the Province of Ontario of these timber limits. Sir, I say that as well might the thief who committed robbery claim exemption for his offence because, after having been arrested, the goods were restored to the true owner, as this Administration claim to be relieved from the odium and responsibility for their conduct, simply because some of their followers did not take out licenses under the Orders in Council. The Government deserve no credit for that. The fact that the Orders in Council were passed, though licenses did not issue, is not because the Government were not willing they should not issue. The fact that some had not been taken out is not owing to the conduct of the Government, but owing entirely to the sturdy and unbending Premier of the Province of Ontario, who found it necessary, in order to stay the hands of the present Administration from despoiling the domain of Ontario, to appeal to the Court of Chancery in the Province of Ontario, and the Premier of Ontario obtained from the Court of Chancery, I think in seven or eight instances, injunctions restraining these licensees from cutting timber in the disputed territory. Judgment was rendered in that matter not long ago by the Court of Appeal in Ontario, holding that this Administration had no power to grant limits in the disputed territory. I say that the people of Ontario and the people of this Dominion are under a debt of lasting gratitude to the Hon. Oliver Mowat, for the stand he has taken, on behalf of Provincial rights, and to that firm and manly stand the people of Ontario are indebted for the fact that there remains a single foot of the timber limits in the

disputed territory which has not been gobbled up by the licensees of the present Administration which would thus be carrying out the policy of the First Minister, when he declared in his place in Parliament that not one ounce of mineral, a foot of land or a stick of timber would belong to the Province of Ontario. The Government have been consistent in their policy from beginning to end, and that policy has been put a stop to by the action of the Province of Ontario, and by the voice of public opinion which has been denouncing this Administration for the last six months for their misconduct. Let me deal further with the Minister of the Interior. He contended that the policy of the Conservative Government prior to the assumption by Mr. Mackenzie of the reins of office in 1873, was to dispose of timber limits by competition, and that Mr. Mackenzie changed that policy. I say that prior to the assumption of office by Mr. Mackenzie, that was not the policy of the Conservative Government. I say that prior to that time this Government granted timber limits without notice or competition in the disputed territory and elsewhere.

Mr. MILLS. Contrary to law.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Contrary to law, as the hon. gentleman says. I make no statement which I cannot establish from the blue-books of the Department of the Interior. Take the Sessional Papers for 1872, No. 30, page 92, and it will be found that on the 30th October and 1st November before Mr. Mackenzie assumed office, as the Tories were going out of office, they granted to Mr. Fowler a timber limit of 100 miles on Rainy River. By the Sessional Papers of 1882, No. 30, page 20, you will find that on the 22nd of January, 1873, an Order in Council was passed granting to Mr. Fuller a timber limit on the east side of Lake Manitoba, near Swan Creek. Their policy was not limited to one section; it applied to every section. By an Order in Council dated the 17th of February, 1873, several islands lying to the north of the Narrows of the Lake of the Woods were granted to Mr. Fuller in place of the limit near Swan Creek, without competition and without notice. By the Sessional Papers of 1882, No. 30, page 24, it will be found that the Conservative Government passed an Order in Council granting to Messrs. Macauley & Ginty a timber limit on the Roseau River on the 30th of January, 1873. and that without competition and without public notice. By Order in Council of the 7th July, 1873, they changed that limit for a limit on the Winnipeg River. I have another word to say to the Minister of the Interior. I charge that the Hon. Mr. Costigan, before he became Minister of Inland Revenue, obtained the right to cut timber in the disputed territory. The hon. gentleman answered me by saying that Mr. Costigan never applied for and never received one mile of timber limits in the disputed territory. Let us see whether he did or not; let us see who is right, the Minister of the Intorior or I. In the Sessional Papers of 1883, No. 118, the names of R. J. Short, and Short & Costigan, partners in business, appear not less than six times as holders of permits to cut timber in the disputed territory. In the Sessional Papers of 1885, No. 53, you will find a return headed thus:

"Schedule showing the names of parties from whom dues have been collected for timber cut in that part of the Dominion of Canada lately declared by the Order of the Queen in Council to be within the Province of Ontario, and the several amounts collected, in compliance with an Order of the House of Commons."

In that return Short and Short & Costigan are credited with over $21,000 for dues paid on timber cut by them in the disputed territory. And yet the Minister of the Interior told the people of St. Thomas, and the people of this country, that Mr. Costigan never received a mile of timber limits in that territory. You will find in this return letters which show that Short & Costigan were partners, in the following words:—

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

"WINNIPEG, 27th September, 1881.

"SIR,—We beg leave to apply for permission to cut railway timber for the South-Western Railway Company, on the lands in the Lake of the Woods, which lie south of Mr. Mather's limit in Whitefish Bay. Parties are cutting for the Canadian Pacific Railway on the main shore of said bay, and we trust we may be allowed to cut on the islands of that bay.

We have the honor to be, Sir, your obedient servants,

"JOHN COSTIGAN,
"R. J. SHORT.

"Rt. Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD."

You will find also the following letter:—

"OTTAWA, 28th October, 1881.

"SIR,—As the lands in Whitefish Bay of the Lake of the Woods, on which we asked permission to cut railway timber, appeared to be included in a lease to the Keewatin Lumbering Company, we beg leave now to ask permission to cut 50,000 ties on that part of the main shore of the aforesaid company, on the west shore of Whitefish. Bay, said permit to have a depth of three miles back from the shore.

"We have the honor to be, Sir, your obedient servants,

"J. COSTIGAN,
"R. J. SHORT.

"Rt. Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, Minister of the Interior."

That the Hon. John Costigan applied for and obtained a permit is quite clear from the following letter, also addressed to Sir John A. Macdonald:

"OTTAWA, 12th October, 1881.

"Have purchased some ties on Lake of the Woods to fill my contract with Manitoba South-Western Railway Company for 25,000 ties to be delivered this month, and a like quantity next month. Can I have permission to cut balance of said contract next to Mather's limit at Pipestone, Lake of the Woods? Just heard my men are ordered off grounds by instruction from your Department. Surely I may claim your favorable consideration in this case. Unless you wire me favorable reply I will fail in my contract.

"JOHN COSTIGAN."

Yet we are told that Mr. Costigan applied for nothing. But Short & Costigan were hunting in couples over these timber lands is still further clear from the following letter:—

"HOUSE OF COMMONS, 15th May, 1882.

"SIR,—I beg leave to say on behalf of R. J. Short, of Winnipeg, that in addition to the ties and piles he asked liberty to cut on permit applied for east of Turtle Portage, he wants to cut 4,000,000 feet of logs of dimension timber for the C. P. Railway.

"He has already asked for a renewal of the permit he held last year on Whitefish Bay and Pipestone for ties and piles, and for lumber cut on which he has made prompt and regular payments.

"I have the honor to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

"JOHN COSTIGAN.

"Hon. Minister of the Interior."

And that his demands were acceded to is quite manifest from the following reply:—

"CROWN TIMBER OFFICE, WINNIPEG, 29th May, 1882.

"SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your T 3061, Ref. No. 322, instructing me to issue a permit to Mr. R. J. Short to cut 1,000,000 feet of lumber, 40,000 ties and 1,000 piles on a berth of fifty square miles, situate north of Sabaskong Bay, Lake of the Woods.

"I have the honor to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

"E. T. STEPHENSON,

"Surveyor General, Ottawa." "*Crown Timber Agent.*

Now, Sir, I ask you, I ask the people of this country who read the speech of the hon. Minister of the Interior, whether there was any justification in the returns and in the blue-books of Parliament for the statements which he made at St. Thomas, but which he has not ventured to make on the floor of Parliament.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I make the same statement here that I made at St. Thomas, and that is that the Hon. John

Costigan, as I am informed by Mr. Ryley, of the Crown timber branch of the Department, never applied for and never obtained a timber license.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I read the letters.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). You read the letters of John Costigan, not Hon. John Costigan, who is the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman knows that John and Hon. John Costigan is the same man; his son's name is not only John. He has a middle name. Does the hon. gentleman expect to escape through that small knot-hole? It will not go down. It is just because Ministers of the Crown set the example of sharing in the public spoils, that their followers have done likewise. But John or the Hon. John obtained other *loot* from the public resources. On the 20th of July, 1882, John Costigan and three others, obtained from the Government 59,000 acres of grazing lands, on Mountain Creek. Mr. Costigan's son was a partner in the St. Catharines' Lumber Company, and this company obtained 32,000 acres of timber lands in the disputed territory. Now, Sir, I say I have shown clearly, out of the mouth of the Minister of the Interior; from the returns brought down to Parliament, and from the blue-books submitted to Parliament, that every charge levelled against the Administration, especially with reference to the disposal of timber limits in the North-West and in the disputed territory, has been proved to the very letter; and I challenge any man, whose mind is not biased by a share of the spoils, to investigate these returns and blue books, and arrive at any other conclusion than that the charges made against the Administration have been proved. I have no controversy with the Minister of the Interior personally; many of these grants, if not all, took place before he assumed office. The hon. gentleman's controversy is not with me; it is with the returns and the blue-books submitted to Parliament, and all I can say on that point is that if he can successfully overcome the facts shown in the returns for his own Department and in the blue-books, he is eminently qualified to fill the highest position in this Administration. Believing as I do that the policy of this Administration, not only with refereuce to timber limits, but with reference to the disposal of the public resources, is a vicious and bad policy; believing as I do that a bad example is being set, not only to the members of the House, but to the people of the country, by their misconduct; believing, as I do, that the action of the Administration in parcelling out and dividing up, among their camp followers in and out of Parliament, a large portion of the public domain and the resources of this country, deserves the condemnation of Parliament, as I am sure it will receive the condemnation of the people. I shall support the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have no desire to prolong this debate, but in justice to myself, in justice to the hon. members who sit on this side, with whom I associate, and in justice to my constituents, I feel it to be my duty to repudiate the slander made against me at a place called Wingham, in Ontario, by a person named M. C. Cameron, in a speech which he delivered there, and which was reported in the *Globe* of 12th January last. It reads as follows:—

"George Taylor represents in the Conservative interest South Leeds. He, too, cast longing eyes on the vast coal and timber lands of the North-West. He accordingly applied to this Government, who distribute with no sparing hand the public estate among their followers, for both coal lands and timber limits. This did not exactly gratify the ambitious views of Mr. Taylor He lives in Gananoque, a small town and with a limited population In the Conservative interest he persuaded the Government to build, at the public expense, costly public buildings in this country village. This is not all. Last Session Parliament voted a sum of $20,000 to dam the Rideau Canal in order to supply water to the mills and factories in Gananoque in which Mr. Taylor and his constituents are deeply interested. George Taylor is the bond slave of Sir John, and dare not vote against the Government."

In answer to which I can only say that I have no interest in any timber limits, or coal lands, or grazing lands in either Manitoba or the North-West Territories, that I never applied for either coal lands or timber limits or grazing lands in the North-West Territory or Manitoba, and that I have no interest, individually, or am I associated with any other party who has any interest in said lands or limits. This fellow Cameron, who made that statement, knew when he made it that it was a malicious falsehood. I say that that statement was manufactured out of whole cloth. I say that there was no foundation for it. I expect this fellow Cameron is the paid agent of the Grit party to go round the country abusing—what he cannot call himself—a gentleman. When I read that article, I wrote the following letter to the Minister of the Interior:—

"GANANOQUE 14th January, 1886.

"MY DEAR SIR,—Please let me know what applications I have made for either coal lands or timber limits in Manitoba or the North-West, if any either since or before June, 1882, and if any were allotted to me, and on what terms, and oblige,

"Yours faithfully,
"GEO. TAYLOR.

"Hon. T. WHITE, Esq.,
Minister of the Interior."

To which I received the following reply:—

"OTTAWA, 19th January, 1886.

"MY DEAR TAYLOR,—I have your note of the 14th asking what applications you had made to the Department for either coal or timber lands. I handed it to Mr. Ryley, the clerk who has charge of these matters, and I send you herewith his memorandum.

"Yours truly,
"THOS. WHITE."

"GEORGE TAYLOR, Esq. M.P.,
"Gananoque, Ont."

(*Memo.*)

"DEPATMENT OF THE INTERIOR, DOMINION LANDS OFFICE,
"OTTAWA, 15th January, 1886.

"There is no record in this Department of an application having been received from Mr George Taylor, of Gananoque, for either coal or timbered lands in Manitoba or the North-West Territories.

"There is, however, a letter from him dated the 3rd October, 1883, in which he states that a friend asked him to enquire upon what terms the Department would grant a certain timber limit in the Pasquia Hills. In reply to which letter he was sent a copy of the regulations governing disposal of timber in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. No further correspondence upon the subject referred to in that letter.

"Respectfully submitted,
"G. U. RYLEY."

I may say that the friend referred to in that letter was a gentleman by the name of Mr. Henry Ruttle, who removed from my county to the Prince Albert country, and wrote me to know if he could secure timber land, as he was erecting a flour and sawmill in that section. I sent the letter to the Department and received the answer I have given. This wholly proves my statement that the charge preferred against me by that gentleman is a wilful falsehood. If the party who made this statement is the party who represents West Huron I must express my regret that a gentleman aspiring to the position of a statesman should stoop so low as to go round the country slandering those who honestly differ with him on political questions. I will just keep the House for a few minutes, while I show how this hon. gentleman stands in his dealings with the Department with reference to lands in the North-West. Here is a letter written from Winnipeg which throws some light on that point:

"WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, 14th July, 1882.

"LINDSAY RUSSELL, Esq., Department of the Interior, Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—We beg to enclose you a list of some lands lately purchased by us through a Mr. Gray, from Sir Richard Cartwright and from Mr. Cameron, the payments for which have been fully made to the Government. We should look upon it as a very great favor if you would very kindly give instructions for the issue of these patents with as little delay as possible.

"Very truly yours,
(Signed) "BOYLE, CAMPBELL & CO."

I have the following detailed statement which I will read to the House:—

STATEMENT showing how the following lands have been disposed of:

No.	Land. Sec.	Part of Sec.	Tp.	Range.	Date of Sale.	Name of Purchaser.	Name of Patentee.	Date of Patent.	Area. — Acres.
1394	9	All	6	9th	Nov. 30, 1880	L. D. Kean	Conway E Dobbs	Aug. 10, 1882	640
1317	17	S.W. ¼	5	5th	do 26, 1880	J J. Johnston	do	do 10, 1882	160
1285	15	N. ½	4	10th	do 20, 1880	L D. Kean	do	do 10, 1882	320
1333	21	S.W. ¼	5	10th	do 26, 1880	do	do	do 10, 1882	160
1251	17	S. ½	3	12th	do 17, 1880	S. A. Bedford	do	do 9, 1882	320
1252	31	S. ½	3	12th	do 17, 1880	do	do	do 9, 1882	320
1243	25	N ½	1	8th	do 16, 1880	Jos. Rinn	do	do 9, 1882	320
123	7	All	2	13th	Sept. 27, 1879	Jessie H. Cameron, wife of M. C. Cameron	L. R. C. & W. L. Boyle	Mar. 12, 1883	640
1642	25	N. ½ / S.W. ¼	5	6th	Oct. 18, 1876	J. M. M. Macdonnell	A & J. Riddell	June 18, 1877	480
1466	7	N.W. ¼	15	12th	Aug. 17, 1877	S. Spencer	S. Spencer	do 25, 1878	160
2987	4	All	4	7th	July 31, 1879	Eleanor Macdonnell	Eleanor Macdonnell	May 14, 1780	640
1553	19	All	5	7th	Dec. 28, 1880	A. B. Elford	M. C. Cameron	Aug. 9, 1882	640
1554	21	All	5	7th	do 28, 1880	do	do	do 9, 1882	640
860	7	N. ½	4	12th	May 13, 1880	D. McDonald (Goderich)	do	do 8, 1882	320
861	15	E. ½	4	12th	do 13, 1880	do do	do	do 8, 1882	320
858	19	W. ½	4	13th	do 13, 1880	do do	do	do 8, 1882	320
859	17	W. ½	4	13th	do 13, 1880	do do	do	do 8. 1882	320
850	21	All	5	12th	do 13, 1880	M. C. Cameron	do	do 8, 1882	640
851	27	All	5	12th	do 13, 1880	do	do	do 8, 1882	640
852	5	All	5	13th	do 13, 1880	do	do	do 8, 1882	640
853	13	All	5	13th	do 13, 1880	do	do	do 8, 1882	640
854	9	All	5	14th	do 13, 1880	do	do	do 8, 1882	640
864	13	S. ½	4	13th	do 13, 1880	Jno. Robertson (Goderich)	do	do 8, 1882	320
1247	19	All	1	8th	Nov. 16, 1880	T. Greenway	do	do 9, 1882	640
112	5	N.E. ¼	3	13th	Sept. 20, 1879	H. J. Keighley (Emerson)	do	do 8, 1882	160
865	5	S. ½	3	13th	May 13, 1880	Jno. Robertson (Goderich)	do	do 8, 1882	320
120	5	All	1	12th	Sept. 27, 1879	M. C. Cameron	do	do 8, 1882	640
119	3	S. ½	1	12th	do 27, 1879	M. G. Cameron	do	do 7, 1882	320
891	5	All	6	14th	May 15, 1880	H. J. Keighlergarty / E. B. Tatchell (Emerson)	do	do 9, 1882	640
121	7	S. ½	1	12th	Sept. 27, 1879	M. C. Cameron	do	do 7, 1882	320
313	25	All	1	9th	Dec. 20, 1878	T. F. McLean (Goderich)	do	do 7, 1882	640

Making a total of 13,920 acres, equal to twenty-one and three-quarter sections. Now, these do not include the lands to which the hon. gentleman referred a few moments ago as having been purchased from some son of some Lieutenant Governor, as that does not appear on this list. These are applications that no doubt were put in in the names of this hon. gentleman's sons, his daughters, his aunts his uncles, his employés, and his wife, and the patents were issued to himself. If any hon. gentleman on this side of the House could be charged with anything approaching that, I am sure he could honestly be called a land grabber. I would like to ask when these lands were bargained for, when the arrangements were made for securing them? Was it not when the hon. gentleman's friends were in power; and had they not been turned out of power when they were, no doubt the hon. gentleman's friends would have gobbled up the great share of the North-West, according to what we see here. This hon. gentleman not only makes a false charge that I was an applicant; he goes further and makes other charges. He says I am the bond slave of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. All I can say in reference to that is, that I have 277 good reasons for supporting that hon. gentleman. I have the honor to represent South Leeds, a constituency containing a population of 25,000, who are as healthy, as wealthy, as honest, and far more intelligent than the electors that the hon. gentleman has the honor to represent. Those people sent me here by a majority of 277 to support the present Government. I said that the electors of South Leeds were more intelligent than those the hon. gentleman represents, and I think I am justified in saying that, from the fact that I support the present Government and was sent here for that purpose, while the hon. gentleman who made the charge against me has nothing else to do but prefer charges against every hon. gentleman in this House The Government he calls hangmen, and charges them with everything that is corrupt, and I think the electors of South Leeds showed they were much more intelligent people than the electors of West Huron. This hon. gentleman is not satisfied with abusing the country, with abusing the institutions of the country, and the representative men of the country, but he singles out the country into locality, and has a pick at a locality. He singles out Gananoque and calls it a small country village. All I can say in reference to Gananoque is that it is not an incorporated town like the town of Goderich, but it contains a population about equal to the town of Goderich, and is of far more importance to this country than the town the hon. gentleman hails from, as I will show before I get through. By the Trade and Navigation Returns of 1884, there was collected in Customs duty at this country village, $15,505.04, while at the town of Goderich there was collected $6,256.81 or $2.50 in Customs duties at Gananoque for every dollar collected at Goderich; while it costs, according to the Public Accounts for that year, to collect that $15,505 the sum of $900, and at Goderich it costs $1,700 to collect $6,256. I find further that for the last three years the exports from Gananoque were $295,751, and from Goderich $214,204; the imports to Gananoque were $364,201, and to Goderich $157,604; there was entered for consumption in Gananoque $363,936, and in Goderich $104,849; the duty collected at Gananoque in the last three years amounted to $43,106.70, and at Goderich to $14,322.56.

Mr. BECHARD. I think the hon. gentleman should confine himself to the question before the House, at this hour in the morning, nearly two o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman who spoke before wandered from Dan to Beersheba, and made a charge

against me. If the Speaker rules against me, I will ask some friend to move the adjournment of the debate. I am going to clear up these charges if it takes till midsummer. I find by another return that, during the last fiscal year, there were entered at the Custom house of this country village of Gananoque, 628 steamers and 124 sailing vessels, making a total of 752.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is going very far from the question.

Mr. TAYLOR. I just intended to say that 136 vessels entered the port of Goderich in the same time, on which port, while the hon. gentleman's friends were in power, they spent half a million of money, I presume in purchasing his support, and making him the bond slave of the hon. member for East York. Now, this hon. gentleman said that he made no statement that he could not establish. I charge him with having made this statement at Wingham, that he has not and cannot establish. The speech of the Minister of the Interior is, to my mind, unanswerable, and proves conclusively how well this Government has guarded the interests of our great domain as compared with the *régime* of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman said that no public man should make a statement which he could not corroborate. I presume that the thirty-nine other thieves whom he arraigned with me in Wingham, have just as good a case as I have. I am not going to fight their battles, but I want to repudiate the foul slander on my own behalf. A Grit lawyer was in my town on Saturday from near this locality, and repeated the charge made against me in the speech of M. C. Cameron, and I now take this opportunity of throwing that slander back into the teeth of that hon. gentleman, and I challenge him to prove it.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I desire to say a few words before the close of this debate, on the subject of scandals generally, and on this one in particular. I am not interested in any timber limits, I did not apply for any for myself, nor for anybody else, and I do not think that anybody else applied for timber limits for me. I believe that applications were made by honest persons for timber limits for themselves, and I also believe that honest people applied for timber limits for others. I do not think there is any great scandal in such a transaction. I observe that the Opposition has at last discovered a policy; they have at last conceived the idea of floating into power on scandals. I find that although I have no interest in land grants or coal areas, Grit writers in the Lower Provinces fancy that they have obtained a little scandal against me and two other gentlemen from Cape Breton. Notices of motion have been put on the paper for the purpose of giving food to our political opponents for digestion during the recess, although it is utterly impossible to reach them this Session. I find one notice placed upon the paper by the leader of the Opposition in reference to two hon. gentlemen from Cape Breton, in reference to which the Pictou *News*, a good Grit paper, on the 30th May last, says:

"The Ottawa representatives from the Island of Cape Breton appear to be distinguishing themselves at the capital. Messrs Dodd and McDougall have been arraigned before the House charged with threatening an elector at the last election in Cape Breton county, with dismissal from the position of pilot if he voted against Mr. McDougall, and with afterwards inducing the Government to effect such dismissal."

There is no truth in the allegation that the pilot was dismissed from office; there is no truth in the allegation that he lost anything by having been placed on the new board. I find also that reference has been made to the member for Richmond (Mr. Paint), in a most scandalous manner. I find also that my own name has been used by this Grit sheet in the following language:—

"Dr. Cameron, of Inverness, has been court-martialled before the House and one of the committees, for getting bogus reports of his speeches in Parliament issued through the means of the *Hansard* reporters."

It is not enough for them to slander myself, but they had to slander the *Hansard* reporters, with a view of making a case against the Government. I find, also, that use has been made of another notice of motion given by the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk).

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is not referring to the question under discussion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I ask your ruling on that point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman to be speaking about the dismissal of some persons from the pilotage board.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Yes, but I will come to the timber limits.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the motion before the Chair is in reference to members of Parliament receiving favors from the Executive. I do not think the hon. gentleman should discuss the question of the dismissal of any member from the pilotage board.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I submit with pleasure to the ruling of the Chair, and I shall therefore confine myself as closely as possible to timber limits. At this early hour in the morning I presume there are some other hon. members who desire to speak on the subject, and I will conclude by referring to an idea which I gather from a contribution to a contemporary periodical, which happily hits off the modern Grit, who imagines that the times are out of joint, and that his mission is to set them right. This has particular reference to the timber limits in the North-West and to coal areas, which were not all disposed off in the interest of the Conservative party but of which all may obtain a slice. The writer says:

"We feel thankful that the Sun and Moon
Are set so very high,
That no presuming hand can reach
To pluck them from the sky.
For were they not, there is no doubt,
That some Reforming ass,
Would soon propose to snuff them out,
And light the world with gas."

If they fail to illuminate this Dominion with scandalising gas I fail to see that any other politicians, past, present or future, can realise the attainment of the power. Yet I apprehend that our masters throughout the Dominion, the electors who have sent us here, begin to realise the fact that there is too little reality and too much gas about all this scandal which is submitted to the consideration of Parliament by the Opposition in this House.

Mr. HESSON. I will not occupy more than a short period of time, and I think I may be pardoned for doing so, as I have been frequently referred to in this connection in this debate, as well as on a former occasion, during my absence, when the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) then, as now, undertook to lecture hon. members as to what their duty was to the country and to this House. The hon. gentleman did not attempt to make charges against me. I defy him to make any charge on account of which I should hang down my head or apologise either to my constituents or to the House. The hon. gentleman has been very assiduous in endeavoring, if possible, to eliminate from the voluminous returns called for by him, at an enormous cost to the country—one return covering something like 20,000 pages—such information as he hoped would damage the character of hon. members in this House. He calls himself an honorable man, probably he is; and probably he may have a right in his own judgment to use that term; but I do not think his talents are so well directed as they might be when they are directed simply to endeavoring, if possible, by hook or crook, by any method, to bring forward statements in this House and place them before the country, as being evidence

sufficient to convict hon. members elected here by the independent electors to represent their views and act for them, of transactions which will damage their character. The hon. gentleman's record may be clean—I hope it is clean. With respect to timber limits, I am not in a position to trace him. He has carried on his work outside this country; he has gone elsewhere, with his labor and his money, to develop another country than his own. That may possibly be right in his view, because I think his connection with that country in the past, would lead the House to believe that he was more interested in that country than in this. He has taken, as I have said, his great energy, industry and wealth outside this country to develop another, and he has gone into timber limit speculations elsewhere, and it is not our privilege to follow him there, as we might possibly do if we possessed the same facilities he has to reach files of documents. I say that in all the communications I have had with the Department of the Interior, there is not one document that I would have the slightest hesitation in having spread on the Table of this House as being of such a character as not to be a proper and fair one from a member representing a constituency of some 25,000 or 30,000 people. It is my duty, as the representative of my county, to facilitate in every possible way the interests of my constituents, and the Government policy is of that character to be open and free to all who may take an interest in helping to develop the great North-West—and that is the object they have mainly in view, for it is not that they might benefit individual gentlemen—and they had a great public duty to discharge in developing the new territory which had been lying for centuries a perfect wilderness and would have been allowed to lie for more centuries if its development had rested with hon. gentlemen opposite. What is the evidence presented to this House, that with the single exception of the two gentlemen whose names have been mentioned, who have taken some interest in the country, who have made some wealth in it—and I congratulate them upon it—the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) and the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright); these two gentleman have been successful; they have invested largely, they took an interest in the country, and they went into that market and made their purchases. But when the hon. member for West Huron, represening as he does a constituency himself, rises in his place time after time and endeavors to damage the character of men who are just as respectable and intelligent as himself, while he claims the privilege of associating with gentlemen on the floor of this House, when the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) read a lis , which if he had been in the House ought to have caused him to hold his head down and blush, —I say that it is out of place for that hon. gentleman and he should be the last man to make these charges against those who stand equally as respectable as he does, who have simply written a few letters on behalf of constituents who are asking for that which they have a perfect right to obtain, under the law of the land. With regard to myself, I may say that I have no favors to ask of them; it requires no favor from them to make me a Conservative or a supporters of the Government. I am a Conservative by birth, education and instinct. I am a Conservative because I believe that the policy of the Conservative party is the best for this country, and if any requests I have made had been refused I would still be a Conservative and support the Government in their policy. He contended that hon. gentlemen are influenced in this House simply, because they are taking the Government at its word, simply because the Government have been placed in circumstances in which they have been called upon to open up that great territory and assist in developing the country; simply because we have assisted others to go there and invest their money, as I have done myself in some town speculations that have not turned out well and, as has been stated by the Minister of the Interior, in almost every one of those cases the Government have received large sums of money into the Treasury from the Conservative party because hon. gentlemen opposite repudiated having done anything in that country by either taking advantage of the Government regulations or attempting anything or doing anything in that country. The policy of gentlemen opposite has not been to direct their energies to the development of the country but to devote their energies in that direction to countries other than their own. Yet we are charged with plundering the country, simply because we have asked on behalf of our constituents that they shall receive such terms and conditions as the Government are by law prepared to give to other individuals. I might go into the history of some of these transactions with which my name has been identified as having made applications for timber limits in that country. I have not been connected with grazing lands, though I have been requested by respectable gentlemen on the other side to enter into such speculations—these gentlemen endeavoring to induce me to take an interest in them because, I suppose, they thought they could trap me into it, and it would be a sort of salvage for them to be able to say the hon. member for North Perth should be interested in these transactions. My hands, I say, are free, and I have no transaction to the extent of a single dollar with them, either in the North-West or elsewhere, and I am determined that I shall not have any. My letters on behalf of my son-in-law, a lawyer practising in the city of Toronto, have been referred to. He, I presume, represented some other gentleman there. He made application on one occasion for six or seven townships for colonisation purposes on the terms that the Government were offering. He did that on behalf of the Commercial Travellers Association, of which he was solicitor. He had already in this House obtained an Act of Parliament incorporating them. They had a large surplus which they wished to invest during the time of the boom, and they thought they could make a good investment in the North-West, and they proposed to take up certain tracts of land for the purpose of colonisation. When they investigated the Government conditions, they found them too severe, and they would not take the Government grant. They went to Montreal and they made arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway and bought land in the neighborhood of Regina—some eight or ten townships—and they paid cash and had no transactions with the Government at all. They considered the Government terms too straight and they took no investment in them. I considered the same and I took no steps in that direction. I want to say one or two words about another matter. The hon. member for Simcoe has been charged with having had a timber limit granted to him on a certain occasion. Now I happen to know something about that timber limit, not that I was interested in it, but some of my constituents were, and the hon. gentleman will not deny that an Order in Council was passed and that he had the privilege, as the last dying kick of that party, to have that 200 square miles so granted to him as a timber limit, and he had three years to make the selection throughout the country in tracts of 20 square miles—a little here or there as it was best. I wish to explain what I know about the matter of the interest and the credit of the Conservative party which came in power in 1878. Two gentlemen, constituents of my own, who resided in the same town, one now dead, were met by the hon. gentleman, and were told that he could not get this grant confirmed by this Government and get the license required. He knew that he occupied such a position that he could not possibly do that, but he had no hesitation in making terms with these two gentlemen, one of them Mr. Daly, now dead, and the other Mr. Jarvis, and they came here and spent

about a whole week endeavoring to impress the Government, and to the credit of the Conservative party and the Government they refused and cancelled the order, although these two gentlemen would have received large advantages from this hon. gentleman, who proposed to erect a mill and give them a liberal interest in it. So much for the hon. member for Simcoe in connection with this matter. I do not wish to take up the time of the House with any further reference to these matters. There is much that could be said with reference to the hon. member for West Huron, who has made his attacks on hon. members on this side and upon their characters. I think it comes with a very bad grace from that gentleman, above all others on that side, that he should attack the reputation of hon. gentlemen on this side, who stand as well here and as well before the electorate of Canada as the hon. gentleman himself does. It is well known that the hon. gentleman found his way into this House by ways that are dark and ways that are devious.

Mr. COOK. I am going to remain here. I have been here a long time.

Mr. HESSON. I was referring to the hon. member for West Huron, although it seems that the boot fits the foot of the hon. member for Simcoe. Now, I would just say that I am not in the slightest degree influenced in my support of the Government by any favors that I have ever received by the Government party. If it should come to that, that my constituents required me to support the policy of the Opposition at any time, I will resign my seat not only in this House, but in the country itself, because I could not follow or work with such a party having such a policy, if they have a policy at all. Now, I wish to illustrate the position the hon. gentleman places some of his own friends in by the course he is pursuing to-night. The Halifax *Chronicle*, a strong supporter of the party opposite, contains this despatch, sent by some person in Ottawa:

"OTTAWA, Ont., 26th April. Col. Ray and Messrs. Forbes, Kirk, Robertson and McIntyre, members of the House of Commons, have addressed a petition to the Minister of Railways asking that a subsidy of $3,200 a mile, granted two years ago by the Dominion Parliament, towards the completion of the railway from Annapolis to Digby be renewed and increased to $6,400 per mile. Col. Ray had an interview with the Minister on the matter a few days ago, and it is probable that the prayer of the petition will be complied with."

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have friends who have been hawking around this petition—I myself had some knowledge of it—requesting the Government to grant this subsidy. We are not going to say that this is going to influence the action of these gentlemen; that it is going to purchase or bribe them; it may be too small a sum to purchase their support permanently for the Government; but their signatures to that petition will secure their votes for aid to this railway, so that on that question at all events their votes will be influenced. Now, what is the difference between receiving such aid from the Government as a cash subsidy and having an interest in some timber limit or some cattle or grazing lands, on the conditions which are open to everybody. Are these gentlemen who support the grant to this railway going to be forever damaged in their reputations on that account? I leave it to hon. gentlemen opposite to say; I do not say that hon. gentlemen opposite will be influenced in that direction; but as the hon. member for West Huron has pointed out in two cases of gentlemen who had formerly been strong Reformers becoming supporters of this Government, it simply shows that when the amount is large enough you could buy the whole of the hon. gentlemen on the same terms.

Mr. LISTER. I shall ask the indulgence of the House for a very few moments. I intended to speak earlier, but hon. gentlemen seem desirous of putting themselves right before the House and the country, and I have no desire to interfere with their efforts in that respect. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) took considerable time o show that the hon. member for West Huron had become a purchaser of certain lands in the Province of Manitoba. Now, I do not know that any person ever thought it was a crime in a member of this House or anybody else to buy lands from the Government in the usual course, or to buy them from third parties. So far as I was able to make out, the list the hon. gentleman read proved, if it proved anything, that the lands mentioned in that list were purchased from some third parties. Be that as it may, there is no law in this country to prevent him from buying from the Government or from anyone else and paying his money, and there can be no wrong doing about it. The complaint made by the hon. member for West Huron is that the members of this House have used their positions as supporters of the Government to get for their friends and associates advantages from the Government that the outside public have not been able to get. It is a remarkable fact that in the instances given by the Minister of the Interior, he could only point out three Reformers among all the hundreds who applied for colonisation lands. It is extraordinary that in the election of 1882, in almost every county of Ontario, leading supporters of the Government gave it to be understood that they had some unusually rich thing on hand; and it is remarkable that in my own county, and in some other counties I know of, leading Reformers were seduced by some of these colonisation companies into a partial desertion of the party with which they had been allied before. But I say that that is not the effect. The charge is that members of this House have used their influence with the Government to advance their own interests; and I care not whether they were successful or not in making money out of those lands, the crime, if it be a crime, was the same. When they applied for those lands, they did so with the expectation that they were going to make enormous fortunes; and if their expectations have not been fulfilled, it is the fault of fortune and not theirs. A great deal has been said to my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Cook) by hon. gentlemen opposite. The Minister of the Interior did not think it beneath the dignity of his position to attack the hon. member who has not spoken in this debate, in an unmanly, cowardly way about some transaction that occurred in the past—something about a timber limit granted to him by Mr. Mackenzie previous to his going out of office. Hon. gentlemen opposite are always ready to have their nick at my hon. friend; they are always ready to charge him with having been peculiarly favored in being allowed to select timber limits where he thought proper, in quantities of not less than 20 miles; but I can tell the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) that the hon. gentleman whom he now follows with such ostentatious zeal granted, previous to going out of office in 1873, licenses to people to cut timber in the North-West Territories, allowing them to select their grants in areas as small as three square miles; and Mr. Mackenzie, in granting to my hon. friend the limit spoken of, only did what the hon. gentleman who had preceded him had done, and what hon. gentlemen opposite now claim Mr. Mackenzie was wrong in doing. I am not here to justify my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) or his Government, but I must say, in simple justice to my hon. friend and his Administration, that hon. gentlemen opposite have no right to make such a charge. Under the Administration of these hon. gentlemen, in 1882, lawyers, doctors, shoemakers, tailors, every other thing but lumber merchants, were found applying to the Government for timber limits. How was it lumbermen became so numerous in this House and throughout the country? Not one per cent. of the applicants for limits knew anything about saw logs or lumber, with the exception, perhaps, of occasionally purchasing a little for their own use. Why were these men so anxious to get timber limits? Why are hon. gentlemen opposite so anxious to secure limits

through their influence with the Government? It is plain, members of this House not interested in timber limits themselves, hope, by the influence they can exercise on the Government, to secure a power and support they had not before. Men who are getting these limits believe that the acquisition of one means untold wealth to those who hold it. I am not here to speak as to the quantity of timber limits granted, bad though that system is, but to speak of the manner in which the Government has used its power for the purpose of keeping itself in office. The Government has granted with a lavish hand the timber limits of this country, which we ought to husband for those who are to come after us; it has granted our lands with a lavish hand; it has given away recklessly coal lands, the fuel that ought to be preserved for ourselves and future generations. Not only that, but it has placed its hands in the public Treasury to pay out money to one of the greatest monopolies in the North-West, Sir A T. Galt's coal monopoly. Bad as those things are, calculated as they are to destroy the independence of Parliament, these are not the only actions for which the Government must be held responsible. So far as the railway policy is concerned, it has been infinitely worse. Hon. members opposite are directly interested in millions of dollars granted by this Government for the purpose of promoting railways in which they themselves are interested. The disclosure made yesterday in reference to a railway under discussion must have shocked any person who heard them. We had letters produced here in which the hon. member for West Toronto is called "the boy," and in which it is stated he was looking for $640,000 for himself. We have another "boy," according to all rumors, in a gentleman who sits in this House, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). On turning up the reports, I find that he is one of the corporators of the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway. I find that that road was bonused, while the hon. gentleman was a member of this House; I find that he, a corporator of that company, was an applicant to the Government to grant the road $12,000 per mile, the first grant being $6,000, and that being supplemented by another of $6,000 per mile. I find the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was interested in shares of the stock of that railway company, I believe, of the majority of the stock. The Hon. Frank Smith, Senator, the Hon. James Turner, Senator, and Mr. Dalton McCarthy, member for North Simcoe, are upon the list of shareholders of that company. The Hon. Frank Smith, the Hon James Turner, Mr. McCarthy and Mr. John Stewart, appeared to hold shares to the extent of 1,820 out of 2,000, so that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and his friends controlled entirely the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, and the hon. gentleman not only controls the stock of that road, but he is sitting in this House to-day as a member and as the president of the railway which has been bonused to this enormous extent. And, if I am correctly informed, there has never been a cent put into the road, except the bonuses granted by this Government. I believe it is a fact that the directors of the company are attempting to sell the bonds of the road, having authority, I believe, to bond it to the extent of $25,000 a mile. I am informed that the bonds, when sold, added to the bonus given by this Government, will more than pay for the construction of the road. I am told, whether correctly or not, that there was $100,000 in that road for the promoters. I would ask that hon. gentleman, if the rumor is true, which is circulated throughout the country, that he and his associates will make at least $500,000 out of the road. That is the statement made. It may not be impossible in the opinion of the hon. gentleman, but I say it is impossible to believe that an hon. gentleman occupying the position he does in this House can be otherwise than under the influence of the Government, under such circumstances. I find that the International Railway Company has upon its stock list the Hon. E. T. Brooks, the Hon. John Henry Pope, Minister of Railways, the Hon. M.H. Cochrane and my hon. friend (Mr. Ives). These gentlemen are the stockholders of this road. I find that another road, bonused to a very considerable extent, and in which Mr. Pope is interested, received at one time $175,000 of the people's money. I say it is a position which no man in this country ought to occupy, that the Minister of Railways, a member of the Government, charged with the care, to a certain extent, of the moneys of the people, a member of this House should vote to himself and the road he is directly interested in $175,000 of the people's money. Another hon. gentleman, his son-in-law, Mr. Ives sits in this House also and he no doubt participates, because he is a stockholder in the road and shares in the profits which, no doubt, must be paid from that railway. I find that the road has been further bonused to the extent of $2,550,000 for the construction of a road from Montreal to the road in which Mr. Pope is interested, and which will form a link of the new road. I say it is a disgrace to this country that a Minister of Railways, owning the International Road, which he had owned for nine or ten years, which this country owed nothing to, should come to this House and ask this Parliament to give him the enormous sum of $146,000 for placing iron upon the road owned by him and built years before, and which there was no reason in the wide world for assisting by bonus or by anything else. I find these two gentlemen are stockholders in that road. They are, as my hon. friend from Huron said, the head, body and tail of the whole concern. I go further and I find that the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway from Aylmer to Pembroke was bonused to the extent of $270,000. This road is owned by the Secretary of State. He is a stockholder and the real owner of the road, and it is owned by Senator Ogilvie and the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White). These are the stockholders in the road. Does anyone tell me that, under those circumstances, it is a small thing for three hon. members of this House, one of them a Minister of the Crown, to come to Parliament and ask this Parliament to give them $270,000. It is a monstrous and disgraceful thing that any member of Parliament should be a corporator in a railway seeking aid from this Government. I can understand hon. gentlemen assisting and promoting a railway passing through their county as far as they can, but they have no right to become corporators, and they have no right to place themselves in the position of receiving a direct benefit from the moneys which may be granted by the Government. I find the Gatineau Railway Company was bonused to the extent of $160,000, and I find that the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh), the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson), and Mr. Alonzo Wright are the stockholders of that company. Of course these hon. gentleman are perfectly independent. Of course they will condemn the Government when it is wrong, just as if they had never got a bonus for their road. The Montreal and Western Railway was bonused to the extent of $160,000; and, again, I find the Hon. Mr. Chapleau, Mr. J. J. C. Abbott and Mr. Joseph Tassé, member for Ottawa, are the corporators of that company. The Secretary of State and two members of Parliament are the corporators in that company, which has upon the Statute-book the right to draw $160,000 of the money of the people of this country. I find again that the Miramichi Railway is entitled to a bonus of $128,000 voted by this Government, and that Mr. Temple, the member for York, is deeply interested in that railway.

Mr. TEMPLE. I beg your pardon; I am not interested in any shape or form in that railway, not in the slightest.

Mr. LISTER. If the hon. gentleman says he is not interested in the road, of course I gladly take the word of the hon. gentleman, but, as far as my investigation has gone,

I had such facts as satisfied me, until the hon. gentleman made the statement now, that he was interested in the road. The St. Louis and Richibucto Road was bonused to the extent of $22,400, and I find that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) is a stockholder in that road. It is a little road six miles long running through the county of Kent in the village of St. Louis, and is bonused as well by the Local Government. The hon. gentleman's name appears upon the stock list as a stockholder to the extent of $2,000. There is also the Hopewell and Alma Railway, which had a bonus of $51,200. That is a short local road, and it was secured I believe by the member for Albert (Mr. Wallace.) I am unable to say whether he is a stockholder in that road or a corporator.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not a corporator or a stockholder.

Mr. LISTER. The Caraquet Railway——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take that back.

Mr. LISTER. I said I did not know whether he had any interest in it or not.

Mr. FARROW. What is the question before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is quite in order. It is about the resources dealt with by Parliament or by the Executive.

Mr. LISTER. I find the Caraquet Railway in New Brunswick was bonused to the extent of $176,000. From all the information that I have been able to get, it is a purely local road, and it was a road built by the hon. member for Gloucester, (Mr. Burns). The member for Gloucester, a member of this House, is the whole company with the exception of giving stock sufficient to other directors to qualify them upon the board. That hon. member for Gloucester pocketed $176,000 of the money of the people of this country. Of course that gentleman is an independent man, of course that gentleman is free of the Government. And he is conductor of the road as well.

Mr. BOWELL. Is he the fireman too?

Mr. LISTER. It cannot be charged that he can be influenced in the support he gives to this Government. I find the road from Metapedia was also bonused to the extent of $300,000 and that this road runs through the county of Bonaventure and benefits Mr. Riopel and Mr. McGreevy, the member for Quebec. I find that another road, the Erie and Huron Road, was bonused to the extent of $96,000. I am informed that a member of this House received and charged for getting the bonus from the Government 10 per cent upon the amount so received.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. LISTER. Perhaps it would not be as well.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. LISTER. The Ontario and Pacific——

Mr. HAGGART. I ask that the words of the hon. member be taken down.

Mr. LISTER. The Ontario and Pacific Railway——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. What is the question?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member stated that a member of this House had received 10 per cent.——

Mr. LISTER. No.

Mr. HAGGART—of the amount of money given to that road.

Mr. LISTER. I said nothing of the kind. What I said was this. I said I was informed that an hon. member of this House had agreed he should receive 10 per cent. upon the bonds received.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is a very serious charge to make against any member.

Mr. BOWELL. Let the official reporter state the words.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is a very serious charge made against any member of the House, and, if the name is asked for, I think some definite charge should be made, because it is a statement against every member until the member is named. I hope the hon. gentleman will withdraw the statement.

Mr. LISTER. Very well, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the statement in the meantime.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. LISTER Hon. gentlemen will probably have an opportunity to laugh another way. Very well, I withdraw the statement in the meantime, in deference to the Speaker I find, Sir, that the Ontario and Pacific Railway, running through Cornwall to Perth, has been bonused to the extent of $262,400, and that the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) and the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) are stockholders in that company. Yet these hon. gentlemen think that it is quite consistent with their position as members of Parliament.

Mr. BERGIN. Allow me to correct the hon. gentleman. As far as I am myself concerned, it is all right; but so far as the hon. member for North Renfrew is concerned, it is a pity that a Grit should be charged with anything so abominable as being director of a railway company.

Mr. LISTER. I mean Mr. White, as the member for Renfrew. I find, Sir, that in 1885, this Parliament granted to the Ottawa, Waddington and Northern Transportation Railway $166,000, and that the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), the hon. members for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé and Mr. Mackintosh), are stockholders in the company. I find that the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway Company, which runs through the county of Westmoreland, represented in this House by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), was bonused to the extent of $118,400. I find that the Montreal and Champlain Railway was bonused to the extent of $300,000, and that the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Montplaisir). is a stockholder, I believe, in that road. I find the Long Sault Railway was bonused to the extent of $25,600, and the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson) is a stockholder in that road. I find that the Gatineau Railway Company has been incorporated by this House, and that the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright), and the two hon. members for Ottawa city, and the hon. member for Pontiac, are stockholders.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Did I understand the hon. member to state that the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company was incorporated by charter from this Parliament?

Mr. LISTER. I did not say it was incorporated by a charter from this Parliament; I said it was bonused by this Parliament, and I think to the extent of $300,000.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I misunderstood t hon. gentleman.

Mr. LISTER. Well, is that right?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. It is your business to find out.

Mr. LISTER. I find that the Rivière du Loup and Edmundston Railway is bonused to the extent of $498,000, and I am informed that the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Grandbois) and the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, are stockholders. The Stellarton Railway to Pictou has been bonused by this Parliament to a very considerable extent, and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) is, I am informed, one of the stockholders of this road or, at all events, a promoter of it. We also find that the railway we were speaking about yesterday, has for one of its

directors the hon. member for Pictou, along with the hon. gentleman for West Toronto. Now, Sir, I have only taken the returns for the past two years, and with the exception of the last mentioned railway, I have confined myself to the Provinces of Quebec, Ontario and the Lower Provinces, and I find, according to the records, that a large number of the members of this House are not only corporators, but stockholders in roads which have been largely bonused by the people of this country. I have observed, yesterday and to-day, that hon. gentlemen readily jump up and deny that they have any interest in these matters, and some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are frank enough to admit that this state of things which have been going on in the past, should be put an end to. Sir, if it is wrong, as has been stated in this House, to receive a trifling sum of money under a contract, it is infinitely a greater violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, that hon. gentlemen should hold seats in this House while they receive benefits from the Government by being interested in railways bonused by this Government. Hon. gentlemen evade the independence of Parliament Act by having their businesses made into joint-stock concerns, such as the Montreal *Gazette*, and other concerns, as otherwise they would not have a right to sit here. If that Act is not sufficiently broad to take in these cases, then it should be amended. I say it is a disgrace to this country. There is not another Legislature in the world, not excepting Central and South America, where members of the Legislature can be charged with being so directly under the influence of the Government as can be charged against members sitting in this House. Corrupt as we are in the habit of calling the United States, I say that if hon. gentlemen occupied similar positions in the State Legislatures to the position they occupy here, public opinion would soon drive them from public life. Sir, I think the time is coming rapidly when the people of Canada will, in unmistakable language, say that this sort of things must be stopped, and they will say to the hon. gentlemen in this House who have been guilty of trafficking in railways, of benefiting from bonuses granted to railways, that they can no longer hold seats in this House, that they must give up the one position or the other. I say it is not safe, under these circumstances, for the people to allow such men to represent them. If a man wants to invest in railways, and wants to make a rapid fortune, let him resign his position in this House, or not come here at all. We cannot condemn this thing too strongly; and I believe that unless the people awaken to a sense of what is proper and right, there is danger in the future. I would say with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that we are fast drifting into a state of despotism. We all know what history has told us, that before despotism is born, corruption has to wipe out the institutions of the people, and we are fast drifting into that condition to-day, when men will be found to justify almost any act of corruption in this House. All hon. gentlemen admit this is not right, yet are they prepared to support legislation to prevent it in future? If they are, it is the duty of the Government to bring in such legislation as will forever prevent any hon. member holding a seat in this House who receives from the Government any direct or indirect advantages, further than the pay he is entitled to draw as a member of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat to what I am sure was an unintentional omission. In his list of martyrology which he has held up to us, I am afraid he has forgotten to include among those guilty of such infamous and unworthy acts, two hon. gentlemen who sit on his own side of the House. I think, if I mistake not, $128,000 have been voted to the Central Railway which run through a portion of Queen's and King's counties, and if I mistake not, two of the hon. gentlemen who are trusted by my hon. friend who has just sat down, the member for Queen's and the member for Sunbury, have been guilty of the infamous conduct of being directors of that road.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I will not impose a speech on the House, but as my name has been mentioned in connection with railways in New Brunswick I desire to offer a few words of explanation. If the hon. gentleman who a few moments ago made such a violent speech is as far astray in regard to the other names he has used in his conclusions—not in the fact of my being a stockholder—as he has with respect to myself, his speech will not be worth much where those gentlemen are known. So far as I am concerned, whatever effect it may have in Ontario, whatever prejudice it may arouse against me where I am not known, where the enterprise is not known, and the circumstances are not known, I cannot avoid. It may be that with the hon. gentleman's loud voice and violent denunciation of members where I am not known, prejudice may serve him in running an election. But in the county I represent, and where this enterprise is known, I do not fear his criticism, and he may send down his speech by bushels if he desires. The St. Louis Branch is a branch of railway that runs entirely through the county I represent. The company was incorporated, not by charter granted by this House but by a charter of the Legislature of New Brunswick. In that county as in other parts of New Brunswick it is not an easy matter to build a railway, and find a sufficient number of stockholders to interest themselves in the undertaking by taking stock and making themselves liable for payments on it without expecting to ever receive a cent on the road. And therefore when this stock list was opened my friends and those who were anxious to see the road built came and asked me to take stock for the purpose of encouraging the undertaking. I did so without expecting to obtain the return of a single cent. I never became a director and never handled a cent directly or indirectly; no money has passed through my hands down to the present time, and I never expect to get a cent. I became a stockholder either just before I became a member of Parliament or immediately I had been elected, and the people thought that, as representative of the county I could more efficiently serve them and give the enterprise more support by having my name on the stock list—not support in this House, but at home—as the representative of the county than otherwise, and I could not very well refuse in view of the law which did not prevent members of Parliament becoming stockholders. But since the discussion took place before the Railway Committee, and objections have been taken, I have thought it better to withdraw entirely from the road; and I have done so. I have written to the board of directors, asking them to have my name struck off the stock list and my stock cancelled so far as I am concerned. I have written the president, among other things, as follows:—

"I do this in view of the discussion had here on the general subject and to silence adverse criticism. As you know I never benefited in a pecuniary way by being a stockholder, nor did I ever expect to; yet I desire to wipe out even the suspicion of my being pecuniarily interested while a member of Parliament. The branch will still have my best wishes and my best efforts for its success."

I repeat that I never made one cent out of the railway, I never handled any money, I never knew anything particular about it beyond the fact that the directors had entered into a contract for building the road by which they gave all the bonuses, both local and federal, to the contractors, and that I do not expect to ever receive one cent. That is about the way I have been influenced by my connection with this railway. If other hon. members are similarly situated all I can say is that the charges made will not affect them very much where they are known.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I do not, of course, desire to detain the House, but in view of the charges made against hon. members, some withdrawn so soon as questioned, I think it due to myself and due to the constituency I represent to offer a few remarks regarding the insinuations, if not charges, made against me. This discussion commenced on the subject of timber limits; it has gradually drifted into a question of railway subsidies, a question fully discussed yesterday and just as fully discussed to-night. My friend, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) proceeded, without investigating the subject, without giving notice to those he intended to charge with high crimes and misdemeanors—although I do not believe any hon. gentleman has been guilty of those crimes and misdemeanors—without any notice whatever to charge me with having, as a member of Parliament, degraded Parliament by personal application to the Government of a party which I have supported since 1867—benefited by my position as a supporter of the Government by securing a grant of timber limits.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I can only say that never since I entered Parliament have I made application to the Government for a timber limit or for a colonisation land reserve. In 1882, before I was returned to Parliament, several friends of mine wished to get a timber limit, and they asked me if I could apply and assist them. I did so. Where that timber limit was I have no idea. I simply recommended them, and immediately on being elected to Parliament wrote refusing to have anything to do with the matter. The lease has expired, and I never received a dollar of profit out of it. So far as the colonisation company is concerned, in May, 1882, I was asked by a gentleman named Moore, and two or three others in this city to assist them in getting a grant of land in the Prince Albert district. Shortly after, I was asked to give up any right in favor of the Press Colonisation Company, which I did willingly. I do not remember the numbers of the lots, and almost forget the circumstances, and even what officer of that company it was who asked if I had any objection to giving up our claim. I said I had no desire or interest in preventing it, and that we would surrender it with the greatest pleasure. There is all the profit and the emolument that I received in connection with lands in the North-West prior to entering this Parliament. I never received a dollar from any man since I entered this Parliament or before I entered, for advocating his interests in connection with North-West lands or colonisation companies, or for surrendering any right or claim I had. Now, Sir, my hon. friend for West Wellington has stated in his place that the hon. member for Ottawa County has benefited as a member of Parliament by being a promoter of the Gatineau Railway. This is absolutely wrong. That company was organised under a provincial charter. I was then mayor of the city of Ottawa, and the City Council requested me as mayor to do all I could to advance the interests of that enterprise. At that time I had no idea of entering Parliament: I think it was in the fall of 1881. I did all I possibly could to advance the interests of that enterprise; my late lamented friend Mr. Currier was then the member for the city, and applied to the Government in 1882 for a bonus towards assisting in the building of that road. The Government at that time, and before I entered Parliament, promised through Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways, to grant a bonus the next Session which was done. So far as the Gatineau Railway is concerned, I have not got a dollar from it; I put my money into it honestly and honorably and have made an offer to those who are interested in it to return the money which I put in the enterprise and that if they did that I would only be too glad to be relieved of it. The people of Ottawa who know me are aware that I have not trafficked in that enterprise, that I have not made money out of it and have never used it for the purpose of benefiting myself, but that I became connected with it when mayor of Ottawa and felt I was in duty bound, in justice to myself and my reputation, and in justice to the city of Ottawa, to take the course which I did, and all the sneers and charges of hon. gentlemen will not deter me from pursuing the strict path which I have marked out for myself. We have heard a good deal on the other side of this House about endeavoring to justify our conduct by referring to what Reformers did in the past. The reason I have always adopted that policy is that hon. gentlemen paraded the country endeavoring to make people believe that of all men they were of the kingdon of heaven, they were of all men most desirous for the independence of Parliament, they were the purest of the pure. Hon. gentlemen know me well enough to be aware that I am perfectly conversant with their record, and I assert that no party ever existed since Confederation, or since responsible government was introduced, who have degraded themselves as hon. gentlemen have, and yet they have the audacity to charge——

Mr. McMULLEN. What about Mr. Whitehead?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I cannot hear what the hon. gentleman says, but certainly desire him to speak if he wishes.

An hon. MEMBER. He wants to know about Whitehead.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. And perhaps you want to know something about Glasgow where you degraded the name of Canada? I will tell you about that presently. So far as I am concerned with regard to the matter to which my hon. friend for West Wellington has referred, I say that before a commission I have shown that I was agent for Mr. Whitehead when the Reform party were in power, and was the man who advised Mr. Whitehead to save his own credit and stop giving money to assist in the elections of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. I have the documents to prove, if they desire, my connection with Mr. Whitehead. It is an old, old story, threadbare through age, but all I can say is that I sold the only property I had in Ottawa to pay notes in the banks in Ottawa in connection with that matter, and the hon. gentleman knows that, or else if he does not know it he should not say without being conversant with the facts.

Mr. McMULLEN. What did the judges say about it?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I am interrupted, but if the hon. gentleman wants to know what the judge said it was this that no proof was adduced to show that I exercised any influence, direct or indirect, in order to get exclusive privileges for Joseph Whitehead. Now, what does the hon. gentleman say? When interrupted, I was proceeding to say that those opposite had, notwithstanding their record, the audacity to charge Conservaties with corruption. As hon. gentlemen contend that we have no right to justify everything we do by references to their action, I will give them the maxim of their old leader, the gentleman whom they deposed, the gentleman whom my hon. friend from Simcoe could tell something about, in these very Glasgow transactions, if he desired. He said in 1877, when he was then Premier of this country, addressing an audience at Unionville:

"Far be it from me to cite their example as any justification of any single act of mine. I know I should have very little standing room in your presence if my defence was based on anything so weak as that, but when they say, as they do say, if not directly, certainly inferentially, that we are guilty of certain things, they mean, of course, that these things are wrong. If they are wrong, how are they to justify themselves in relation to matters exactly in the same line which they have done. I say we have done nothing that can in the slightest degree justify the attack which has been made upon us; but I say further that if you charge that these things are wrong, how are your own actions in regard to the same matters; how do you justify them?"

Now, in referring to a matter which it suits hon. gentlemen opposite to deem ancient history, I have always worked

upon this maxim, and I have said if you were right how do you turn about now and tell us in the course of a few months that we are wrong in doing the same thing? Consequently, I may remind them that they are preaching and professing what they never seemed to believe when in power. They cannot possibly forget that the Hon. Senator Foster, who is now dead, not only received a contract from the Government, but that the hands of the Ministers were thrust into the Exchequer, and $45,000 of public money taken therefrom and paid to Mr. Foster. Nor can they forget that members of this House owning railways, had many tons of rails loaned to them by the Government in order to enable them to construct their roads. I remember one particular instance in which an hon. gentleman rose in this House and condemned the Government for not giving him the rails; he went back to his constituents and said: "I told Mr. Mackenzie that if he would not give me rails enough to rail my road, I would not support his Government." What was the result? The hon. gentleman got the rails, and he supported the Government. Now, there is not an hon. gentleman opposite who believes that any favor the Government could grant would make me a more ardent supporter than I am. I have always been a Conservative, although I have endeavored to treat my opponents as courteously as possible. But I desire to direct their attention to the opinion of an hon. gentleman, whose opinion they ought to respect, whose opinion they did once respect when he had power and patronage; I refer to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). Many hon. gentlemen present must recall, as I recall, sitting in the press gallery at the time, that in 1877 the Speaker of the House was charged with receiving patronage from the Government, and Mr. McLeod, a member from New Brunswick, was charged with receiving $10,000 for transporting rails; what was the defence of the hon. member for East York at that time, when the leader of the present Government made those charges against hon. gentlemen? He said, addressing an audience at Newmarket:

"No language could be too strong to denounce such a statement as this. I recollect reading an incident related of a man who was known to be a very profane swearer. He was taking a load of pumpkins up a long hill, when some boys came up from behind, took out the tailboard of the waggon. His horses sprung forward, and he looked back to see all his pumpkins rolling down the hill. He sat speechless, and the boy said: 'Why don't you swear?' 'I can't; why, no language can do justice to the occasion.' No language, I say, can be put in the mouth of man to denounce so shameless a piece of political profligacy—to denounce such a speech as that from a gentleman in his high position—a statement so scandalous in its conception, so infamous in its utterance."

At that time the present leader of the Government was arraigning the existing Government for its offences against the Independence of Parliament Act. The hon. member for East York further said:

"Let him name a member or a man who, as he says, was bought by the giving of a contract. Surely he does not refer to the case of Mr. Anglin, for, as every one knows, I had no firmer and few abler supporters in Parliament than the member for Gloucester from the moment I first took office. We had worked together in almost everything since I sat in Parliament; and it is a curious thing if one is to be obliged to buy one's staunchest friends."

The Reform party were jubilant over this maxim; but to-day, ready to turn with any fashionable gale, they condemn those who, not in their own interests, but in the interest of the constituencies they represent, are endeavoring to advance public enterprises by expending a portion of the surplus an active and industrious Conservative Government have rolled up. We are to be condemned as criminals by hon. gentlemen opposite, who placed on the Statute-book the very law that allows members of Parliament to be shareholders in corporations which secure patronage from the Government; they are prepared to assume a virtue though they know they have it not. Now, Sir, what is the truth with regard to this Independence of Parliament Act? We have been lectured to-night about it, and have been told how wrong it was. I ask hon. gentlemen who put the existing law on the Statute-book, and why they put it there? The Government of the hon. member for East York inserted that clause in the Act—and what for? For the very purpose of allowing hon. gentlemen opposite to participate in profits derived from business done through companies with the Government. And yet, as soon as they were caught, so soon as the public eye was on them, instead of facing the public and admitting they had done wrong, they brazened out the offence and used a powerful majority to bolster up their corrupt cause. This was the provision they placed on the Statute-book:

"This Act shall not extend to disqualify any person as a member of the House of Commons, by reason of his being a shareholder in any incorporated company having a contract or agreement with the Government of Canada, except companies undertaking contracts for the building of public works, and any company incorporated for the construction or working of any part of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

Why was that passed? because Mr. Norris, who was unseated for his offence, was proved guilty of having received $40,000 of patronage from the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, and by whitewashing him, they opened the way for further inroads on the public Treasury, and placed on the Statute-book, this clause which they now blame Conservatives for having transacted business under.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Norris resigned.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. He did resign, but when on a public platform he was accused by Mr. Miller of having a contract with the Government, he denied it, and expressed the wish that his hand might wither before he would sign a contract with the Government; and when the investigation took place in this House, it was found that he might not have signed the contract, but that one of his relatives probably signed it, and he became again a candidate for the representation of the county of Lincoln, and the hon. member for Bothwell knows that. Now, we have been told that this Government has assisted its friends by giving them timber limits. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has made it perfectly clear that there has been no favoritism shown towards Conservatives—that Liberals as well as Conservatives have had the opportunity of doing business with the Department of the Interior; but we can remember when that hon gentleman, referred to in this debate as the sturdy and unbending Premier of Ontario, Mr. Mowat, made grants of timber limits to his friends. We can recall when the Hon. R. W. Scott secured the commissionership of Crown Lands under the Administration of Mr. Blake, in consequence of a telegram sent to him from the city of Ottawa, saying, "Do not take anything unless you can get the Crown Lands." So soon as those gentlemen were in power we find that Oliver, Davidson & Co.—Mr. Oliver being at the time a member of the Local Legislature—purchased 24,800 acres in 1872-73 from the Ontario Government in the townships of Blake, Crooks, and Pardee, in the Thunder Bay District, obtaining mineral land at $1 per acre. This did not give them the title to the pine timber; but after the purchase, Mr. Oliver procured an Order in Council allowing the owners of the land to purchase the pine on the property at 50 cents an acre. Oliver, Davidson & Co., availed themselves of this Order, and in October, 1873 it was revoked. Oliver, Davidson & Co. secured their lands at $1 an acre, re-sold them again for some $97,000, and they are held to-day by Mr. Carpenter at $400,000. More than that, I will tell hon. gentlemen that in the case of Mr. Birkett, a wealthy and influential citizen of Ottawa, when he was refused by the present Government a renewal of the lease he had in the disputed territory, on the ground that the dispute between the Ontario and the Dominion Governments was not settled, the secretary and organiser of the Reform party, Mr. Preston, wrote a letter to his father in this city, saying that if Mr. Birkett would give him one-half interest, he would secure the title from Mr. Mowat, and Mr. Birkett could endeavor to settle his matter at this

end of the line, so far as the Dominion Government was concerned. That is the manner in which these gentlemen, purists in opposition, deal with the public domain when in office. I regret having to trouble the House, but I do not desire to sit down without showing the unfairness of the attack made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron). They insinuated that every gentleman who wrote a letter in favor of a constituent or anyone in any part of the country, for the purpose of promoting any transaction the latter might have had with the Department of the Interior, was guilty of corruption. Let hon. gentlemen look back again and see the position in which they place their leader, the hon. member for West Durham, by this contention. We remember that when his party controlled this House, in 1874, he wrote a letter in favor of his friend, Mr. Moore. How he repudiated the charge, how, as a pure-minded statesman and the son of one of the purest men that ever lived, it cut him to the heart to be suspected of anything wrong. What did the right hon. the First Minister say on that occasion? He stated, at once, he believed the transaction was correct, so far as the hon. member for West Durham was concerned. The First Minister had the manliness to stand by the member for West Durham. Then that hon. gentleman wrote:

"My Dear Mackenzie,—David Moore, of Walkerton, asks me to inform you that he is about to tender for the Goderich works, and I do so accordingly. I told my friend Moore that an introduction was unnecessary, as you would let the work fairly without respect of person."

Mr. IRVINE. Tell us all about the Pacific scandal too; tell us the whole of it.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I promised to refer to the Glasgow scandal, but I certainly do not desire to detain the House. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the two men who made surveys with regard to the amount of timber on the hon. gentleman's land which was sold in Glasgow, are doing well and growing fat under the Ontario Government. See how fairly the right hon. the First Minister acted with the hon. member for West Durham at that time, and that hon. gentleman proudly quoted the words which the right hon. the First Minister had said in his behalf. This was the language used by the First Minister:—

"The letter written by the hon. Minister of Justice was highly creditable to him—it was a letter which Mr. Moore had a right to ask from him. Mr. Moore supported the hon. Minister of Justice as the candidate for North Bruce in 1867. He was, therefore, a friend of the hon. gentleman, and had a right to receive a letter stating all the hon. gentleman could honestly state. The hon. Minister of Justice was not in any way personally responsible for the loss of those $29,000 to the country."

Mr. MILLS. I would like the hon. gentleman to say whether he does not know that his leader afterwards withdrew that statement and reiterated the charges made by his followers against Mr. Blake.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I am not aware what subsequent evidence was produced to change the opinion of the First Minister, but I can simply say that taking the charge as it came up in this House, without investigating it, he was willing to absolve the hon. member for West Durham, while hon. gentlemen opposite attack us without giving us an hour's notice, and on the flimsiest possible foundation. I am sorry to have detained the House so long, but must say in concluding that never since I have entered Parliament have I known what it was to receive one dollar of public money improperly; never have I received one dollar of public money for services rendered to any corporation, and when I hear these charges made, naturally enough feel indignant, knowing what I have done, knowing I am a poor man, that I have kept my honor as a member of the House of Commons clear and spotless.

Some MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Hon. gentlemen may sneer. It is the nature of some human beings not to know what honesty is, not to believe public men can be honest; and when I meet that class of men, I am prone to be very suspicious of their character. So far as I am concerned, and so far, I believe, as my brother members are concerned, the charges of hon. gentlemen are groundless. If they have any direct charges to make, let them formulate them where we can meet them. It is not fair, while the lips of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) are closed, to allow the evidence of irresponsible men without this House, men suspected of perjury, whose testimony would not be accepted in any court of law, to go against the solid opinion of Parliament. Hon. gentlemen may themselves be in power some day——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I do not insinuate that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) will ever live to see that day, or that the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Irvine), will live to see it; but the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and some other of the younger members may, and as hon. gentlemen opposite put utterances on record at one period that come up against them now, so will the record of their utterances to-day come up against them in the future. I say it is only right to deal honestly between man and man, to have courtesy towards one another, and if we have done wrong, let hon. gentlemen arraign us before a committee of the House. Knowing hon. gentlemen on this side, I believe them to be as guiltless and as fair-minded as men can be, and so far as I am concerned, I make my own statement, not because I believe any hon. member has not the right to purchase lands and to lease lands or timber limits, but simply to show upon what a fragile basis the charges are supported. Whenever hon. gentlemen opposite choose to prefer those charges, let them give us notice, and they will find that we are prepared to defend our character at five hours' or two hours' notice; but it is unfair for the hon. member for West Huron to travel through the country making statements which we have no opportunity of denying, and in so far as the hon. member for West Simcoe (Mr. Cook) is concerned, we are absolutely indifferent as to whether he speaks or does not. My own impression is that if we could induce him to make a tour through Canada, we would sweep the entire constituencies.

Mr McCARTHY. I certainly do not propose at this hour of the morning to debate the question which is before the House. I rise simply to make a personal explanation. It will be very brief, and I trust sufficiently so to allow my hon. friends on both sides to listen to it. With regard to the charges made, not so much here as in the newspaper press, that I was interested in timber limits, or grazing lands, or coal lands, I have only to give these charges a most distinct and positive denial. I never applied for either one or the other, either for coal lands, timber lands, grazing lands or anything else, either for myself or for anyone else with whom I was interested, either directly or indirectly. In any form of words I can put it, I desire to state that I had nothing whatever to do in any way, shape or form in obtaining a timber limit or anything else in the North-West. That I applied for my constituents from to time I do not deny. If that is a crime, I plead guilty to it. As to the other matter in regard to which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has made a statement, which he shows the most perfect ignorance about, which has evidently been placed in his hands, and which he has not taken the trouble to investigate, I think I have a right to complain. I think, before a charge is made against a member of the House, the member who makes the charge should endeavor to satisfy himself as to the particulars and nature of the transaction. But I am safe in saying the hon. member did not know what he was talking

of, and did not understand it in the slightest degree. It is evident, however, that the policy which has been adopted by the Opposition, since everything else has failed, is to slander indiscriminately, to slander every man, whether there be any truth in it, or any ground or pretence for it or not. They know they are safe under the privileges of Parliament to make their charges, which they know they dare not make outside of Parliament, or in any other way. In regard to this particular matter, the charge is so grotesque and so absurd as almost to refute itself. The history of it is simply this: When the Government determined finally to give a bonus to the road which was connecting the railway system of Ontario with Callander, they determined to give it to the Ontario and Pacific Junction, or rather to the Northern Pacific Junction Railway Company with which I was connected, simply on the condition that it was leased to the Northern and the Hamilton Railway Companies, which formed the connecting links between Gravenhurst and the cities of Toronto and Hamilton. Since that time, I have had only a nominal connection with the road. It is true I am the president of it, and if the House will bear with me I will explain how that position was offered to me, but I have had nothing more than the barest nominal interest in the road. With regard to the bonus, it was made over to the contractors as their price or a portion of their price for building the road, the balance of the money which was to be paid them was to be paid in bonds. The only bonds that have been issued have been issued to the contractors on account of their price for building the road. The only bonds which are to be issued are for that purpose and for the purpose of equipping the road. No bond or the proceeds of any bond, or the proceeds of any bonus, has gone into my pocket or any of my associates, or, as far as I know and believe, into the pockets of any of the gentlemen who are interested in the enterprise. The bonus is taken up substantially by the two railway companies, the Northern representing two-thirds and the Hamilton representing one-third. The road is built by these companies with the bonus which the Government granted, as it granted a bonus to the Canada Central Company, and upon these bonds issued to the contractors, and now held by banks on behalf of the contractors. As to my position as president, it is really a matter with which this House need not concern itself very much, and I am almost ashamed to trouble it with a matter so purely personal and with which, I am sure the House will agree with me when they have heard my statement, it has no concern whatever. The history of it is this: When the Hamilton and the Northern roads, the one representing the city of Toronto and the other the city of Hamilton, agreed to take the road over as they did, there was a certain rivalry between the two companies and the two cities, and it was arranged that the board should be composed of four representatives from each city and from each road, four from Toronto and four from Hamilton. I was to be the ninth director, occupying the position of president in order to see that between the two companies and the two cities there should be fair play. So necessary was that felt to be that, when I had to go to England in 1884, I resigned my position as president and Mr. Charles Moss, of Toronto, was appointed to fill my place. He did fill my place, and he was the person who actually signed the contract, and I assumed my position on my return. The only object in my holding that position, is to see that there is fair play between these two rival roads and these two rival cities in the matter which has to be dealt with in the lease of the road and the building of it, and so on. I ought to say a word in regard to Mr. Stuart, whose name is mentioned here. Mr. Stuart is not a member of the Conservative party. Mr. John Stuart, of Hamilton, is a leading and well-known Reformer, but I feel I have a right to speak for him in this matter, and I am safe in saying that he has not, nor has any other gentleman in connection with that road, pocketed one cent or one dollar illegitimately or improperly. I know, because I am interested on behalf of that road between them and the contractors just now, and so I happen to know more about it at this moment than I have for some time. There have been disputes between the board and the contractors, because they think the contractors have not handed over the sections as they should have done, from time to time, while the contractors claim that they are entitled to hold the whole road until it is built. There is no further dispute between them, and I know that for the money which the contractors are getting, and the sum which will be spent in equipping this road, the bonds will be issued and for nothing else. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) whom I see now in his place, who made this charge, ought not I think to have made it under the circumstances, and considering the relations between us in the past, he ought not to have taken that course without a better knowledge of what he was speaking. Had some members done so I would not have minded it, but from him I did not expect it, and I think he ought not to have adopted it and to have made the charge. It is utterly and entirely without foundation, and I give it the most entire and absolute contradiction.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I must say that I regret that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has thought it his duty to make such sweeping charges against the House in general. The system that he has been denouncing may have led to some abuses. I do not know of any system that cannot lead to any abuses by designing persons, but from that to making such a condemnation as he has wanted to have the House register against the system which has obtained for a certain number of years, I think there is a distance which we must pause before passing over. I for my part cannot entertain the opinion that some of the hon. members on this side of the House seem to entertain on the general character of the members of this House. It is a well known fact that, on account of the special condition of the country, with a small proportion having undertaken the task of developing its immense territory, members of Parliament are expected, public men are expected, to do many things, to promote many useful enterprises that would suffer if they were not to be promoted by public men having the confidence of the country. When you have to take some 300 men who are supposed to be the most prominent, commanding the trust and confidence of the country, to bring them to fill seats in the House of Commons and in the Senate, if you prevent those men engaging in any public undertakings calculated to promote the welfare of the country, you are doing a great injury to the country itself. Hon. members have been charged with making applications to the Government not only on behalf of themselves, but even on behalf of their friends and constituents. Well, Sir, this is the first time that I have heard it was a crime in members to perform one of the duties of their mission. A member is the representative of his constituents; he is considered as the intermediary between them and the Government. It is through him the electors expect to obtain anything of advantage to them; and if a member is to be prevented from taking advantage of his position to make application for the people he represented for timber limits, railway subsidies, or anything of public or local interest under the special invitation of our own legislation, his position would be useless. The position of a member is not only to record votes for or against the Government, but after the Session is over he is supposed still to continue to look after the interest of his county and the country in general. Some members have been charged with procuring railway subsidies from the Government. I must at once admit that I am one of the culprits, I happen to be a shareholder and

director in a railway company known in our district as the *Chemin de fer du Curé* Labelle, that is, a railway that is to start from St. Jérôme, pass over the Laurentian range to the Ottawa Valley, and bring the increasing population of that important region into communication with the commercial centres. A subsidy has been granted to this railway, and although it is apparently a large one, yet when compared with the amount of work which must be done, it has proved to be so insufficient that no contractor has been found who would undertake the construction of the railway, under the conditions established by the Government. It reminds me of a remark of my late lamented friend from Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), who, when speaking of the subsidies granted by the Government, said that they, in the majority of cases, would prove to be illusory because insufficient. The fact is that millions of dollars have been voted by this Parliament within a few years to open new districts of country, through the construction of new lines of railways, so as to open them to colonisation, work their mines to give an impetus to commerce, and still many of those railways are not yet constructed, for the reason that contractors dare not undertake them with the aid at present offered. Only a small sum has been paid out of the large amounts voted in some particular lines, because in most of the other cases the help granted by the Government, was insufficient to enable the promoters to build it. I think that unless the hon. member for North Norfolk is able to point to some particular act wherein the Government have unduly influenced members of this House, it would be unjust and unfair to ourselves to pass his motion. We would lead the public to believe that the men they have sent here to represent them are a corrupt lot, who look only after their own interest to the neglect and detriment of the interests of their constituents. Under these circumstances I feel it my duty to vote against the motion.

Mr. COOK. I much admired the ingenious way in which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), answered the charges made against him. He said he could assure this House that he had sold no bonds, and had pocketed no money, but he did not say that he was a one-third shareholder in the stock of the Northern Pacific and Junction Railway to the extent of $182,000, out of the total capital stock of the company of $200,000.

Mr. McCARTHY. If I did not say so then, I say so now.

Mr. COOK. Well, Sir, your name is down, it is on a return brought down to this House a short time ago.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not correct.

Mr. COOK. I will read the names of the parties on that return :

"Samuel Barker, Adam Brown, C. J. Campbell, Wm. Joice, John Procter, Hon. F. Smith, John Stuart, Hon. James Turner, Hon. F. Smith, John Stuart, Dalton McCarthy."

Mr. McCARTHY. "In trust," read the whole of it, please.

Mr. COOK. Not in trust.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. COOK. It is not so stated in the return, it is very easy to have it in trust for yourself. The hon. gentleman did not say that he was not receiving $5,000 as president of this road.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was not charged with it.

Mr. COOK. He did not say that he was receiving money for being solicitor of this railway.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not the solicitor of the road.

Mr. COOK. I did not say you were. I say it has been charged against you that you received money as president of this road.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not deny that.

Mr. COOK. Now I am satisfied. I did not know but that you were solicitor for the company. I know that you are after a good many little pickings. I remember the time when that hon. gentleman in Simcoe held up his hands in holy horror at the Mackenzie Administration, and said that men who would do these things were not worthy to be the people's representatives. We, however, find the hon. gentleman at the very first opportunity coming to this House and engaging in the acts he had condemned. What will the people of Simcoe think of it, for probably they will hear of it? The hon. gentleman caused a large number of circulars to be placarded against me at the last election, in regard to a timber limit they said I got in the North-West. The hon. gentleman was very anxious to show the electors the wrong side of the shield. He wanted to make it appear that I had committed an illegal act. I am fortunately or unfortunately a lumber merchant, and it is necessary for me to have lumber standing to cut in order to carry on my business. I purchased my limits from the Ontario Government, and they are sold by public auction. I never got or asked from the Government of Ontario a single tree that I did not buy at public auction. I am opposed to the principle of granting timber limits except by public auction. I have stated that before and I will repeat it on every platform when I have the opportunity. But the hon. gentleman who knows nothing about lumbering, and men who do not know a tree from a saw log, went to the North-West and got timber limits—lawyers, doctors, clergymen, tailors and every other class of the community got timber limits. What did they do with them? They try immediately to sell them. They never attempt to work the limits. Lumbermen who get limits have a right to them. A night or two before Sir John A. Macdonald resigned in 1873, what did he do? He wrote three letters to three different parties, in which he said they could have timber limits in what is now known as the disputed territory. When Mr. Mackenzie came into power I saw the letters. He consulted me in regard to the matter, because I happened to be a lumberman. Those limits were granted to those parties because Mr. Mackenzie felt he was in duty bound to carry out the acts of his predecessor. Were they Reformers? No, everyone was a Tory. Was Mr. Fuller, of Hamilton, a reformer? No. Was Mr. W. J. Macauley a Reformer?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. COOK. A curious kind of Reformer he was. When Sir John A. Macdonald was defeated in Kingston, did he not travel to Provencher, and then sent a telegram that he had secured the constituency for the Tory leader. Sir John A. Macdonald would not accept, but he telegraphed to Victoria, B.C., for a seat, as he could not get a seat in his own Province where he was best known. I find also that Mr. Quinn, my old opponent, has a timber limit. I asked the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) at what time Mr. Quinn obtained that limit. I do not know whether he had the limit at the very time he was running against me or not. I believe he had. At the same time he was telling my constituents that I was doing a very wrong thing. If he had not the limit at that time, he had it shortly afterwards, for he acquired it soon afterwards, and holds it now. Something was said about my friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) purchasing land in the North-West. If he has not the right to purchase land when he pays money for it, I cannot understand it. He bought most of it at second hand; if not, he had the right to buy it from the Government. But hon. gentlemen opposite did not buy it—they got it for nothing. Hon. gentlemen got timber limits for nothing, lands for colonisation companies for nothing, and they put these then on the market and traffic in them, and some of them have lost money, and I am mighty glad of it. Hon. gentlemen opposite should do as

well as they can because I do not believe they will be let off scot free if the Grits get into power as they will do whenever an election takes place. The handwriting is on the wall. I see another friend of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is down as getting a timber limit —Dr. Kirkland, who is one of the men going to be a candidate. The hon. member (Mr. McCarthy) is getting tired of the constituency; the truth is he is being driven from the constituency by the nomination of the Hon. Mr. Anglin and he feels his chances are waning. His brother has been made a judge; his brother-in-law has been made a judge. I will not go into family matters. It is well known that the people of the riding are looking about. Only the other day a gentleman said to me: "I wanted to get the position of collector of Customs at Penetanguishene, but Mr. McCarthy wrote me to the effect that they wanted to get a man who knew something about the business He was a first-class bookkeeper and an intelligent man, a man as capable of performing the Customs duties as the hon. gentleman himself. He was refused because he was not intelligent enough, but the position was given to a young man who was not of age, and they had to wait until he became of age. He was the son of a wealthy man, one of the nabobs, one of the blue blood. The Government must distribute their honors to their friends, although the poorer classes do not like it, and as regards the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) they say he is not the boy for Galway. The hon. gentleman is now seeking a seat in Toronto, where he is building a house; and although he left Simcoe under circumstances that were not very favorable, no-doubt with the Government grants he is in a more favorable position. One day, in the Session of 1877, I had occasion to go into the Surveyor General's Department to get some maps to send away to my constituents. Colonel Dennis said: Why do you not go up and get a timber limit? I replied that I did not want a timber limit in the North-West. There were no railways. The place where the limits were selected were 1,000 miles from Winnipeg, and it was of course no easy task to go in there. You had to take your machinery down the Red River from the Northern Pacific Railway and cart it across a distance of 900 or 1,000 miles.

Mr. McCALLUM. You had three years in which to do it.

Mr. COOK. Certainly; it required that time to do it. The Minister of the Interior has made the statement on several occasions that is untrue, and I state in my place that I can prove it to be untrue, just as the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) proved that one of the hon. gentleman's statements was untrue on another occasion. It is highly improper for hon. members in this House to make statements that are false. This was in the spring of the year, and I knew I could not spare the time and would not bury myself in that wilderness. I made arrangements with one of the managers, and I then wrote to the Minister, making application, and I got a reply which I shall read before I sit down. It has been said there were no conditions, but there were conditions. The extent of the limits was 100 miles, but mine were joined with Mr. Sutherland's by the Order in Council, making it 200 miles, and I did not object. We were to pay $3,000 bonus. When the Government took it away from me, they gave it to Nicholas Flood Davin, who is a lumberman, of course, at $2.50 per mile. They gave it to him for $500, but they would not let me have it for $3,000. I was to cut the timber and have everything in operation in three years. I was not to charge over $25 to $35 per 1,000 feet, the current price being $35 to $40 per 1,000 feet, as the Government were anxious to have lumber sold cheaply to the settlers to encourage the settlement of the country. Colonel Dennis was anxious about the matter; he was, I believe, a good Conservative and he said that they must get some one who could manufacture lumber, that they must have a man of capital.

Mr. COOK.

Mr. McCALLUM. Where was that?

Mr. COOK. It was west of Edmonton.

Mr. McCALLUM. Did you select it yourself?

Mr. COOK. Partially. We spent $6,000, and I put on our men until we discovered that the Order in Council had been made inoperative. I telegraphed and wrote to Sir John A. Macdonald, and it was stated that the reason it was inoperative was because we were idle and were not doing anything. Sir John A. Macdonald would not allow me to retain it on any consideration. It was not the first time he showed his hostility to me, but I could live without him and beyond him; I know that he and his friends have carried their hostility into private life but I do not care.

Mr. McCALLUM. Did you select the 200 miles in one block or where?

Mr. COOK. The timber of that country grows in clusters, and when I made application I made it on the same terms as others. When I came to look at the applications made by other gentlemen I found it was three square miles in a block.

Mr. McCALLUM. Do you mean Mr. Davin?

Mr. COOK. No, I am not talking about Mr. Davin. You cannot bother me even if you get up your old mud scow with $8,000 damages. Then, Sir John A. Macdonald's Government allowed Mr. Macaulay and three other applicants to whom he gave limits the very night before he resigned to select it in three mile belts. The Government insisted that it should be twenty mile belts and that it should not be any more, because there was a large portion of the country on which there was no timber, and there was no necessity for licensing that, and I agreed with them. Now, I do not ask for any favors in this matter; if I had wanted to act sharply I could have made application in the name of some person else, but I did not want to steal anything; I wanted to operate a mill and make lumber, which was my legitimate business. But what did this Government do? They locked up the whole country for the benefit of their friends and their personal gain. I look upon it that I was a member of Parliament when I got the license, and that it was my legitimate business as my constitutents quite understand. On the 14th May, 1878, I wrote to the Hon. Mr. Mills, Minister of the Interior, this letter:

"MIDLAND, 14th May, 1878.

"HON. D. MILLS,
"Minister of the Interior, Ottawa,

"DEAR SIR,—I have the honor to make application to you for a timber limit, say for 100 square miles, to be selected and surveyed at my cost, in the vicinity of the Saskatchewan River, between Edmonton and the Rocky Mountains. My object in obtaining this is for legitimately manufacturing and supplying lumber, shingles, &c., &c., to the settlers on prairie lands in the territories to the east.

"As you are aware, the supply of timber fit for making lumber, in Manitoba and the territories south of the river mentioned, is so limited that unless the Government facilitates to every reasonable extent the views of men having capital, and accustomed to the lumber business, who are willing to develop the large timber district known to exist west of Edmonton, the price of timber must be such, for years, as to operate powerfully against the settlement of the country. I now, therefore, respectfully urge the concession of the above privilege, requesting one year from the 1st of July next, in which to make my selection, and to furnish you with the plan and description of the limit, when I will be prepared to accept the same on such terms as the Government may, under all the circumstances, and considering the great expenses of taking machinery to such a great distance, may consider reasonable."

When I mention one year, I would make the selection in one year, but it would take two years to get the mill into operation. On the 6th of June following, I received this reply from the Department:—

"I have the honor by direction of the Minister of the Interior in reference to your application dated the 14th ultimo, for a timber limit of one hundred square miles to be selected and surveyed at your cost in the vicinity of the Saskatchewan, between Edmonton and the Rocky Mountains, the same having had the consideration of the Minister of the Interior, I am directed to inform you that under certain conditions,

he would be disposed to recommend the same to the favorable consideration of the Privy Council.

"As the great object of encouraging a proposal of this nature is to cheapen the price of lumber to settlers in the Territories, the Minister would desire to receive an assurance from you, that whereas he understands that at present the price of lumber at the mills in Prince Albert is from $35 to $45, you should agree not to charge more at your mills than from $25 to $35 which he considers would be very profitable rates. In case the limit should be conceded you, a certain bonus per square mile would be required, in addition to which you would require to conform to the terms and conditions as regards payments of ground rent and royalty as set forth in section 51 of the Dominion Lands Act, a copy of which is herewith transmitted."

Now, sub-section 5 of section 51 of the Dominion Lands Act states: That a man must pay in addition to the bonus an annual ground rent of $2 per square mile, and further a royalty of 5 per cent on his monthly account. That is contained in the Statutes of 1872, and it is in the Dominion Lands Act to-day, and these gentlemen disregard it. They charged us $15 a mile as bonus, an annual ground rent of $2 a square mile, and a royalty of 5 per cent. on the monthly account, that is, on the gross receipts on the money invested, and not the net profits.

Mr. McCALLUM. Will you tell us where you were going to sell the lumber?

Mr. COOK. I was going to sell it on the Saskatchewan.

Mr. McCALLUM. You were not going to take it to Glasgow?

Mr. COOK. No, we send other kind of lumber there; we send logs there, something like yourself. I will tell you something about Glasgow. A company in Scotland had a limit on a reserve west of Owen Sound for which they paid a large amount, and the moment this Government got into power and found that I was the manager of that company they cancelled the limit. The company paid $60,000 for that limit.

Mr. McCARTHY. Whom did they pay the $60,000 to?

Mr. COOK. To several companies that they purchased it from; I am not able now to give the list. I want to say that this system of granting limits by this Government extends not only to the North-West; there is not a limit all along the Georgian Bay in the Province of Ontario that has not been put under license at a nominal sum; and some of the constituents of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in the town of Collingwood, have been faring very well by them. Mr. Long, Captain Campbell, and Mr. Charles Cameron, have been figuring to a large extent. I believe there was one limit last year that was granted to them by this Government at a nominal sum of $15 or $20, and they sold it a week after they got it for $15,000. I am not sure of the amount they paid, but I know that it was a nominal sum. I do not suppose my hon. friends would do it, but there have been gentlemen who get commissions on sums of money that are made out of the country by granting licenses to their friends.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. COOK. If you want the name it was the member for Lincoln; he is not here. I have had occasion to refer before to the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in this House, but seldom could find him here. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said it was a shame that I should attack the hon. member for North Simcoe in his absence, but I told the hon. gentleman that I had met him on four occasions in Simcoe, and on three I had made him touch the beam pretty lively, and if he has ever an opportunity to cross my path again in any constituency, he will touch it higher than he ever did before; he will go as high as Gilderoy's kite. The junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) made a speech, but I do not think I shall pay any attention to that, because the speech did not amount to anything. He simply made criminations and recriminations, stating some things, and apparently did not know what he was talking about. I know in one case he did not know what he was talking about, and that was when he referred to a place called New Glasgow, and the hon. member for Monck took it up.

Mr. McCALLUM. I have been in New Glasgow before.

Mr. COOK. No doubt.

Mr. McCALLUM. Yes; and I can go there again, too.

Mr. COOK. Do doubt you could, but I do not think the hon. gentleman could ever get away again. They would put him in a glass case because he would be quite a curiosity there now. I want now to go a little further with this. I want to show the opinion of Mr. Dennis on this matter. This is a memorandum written on the 21st May, and it shows the recommendation he made to the Department after the conversation I had with him:

"Referring to Mr. Cook's application for a timber limit, as set forth in his communication of the 14th instant, the undersigned begs respectfully to remark that he considers that it would be very much calculated to encourage the formation of settlement on the line of the Saskatchewan, if facilities were afforded for obtaining lumber at a reasonable price.

"The undersigned has been given to understand that the price of lumber at Prince Albert is from $35 to $45 per thousand, and shingles at $6.50 per bundle.

"The undersigned is convinced that a reasonable competition would reduce the price of lumber to from $25 to $35 per thousand, and the price of shingles in proportion, and if Mr. Cook or any other capitalist accustomed to the manufacturing of lumber would undertake to supply settlers along the line of the Saskatchewan within those figures, it would appear to him that the Government should facilitate such person being placed in a position to do so, by a grant of a timber limit upon reasonable conditions.

"Respectfully submitted,
(Signed) "J. S. DENNIS,
"Surveyor-General."

Now follows the Order in Council, and, as I said before, we sent our men up there. They were sent by Mr. Sutherland and myself, and we expended a large sum of money, $6,000, and deposited copies of the accounts in the hands of the Government to the amount of $4,000. We, therefore, went on with the locating in good faith and with the result you know.

Mr. BOWELL. Read the Order in Council.

Mr. COOK. There is no parellel between this case and that of hon. gentlemen who hold positions in this House, and go into enterprises they know nothing about; men who embark in railway speculations, who get stock and money out of these railways for the use of their position and influence in this House and the Government. I am told that several members of Parliament, in the case of the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, share in the profits, and that one member pocketed $50,000 as his portion. It is hardly possible that these gentlemen would vote against the Government, supposing there was another Pacific scandal. I appreciate hon. gentlemen who have risen in their places and made statements; they are good, strong party men. I am satisfied the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) is a good party man, and that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is a good party man; but as for the latter it is said he is not quite in accord with the policy of the Administration. I do not know whether it is on this account or because he wants to go in a little deeper. I am told, however, that he does not think, and some others do not think, the Old Man is running the machine to suit them; but this, of course, is only a rumor. No doubt other hon. gentlemen are good party men, safe to support the Government by all means through good and evil report. If they were members of an election committee I am quite sure they would not convict any hon. member who might be brought up for offences of which they are guilty themselves. I would be surprised, for instance, to find the hon. member for Simcoe

(Mr. McCarthy) declare that the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White) should be released f om blame. I would like to know if the gentleman who is president of a company, who has such influence with the board that he can relegate his position to another man and go on a tour to the Old Country for either gain or pleasure, gave the party who acted in his behalf the money he was entitled to, at the rate of $5,000 a year. Men in that position will not convict a man who is guilty of the same crime, and that was the reason the leader of the Government in 1873, when he committed that act by which the whole world was shocked, his friends, his honest Conservative friends, in the House then, the independent Conservatives, said: We cannot stand by you, we cannot vote for you; but there are acts as bad as that today. Will you tell me there is a gentleman in possession of one of these chartered companies, a gentleman who gets stock in these companies, or who gets $5,000 a year for being president of a company, who will go back on the Old Man? No, they are bound hand and foot; they are slaves; they are not independent men, and they will find that out when they go to their constituencies, they will hear tell of it when they go for re-election.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. COOK. It is all very fine; gentlemen may laugh, they may talk, they may chirp like unmentionable animals, but it is not going to drown the effect of this thing. Do you mean to tell me if the whole electorate of the Province of Ontario or the Dominion of Canada were here at the present time, and saw the action of these men like children, like boys, they would not be ashamed of them? Do you think they would not go back to their homes and friends and say: We are going to send common sense men to Parliament? The time is coming. Oh, yes, Sir. Now the hon. member the Minister of the Interior—I am sorry he is not in his place—has been going through the country making statements which are untrue. He goes to one place and he iterates the statements; he goes to another place and reiterates them, and some people believe them. Yes, some people who do not know him believe his statements, and it is an unfortunate thing for the country, because the papers of the country are so bound up, are so subsidised that they cannot give an honest expression of what is going on. They are also bound with the members of this House, and there is not a paper on the Conservative side of any consequence but is subsidised, and the political articles that appear in these papers are dishonest.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. COOK. I say the honest articles that should appear in these papers do not appear there; they are dishonest; and the people do not in their own organs get an expression of what is right and what is wrong. What do you think of the Montreal *Gazette*? What do you think of the Belleville *Intelligencer*? Why, the hon. the Minister of Customs cocks his ears up as if he was the editor of that paper. I do not for a moment intend to accuse him of having an interest in that paper. No; I do not think he has. I will trust you, anyway. Now, I only want to deal with one more gentleman. When the member for Cardwell *via* Montreal, got up and attempted to attack me, he said it was a vile thing on my part to take a timber limit, but he turned round to his friend, the member for Russell, and said: "My friend, Mr. Dickinson, who is an old established lumberman, has a right to have timber limits." Well, I do not know how long he has been lumbering. My impression is that he is not lumbering now. Are you?

Mr. DICKINSON. Since 1852, unceasingly, more or less.

Mr. COOK. The last time I heard of him he was lumbering in spools. He had a little turning lathe run by a four-horse power machine. I have no doubt that he is so wedded to the lumber trade that he will stick to it like old Mr. Marsh after his failure, who had been a lumberman, and who was found one day shaving shingles. He was asked what he was doing now, and he said: "I am in the lumber trade, and I am going to remain there even if I have to get down to wooden toothpicks." I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has got down to wooden toothpicks yet, but he has two timber limits which are of wonderful value, for he professes that they have four hundred millions of timber on them.

Mr. DICKINSON. False.

Mr. COOK. That is the statement. He came to a party in Toronto to sell it, and when he was talking about the enormous amount of lumber on that limit—he was talking to a lumberman, mind you—when he saw Professor Macoun's report, which was given to him no doubt for no other purpose than to endeavor to sell his timber limit, stating that there were four hundred millions of timber on 100 miles—he got one limit for himself of fifty miles and one for his son, he could not get it all in one name, because Sir John had declared that he would not give more than fifty miles to one person; he changed that in order to get an excuse to cancel my timber limit. Well, he stated that there were four hundred millions on the two limits, and, when he said that, that party in Toronto cooly said: "I cannot have anything to do with it." He was not talking to the marines. It is impossible for four hundred millions of timber, of spruce, to grow on 100 miles in this country. The statement was falsified, and he was going about with a false statement supplied by Professor Macoun of the Geological Department of this Government, he was going about trying to make people believe there was more timber on that limit than there was. He approached the hon. member for Welland, so he stated; he went all the way to Niagara Falls to try and sell it. Then he said, if they would take half interest, he would sell for $10,000. And it had four hundred millions of timber on it. Why, if it was worth a cent, it was worth $400,000, and he was willing to sell one-half for $10,000. I would not refer personally to matters of this kind, but gentlemen say he is immaculate; he is entitled to have timber limits, he is a lumberman—in making spools; and then he tried to get rid of that limit by nothing more nor less than a fraud, and I characterise it as such.

Mr. SPROULE. Many members of this House are charged with very serious and grave offences. As I am one who is included in these charges, I think I have a right to make an explanation and defend myself in this House, especially as the charges are made by an hon. gentleman who was last year in his place in the House when the subject was referred to by the *Globe*, and when, on a question of privilege, I distinctly denied any connection with the charges made. I think, if an hon. gentleman who holds his place in the House, and by virtue of his position we are bound to call him honorable, will not accept that, but will go out into the country and repeat it, we are not entitled to call him honorable. I have in my hand a copy of the *Globe*, of the 12th January last, giving a report of a speech by M. C. Cameron at Wingham, in which he read charges against Conservative members of Parliament. I am spoken of in the following language:—

"Dr. Sproule represents East Grey in the Commons. His brother was an applicant for a timber limit in the North-West. Another relative, a brother I believe, is one of the corporators in the Farmers' North-West Land and Colonisation Company, and he is mixed up with one Graham, for a timber limit of fifty square miles on the Carrot River. Dr. Sproule is but clay in the hands of the chief potter."

Now, only a few days ago, when a libel suit was brought against that paper, its managers said that they had been

mislead, they were always ready to do justice to anyone who had been maligned or misrepresented in its columns. I wish they had always been as willing to make reparation as they pretended to be then. Now, we are charged in this House in a wholesale manner. There is scarcely a member supporting the Government who is not included in these charges, and my name has been mentioned among others. I will explain the only connection I have had with anything of the kind, either directly or indirectly. Like other members I am obliged to do the work of my constituents when they ask me. When my constituents have asked me to procure post office facilities, I have endeavored to do so; if any of them ask me to apply for timber limits, I did so. Applications have been made to me for that purpose by parties whom I never saw. I gave the post office address of the parties, and put in an application, and I paid no attention to them since. I may say that out of fourteen or fifteen applications that I made, I think twelve of them were for Reformers. One is a Mr. Nelson, who was formely a resident of my riding, a Reformer, and a respectable man, who went to Birtle. He built a grist mill there, and afterwards sold it and went into the timber business, and intended to take up machinery from Ontario with which to build a saw mill. He applied for a timber limit for himself, and in the name of some of his associates whom I never saw. I believe one was a Mr. Graham. I never saw him, but I am told he is a Reformer. I have had no connection directly or indirectly with this limit, and no interest in it. I never had an acre of land in Manitoba or the North-West, except a few town lots which I bought at auction. I never had a relative of mine who got advantages from this Government for any timber limits, or grazing lands, or anything else, directly or indirectly, except for one of my brothers who has been living in Winnipeg for a number of years, associated with a Mr. Wood, whom I never saw, and Mr. Fair, another gentleman who proposed to build a mill somewhere in the North-West. I was written to by Mr. Fair and Mr. Wood to put in an application for them, and I did so, but after a while they decided to abandon it. Mention has been made to-night of a case where an Order in Council was passed. When that Order in Council was passed I think it was sent to the parties, and so far as my impression goes there was nothing more about it. With reference to the other assertion that I have a brother who was an applicant for incorporation connected with a colonisation company, I have no knowledge whatever of it. If it is the case I do not know it, and I am sure it could not have occurred without my knowing something of it. Surveyors have also asked me to apply for them for positions in the North-West; and in obedience to their wish I have written down to the Department, and endeavored to assist them, as any other member of Parliament would do. But in no case whatever have I done anything which could prejudice my independence as a member of Parliament. Now, who makes these charges? They are made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and what is his record in this House? He is a man, the height of whose ambition, it appears to me, is to mix up with scandals of his own manufacture, or to tinker with seduction Bills. The only instance in which he deviated from that, is when he introduced a resolution for shortening speeches, and he is, himself, the greatest violator of that principle. Who is the other member, the one who spoke at Wingham? Mr. M. C. Cameron, and we have all heard what the courts have said of him. The judge said, speaking in reference to his corruption, that he could as readily believe that he might be put down in a lake and taken up dry, as to believe that that man was not connected with bribery in his election. I have a book before me, and what does the record show? When he was brought before the courts, what was the evidence brought out?

Mr. MILLS. The judge does not say so.

Mr. SPROULE. Let the hon. gentleman for Bothwell restrain his philosophy for a little while I have before me a record of the evidence of what his expenses were, and how he gained his election. I have here: "Callendar, $50; expenses at nomination, $25; expenses on election tour, $200." From the information I have received about this man he is recognised as the shylock of his profession in that part of the country. It is a pity for the man who gets into his clutches, for he generally skins him and leaves him nothing. But when it comes to elections, he is very liberal in the cause of Christian churches, he not only tries to bribe the electors, but those who are connected with the House of God. He gave to one church in Erinville, $50; to the church in Freidsburg, $75; to another at Crediton, $50; to the Bayfield church, $25; to the Stanley church, $25; to the Catholic church, $25; in all $250. I find some other items here. A gentleman states that he received $250 to go out and electioneer, and he tells him to keep within the bounds of the law. Another says he has received $500 for the same purpose; another admits he has received $750, and the various items make up somewhere, I think, about $2,075. I believe an estimate that was made by a gentleman, who was acquainted with the facts, that he must have spent somewhere about $10,000 in gaining that election. This is the champion of purity; this is the champion of bribery and corruption, who has lectured this House on every occasion, and refers to what he believes to be a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. Now, what is the history of that hon. gentleman? a man of whom it was said, he came into the world by accident; who has been pushing his way through life by cheek and abuse of others,——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. DAVIES. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has been guilty of most unparliamentary and ungentlemanly language.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that language. It is out of order to speak of an hon. member as coming into the world by accident.

Mr. SPROULE. I said he was credited with it.

Mr. McMULLEN. You did not say so.

Mr. SPROULE. I did.

Mr. McMULLEN. You did not.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentlemen will please address the chair and not continue the personal remarks.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman professed to state the words that he said were to be found in that judgment. I said they were not there. He said they were, and I asked him to read from the judgment the words he used.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman made any such statement, I misunderstood him. I did not say they were in the judgment, for I have not the words of the judgment here. I said they had been brought out in evidence on the trial.

Mr. MILLS. What the hon. gentleman said was this: That the judge had said with respect to Mr. Cameron's conduct he would as soon believe that a man might be dipped into the lake and come out dry as that Mr. Cameron could have done what he did and not be guilty of bribery. I say there are no such words in the judgment.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I have the words of the judgment here, and I will read them:

"There are strong grounds for thinking that the respondent, Malcolm Colin Cameron, was guilty of personal bribery. Had the judge, who tried the case, found the respondent guilty of personal bribery, which would have sustained the judgment. As it is, we will sustain his ruling."

Mr. BOWELL. The remarks applied to the hon. gentleman were applicable to Mr. Walker, of London.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly, if I am wrong I withdraw the statement with pleasure, because I do not want to misrepresent anyone. I spoke in regard to the items brought out in the evidence which I have here in my hand, and any hon. member can satisfy himself in regard to them. I say these charges are made by men notorious throughout the country as violators of every principle that they are professing to champion here to-night. I need not say more in regard to those hon. members, because I do not wish to occupy any more time than is necessary. I will say a few words in regard to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook). That hon. gentleman pretended to defend himself here to-night. If there is one man in the Dominion of Canada who ought to be ashamed, and hide his head when timber limits are mentioned, that man is the member for East Simcoe. He is a man who has travelled all over the country and taken the timber off it. He is a man who has had islands in the Georgian Bay bought from the Department of Indian Affairs, and limits in Parry Sound and Georgian Bay districts, on the south shore and north shore in Algoma, in Manitoba and the North-West, and in every instance, he has shown the most unscrupulous disposition in dealing with the parties where he has been operating in lumber, and with those to whom he has sold it. He stated that parties who got timber limits from the Government never intended to work them. They could not do worse than did that hon. gentleman himself, if they sold them to some foreigners and cheated them out of a large amount of money. The poor unfortunate Scotchmen, in Glasgow, who paid him $450,000 have a lively recollection of the hon. gentleman and his timber limits. The hon. gentleman said, in regard to timber limits he held on the Indian peninsula, that the present Government cancelled those limits, because he was president of the company. I say, from some knowledge of those grievances, that it was nothing of the kind. The poor unfortunate settlers who went into that country and located on land, from which they were scarcely able to make a living, were not allowed to cut a stick of timber, for Cook & Co. had a lease to cut every stick of timber. I have in my possession, though not here—I would have had them here if I had known the question would come up to-night—petitions from my constituents praying that the timber license might be cancelled. If they were starving, those poor people could not take a stick and sell it for they were liable to be brought up by Cook & Co., and it was in consequence of representations made to the Government on behalf of those poor unfortunate settlers that the present Government cancelled the lease, and they did it justly. The hon. gentleman, I understand, still holds a lease for a large amount of timber in Manitoulin, and on a number of islands in the Georgian Bay, and a large extent on the north shore, and if there is one man in the Dominion who has a right to hide his head when timber limits or timber speculations are mentioned, it ought to be the member for East Simcoe. If we went into the question of subsidising and supporting railways I could name numbers of hon. gentlemen who were now posing as virtuous men, who have connections with railways. I need not go further than the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I notice when any Grand Trunk question comes up, that hon. gentleman, because he happens to be president of a branch of the Grand Trunk, about forty-five miles in length, and has had a rather amusing connection with the road, is always ready to champion the Grand Trunk and condemn the Canadian Pacific Railway. Did that connection influence the hon. gentleman's actions? I think it would influence him as much as other hon. members would be influenced by roads running through their constituency in which they were very much interested. I might go on and give several other cases; I do not do it because it is not required. The newspapers have been repeating the charges and members of the Opposition have been reiterating them in the face of a distinct denial. The idea of the Opposition is to "boom" scandal, to reiterate it and to endeavor to press charges home on members so that if possible by sheer force of agitation and persistency the people of the country may be led to believe there is something radically wrong in the condition of the country. It is not because hon. gentlemen opposite are able to prove them or that they believe them. It has been even stated that men were bought by receiving their indemnity, and that it was something wrong. That was on the principle of throwing mud in all directions, with the hope that some would stick. I repeat that hon. gentlemen opposite are making these charges in the belief that by persistency they will make some people believe there is something in them.

Mr. DAWSON. I had intended to say something on this subject a little earlier in the evening, and if I had had an opportunity of speaking I could have shown that the timber limits which hon. gentlemen have spoken of so much have really cost the people who bought them more than they have got or are likely to get out of them. The hon. member for North Norfolk referred to applications for timber limits, but as the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) said just now, one who is in the position of a member must sometimes be a medium of communication between his constituents and the Government; he cannot be otherwise, especially in such a wild district as I represent—not with reference to applications for timber limits alone, but applications for a great many other things as well. The course I have always adopted in such cases, is to mail these applications to the proper Department, to be there dealt with. The hon. gentleman mentioned the name of Mr. Marks, and said that I sent in an application for him, I suppose because he is a very prominent supporter of mine. I remember sending in an application for Mr. Marks, but I forget what particular place that application was for, and I rather think that he did not get what he applied for. At any rate, I had no personal interest in the matter, and I think that the course of throwing out serious charges against members of this House, simply because they had sent in applications of this kind, is discreditable to the hon. gentleman and contrary to what I have hitherto known of the hon. member for North Norfolk. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) indulged in a a great deal of the worst kind of abuse and insinuations against members on this side of the House, and then he walked out of the House and was not here when the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) showed, on incontrovertible evidence, that the accusations he made were utterly and entirely wrong, and left the hon. gentleman absolutely branded as a slanderer. He did not wait to answer, and no person has answered the clear and distinct charge which the hon. member for Leeds has made. With regard to these timber berths, it is not simply $250 which has to be paid for them, but a mill which will saw at the rate of 10,000 feet per day, has to be put up. Now, on the whole area which the hon. member for North Norfolk says was granted, this would produce in six months more than 780,000,000 of feet, more than enough to supply all the markets of North America. The fact of the matter is, that many of these parties took up limits, without knowing that the country was bare of timber, and they abandoned them.

Mr. ORTON. I must say that nothing is more plainly proved by the course which hon. gentlemen opposite have taken than the utterly helpless and hopeless condition of their party. The motion was made to give the hon. member for West Huron an opportunity of uttering slanders

with regard to members of this House inside of these walls as he had formerly uttered them outside. The hon. gentleman made the following statement in Wingham with regard to myself on the 12th of January, as reported in the *Globe*:—

"Dr. Orton, the Tory member for Centre Wellington, secured his appointment as physician to the C. P. R., from which he derives an income of $10,000 a year. Like Darby Bergin, Dr. Orton is a versatile genius. He was not satisfied with a princely income received through the C. P. R., he applied for fifteen square miles of timber limits on the Bow River, and fifty square miles elsewhere in the North-West Territories, and in March, 1882, he obtained from the Government 320 acres of rich coal lands. Men under such obligations to the Government; men who share with the Government the odium of dividing up among them the public lands of Canada; men who are *particeps criminis* with the Government in plundering the country of its most valuable asset, dare not vote against the Government."

Now, with reference to this allegation, all I have to say is this that I never received a salary from the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is true I have a contract with that company by which I was to provide not only medical assistance, but also to build hospitals and supply them with food and bedding during the construction of the railway through the Rocky Mountains. That was a contract entered into with the construction company, and although I may perhaps have made some money last year, yet during the first I lost some $1,500 in consequence of an epidemic of typhoid fever breaking out in the mountains, which necessitated the building of a number of hospitals and extra assistance. Had I been employed by the Canadian Pacific Railway I have only to say that I would not have occupied any worse position than some hon. gentlemen on the opposite side. I believe the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Wells) is to-day paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway, as their solicitor and, perhaps, to some extent, as we have seen, it may influence his vote; but the position I occupy has never influenced my vote. I say that medical men have just as good a right as lawyers have to be employed by a railway company, or any other corporation in such matters. The next charge is that I applied for fifty square miles of timber limits on the Bow River. It is very true there were some limits advertised on the Bow River, which I, in conjunction with another, tendered for. There were a large number of tenders made at the time, and we deposited our cheque in the same way as other tenderers. We did not obtain the limit because our tender was much below that of the party who obtained it. With regard to any other limit in the North-West, it is utterly untrue that I have any other limit, and it is also utterly untrue that I applied for a coal limit or ever obtained one. This is only another instance of the gross falseness of the slanders made by hon. gentlemen opposite against members on this side. I wish to point to the position occupied by the hon. member for West Huron with regard to the lands in the North-West. He undertook to purchase those lands, not by himself, because he knew that it was utterly impossible for any one person under the regulations to buy more than one section, and he bought them through agents who made them over to himself, and he obtained patents for 13,000 or 14,000 acres of land by fraud.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. ORTON. If I am out of order, I will withdraw the assertion; but certainly the regulations at that time did not permit any one gentleman to purchase more than one section of land; and he has acknowledged himself that he became the owner of 13,000 acres. I believe the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) also became the possessor of a large quantity of land in the same roundabout way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is utterly wrong. The Government of Mr. Mackenzie did impose such a restriction, and the hon. gentleman's leader abolished it, and at the time he speaks of you might have bought 100,000 acres if you desired.

Mr. ORTON. My recollection is quite different. I cannot recollect the regulations being altered on that point. It certainly never was the intention of the Government to allow parties to become possessed of those large quantities of land, and the only reason they allowed settlers to purchase was that they might be together.

Mr. TUPPER. I will only occupy the attention of the House a moment or two while I refer to a matter that has already been referred to, that is, the extraordinary recklessness and ignorance shown by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) in hurling charges against his fellow members in this House. Two or three instances have been given by hon. members who followed him. I think the charge which he levelled against me will also show the game which the Opposition are playing in this House. It is not a new game by any means; they have played it before—once with tolerable success, which has encouraged them to do it again. But I wish to call attention to the gross ignorance of the hon. member for Lambton. After having voted on the Bill for the construction of the railway from Stellarton to Pictou Town, after having sat in this House during the explanation and discussion of that measure, interrupting speakers by calling out that it was a job, he shows how little attention or thought he gives to matters on which he bases charges of corruption, when to-night he speaks of the Stellarton Branch Railway as a private affair, and as being promoted by a private company, and charges me with being not only a promoter but a shareholder, or as he said, either a shareholder or a promoter. He will be surprised on looking over the votes he has given in this House during the present and the last Session, at learning that he is just as much interested in that railway as I am—that he and I, alike with all the people of Canada, are interested in that railway, because it belongs to the people of Canada. I wish to speak of another matter. Although it was stated in this House, and not denied, that I had severed the connection I had with the North-West Central Railway Company, that I had resigned the position to which I had been elected without my knowledge, and had no connection with the company in any shape or form, the hon. gentleman in order I suppose to string out this long list of imaginary corrupt doings, and to connect me with them, began with that railway company. I simply give that my denial. In conclusion, I would call the attention of the hon. member for South Huron to his experience in by-gone days, and I think he will sympathise to some extent with the party he has forsaken in having now to stand this storm of filthy abuse from their opponents. It does not matter whether a member of Parliament obtains a railway subsidy, a land grant, or a timber limit, so long as it is a reward and the member is working for that reward; and this is the opinion of the *Globe* of 3rd June, 1869, of that hon. gentleman, and I ask him to sympathise with us. The *Globe* alluded to him as "one of Sir John's most docile followers, who hoped that his leader would, at some time, reward him with a Cabinet office." I think that reminiscence for the hon. gentleman is appropriate to-night.

Mr. HAGGART. I intend to take up the time of the House only for a few moments for the purpose of correcting some of the charges made by the member for North Norfolk against me. He stated that I was an applicant for a coal lease of 320 acres of land. I give that an explicit denial. I never was an applicant for a coal mine or a coal lease or any acres of land in which there was a coal mine. Another charge he made against me was that I promoted the application of a friend of mine, Mr. McLaren, for a limit of twenty-six miles on the Turtle River. There was an application made for such a timber limit jointly by Mr.

McLaren and Dr. Sinclair, and I simply sent to the Department the application of those gentlemen. Anyone who knows Dr. Sinclair knows that he is one of the most pronounced Grits in the Dominion of Canada; and the hon. gentleman, in mentioning Mr. McLaren, concealed half the facts of the case; he never mentioned that Dr. Sinclair was connected with him. They did not get the timber limit on their own application, they were notified that there were other applicants, and they were told to tender for it. They did so; they offered a certain amount, and they got the timber limit, showing that by no act of mine was any influence used with the Government in order to obtain it for them. The hon. member for West Huron has made some charges through the country, which he has not had the courage to make on the floor of the House this evening. He made some charges against members of Parliament, when speaking at a place called Wingham, and he has not had the courage to state one single particle of those charges this evening. He made a charge against me, and I have been waiting a long time, for an opportunity to meet that hon. gentleman and see if he would dare repeat it in the House, or hear what his reason was for making the charge, that I might give it a flat contradiction. He stated in reference to me:

"John Haggart, the Tory member for South Lanark, has managed to capture out of the 'loot' 320 acres of coal lands, a timber limit on the Shell River, at $5 a square mile, an interest with Peter McLaren, of 'Rivers and Streams Bill' notoriety, in other portions of the public property, and is believed to have had an interest in more than one of the contracts on the C.P.R. Those who know John Haggart best say that there are many and peculiar reasons why he must stand firm by the Government."

I simply state that is a cowardly, lying statement, framed out of whole cloth, by a party who had not a particle of evidence to justify him in making the statement.

Mr. TYRWHITT. As my name has been mentioned amongst those guilty of corruption, I feel it my duty to say a word in my own defence. The mover of the present resolution has stepped out of his ordinary character in this House. As it has been his custom in the past to promote legislation of a moral character, he opened his remarks by saying he had been to church, but he immediately afterwards broke the pledge he had made with the Minister of the Interior, that he would not bring this motion up to-night. He proceeded then to quote scripture and make false statements alternately.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I withdraw the expression; but it is certainly a false statement, as far as I am concerned. It has been well proved, that every statement made by the mover and seconder of the resolution, was false.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. There are parliamentary expressions which the hon. gentleman can use, and he must confine himself to those.

Mr. TYRWHITT. The offence of which I confess to have been guilty is a very simple one. I consider it my duty as representing my county to correspond with the Government on the business of my constituents, and on the present occasion two gentlemen visited me and asked me to correspond with the Minister of the Interior with regard to timber limits. They were men of different political stripes. The main mover happened to be a Reformer, Mr. Meany, and the other was a Conservative. The Reformer had been in the North-West, and had seen this timber limit for which he made this application. His application was granted, and I have never seen the gentleman since. I do not believe he received the grant, because he did not comply with the regulations of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman who leads the House that in view of the fact that there are a number of gentlemen on both sides who would like to say something more, it would be better to adjourn and finish the debate during the course of the day. It may be closed now, but I fear the result will be that another day will have to be given up to this, and it would be better for us to adjourn at once. As it is past five o'clock I will not weary the House with a discussion on the question, but simply make my suggestion because I do not think this argument can be regarded as closed whether we take the vote or not.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that this matter has gone too far for the opposition to rest. Hon. gentlemen opposite have made statements which are either true or not. If hon. gentlemen on this side have spoken the truth, these charges are most foul slanders, and it behoves the Opposition, who have made these charges, not alone on the floor, but on every hustings, to make them good if they can. I believe the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat has taken the proper view, and that this debate should be adjourned so as to give the Opposition the opportunity of making good the statements, the slanders, I believe, they have hurled against hon. members on this side.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) accused me of making a false statement with regard to himself, and proceeded to corroborate exactly what I had said, which was that he had been an applicant on behalf of another party for a timber limit.

Mr. McCARTHY. That was not the charge made against me.

Mr. CHARLTON. I refer to Mr. Tyrwhitt.

House divided on Mr. Charlton's motion.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	McMullen,
Auger,	Fisher,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Mulock,
Béchard,	Glen,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guay,	Platt,
Cameron (Huron),	Harley,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Holton,	Scriver,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright,	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Jackson,	Springer,
Casgrain,	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Charlton,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Cook,	Lister,	Watson,
Davies,	McCraney,	Wilson.—43.
Edgar,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Ferguson(Leeds&Gren)	McGreevy,
Bain (Soulanges),	Fortin,	McLelan,
Baker (Victoria),	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Gaudet,	O'Brien,
Benoit,	Gault,	Orton,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Ouimet,
Bergin,	Girouard,	Patterson (Essex),
Blondeau,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Bourbeau,	Grandbois,	Pruyn,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Bryson,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Burnham,	Haggart,	Royal,
Burns,	Hesson,	Scott,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Shakespeare,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Hilliard,	Shanly,
Cimon,	Homer,	Small,
Cochrane,	Ives,	Sproule,
Costigan,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Coughlin,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Curran,	Kinney,	Tassé,

Cuthbert,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Daly,	Landry (Kent),	Temple,
Daoust,	Landry (Montmagny),	Thompson,
Dawson,	Langevin, (Sir Hector),	Tupper,
Desaulniers (Mask'ng6),	Lesage,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers (St Maurice)	Macdonald (King's),	Vanasse,
Desjardins,	Mackintosh,	Wallace (Albert),
Dickinson,	Macmaster,	Wallace (York),
Dodd,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Ward,
Dugas,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Cardwell),
Dundas,	McCallum,	White (Renfrew),
Everett,	McCarthy,	Wigle,
Farrow,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Brockville).—99.

Amendment negatived.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Committee rose and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That the proposed motion of which Mr. Blake gave notice in his place this day be made the first order of the day on Thursday next, after questions put by members.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 5.45 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 5th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WORKS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 130) respecting certain works constructed in or over navigable waters. He said: The object of this Bill is to regulate the construction of public works in navigable waters, in order that everybody may not erect works of that kind without proper authority.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT, WOODSTOCK, N.B.

Mr. IRVINE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a successor to the late James H. Jacques, Customs Department, Woodstock, N.B.? If so, when?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government will appoint a successor to Mr. Jacques as soon as they consider the interests of the revenue demand it.

NORTH-WEST TROUBLES.

Mr. LAURIER asked, 1st. Whether any of the half-breeds admitted, upon enquiry by the commission, that they had taken part in the late insurrection? If so, how many? 2nd. Were the claims of such half-breeds to scrip rejected on account of such admissions? If so, is it now the intention of the Government to give them certificates for scrip?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Thirteen half-breeds, who appeared before the commission, admitted having taken part in the rebellion. Two refused to answer the question put by the commission as to whether they had taken part in it. No scrip has been issued in any of those cases, and the question as to whether scrip will be issued is still engaging the attention of the Government.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether Mr. Dewdney has been authorised to inform the Indians of the North-West Territories that no arrests will be made of any who took part in last year's troubles?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Dewdney has not been so authorised; but with regard to certain half-breeds in the vicinity of Turtle Mountains, on the other side of the line, who, it has been represented strongly, were simply misguided, and have not been guilty in any way except in joining in the outbreak, he has been authorised to say that if they return and behave peaceably and loyally they will not be disturbed.

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex) asked, When will the special report promised in the Annual Report of the Minister of Militia, respecting operations in the North-West, be brought down? Will the Government also submit to the House a statement showing the payments on account of the service since the 30th of June last?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. A special report respecting operations in the North-West, will be brought down within a very few days. I hope the expenditure on account of the service, as far as possible, will be brought down, since the 30th June last.

POSTMASTER AT MOUNT MIDDLETON, N.B.

Mr. BURPEE (for Mr. WELDON) asked, Is D. S. Sinnott, the postmaster at Mount Middleton, King's County, N.B.? If not, when did he tender his resignation, and at what date was the same accepted by the Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Sinnott resigned his appointment on the 21st April, and his resignation was accepted the same day by telegram.

POSTMASTER AT BUTTERNUT RIDGE, N.B.

Mr. BURPEE (for Mr. WELDON) asked, Is Charles J. Keith the postmaster at Butternut Ridge, King's County, N.B.? If not, when did he tender his resignation, and at what date was the same accepted by the Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Keith resigned his appointment on the 24th March, 1886. His resignation was accepted 26th March, the same year.

POSTMASTER AT NEREPIS STATION, N.B.

Mr. BURPEE (for Mr. WELDON) asked, Is David McKenzie the Postmaster at Nerepis Station, King's County, N.B.? If not, when did he tender his resignation, and at what date was the same accepted by the Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. McKenzie has not resigned.

WOODENWARE GOODS—DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY.

Mr. RAY asked, Do the Government place upon the Canadian market, in competition with Canadian manufacturers, the woodenware goods manufactured by convict labor in Dorchester Penitentiary? Is it the intention of the Government to discontinue such manufacture and sale of that class of goods?

Mr. THOMPSON. Wooden goods were manufactured for many years before in the penitentiary of St. John,

Machinery was erected, and these goods manufactured at the Dorchester Penitentiary. Representations have recently been made that the production of those goods at Dorchester interferes with Canadian manufacturers, and the propriety of continuing the production is under consideration.

ASPY BAY AFFAIR.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, Whether the Government have in their possession any report or reports from any officer of the Marine and Fisheries Department in reference to the Aspy Bay affair, and if so, whether they will lay them before the House?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government have not in their possession any such report or reports.

CARRYING FIRE-ARMS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether Mr. Dewdney has been authorised to notify the North-West Indians that there is a law for both whites and Indians, prohibiting them from carrying fire-arms in settled districts; and that as the Government intends to send a large number of soldiers and police into the country, it will be necessary for any Indian who wishes to hunt off his reserves to get permission of his agent to carry fire-arms; and that if found off his reserves with fire-arms, without the permission of his agent, he will be liable to arrest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No authority has been given in the terms of this question. However, Mr. Dewdney has been called upon to make a report as to what action he has taken in this connection, and his report will be communicated to the House as soon as received.

RIDEAU RIVER FLOODS.

Mr. MACKINTOSH asked, Is it the intention of the Government to institute an enquiry into the causes of the floods from the Rideau River, in the vicinity of the city of Ottawa?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A complaint or representation has been made to my Department on this subject, and my intention is to have the matter looked into.

MUSKOKA DISTRICT—NET FISHING.

Mr. COOK asked, Is it true that the Government have refused to allow the settlers of Muskoka District to take fish in nets in the waters of Lakes Muskoka, Rousseau and Joseph?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not true.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY TARIFFS.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Have any alterations taken place in the authorised tariffs of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and if so, will the papers be laid on the Table? What is the passenger rate at present authorised between Winnipeg and Emerson?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of the Minister of Railways, I have to say that no alterations have taken place in the authorised tariffs of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The passenger rate at present authorised between Winnipeg and Emerson is, I believe, 3½ cents per mile.

CONSOLIDATED FUND.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What amounts were expended and received on account of Consolidated Fund during the month of April last, giving sums received on account of Customs and Excise and other items, as usually stated in the *Gazette*.

Mr. THOMPSON,

Mr. McLELAN:

Receipts from Customs in April	$ 1,393,627 00
Excise	157,088 00
Post Office	210,393 00
Public Works, including Railways	247,025 00
Miscellaneous	134,189 78
Total	$ 2,142,322 78
Revenue to 31st March	25,165,252 23
Total	$ 27,307,575 00

The last item is hardly embraced in the question, but it is usual to give it.

Expenditure in April	$ 2,647,642 54
to 31st March	26,202,606 59
Total	$ 28,850,249 13

THE FLOATING DEBT.

Mr. JACKSON asked, What was the floating debt of the Dominion Government on 1st May, 1886?

Mr. McLELAN. $14,263,625.

THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, 1st, the amount of the gross public debt of Canada on 1st May, 1886; 2nd, the amount of the net public debt of Canada on 1st May, 1886?

Mr. McLELAN. Gross, $281,433,629; net, $205,569,263.

FISHING FEES.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex) asked, What is the license fee charged to fishermen engaged in fishing in the waters extending from Point Edward to Lake Erie? Was such fee charged during the present year? If so, when? What was the former license fee? and what is the present? Was the license fee increased from $40 to $50, and again reduced from $50 to $25 per one pound net this year? If so, when were these several changes made?

Mr. FOSTER. The license fee charged to fishermen engaged in fishing in the waters extending from Point Edward to Lake Erie is $10 for seines and $50 for pound nets. Such fee was charged during the present year. The fee is charged generally at the issue or about the issue of the license. The former license fees were respectively $10 for seines and $40 for pound nets. The license fee last year was $40 for pound nets and $10 for seines, and it was increased to $50 for pound nets. There has been no reduction from $50 to $25.

I. G. BAKER & CO.'S CONTRACT.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant), for Mr. McCRANEY, asked, Have the Government given, or do they intend giving any more contracts to I. G. Baker & Co., after the revelations in this House on the supply of flour by that firm?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I object to the form of this question, for it is much more than a question. If the question is reduced in its proportions, so as to be merely a question, I shall answer it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, there is a matter of argument there. Strike out from "after the revelations."

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I beg to ask, Have the Government given, or do they intend giving any more contracts to I. G. Baker & Co.?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have given a contract for the ensuing year, commencing 1st September, for a portion of the beef to be supplied, to I. G. Baker & Co., they putting in the lowest tender and giving ample security.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). At what date was that given?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The other day.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BRYSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to a question of privilege. As I read in the *Hansard* of the 3rd May, the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) made the startling statement to the House, with reference to myself, that:

"The hon. member for Pontiac is a director of the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway. I see he is not in the House, but I would not fear to make the statement if he were here. I make it from the 'Parliamentary Companion'"

I desire to inform the hon. gentleman from Grey that he has been entirely mistaken. The "Parliamentary Companion" for 1885 does make that statement in reference to me, and it is wholly unwarranted. The statement must be an error, and it has never been submitted to me for my approbation. I am not, and I never have been, a director of the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway, nor was I ever a stockholder in that railway. The only matter in which I was interested in regard to that railway was the construction of it through my county, in which I contributed with some little zeal to assist the Government in carrying through the measure giving a subsidy to that railway. I hope the hon. gentleman and his supporters on the Liberal side will cease making that statement, because I think no hon. gentleman has any desire to misrepresent me in that way, but, as reference was made to it last night by two or three members on the Liberal side, I hope, after my denial, that statement will be withdrawn, and that my statement will be accepted by the hon. member.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I made the statement on the authority of the "Parliamentary Companion." I had no desire to misrepresent the position of the hon. gentleman. I supposed the "Parliamentary Companion" was but an autobiography given by the hon. gentleman himself. I had no desire, nor have I now, to misrepresent the hon. gentleman or any other gentleman in the House, but I gave it from a source which I supposed was reliable and which I was justified in quoting from.

THE COLONIAL EXHIBITION.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to direct the attention of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture to the statements which have been repeated in various quarters, on this side and on the other side of the water, in reference to the very unprepared condition of the Canadian exhibit at the Colonial Exhibition, and the statement that there has been a detention at Halifax of a considerable portion of the goods. We must be very much interested in Canada in that matter, after the liberal contributions which have been made, and the anxiety to be fully represented from the beginning; and it would be interesting to us to know from the hon. Minister what measure of truth there is in the statements, what steps have been taken to remedy the delays, if any delays have taken place, and what expectations the hon. gentleman has as to the condition of the Canadian exhibit, at an early day.

Mr. CARLING. I have not seen the statements the hon. gentleman referred to, but I believe that the great portion of the goods has been delivered at London as intended. There were some pictures of the different cities in Canada that, through some mismanagement, were detained on one of the railway cars, but the moment the attention of the Department was drawn to that, they were immediately sent forward, and they are on their way now to the Old Country. There are some goods still at Halifax, but not to any very large extent, and everything has been done that could possibly be done to push them forward as fast as possible.

THE WRIT FOR HALDIMAND.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I wish to again ask the attention of the Government and the House to the enquiry I made yesterday in reference to the issue of the writ for the electoral division of Haldimand. Yesterday, the First Minister informed me that a decision had not been arrived at. I should be glad if he could now tell me that the Government have arrived at a decision and have directed the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to issue the writ.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have not yet selected a returning officer, and have not yet given instructions for the issue of the writ. If the hon. gentleman will repeat the question on Friday, I will be able to give him more specific information.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. IVES. I desire to make a personal explanation in regard to a matter which was referred to in the House the other night by the hon. member for Grey, and which appears in the Toronto *Globe* of the 4th May. I should not refer to this matter were it the first time that I have seen a similar statement made, and were I not satisfied that—I will not say a conspiracy—but a persistent effort is being made by gentlemen on the other side of the House and their press, to put me in a false position, a position in which I have no right to be placed. Now, the *Globe* says:

"It was eminently fitting that the principal defender of Mr. Beaty's railway jobbing, should be Mr. Ives, son-in-law of the Minister of Railways and successor to the latter on the directorate of the International Railway Company."

And in another place:

"Mr. Pope allows his son-in-law to take his place on the board of directors. 'A fellow feeling' makes Mr. Ives wondrous kind towards Mr. Beaty."

Now, I may say, once and for all, that I am not a director of the International Railway Company, chartered by this House, and never was. I never had any connection with that undertaking, except as solicitor to the road. In that capacity, on one occasion last autumn, when certain arrangements and contracts were being made between the International Railway Company and the International Company of Maine, of which I am a director. I was appointed a director of the company, in order that I might sign contracts and represent, as it were, the International Railway in Maine, and I resigned immediately on my return. I never had any connection whatever with the company, never owned any of its stock, and have not now, and never expect to have, the slightest pecuniary interest in it, one way or the other. This story has been copied in the local Grit press in the townships, and a great deal is made of it. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin), the other night, alluded to the same matter, and I was surprised to find that he, when quoting from the "Parliamentary Companion," failed to quote the exact facts. He told the House that I was a director of the International Railway. He was talking about railways subsidised by the Parliament of Canada, and chartered by this Parliament, particularly. Now, he certainly could not have failed to observe from the "Parliamentary Companion" he was reading, that there was no statement in it that I was a director of the International Railway, but a statement that I was a director of the International of Maine, an organisation chartered by the State of Maine, and, it may be said, indirectly assisted by this Government; but, at the same time, it cannot be held that the hon. gentleman was in good faith in making that statement. With regard to the International Railway, I have no interest in it whatever, I am only solicitor for the company, and have acted for it in various matters in which the two com-

panies are interested, but I have no stock, no interest whatever in it, except as a professional man in my capacity as solicitor.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I wish to say one word, in order to show the good faith in which I acted in this matter in quoting from the "Parliamentary Companion." I will read from that book again, to show how far I was justified. I believe the International of Maine, is a road that was subsidised by this Government.

Mr. IVES. That was not the gravamen of the charge.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was not speaking of the charters given by this House, but of the roads that received subsidies from this House. I quoted in good faith from the book, and in doing so I acted from a stern sense of public duty. I have no desire to injure the feelings of the hon. member at all. This is what the "Parliamentary Companion" says, in reference to that gentleman:

"He was called to the bar of the Province of Quebec in the year 1867; was appointed Q.C. on the 11th October, 1880. Is president of the Dominion Cattle Company, of Texas, and a director of the International Company, of Maine."

Mr. IVES. That is just what I said.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course the hon. gentleman is quite in his right in making the statement. But in order that the explanation may be complete, I desire to say that I suppose the statement that I have seen in the press that he was the person who signed the contract for a subsidy from the Government of Canada, the Minister of Railways being the signatory on the part of the Government, and himself on the part of the company, is not correct?

Mr. IVES. It is not correct at all. The contract was signed by the president of the company, and not by myself, who never held that position.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—RELEASE OF BONDS.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House receive the report of the Committee of the Whole on resolutions respecting the release to the company of the amount held as security for the operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He said: one or two points were brought up in respect of these resolutions when they were in committee. The first was respecting the application of the bonds that are to be raised upon the Algoma branch. I propose to insert in the Bill this clause:

But the proceeds of such bonds shall be applied exclusively to the cost of construction and equipment of the said Algoma branch, including a bridge over the said river.

And further on:

Exclusive application of the proceeds of said bonds for the purposes hereinbefore defined shall be secured in case of default.

And so on. I will insert in the Bill a clause applying strictly the proceeds of the mortgage to the completion of the Algoma branch, as well as the bridge over the river; also a clause with respect to the bonds that are in the hands of the public and that are not yet taken up and not provided for, stating:

Nothing herein contained shall affect or impair the security or remedies of the holders of outstanding land grant bonds.

I propose to insert in the Bill founded upon the resolutions these two clauses. I understand the latter one is satisfactory to the bondholders in all respects.

Mr. BLAKE. After the statement of the hon. gentleman—of course it is impossible properly to appreciate the value of words one hears across the floor—but it occurred to me that the first phrase the hon. gentleman used was, perhaps, not exactly adequate to carry out his intentions, because it is, as he read, that the proceeds of the Algoma branch bonds are to be applied to the construction of the branch as well. As I understand the arrangement when we agreed to that special mortgage, it was to the completion of the branch. What I mean is this: that it should not be competent to the railway company, having issued bonds upon the Algoma branch, to take two millions and a-half of the proceeds of those bonds and say: We shall use them to apply them to the work we have already constructed; but that the money raised upon the whole and already constructed work was to be applied to the completion of the work. However, it is not easy to hear the words accurately across the House, and I shall not attempt to discuss them now. So far as I can judge from the explanation of the hon. gentleman's proposals, they are, in both these respects, reasonably satisfactory; but as inasmuch as one cannot form a final judgment upon them, nor upon some other points to which I wish to call the attention of the House before this measure receives its final reading, and I shall not detain the House now, preferring to wait till the opportunity which will be afforded when we have the measure of the hon. gentleman fully before us.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire of the Minister of Finance, whether these same bonds in the hands of the public are not liable to be redeemed by the railway company on payment of 10 per cent. premium?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, they might easily close the whole affair, then.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 131) further to amend the Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Bill read the first time.

DOMINION LANDS.

House again resolved itself into Commitee on Bill (No. 94) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1883.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If the commitee will allow me, there are one or two clauses I should like to go back to for the purpose of making merely verbal alterations. The first is clause 3, in regard to the different forms. The clause at present provides that these shall be changed by the Minister of Interior, with the approval of the Governor in Council. I propose to leave out the words "with the approval of the Governor in Council."

Mr. BLAKE. I thought when this clause was inserted that it was one of very doubtful propriety, and I think it is made still more objectionable by the proposed amendment. If there is one thing important it is that the forms on which the various steps are based which are required to be taken in order to acquire those titles, should be general forms, the same for all persons. But the hon. gentleman proposes, not merely to take power to make forms applicable to a special class of cases, but also forms applicable to any special case. And now he proposes that the power shall be conferred on the departmental Minister. What does that mean? It means that those forms are to be moulded to suit each case, as the Minister pleases, and thus there is no certainty whatever. The regular form may be used in one case and a different form in another, and no one is to know, with any degree of certainty, what the real limit of the obligation may be. The proposal affords the greatest possible loophole for fraud.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think the hon. gentleman has magnified the importance of the clause, which has been pressed upon me as being of great convenience to the Land

Board at Winnipeg. They say there have been cases where such a power is desirable. For myself, I do not attach a great deal of importance to it one way or the other; it is a mere matter of convenience to the Land Board. I do not see the inconvenience mentioned by the hon. gentleman, but I would rather drop it than it should be necessary that every form which might be required to be altered would necessarily come before the Governor in Council. That would be giving an importance to the form that is not warranted. This change, I repeat, is urged upon me by the Dominion Land Board in Winnipeg as a matter of convenience, and the commissioner, who is giving a very great deal of attention to land matters there, and who is probably the most popular officer ever connected with the Government in the North-West, urges that this change would be convenient in the working of the Land Act.

Mr. BLAKE. Before we make such an important change, which, as I conceive, will place the forms all at sea, because it is the Minister who has to decide what the requirements shall be, we should have some greater reason for the change stated than that the Chairman of the Land Board thinks it would be convenient. The hon. Minister ought himself to have mastered the reasons why these officers desire this change, which, so far as we know, have not been given, because the Minister has not stated to us any reason. He simply says that the Chairman of the Land Board thinks the proposed change would be very convenient. This is a re-introduction of the appeals to Ottawa, which the Minister has himself declared to be most objectionable. It is not the Land Board that has to do this work—though perhaps next time we go into committee the duty may be assigned to the Chairman of the Land Board—but it is the Minister. Some one may say to the Land Board that he is unable to comply with the law, and ask what release he can obtain. The reply will be: None at present; but after this Bill passes, the application can be sent to the Minister of Interior, and he may order that the particular requirement that cannot be complied with may be dispensed with. The whole machinery is to be thrown at loose ends, not merely for a class of cases, but for a single case. Before the proposal of the Minister is acceded to, it should be shown that the wisdom of man cannot devise some different forms or an alternative set of forms that would be satisfactory. The hon. gentleman says he would rather abandon the clause than that it should be required that the Governor in Council should act in every case, but then it was the hon. gentleman himself who proposed to us that the Governor in Council should act; it is his clause. A few days ago he did not propose to abandon the clause, because it would be a wrong thing to ask the Governor in Council to interfere: that was what he asked the House to agree to. Now he says he is mistaken and that we had better drop it. I say that we ought to have some better reason for the course pursued—that reason being really, for parliamentary purposes, noth ing at all. The mere statement that an officer thinks it convenient that this should take place is no reason for Parliament.

Mr. MILLS. This clause is practically doing away with the forms altogether. There is no difference between saying that there shall be no form required by law and saying that the Minister may vary those that are given in the law; the result will be exactly the same. Now, I think the Land Board or the Commissioner ought to have pointed out to the Minister in what particulars the law at present is found inconvenient. New experience from time to time will suggest a variation and modification in the forms required, and perhaps the introduction of new forms, but the Land Board, if it does its duty, ought to furnish the Minister with the information as the result of its own experience. If it had informed the hon. gentleman in what respects the present forms are found to impose impediments in the way of an efficient and convenient administration of affairs connected with the Department, then the hon. gentleman might have introduced some variations in the existing form, or some additional forms, and so Parliament might have retained its control of those having to deal with the Land Department, and that is precisely what is required. But what the hon. gentleman proposes, if this clause is carried in its present form, or is amended as he suggests, is to leave those who are interested in the matter, and Parliament which is responsible for the law, in the dark with regard to what is done. Now, it would be a very easy thing, not with the intention perhaps of doing any wrong, but with the view of meeting a particular case of apparent hardship, to vary the form in such a way as, if it were made a general rule, would lead to very great abuses, and if it were not a general rule would also give rise to abuse, by furnishing one measure of relief to one party, and another and different measure of relief to another party. What we ought to do, as far as we can, is to substitute a law for the mere will of the Minister or officer engaged in the administration of public affairs, and in order to do that, there must be some uniform rule of action laid down which everyone who chooses may know, and which, if they choose to conform with it, will entitle them to a certain remedy and relief which the Minister or the Department will not have any authority to withhold. Now we do not want to place in the hands of any Minister of any party the power of determining what the rule of law shall be in a particular case; the law itself should determine that. I am satisfied that the Minister would do that which is best in his own interest and that of the public, by striking out the clause altogether, and requiring the commissioner to give him information on this particular point, and indicate in what respect the present forms are found to be defective. It will be an easy matter another Session to frame a series of additional forms, if so required, in accordance with the rules that experience shows are necessary. It is certainly most desirable that in these matters we should adhere to well-settled rules and principles, and that we should not substitute the mere caprice of the officer, far away it may be from the Department, by whom the Minister himself must in a large degree be guided, for what ought to be a settled rule of law.

Mr. CHARLTON. I fully concur in the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that the law should govern these matters rather than the will of the Minister; and I have felt for years disposed to make more radical changes in this matter than my hon. friend would seem to indicate. I believe the will of the Minister has been used, in place of consulting the will of Parliament, in matters relating to our public domain, greatly to the detriment of the public interest. I do not believe the Department of the Interior should be allowed to fix the price of land or the conditions of settlement, or to arrange as to the conditions of homestead entry. I believe that any regulations pertaining to the management of the public domain, dividing these lands into classes, fixing the price of those lands in the various classes—that all these should emanate from the Parliament of Canada, and that the Minister of the Interior should not be allowed to fix the price, and usurp the legislative functions of this House, as he has hitherto done. Now, commencing in 1879, between that period and the 23rd December, 1881, the Minister of the Interior usurped—I think I may properly use the term——

The CHAIRMAN. Is the hon. gentleman confining himself to the clause?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think so, Mr. Chairman—usurped the power of fixing the price of the land with reference to four different occasions. These regulations and the frequent changes which were made in them were the means of creating a great amount of confusion and discord and pre-

judice to the public interest. We had, for instance, the first five mile belt in which homesteads were not allowed and the lands in that belt were fixed at $6 per acre; the next belt at $5; the next at $4; the next at $3; and the next at $1 per acre. Now these were regulations of the utmost importance in their character; it was dealing practically with an empire. No legislation, no regulation pertaining to the interest of the public of Canada could be of greater importance than these regulations which emanated from the Department of the Interior and were put in force by the will of one man. It was an exercise, in this country with free institutions, of despotic power, and that power has been exercised by the Minister of Interior very naturally in such a way as to forward the interests of his party. If you take the colonisation regulations of 23rd December, 1881, by which parties could make application for colonisation lands, in one year and eight days 251 applications were made, covering nearly 2,300 townships, and by means of that scheme the Department of the Interior and the Government were able to use a leverage of vast importance and power in the elections. Now, whatever may be the rules and regulations adopted with regard to our public lands, it is a matter of the greatest moment and public interest that these matters should receive the careful and full consideration of this Parliament, and that before the Minister of Interior or the Department is permitted to act in this matter they should be obliged to consult Parliament and receive the sanction of Parliament to any rules and regulations they may propose to establish. For this reason I believe that our policy with regard to the public lands should be entirely changed. Now, in the United States the idea of a head of a Department making regulations with regard to the price of the public lands——

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman is in order in entering into the general discussion.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am about to propose a substitute for this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Still the hon. gentleman should not open up a discussion on the whole policy.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it is high time it was discussed.

Mr. BLAKE. As I understand, the question we have before us is the policy of Parliament putting in the hands of the Ministry power to alter the stipulations and the rules which Parliament has made.

The CHAIRMAN. As regards this clause.

Mr. BLAKE. But this clause involves the whole thing, as you will see if you look at it.

Mr. CHARLTON. As I observed, the exercise by one man of such a power in the United States, would not be permitted for one moment. Everything in that country relating to the management of public lands is carefully considered and sanctioned by Congress before any action can be taken by the heads of departments or by the officers of the Government. Such ought to be the case here. I would rather trust to the collective wisdom of this body than to any one man as Minister of the Interior, however wise or just he may be. We are more likely to have the public interest looked after by the representatives of the people than by the Department, which is liable to make use of its powers for political purposes, as it has done in the past. I move that the following be substituted for this section:

All regulations as to the price of the public lands of Canada, conditions of settlement, reserves for homesteads and pre-emption, and grants under leasehold, shall first receive the sanction of Parliament before being acted upon by the Minister of the Interior, and all provisions of the existing law, conflicting with the reservation by Parliament of full control in all matters pertaining to the management of the public domain as aforesaid, are hereby repealed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I object to that as altogether out of order. It has no relation to this clause.

Mr. CHARLTON.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think this is a proper amendment to this clause.

Mr. BLAKE. Since we opened this discussion I have sent for the Act, and I find that the practical effect of the hon. gentleman's proposal is to place at the disposition of the Minister of the Interior all the conditions upon which homesteads are to be secured. This clause proposes that whenever it is necessary the Minister may vary any of the forms from A to M, or cause to be adopted such other forms to the like effect as he considers applicable to any special case or class of cases. Now, Sir, the forms are the regulations and the requirements. They are not merely the proofs of certain statutory requirements, but it is in the forms alone that you find the requirements of the law. For instance, the 27th section of the Act which is proposed to be amended, says this:

"Any person, male or female, who is the sole head of a family, or any male who has attained the age of eighteen years, shall, on making application in form A in the schedule to this Act, be entitled to obtain homestead entry."

Now, form A is a simple application; that, of course, is of no consequence. Then, clause 29 says:

"To obtain homestead entry it shall be necessary for the person applying therefor to appear and make affidavit before the local agent, according to form B, C, D, or E, in the schedule to this Act, as the circumstances of the case require."

Form D is an oath or affirmation that the party is over 18 years of age; that to the best of his knowledge and belief the land in respect of which his application is made is open for homestead; that there is no person residing on the land applied for; that the application is made for his exclusive use and benefit, with the intention of residing upon and cultivating the said land; and that he has not heretofore made an entry for a homestead on Dominion lands.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). They are all in the Statute.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not find them in the Statute; but if everything here is statutory, the hon. gentleman is proposing to take power to vary the Statute, because if this form requires to be varied, it must be because the requirements of the Statute cannot be complied with. So with reference to forms B, C, D, and E, and so with reference to forms H, J, K, and L—they are all requirements or proofs of statutory requirements. M is the local agent's certificate that the party who is the holder of a homestead entry has complied with the provisions of the law in order to entitle him to receive a patent for such land, and recommending the issue of such patent. The hon. gentleman is to be authorised to alter that, so that the agent may give a certificate which will not prove that the law has been complied with, and upon that the patent may issue. Now, it does seem to me that it is monstrous that the power should be placed in the hands of the Minister to alter these provisions, and that secretly. There is no provision for publicity; the rule the hon. gentleman adopts in the case of John Jones, the relaxation he makes in his case, may not be known to others, and other parties have no means of knowing what measure of justice and favor may have been granted to him and omitted to them. You thus expose the Minister and the Department to constant applications to waive the provisions of the law in all sorts of cases; you invite the homesteader to be careless about fulfilling the conditions, in the hope that by pressure he may remove them; and you authorise the Minister privately and with reference to a particular case to alter the conditions, and so to establish rules for different individuals in cases analogous or nearly so. It does seem to me that no reason has been given for such a serious change in the law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The argument of the hon. gentleman is quite relevant to the resolution, and it is a question of course whether the words "with the approval

of the Governor in Council," should or should not be struck off. His argument is in every way clear and unobjectionable, and I must say there is weight in it. But that is a different thing from the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Norfolk.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood the Chairman to rule that out of order; I thought he was quite right, and therefore I did not address myself to that.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In that case I will move the clause as we passed it the other day. I do not know that any danger can arise from that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to hear the decision the Minister of the Interior has arrived at, because it is consistent with the action of other Departments. I remember, for instance, that the Minister of Customs, when passing his Customs Bill, would not take the power that this House was willing to give him, to deal with special cases of hardship, when false entries were made in good faith. I am not sure but he was right, contrary to my own idea at the time in providing in the Act that certain things must be done, and taking no responsibility to deal with cases himself; and I am not sure, looking at the experience we have had in the North-West, that the same rule should not be applied to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BLAKE. Under these circumstances I will not prolong the discussion now, but will give notice that unless at a further stage the hon. gentleman is able to give us more reasons, or rather any reasons—for he has not given us any yet—for enacting this provision, I will move an amendment to this clause.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps I may give notice that I intend to move my amendment as a new clause to the Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The third sub-section provides that the Minister of the Interior or the Dominion Land Board may, on a requisition signed by intending immigrants or other persons proposing to settle together, authorise any person they name to obtain homesteads and pre-emption entries for them before their arrival in the Province or Territory. I propose to extend this provision to ordinary settlers who, after their arrival, may depute one of their number or any one to make the entries for them, on condition, of course, that they settle on the lands personally within six months. Under the law at present, each of these intending settlers is obliged to make his entry in person. The clause, as altered, will read:

The Minister of the Interior or the Dominion Land Board, upon requisition, may authorise any person named therein to make a homestead entry or homestead and pre-emption entries on behalf of any person desiring to obtain such entry or entries.

Mr. WALLACE (York). The change is in the right direction. If several people go to the North-West and select their homesteads, by the law at present each one has to go to the land agent in person. The change will enable them to appoint one to make the entries in their names, and will thus save a great deal of trouble and expense to settlers.

Mr. BLAKE. But the trouble is that no precaution is taken to see that the person who makes a requisition to the Minister of the Interior or the Land Board to obtain homestead and pre-emption entries for others, who, he declares, have authorised him to act in their behalf, has really such authority, or merely does so for the purpose of preventing the land being taken up.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is an omission that can easily be rectified by altering the sub-section so as to require proof that the requisition is a *bonâ fide* one.

Mr. MILLS. I would suggest that, providing the agent is duly authorised by the party on whose behalf he acts, a form should be provided, and then there would be no difficulty.

Mr. BLAKE. What difference will be effected by the proposal the hon. gentleman submits to the committee from the clause as it stands?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Under the law as it stands this is confined to persons who propose to settle together. This will make it wider; then the general form of the existing law makes it apply specially to immigrants, while this applies it to every person.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly the law does apply very distinctly at present to others than immigrants unless you strike out the words "or other persons," which I do not suppose the hon. gentleman would feel authorised to do even if we gave him very considerable power in regard to the law. I understand, then, that the substantial reason is to apply it to the case of persons who do not propose to settle together?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. That, of course, is capable of very large application. Has it been found in practice that inconvenience has resulted from the present limitation?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Sometimes a person who desires to settle on land goes out to look at it, and it is remote from the agent's office. By this, he can get anyone who is going to the agent's office to make the entry instead of going one or two hundred miles himself.

Mr. BLAKE. That is, of course, perfectly legitimate. It would be covered by striking out the words "before their arrival in the Province or Territory," and the words "proposing to settle together," and leave the law as it stands.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In the 4th sub-section I propose to strike out the words "or before the homestead inspectors." In the Bill, as originally drawn, the homestead inspector was allowed to take entries; but, on considering the matter, I thought that was open to serious objection, but the words were not struck out of this clause. In sub-section 7, I propose that the person making the entry shall prove to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, or the Dominion Land Board, instead of to the satisfaction of the Dominion Land Board only. If there should not be a majority of the board at Winnipeg at the time, it might be inconvenient.

Mr. MILLS. Why not strike out the word "satisfaction?" It is a surplusage.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think the word is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. It is proposed to amend sub-section 7, clause 5 by inserting after the words "to the satisfaction of the" the words "the Commissioner of Dominion Lands or the Dominion Land Board."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. WATSON. I suggested the other day that it would be well to make some change in the provision for a person holding his title to pre-emption. There are provisions in this clause whereby a person is entitled to make an entry, to prove the entry, and to receive a patent. I find by the memorial presented by the North-West Council that the same feeling exists in the North-West as in Manitoba, to a large extent. Therefore, I wish to move:

That settlers who are entitled to homestead and pre-emption, and who are now, or may be hereafter, entitled to a patent for a homestead quarter section, be allowed to enter their pre-emption as a second homestead entry on the condition of additional three years homestead duties.

I find that the North-West Council go even further than that. They ask the Government to give homesteaders the privilege of making an entry of the pre emption on condition of an additional three years' settlement. It was

stated by the Minister of the Interior the other day that he was repeatedly told by parties who met him in the North-West, that one of the reasons why they wanted to have second homesteading done away with, was because people were leaving that section of the country, and it was becoming depopulated from the fact that an Order in Council provided that they should not take up a homestead within forty miles of the first homestead, and that this practically obliged them to remove from that section. I am aware that petitions were presented to the Minister of the Interior, to the effect that homesteaders should be allowed to homestead their pre-emptions on condition of an additional settlement of three years. Now I think that would be just to the settlers. Some sections of the country are not as well settled to day as they were a few years ago, and I think this would have a good effect in securing a settlement of those places, and would be agreeable to the people of the North-West. I will read from the memorial of the North-West Council, clause 13, where they say:

"That settlers who have entered for homestead and pre-emption, and who are now, or may be hereafter, entitled to a patent for their homestead quarter section, be allowed to enter their pre-emption as a second homestead on condition of additional three years homestead duties on their former homestead quarter section, and cultivation duties on the present pre-emption or homestead, as circumstances will permit."

I do not go so far as to allow a man to have the right of free pre-emption on those terms, but I think there could be no objection to allowing a man to enter his pre-emption as a homestead on condition of three years additional residence.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not think the hon. gentleman seriously expects Parliament to accept his amendment; I am quite aware that the North-West Council have passed resolutions to this effect, and I am well aware it is popular with the settlers. They would be different from any other people I ever saw if they would not desire to get all they could for nothing, it is the most natural thing in the world. It is presumed that the settler intends to live upon his lands after having taken a homestead, and yet the hon. gentleman proposes that he shall do nothing but remain there for three years more, and, by the simple fact of his being there, he shall escape the payment of his pre-emption altogether. It means converting every homestead into 320 acres instead of 160. Even if we were disposed to do this, I do not think it would be an advantage to insist that the extra homestead duties should be made upon the pre-emption quarter section. The man would be the best judge himself of what part of his farm he desired to cultivate, or what part he desired to reserve as pasture land for the cattle he may have; therefore, I do not see that it would be any advantage to him at all. The presumption is that the homesteaders of the North-West intend to remain upon their land and to cultivate as much of it as they can with their means, and, therefore, there is no obligation whatever, in connection with this, imposed especially upon them. It is merely a proposition to give homesteads for nothing, 320 acres instead of 160, on a six years' residence instead of three.

Mr. WATSON. Six years residence is much better than three, as the Minister is aware. Quite a number of settlers have left their homesteads in different parts of the North-West, and also from some parts of Manitoba. I do not suppose they have resided there long enough to receive patents. It is not expected that they shall reside on their homestead and receive a patent for 320 acres after a continued residence of six years; it is supposed to be provided that they shall reside on the pre-emption. I would suppose that very often the original homesteader would sell his original homestead, and would reside upon and cultivate his pre-emption.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). When this Bill was in Committee the other day I stated to the Minister of the Interior that I had received several communications from the North-West with reference to it, one coming from a meeting of citizens which had been convened to consider the Dominion Lands Act. I understand that a copy of the proceedings of that meeting was forwarded to the Minister. I have also, since then, received communications from the North-West dealing with the same matter and without expressing an opinion on them myself I propose to lay them before the committee in order that they may receive the consideration they are entitled to. One of the subjects mentioned in a letter I have is that of pre-emption, and it is therein stated:

"Another clause I do not see at all in said Act, is one lowering the price of pre-emption from $2.50 to $1.00, as Mr. White, I understood, gave us to understand when he was west; for I can assure you that unless there is a reduction made of some kind, our pre-emptions will be left to the badgers and gophers, as there are very few of us able to pay for said pre-emptions."

Such were the representations made by the chairman of the meeting.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). What district is that from?

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). From the Moose Jaw district. Although these matters have no particular reference to the clause under discussion, I desire to place these representations before the Minister. The chairman of the meeting further represents that the Minister promised them some consideration in view of the fact that water was exceedingly scarce there. They understood that one of the promises of the Minister was that a well borer would be provided. They also represented in view of the water difficulty that settlers should be allowed to live a greater distance than two miles from their homesteads. I suppose these are exceptional cases, and possibly would justify exceptional treatment. It is also represented that settlers who came into the country since the alteration of the Act, allowing second homesteading, feel considerably aggrieved over the change of policy in that particular. The chairman said that, while he was not entitled himself to the privilege of second homesteading, some of the settlers there were entitled, and it seemed to be depriving them of a right that really belonged to them. I cannot imagine that the number of settlers entitled to that privilege could be very large, because the privilege of second homesteading only existed for a short time. I observe that the Minister is making provisions for special cases under the Act, and perhaps the claims of those settlers would receive special consideration.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I desire to correct the member on one point, and that is, that I made any promises in the North-West to anyone. I made no promises whatever, I was not authorised to do so, and therefore I did not make any. The only point on which I expressed a decided opinion was on the subject of the abolition of second homesteading. As to the price of the pre-emption, I discussed the various suggestions that had been made to me without expressing any opinion of my own or making any promise that a reduction in price would be made to $1, because I was not authorised to do so, and I could not make any promise without the consent of my colleagues, even if they had the power to make the change, and inasmuch as it would be giving up a debt due to the Crown we could not have done so without the sanction of Parliament itself. As to the promise of a borer, what I said was that there was a borer coming into the territory. It is now at work in the Regina district, and as soon as some progress is made the intention is to move it to the Moose Jaw district, where efforts will be made to obtain water. It is rather remarkable in connection with this water question that borings have been made to a depth of several hundred feet without obtaining water and yet within a very few feet of that point an abundant flow has been struck within fifty or sixty feet of the surface. It is very much a matter of accident as to whether water will be struck at a particular point or not.

Mr. BLAKE. There is one point in the remarks of the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Cameron) to which the Minister did not allude, and which I must confess has very considerable weight. Nothing I think has given greater satisfaction and more relieved the apprehension than the adoption by the Department of the equitable rule that the conditions on which a man entered should be the conditions on which his title was to be considered throughout, no matter what subsequent conditions might be made. That principle, applicable to the conditions which the Government were authorised themselves to make and change, appears to me to have still greater force with respect to parliamentary conditions. We provided, during a year or two, that persons who came in and settled in the North-West should be entitled, under certain conditions, to a second homestead, and it will be considered to be a breach of parliamentary faith if we subsequently repeal that law in such a manner as to deprive those persons, who entered during the period of the existence of that law and came into the country upon the faith of it, of the right they had so acquired. So far as one can judge of the number that came in during the time when this law was in force, it is clear that the number will not be very many of those entitled to avail themselves of that privilege. What I would submit for the consideration of the Minister is whether it would not be better to repeal the law except with regard to those persons who came into the country and took up homesteads during the vigor and vitality of that law. The man who was in before finds himself deprived of a benefit which would have been conferred on him if he had seen fit to avail himself of it. He cannot however be said to have acted on it, but the man who came in while the law was in force and on the faith of that additional advantage, occupies a different position.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As to the meeting held at Moose Jaw, at which this subject was discussed, it was in favor of abolishing second homesteading. I am speaking of the meeting at which I was present. I did receive a communication from a gentleman, a friend of my own, in which he strongly protested against the abolition; but the feeling of the people was generally against the principle of second homesteading.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Middlesex did not deny it, but he said it was represented by the chairman of the meeting, who said that he was not himself entitled to come within the clause; that those who came into the Territory and took up homesteads during the time the law was in force, not unnaturally claimed that they were entitled to have their claim allowed, although the policy of Parliament as to other persons was altered.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It is represented that a meeting was recently held at Moose Jaw, at which this particular question of second homesteading was considered, and that whatever their wishes may have been as to the future, they were unanimously of the opinion that it would be unjust to permit those who had settled within the time when the second homestead was allowed, to be deprived of that privilege.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. WATSON. As I stated the other day I think there should be a clause in this Bill providing for homesteads under conditions of cultivation. I think such a clause would be in the best interest of the country, and I have prepared a clause which I think would meet a large class of cases. The conditions of cultivation are large and such a homesteader is not to get more than a homestead of 160 acres without any pre-emption. I move that the following be added to the clause :—

That homesteads of 160 acres be granted on the following conditions and entitled homesteads on conditions of cultivation that within the first year after the date of his homestead entry he broke and prepare for crop not less than twenty acres of his homestead. That within the second year he cropped the said twenty acres and broke and prepared for crop not less than thirty acres in addition. That within the third year he cropped the said fifty acres and broke and prepared not less than thirty acres in addition. That within the fourth year he has cultivated the said eighty acres and erected thereon a dwelling house and outbuildings of not less value than $600.

I think there should be no objection to a homestead being taken up on these conditions as they are large, and any person availing himself of such a provision will earn his homestead. I know of a number of people who I think would avail themselves of this privilege, and I think we should induce mechanics, who are perhaps making more money working at their trades than by settling on a farm, to put out their earnings into the cultivation of the soil. The fact that so large an amount of land required to be cultivated will always ensure the residence of some one upon it, and I do not think it makes much difference whether it is John Jones or John Smith who reside on the land, so long as the cultivation is done. As the country can only become valuable by the cultivation of the soil and the export of grain I think every inducement should be offered for people to invest their money in the cultivation of the soil, and therefore I hope my resolution will be accepted.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I hope the committee will not accept the amendment. The homestead principle in the North-West should be the principle of residence, and the moment you depart from that, we give up the great motive we have for giving away the land at all. We give, say, 160 acres, in order that we may have a settler on the soil, who contributes by his presence to the growth and progress of the settlement, and I think any principle by which we would allow persons from towns and cities to get land by simply coming out and performing certain settlement duties would be a serious mistake.

Mr. MILLS. There is a class of cases which impressed themselves very strongly on my mind in Manitoba, and I daresay they are to be found in the North-West too, for which no provision is made. There are cases where there is no good water to be found on the homestead or its immediate vicinity. I know parties who took up homesteads in Manitoba, and were obliged to build some distance away from their homesteads, simply for the convenience of obtaining water for domestic purposes and for the use of their stock. The house was perhaps one mile or two miles away; they cultivated the land, they used it for homestead purposes in every way except that the buildings, the actual residence, was not upon the land. Now, it seems to me to be a hardship to such parties to say that they cannot take that land as a homestead, but that they must purchase it. There were cases of that kind, I know, to the west of Rat Portage, where the parties had to build some distance away, in the vicinity of a spring creek, in order to obtain water. Now, I think the hon. gentleman would not interfere with the principle of homesteading, and he will perhaps consult the convenience of a very considerable number of the population in different parts of the country if he provided by the Bill that parties might be counted as homesteaders.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I am afraid the suggestion of the hon. gentleman would be open to great abuse. I know of some cases such as he describes, but the practical difficulty is how are you going to meet them. You cannot form any set of regulations to be of general application—and I think they should be open to as few exceptions as possible—without having some individual cases of hardship, but the moment you open the door to these cases—as in the case of the absence of water, which may be merely due to the absence of proper search and digging for water—you open the door to serious abuses. However, the matter may be held over and considered, but I do not think we should deal with it now.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that the question of sinking artesian wells and searching for water is a matter to be determined by the homesteader, and a man will not submit to the inconvenience of living off his homestead, when he is cultivating it, unless for good reasons. Cases of that sort might be reported upon, and I think there will be no difficulty in providing fairly by law when such parties might be allowed to have their homesteads on certain conditions.

Mr. WATSON. I do not agree with the Minister of the Interior that the amendment I moved is one which the Government could not possibly accept. Under the provisions of the Land Bill it is provided that a person who has made entry for a homestead shall go upon his homestead within six months; that he must break five acres the first year and ten acres the second year. Now in two and a half years he is supposed to have fifteen acres broken on his land, and he has also the privilege of taking a pre-emption. In the fourth year he is supposed to crop the fifteen acres and he has to reside, or is supposed to reside, on his land six months a year for the three years next to his application for a patent. Now, under the amendment, I propose that a man must hold his homestead four years; and he has to have 80 acres under cultivation and buildings to the value of at least $600. This ensures that some person shall live on and cultivate the soil; and that being our object, I think we ought to encourage all parties who have surplus earnings to put them into the cultivation of the soil. I believe this provision would be acceptable to a large number of settlers in the North-West in preference to the ordinary homestead provision. To my mind it would be much more in the interest of the country to have 80 acres broken upon a quarter section than 15 acres, and to have buildings erected to the value of $600 than to have merely a habitable house, which might cost not more than $75 or $60. I do not think this provision could be open to abuse, because a man could only obtain a quarter section of land in four years. I believe it would be a good thing for the country, and I hope the hon. Minister will accept it.

Amendment negatived.

On section 6,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). This clause was laid over. The objection made to it, as it stands, was that it was going to delay considerably the issue of the patent, so that practically the settler would not get his patent until the end of four years after his entry. The clause is practically in the interest of the settler himself, with the view of securing an inspection of the homestead at the earliest possible moment, so that the patent may issue. In the United States a very expensive method to the settler is adopted. There every settler has to give three months' notice every alternative week in a newspaper, and in it he has to give the names of his two witnesses who are to testify that he has performed his duties. He must do that before he can get his patent. We propose to require a simple notice to be sent to the Commissioner of Dominion Lands or to the Land Board; but as the question of six months' notice arose, I would suggest this as a substitutionary amendment to the clause:

Every person who has obtained a homestead entry, and proposes to apply for a patent for such homestead, shall give six months' notice in writing to the Commissioner of Dominion Lands of his intention to make such application, and shall produce evidence to the officer who is authorised to receive the application that such notice has been duly given.

The effect of that would simply be that if the homesteader gives his notice to the Commissioner of Dominion Lands six months before the time at which he would be entitled by lapse of time to receive his patent, having at the time really fulfilled the conditions of residence and improvement, he would get his patent at the end of six months. But if he leaves his residence duties to the end of three years, it is his own fault if a longer time elapses. It does not at all follow that because the notice is given the whole six months will be consumed; he simply gives his six months' notice in order to give the inspector an opportunity to go to the homestead and see that the duties have been properly performed before the patent issues.

Mr. MILLS. When this clause was under discussion the other day, I pointed out that the six months' notice was altogether unnecessary. What the hon. gentleman desires is to put the necessary machinery into operation for the issue of the patent. He does that by authorising the party to give notice that he desires the patent, and once that is done, the Department will no doubt issue the patent as soon as it can. The party gives notice by making his application. What is the object of requiring him to give six months' notice of his intention to apply, and then requiring him to give a second notice after the report is made? His very object in giving notice is to state that he has performed his duties, and that he is ready for the inspector; and the hon. gentleman is compelling him to make two applications when only one is required. The conditions of the American law are altogether different, because the circumstances are different. The Government there does not depend on an inspector but it requires that legal testimony shall be furnished that the homestead duties have been performed, and that makes all these preliminary steps necessary. But the hon gentleman does not depend on testimony of that sort; he depends on the report of the officer of his Department. I think the clause will meet the object hon. gentlemen have in view by making it read as follows:—

Every person who has obtained a homestead entry and has acquired the right to receive a patent, under the provisions of the said Act or of this Act, shall, on giving notice to the Commissioner of Dominion Lands and providing he has complied with the settlement conditions, be entitled to such patent.

All that would be necessary is that the report should be made; there should be no necessity for six months' delay or for second notice.

Mr. WATSON. I cannot see why the Minister wants a homesteader to give six months' notice. If the homesteader proves that he has complied with the settlement conditions and is entitled to receive the patent, he ought simply to have to apply for his patent and receive it, as soon as the Government are satisfied he has complied with the conditions. If the settler expected, under this clause, to get his homestead at the end of three years, he would have to be qualified at the end of two and a half years, because he has to give six months' notice, or else wait three years and a half for his patent.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman ought to amend his clause and adopt it to suit the convenience of the population. Why require a settler, who has resided upon his homestead for three years and performed the necessary settlement work, to wait another six months before he can get his patent? Why should he be required to make a second application at all? A simple notice from him that he has conformed to the law and that his homestead is open to inspection should be sufficient. The hon. gentleman has made a cumbrous proposition, taken from a law based upon a wholly different plan and policy.

On section 9,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). This is the clause for which I propose to substitute the clause of which I have given notice. Under the law, as it stands, any person can advance to a settler going into the North-West, and I think the Crofters were brought out under that provision. The law at present provides that any person or persons or companies can advance any immigrants coming into the country

to the extent of $500 at 6 per cent., to enable them to make settlements on the lands, and if they remain on the lands three years and get their patents, this $500 is the first lien on the property. It has been represented to me by those who have assisted immigrants, that a somewhat greater security is necessary, and I believe the clause I propose to substitute meets with the approbation of a large number of members on both sides who did me the honor of calling on me. It enables persons to advance to settlers, to enable them to go into the North-West, to the extent of $600, at a rate not exceeding 8 per cent., and against that amount can be charged the money expended in paying the passage money of the settler, for building the settler's house, breaking a portion of his land, &c. In addition may be charged the interest for such period as may be determined upon—for one or two years—against the capital, so that the settler will not have to pay interest the first year or two, that going as part of the capital he will have to pay. The important difference between this clause and the present law is, however, that in the event of a settler leaving the land before he has completed his settlement duties, those who advanced the money shall be entiled to the patents, and their advance will be the first lien upon it; and if, within two years after getting the patent, they have not put on the land a new settler, they be forced to sell the land to any settler for the amount of money advanced, together with the expenses. At present, they simply have the power to put another settler on if they think proper, in cases where the original settler abandoned the land before the issue of the patent. That is the principle of the amendment proposed. It has been represented to me by several people—I may mention one, Sir George Stephen, who has practically, now the railway is completed, ceased to be so actively and constantly engaged in that enterprise, and who is most anxious to devote himself to the settlement of the North-West; I may mention, also, the solicitor of Lady Baroness Burdette-Coutts or of Lady Cathcart, I forget which, Mr. Edwards, of Edinburgh, also spoke to me on the subject. They are all very anxious to continue the work; but one or two settlers, among those brought out, abandoned their lands, and that somewhat alarmed those who have been aiding this excellent work, because the security did not turn out quite as good as they hoped it would, since it is only on the improvements, and, unfortunately, improvements on a deserted homestead are not very valuable. As to the settlers who have taken up lands under these auspices, about 8 per cent. of them have left, and the balance, 92 per cent., are to-day on their homesteads, apparently doing well and quite contented. The belief is that a policy of this kind will enlist a large number of persons in the Old Country, particularly, in the work of putting on new settlers in the North-West. That is the chief object of the resolution of which I gave notice, and which I wish to see embodied in the Bill.

Mr. MILLS. There are two features in the Bill: first, the lien which the hon. gentleman proposes to create on the property; and second, the method by which the lien is to be secured. I suppose the Minister of Justice has looked at the clause and compared it with the Land Registration Bill before the House. The hon. gentleman proposes a method of registration by the entry of a memorandum upon the certificate title; but here is no patent issued, no certificate of title, no provisions to make the proposed law conformable to the provisions of the other Bill.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the School Savings Bank.—(Mr. Massue.)

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Yarmouth Steamship Company, Limited.—(Mr. Kinney.)

Bill (No. 90) to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Montreal Board of Trade.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 112) to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Western Canada Loan and Savings Company and to authorise the said company to issue debenture stock.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 113) to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Freehold Loan and Savings Company and to authorise the said company to issue debenture stock.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 98) to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Canada Permanent Loan and Savings Company, and to authorise the said company to issue debenture stock.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Bank of Yarmouth.—(Mr. Kinney.)

Bill (No. 114) to amend the Acts respecting the British Canadian Bank.—(Mr. Dawson.)

WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

Mr. ROYAL moved the second reading of Bill (No. 119) to amend the Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway and Steamship Company. He said: The object of this Bill is to modify certain clauses of the Act in order to facilitate the work of Mr. Sutherland, the president of the company, who is now in England, to float his scheme. This accounts for the lateness of the season at which this Bill has been placed before the House, and I may say great interest is taken in this enterprise by the people of Manitoba.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 128) to incorporate the Northumberland Straits Tunnel Railway Company.—(Mr. Hackett.)

DOMINION LANDS.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 94) to amend the Dominion Land Act, 1883.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). As to this clause the question arises whether under the Act as it stands the certificate of entry was subject to cancellation at all or not. A difference of opinion existed on that point, and it was to meet that difficulty that this clause was put in. On reading the clause, however, it will be seen that the certificate of entry, unless the entry or sale has been revoked by the Minister, entitles the person to maintain suits of law, &c., and that therefore it may be regarded as an instrument respecting lands, and is covered by section 74, which provides a msans of cancelletion for such instrument. I propose to drop clause 10 of the new Bill. Then I propose to add the following words to clause 13:—"Or such other places as shall from time to time be fixed by the Minister of the Interior." This refers to the meetings of the Board of Examiners of land surveyors. At present the place of meeting is fixed at Ottawa.

Mr. MILLS. The fixing of other places would entail additional cost for travelling expenses. Does the hon. gentleman make any provision for that?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not know that it would necessarily imply any more expense, as the members of the board are scattered all over the Dominion. There are a large number in the North-West and a good many in British Columbia, so that, so far as the expenses are concerned, it might involve no more expense to hold a

meeting, say at Winnipeg, as it may be convenient sometimes to do.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope before the amendments are considered, the hon. gentleman will have the Bill reprinted, as they are somewhat numerous.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Very well.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

Mr. FOSTER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 103) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act of 1882. He said: This Bill has been partly explained when it was introduced to the House. The first two sections have reference to some legislation to provide for the issue of 1st and 2nd class certificates to engineers. This is consequent upon the action of the Board of Trade, the outcome of which is that our engineers of the 1st and 2nd grade shall have equal rights with those of the same grade as constituted by the English Board of Trade. Section 4 and the following sections amend the Steamboat Inspection Act of 1882. Section 5 gives a little more power to the chairman of the Board of Steamboat Inspection. The work of the inspector of hulls and the inspector of boilers and machinery is divided, and the certificate of each of the officers is made independent and complete in itself, whereas under the old law the boiler inspector had the power of revising the certificate and the work of the inspector of hulls. Sections 7 to 10 inclusive make verbal amendments. The most important section is section 14 which adds some securities against the dangers arising to vessels from the employment of coal oil lamps and of explosive oils on board of steamers. Section 15 changes the status of engineers, so far as the yearly renewal of their certificates is concerned. Under the law at present these certificates have to be renewed each year. It is proposed in this section to put the original certificates of engineers on the same footing as those of masters and mates. When once gained upon examination they remain good, unless forfeited for cause. Section 52 of the Act is amended so as to make it obligatory on the officer of Customs to demand the production of the certificate of inspection, instead of leaving it optional, as it is under the present law.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 12,

Mr. WELDON. What provision does this repeal?

Mr. FOSTER. Section 32 of the present Act provides that every steamboat shall be provided with sufficient means for lowering safely and expeditiously each boat required to be attached to such steamboat; and sub-section 2 of that section provides that three davits shall be sufficient for lowering the boats. That sub-section it is proposed to repeal, as three davits are not considered sufficient.

Mr. WELDON. Does the hon. Minister propose to have an inspector appointed for New Brunswick? I believe the late inspector has resigned.

Mr. FOSTER. Application has been made looking to a division of the Maritime Provinces into two inspectorships. It is not proposed, however, at present to do that. Mr. Smith, who was formerly our inspector, has been superannuated, and a younger and more active man has been appointed. If he cannot overtake the work, help will have to be given to him.

Mr. WELDON. Where is it proposed that the new inspector shall reside?

Mr. FOSTER. The new inspector has been for the last month in St. John city.

Mr. WELDON. It is important that, as navigation has opened early, the boats should be inspected speedily.

Mr. FOSTER. The law provides that each boat shall be inspected once a year, and the inspector is given two or three months to overtake his work.

Mr. McCALLUM. A great many complaints have been made by steamboat owners about the office of the chairman of steamboat inspection. They consider that his office ought to be here at headquarters. There is a great deal of red tape about it. If any complaint is made, it is sent here to the Minister; then it is sent to Toronto, and then it is sent back to Ottawa again before an answer is given. I insist that the Government shall make it their duty to see that the chairman's office is brought here. There are no less than three of these people living in Toronto, and I do not see why the chairman should be there also.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is no doubt about that. A great many questions arise at the Department for the solution of which the chairman should be here, as vexatious delays often take place. However, it has been found somewhat difficult during the past years to make the change; but the Department has the change in view, and on the first feasible occasion it will be made.

Mr. McCALLUM. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what is in the way? There is a great deal of trouble caused in having the chairman in Toronto instead of in the capital. This place is as central as Toronto, and I do not see why he should not remain here.

Mr. BLAKE. I can tell the hon. gentleman why. It is the grand principle that the office is made for the officer and not the officer for the office.

Mr. McCALLUM. It is a very important office, but at the same time there are many men in this country qualified to fill it; and it is not treating the steamboat interest fairly, that, for the sake of aiding one individual—I do not care whether he be friend or foe—its interests are to be neglected.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt Toronto for steamboat inspection purposes, especially in this section, is quite as central as Ottawa, probably it might be more so, but the difficulty arises in the Department itself, on account of delays in settling questions, which might be settled at once if the chairman of the board were here.

Mr. WELDON. Who has been appointed inspector for the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Douglas Stevens of Halifax.

Mr. WELDON. My hon. friend is aware that a large number of steamers are employed in bringing down rafts to St. John and in the harbor itself, and steamboat owners complain that they cannot have their boats inspected in time. I think the work of inspecting steamers is too much for one man, taking the number of boats in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Mr. FOSTER. One inspector has done it up to the present and he resided in St. John. The present inspector is also a resident of St. John, and although it will be a little more difficult for a new man to undertake the work, it is to be hoped the difficulty will only be temporary. The expense of the steamboat inspection has to be borne out of the fees, and of late years it has been more than the receipts from the fees. We have to take that into consideration, if we wish to make the expenditure balance the receipts.

On section 15,

Mr. FOSTER. I have been asked by steamboat owners to remedy what seems to be little injustice in section 45, sub-section 4 of the Act. That provides that persons who hold certificates as assistant first-class engineers under the old Act may, at any time, exchange them for certificates as third-

class engineers under the present Act, on the payment of $5 to the Inspection Board. It appears that assistant first-class engineers are inferior in qualifications to the second and third-class engineers under the old Act, and I have been asked to insert before first-class assistant engineers second and third-class under the old Act. I would ask, therefore, that after "as" in the first line of sub-section 4, section 46, of the Act be added the words "second or third-class engineer or as."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 16,

Mr. VAIL. It seems to me that this might be improved a little in the wording. It refers to "section 50 of this Act." It ought to be "section 50 of the Act hereby amended."

Mr. MITCHELL. Is this power given to the chief officer, to sell a steamboat in default of payment of the penalties contained in the old Act? It seems a large power to entrust to a chief officer of Customs.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the same in the old Act. I wish to add another section. Section 34 of the old Act provides that life-preservers shall be made of the size and material approved of by the inspector. That may mean the quality of the material, and in that case it is consistent with section 36, which provides that a cork jacket shall be the only form of life-preservers to be used on passenger steamboats. That restricts the form of the life-preserver to one material alone. It has been brought to the attention of the Department that a cheaper, and it is thought equally good form of life-preserver, not made of cork, may be had which could be used on some of the smaller vessels; and probably, if after being tested it proves good, could be substituted in part for the present and more expensive article. I propose, therefore, to amend section 36 by adding "or such other description of life-preserver as may be approved by the Governor in Council."

Mr. WELDON. A cork jacket is known to be a valuable life-preserver on large steamships, and it would be well to limit this to smaller boats.

Mr. FOSTER. Our larger boats carry life-preservers to a certain maximum, and are then allowed to use wooden floats or other contrivances. If a form of life-preserver, other than cork, is found to be sufficient, the deficiency might be made up by these instead of by the bulkier floats.

Mr. MITCHELL. A petition was, I believe, presented to the Department in regard to life-preservers containing a light in the case of people falling overboard. I would ask whether the Department has taken that subject into consideration, because I think it is very important. It is adopted in England, and by our Atlantic steamers, and I think the Minister should give it his attention.

Mr. FOSTER. A largely signed petition came before the Department this year, and I have no doubt that the particular kind of light and preserver is excellent. It was not, however, thought necessary to introduce it by legislation this year. Of course it is an added expense, and, unless there is a fair demand for it, or a necessity for it in our inland waters, the expense would bear heavily, especially just now, when the shipping interest is not in the most prosperous condition in our inland waters.

Mr. MITCHELL. I found that the petition was signed by the leading shipowners of Montreal, and I think it is a subject the Department might fairly take into consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. The Department has already tested those lights, and found them to be excellent of their kind.

Mr. JACKSON. What amount of dead weight are these life-preservers intended to buoy up?

Mr. FOSTER. The Bill provides that every life-preserver shall sustain twenty-three pounds of cast iron immersed in water.

Mr. JACKSON. Under the American system, it is twenty-five pounds.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be objected that substituting this new form of testing might add expense, in that the present life-preservers would not come up to that buoyancy. I am informed, however, by the chairman of the board that the new test will not displace any considerable number of the life-preservers at present in use.

Mr. McCALLUM. Can the Minister tell us the material which the new preserver he speaks of is to be made of?

Mr. FOSTER. At present there is only one material out of which the law allows life-preservers to be made, that is cork. I have had in the Department, within a few days, a rather ingenious form of life-preserver, which the officers are now testing. It is made of light wood, hollow inside, in cylindrical form, with a head screwed into it filled with air. It is very buoyant and less expensive than the cork jacket, and, if it stands the test, it will be as effective and at the same time less costly.

Mr. McCALLUM. It is a most important question whether it would not get out of order and let out the air. Large steamships now carry the cork jackets, and a number of floats in addition. It is easy to throw a piece of plank out which will support a man, and that does not get out of order. You should be very careful in regard to any life-preservers except those made of cork. Formerly they used to make pin-cushions of them and destroy them. It would not do to make a pin-cushion of this new kind.

Mr. BAIN. A friend of mine drew my attention to the fact the other day that in the Act, as you propose to amend it, you require the standard of weight to be thirty-three pounds in place of sixteen. Does that imply that all the old life-preservers are to be laid aside and superseded by the new standard at once, or does it only apply to future changes?

Mr. FOSTER. I explained that a moment ago. The clause which is introduced into this Bill making the new test, is simply a change in the form of test, and the test as applied here will not displace those that come up to the proper test at the present time, so that it will not involve additional expense. It is simply another way of testing by attaching to the life-preserver cast iron metal to the weight of so many pounds, and throwing it into the water, and if the life-preserver buoys it up, it passes the test.

On section 17,

Mr. LISTER. I desire to call the attention of the Minister to a circumstance that materially affects the masters, mates, engineers and pilots of steamers of this Dominion. Before coming down to this Session I met several of these people, and they desired me to call the attention of the Government to the fact that before they were entitled to take command or to sail on American steamers, they have to be residents of the United States and to declare their intention to become citizens of that country. Now, people following these avocations in this country, feel that if such regulations are adopted in the United States our Government ought to provide similar regulations with respect to foreigners in Canada. Within my own knowledge several of our sailors, masters and others, within the last few months, have removed from Canada to the United States and made the necessary declarations although they had heretofore commanded and sailed American steamers while residents of

this country. I noticed the other day, in one of the local papers, this item:

"Some months ago Congressman Mayberry, of Detroit, Mich., introduced a Bill in the House, which provides that hereafter no alien who has not declared his intentions to become a citizen of the United States shall be granted a license as pilot, engineer, mate, captain or other officer on any steam-vessel carrying the flag of the United States. The object of the Bill was said by its author to prevent Canadian vessel men from entering the service of the United States steamboat owners to the exclusion of Americans. The Bill was favorably reported from the Commerce Committee of the House some days ago, and passed Wednesday without a dissenting vote. It is believed that it will go through the Senate with equal facility."

Now, these men I refer to appear to have had some knowledge that such legislation was to be introduced into Congress, and for the purpose of protecting themselves and being able to follow their employment, they have left the Province of Ontario and removed to the State of Michigan. Now, Sir, if the United States think proper to pass such a law as that, excluding Canadians from commanding or working upon American steamboats in the capacities mentioned in this article, I think it is but right to our people on this side, that Parliament should pass a similar law. I believe there is a law upon our Statute-book preventing Americans from occupying these positions upon vessels above a certain tonnage; but on vessels below a certain tonnage, American engineers, mates and so on, are entitled, I believe, to take command and sail them. I think, on behalf of this large class, it is the duty of the Government to introduce such legislation as will place them upon an equality with men of their class in the United States. I promised these gentlemen I would bring the matter before the House, and I now discharge that duty. I hope the matter will receive the consideration of the Government, and that such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the reasonable wishes, the simple rights of these men, will be passed, if not this Session, at all events at the next Session.

Mr. McCALLUM. Does the hon. gentleman complain that Americans come into this country and take charge of our vessels as masters, mates and engineers? If they do, of course there is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman says. But if they do not, certainly we cannot interfere with the legislation of the United States.

Mr. LISTER. Because they do not do it, we should give them the privilege of doing it—is that the hon. gentleman's reasoning? I know as a fact that American engineers are working on our vessels.

Mr. McCALLUM. I do not think I know a single instance where Americans have come in and taken charge of our vessels; but, on the other hand, I know that many Canadians go to the United States, and that one-half the American vessels on inland waters are to-day commanded by Canadians. The hon. gentleman says that now they must become citizens. Formerly, I believe, if they lived there it was sufficient to declare their intention. But as long as that does not affect Canadians here, of course we cannot put an embargo on people going into the United States to take charge of American vessels. But do American citizens come into Canada and take charge of our vessels as masters, mates and engineers? If they do, there is a cause of complaint, and the Government ought to look into it.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman forgets that although many Canadians have gone into the United States and many American vessels are commanded by Canadians, these men heretofore have not been obliged to sever their allegiance to this country. But under this new law they are obliged to do so, and to become American citizens. Because none of these men come over to Canada, the hon. gentleman argues that we should allow the law to remain as it is. The hon. gentleman must not forget that while our people heretofore have gone to the United States, it is only reasonable to suppose that under the National Policy, which the hon. gentleman supports, the shipping interest ought to become very great and prosperous in this country. It is hardly creditable that it is in a depressed condition, and if it booms up, as we have a right to expect, we will find Americans coming over here to take the place of our own engineers and seamen, and we ought to stop the possibility of such a thing. As a matter of fact, American engineers are working on boats in our waters to-day, numbers of them. I say this should not be so. If the Americans think proper to place restrictions upon Canadians working on their boats the same restrictions should be placed upon Americans working on our boats. There should be reciprocity.

Mr. McCALLUM. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has become a convert to the National Policy, and that he now goes in for protection.

Mr. LISTER. It does not involve payment of any duty.

Mr. McCALLUM. Certainly it does. If American engineers come here to work, they have to pay a fee on examination. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has become converted and is now a National Policy man. I do not, however, see that it is necessary to have an Act of Parliament passed to accomplish that result. His only complaint is in regard to engineers. There is nothing to hinder the Government passing an Order in Council, providing that all engineers on Canadian boats shall be British subjects.

Mr. LISTER. Let such an Order in Council be passed. But from the feeling way in which the hon. gentleman speaks, I should judge he has an American engineer on one of his own boats. I believe he has; if he has not this year, he had last.

Mr. McCALLUM. I always speak feelingly what I believe is right. The hon. gentleman says I have an American engineer on some boat owned by me. I never employ American engineers when I can get Canadians. He had no right to make that statement. I may say I have no engineer at all now. I did not come to this House, however, to represent myself, but my constituents, and to say I am interested, because the hon. gentleman brings up a point in the discussion in which I cannot agree with him, that the Government should bring in a law which I do not consider necessary, is surely improper. I agree that we should exclude Americans, if it is necessary to do so, but they do not come here.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman must pardon me for having charged him in some way with interested motives. I had entirely lost track of the fact that the hon. gentleman had the great misfortune some years ago to have lost that vessel.

Mr. McCALLUM. What vessel was that? I want an explanation as to what vessel is referred to, as I have lost several vessels. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the vessel for which the Government paid me. I can tell him that what I got from the Government I got by a vote of this House, and further there were only eighteen Grits who voted against the grant.

Mr. LISTER. I did not charge the hon. gentleman with anything of that kind; I am not complaining about his getting the money.

Mr. McCALLUM. If you have any dirt to throw, over with it, and I am ready to meet you.

Mr. MILLS. Down with your cash.

Mr. McCALLUM. So far as my acts have gone they have been straightforward. There was another hon. gentleman who talked in somewhat much the same way about me. It is true a few years ago I had a vessel going through

the Welland Canal and she was damaged owing to the fault of the Government in not keeping the canal in proper repair. The amount the Government paid me was what I proved to be my loss before the arbitrators, and they kept me out of the money eight years and then did not pay me any interest. There were only eighteen Grits who voted against that grant, and they were the extreme wing of the party, for everyone knew that I had suffered and all through no fault of my own. This is the scandal of which I am said to be guilty, and I cannot rise in this House and speak on a question of importance to the commerce of the country without being told that I am unfortunate, if so, there are many unfortunate men. I am not the first man who has got damages from the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. We will take it all back and say that the hon. gentleman has been fortunate.

Mr. McCALLUM. That may be your opinion. I have not made any complaint against you, but I am here as an independent member of Parliament and I am ready to meet any charges. If any hon. member has anything to say against me or against my course in Parliament or any insinuations to make, out with them, for I am ready to meet one and all.

Mr. FOSTER. With respect to what the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) spoke of, I have noticed the same paragraph in the paper as that which he read. I do not think it is the law yet. I think they have had a provision making residence necessary. That is also necessary for masters and mates who take charge of our boats, they must have been domiciled for a number of years in Canada before they can obtain certificates as masters and mates of our vessels. With respect to engineers, I do not think it is so. However, when that legislation becomes perfect, if it should become the law of the United States, the Government can look into the matter with respect to our engineers.

Mr. MILLS. I am sure it will be gratifying to the colleagues of the Minister of Public Works to know that the constituency of Verchères in Quebec has been carried by the Liberals by a very large majority.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate $57,388 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is something contrary to all precedent. The Senate are cutting down expenses, and I would like to know the reason. How is it that they are able to get along with only $57,000 as against $61,000 the year before?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. "While the lamp holds out to burn, &c."

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose the hon. gentleman has not forgotten the fact that the Session last year was about double the usual length.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think any of u will forget that fact for the term of our natural lives. Is that the only reason for decrease?

Mr. SPEAKER. The details show that the vote last year was only $57,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that, but I see there is no apparent explanation of it.

Salaries, House of Commons per Clerk's estimates $64,075 00

Mr. SPEAKER. This item shows an increase of $725, which is accounted for in this way: There are thirty clerks who are receiving an increase of $50 per year, in accordance with the report of the Internal Economy Commissioners, laid on the Table last year. That makes $1,500. That report provided for a new junior clerk who has been appointed at $400, making an increase of $1,900, but there has been a saving in the salary of Mr. Poetter, whose death has occurred since last Session. This makes a net increase of $725, but owing to some changes which have taken place since that time, next year there will be really no increase, although we are giving these statutory increases of $50.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there are thirty-seven sessional messengers at $250 a Session. A certain number of messengers are, no doubt, necessary, but I hardly think there is a necessity for thirty-seven. I do not know how many there were engaged in the past, but I have noticed that there are more than are really necessary. I cannot see that there is work for so many men at $250 a Session.

House of Commons—Contingencies $24,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Last year, although we had a very long Session, we did not seem to require the whole of this amount. Only $19,000 were charged to contingencies. Was that sufficient?

Mr. SPEAKER. The whole of the $12,000 is required for stationery. The stationery is increasing very largely every year, as the hon. gentleman must know from the quantity sent out to the country, and it is with great difficulty that the clerk of stationery is able to keep down the estimates. He has only done it by giving us a cheaper kind of stationery. He has made a great saving by lowering the quality of the envelopes. Hon. members now use a great number of envelopes instead of wrappers in sending out their speeches and papers, as they think that ensures their being sent with greater expedition, and they, of course, cost more than common wrapping paper. The other items are the same. We may have only spent $9,000 last year, but the saving has been in unforeseen and unprovided expenses, the amount of which we cannot estimate exactly in advance, and we try to save as much as possible in them.

Mr. VAIL. Do the boxes of stationery come out of that amount?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, out of the $12,000.

Mr. VAIL. I observe in the Auditor-General's report that while the trunks of the House of Commons cost only $3, those of the Senate cost $4.50. Are they not made by the same party?

Mr. SPEAKER. We buy very closely; I suppose we are more economical.

Publishing Debates, House of Commons..... $40,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much did this service cost us last year?

Mr. SPEAKER. About $70,000, owing to the long Session.

Salaries and contingencies, per Sergeant-at-Arms estimate $30,842 50

Mr. SPEAKER. That shows a decrease of $10, which arises from putting the report of the Commissioners of Internal Economy into operation, and is owing to a change in the messengers. While the other messengers got the statutory increase, the new messenger was given the lower salary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under whose control is the restaurant down stairs?

Mr. SPEAKER. The Internal Economy Commissioners. I hope it has been satisfactory this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, it has not. I believe it is good enough up to a reasonable hour, but when we are kept late, it requires a little looking after. It is not as well attended to as it might be.

Printing, printing paper and book-binding..... $80,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. One would suppose that the amount last year would have been more than ample for any ordinary Session. I presume a portion of the expenditure was due to the increased Session, but apparently we only spent $72,724. It appears a very large sum for that particular service, and it has been increased once or twice within two or three years.

Mr. BOWELL. It is possible that last year they may have had a surplus from the year before, or otherwise the amount might have been exceeded. That is the only information I have been given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Apparently there were some disputes with the contractors. What was it about?

Mr. BOWELL. I never heard of any, except the usual dispute as to quality of paper or difference in color.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. 20 per cent. of half the year's work is said to have been withheld for some reason or other. What I want to know is simply whether this $72,000 really covers the amount expended last year or is only apparently covering it. The whole account seems somewhat complex.

Mr. BOWELL. It may be possibly some accounts are not in. They retain 20 per cent. every year until the whole business is closed, and in this account they are charged with the 20 per cent. of last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They seem to have got through in a manner which is rather suspicious.

Mr. BOWELL. I see there was some dispute between the Auditor General and the Printing Committee, the nature of which the hon. gentleman will see by the correspondence.

Mr. SPEAKER. The account was not made up in the form that pleased the Auditor General, and the committee recommended that his signature be dispensed with.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Auditor General would not pass the account, and he is to be relieved of any necessity of signing any account. I do not think this House ought to concur in a report which nullifies the duties of an officer as regards ourselves in particular. It is a short and summary way of disposing of the Auditor.

Mr. SPEAKER The objection was only as to the form of the account. The hon. gentleman will see it all explained in the report of the Committee which comes up for concurrence on Tuesday next.

Salary of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery..... $2,250 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Up to what figure is he supposed to go!

Mr. SPEAKER. $2,400.

Arts, agriculture and statistics..... $99,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was done with this amount of $6,000 for the care of archives.

Mr. CARLING. This is the usual expenditure: Books purchased, $1,058; copying, $732; travelling expenses, $942; expenses in London, Eng., $1,833; binding, $773, and so on.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. VAIL. What did the whole expenditure amount to?

Mr. CARLING. $5,224.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is it that in 1885 apparently an expenditure of nearly $12,000 took place on this? The vote appears to have been very largely exceeded.

Mr. CARLING. It is made up of the same kind of items.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I wanted to know was what had been done, what particular manuscripts or works connected with the history of Canada are at present in process of being obtained, and what does the Minister intend to use this particular vote for in the course of the next year.

Mr. CARLING. I am told that this is printed in detail in the report of Mr. Brymner presented to the House. Historical documents have been copied which have been selected by Mr. Brymner.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What ones?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot exactly recite them at the moment, but I shall be glad to get the information for the hon. gentleman before concurrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In 1885, one sees a large sum, nearly $2,000, for books and newspapers for archives. Books of course one understands. What description of newspapers are they, and how much of that went for newspapers? Are they old files of newspapers that have come into the possession of the archivist?

Mr. CARLING. They are files of newspapers which are selected and kept as a record.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, you make future history. I hope, if that is part of the work, the newspapers which represent the cause of truth and purity on this side of the House are not forgotten. I have no doubt that, if the future historian only gets the subsidised press, he will be awfully bothered on comparing it with *Hansard* to know which is which.

Mr. BOWELL. I am afraid it will be very difficult to get any newspapers such as the hon. gentleman refers to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What! the subsidised newspapers?

Mr. BOWELL. No; the first-class the hon. gentleman refers to, the newspapers representing truth and purity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt. However, there is a paper called the *Intelligencer* which might be got.

Mr. BOWELL. No doubt, that is a true paper. Then there is the *British Whig*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, there is some truth in that.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose in the part you own.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How did we come to spend so much as $2,500 for the Queen's Printer in connection with the archives?

Mr. BOWELL. An hon. gentleman wants to know if you are a shareholder in the *Whig*?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I am not. I give the hon. gentleman that information gratis.

Mr. BOWELL. You are just as much as I am in the other paper you mentioned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does that amount of $2,500 consist of?

Mr. CARLING. It is chiefly for binding.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not that a disproportionate sum out of so small a vote?

Mr. CARLING. I am informed that it is all for binding. Large numbers of public documents and papers and all the manuscripts were bound.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely that would not be an ordinary usual charge?

Mr. CARLING. No, it is not an ordinary usual charge, but an extra charge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has been long enough in the Department to have had his attention specially called to these matters. But with respect to these archives, I mentioned once or twice that there was reason to believe that very important papers were to be found in some of the American States, more particularly in New England. I want to know if any steps are being taken to procure copies of the rarer manuscripts in the various libraries in the New England States. I called his predecessor's attention to that matter, and something was said about the desirability of making an enquiry.

Mr. CARLING. Correspondence is now going on in reference to this subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am inclined to think there is a good deal of interesting and valuable matter connected with the early history of Canada to be found in the New England State libraries, and I happen to know that the New England societies have been paying a great deal of attention to these matters within the last two years. It would be worth while for the hon. gentleman to make a note of this, and to cause some attention to be directed that way. A few hundred dollars expended there would, I am inclined to think, produce very interesting results.

Preparations of Criminal Statistics..... $4,000 00

Mr. VAIL. There is an amount for extra services in the Agricultural Department, and I do not see how that can come in here. On this item of criminal statistics, $4,323 were spent last year, and to make up that item there is extra services in the Agricultural Department, $1,012. It seems a large amount for extra services in making the criminal statistics. I do not think that ought to appear in the Agricultural Department,

Mr. CARLING. This is chiefly for extra clerks, copying and compiling a large amount of statistics.

Dominion Exhibition $10,000 00

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the Minister whether any decision has been come to yet as to whether this exhibition is to be held this year.

Mr. CARLING. Applications have been made from different parts for this money, but no definite decision has been come to yet.

Mr. FISHER. I would strongly urge upon the Minister that this grant should be given to the exhibition of the Eastern Townships' Agricultural Association, in Sherbrooke next fall. Last fall this association held its opening exhibition in the city of Sherbrooke, which may be called the capital of the Eastern Townships, and that exhibition gave promise in the immediate future of a very important agricultural union of the people from all over the Province of Quebec, and I may also say from all over the Dominion. A great effort is to be made this year that the second exhibition of that agricultural association shall be a very much greater success than it was last year; and knowing, as I do, that this association is taking a great deal of pains and spending a great deal of money to perfect their new grounds for the exhibition, I trust the Government will aid them by having the Dominion Exhibition there this season. I understand that the Quebec Local Government has agreed that the grant for the Provincial Exhibition shall be given to this association at Sherbrooke, and if additional assistance is given by the Dominion Government, there is no doubt whatever that the exhibition this fall at Sherbrooke will be one of the best which has ever been held in the Dominion of Canada. The association of which I speak is a young organisation, just commencing a work which, I think, will be of the greatest benefit to the Eastern Townships, and I think it is only fair that it should receive the assistance and recognition from the Dominion Government which the holding of the Dominion Exhibition there this year would afford it. I refer to this matter as being myself a member for one of the counties of the Eastern Townships, and especially as being interested in this association, which the people of the townships hope will become a permanent one, and will be of great value and assistance to the agricultural interests to that part of the Province of Quebec. I trust, therefore, that the Dominion Government will favorably entertain the application which, I understand, has been made to them, that the Dominion grant should be given to that association.

Mr. CARLING. An official application has been made by the Agricultural Association at Sherbrooke, and I also understand that the Provincial Exhibition is likely to be held there.

Mr. FISHER. That has already been decided.

Mr. CARLING. An official application has been made and strongly urged by the member for Sherbrooke, the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), and the member for Compton (Mr. Pope). I can only say that the matter is receiving favorable consideration.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that he should consider whether it would not be well to have this exhibition in British Columbia. I think that would be a most desirable place, and I am certain the people of Eastern Canada would embrace the opportunity of visiting that part of the Dominion which the opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway will shortly enable them to do at little expense. I sincerely trust the Minister will take this matter into his serious consideration.

Mr. HESSON. There are other points, as well as the city of Sherbrooke and the Province of British Columbia, that deserve some consideration. I also am an applicant for a grant by this Parliament to an agricultural exhibition. The city of Stratford is a young, flourishing and enterprising city, the centre of a fine agricultural district, yet it has never had a dollar's support for agricultural purposes, since this Government came into existence. Stratford is well situated for railway accommodation, it has six railway outlets, and is in the centre of one of the finest agricultural districts in Ontario. Indeed I may say it is the garden of Canada, and I think the Minister of Agriculture might very fairly consider the claims of Stratford. A grant has gone to London, to Hamilton, to Guelph, and frequently to Toronto, but, Stratford, the hub of Canada, has been omitted. I trust the Minister of Agriculture will not overlook us any longer. He is a neighbor of my own and should have some consideration for the flourishing county where agriculture is far from being neglected, but still it could be encouraged by the Government. The Eastern Townships are also pressing their claim. I trust the Minister of Agriculture will consider that there are also points elsewhere which have claims that should be pressed and would be pressed.

Mr. WATSON. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will not lose sight of the North-West. I have an idea that British Columbia is a little too far west and Sherbrooke a little too far east, that Stratford does not belong to us, and that the exhibition should be held at Winnipeg, which is

the hub of the Dominion. I hope the Minister will take into his favorable consideration the question of giving the grant to Manitoba. I pointed out last year that it will be a great benefit to the country if the people who went there were able to see the exhibition held there. I hope the Minister will take the matter into consideration, not only in fairness to the Province but for the advantage to the Dominion.

Mr. TROW. The convincing argument of the hon. member for North Perth, should satisfy the Minister as to the advisability of holding the Dominion Exhibition at Stratford. We have every convenience there, and a more favorable point could not be selected in the Dominion. The Government, I hope, will take this matter into its favorable consideration.

Mr. CARLING. I am very glad to hear such glowing accounts from the different sections of the Dominion, including Victoria, B. C. I am sure this House has a desire to do everything possible to advance the interests of British Columbia; but the Canadian Pacific Railway is barely completed, and not in running operation. It will be in thorough order in a short time, and I hope we will all have an opportunity of seeing that beautiful country, when no doubt we will be able to consider the propriety and necessity of doing everything to advance its interests, from an agricultural point of view. With respect to the remarks of the members for North Perth and South Perth, I am sure no one knows the prosperous state of that country better than I do; that Stratford is a most prosperous city, and the county is one of the best agricultural districts in Canada. But as the amount of money voted for agricultural purposes was expended in the west last year, I can hardly promise that we will consider the claim from that quarter this year, but another year we will be glad to give it every consideration. With respect to Manitoba; there can be no doubt its turn will come, but for the present I hardly think the hon. member would expect the Dominion Exhibition to be held there. No doubt, in a few years, the excellent facilities for getting into the country will justify it being held there.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that the money was divided last year. According to the Auditor General's report $5,000 was contributed to the Montreal exhibition and the balance to Ottawa.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman is referring to the previous year, when the amount was divided as he has stated. $10,000 were given to the Provincial Exhibition at London last year.

Mr. BAIN. I do not propose to put in a claim for any particular locality with which I am connected, but I think it would be wise to ask, what is the beneficial effect to the Dominion of the grant we make to this exhibition? What is the benefit to the Dominion at large after the experiment has been tried for several years? I grant that, in so far as the localities receiving the money is concerned, I can understand that Stratford, Montreal, and all those places are quite interested in having the prize lists of their exhibitions in the locality increased by a handsome sum such as Parliament contributes. So far there is no fault to be found. But I remember a few years ago when this proposal was started it was with a view to secure something in the way of a Dominion representative character in those exhibitions. I begin to doubt whether we have any tangible results sufficient to justify us in continuing this large expenditure. In so far as the newer Provinces of British Columbia and of the Prairie Province are concerned, and perhaps one central point in the Maritime Provinces, there is considerable to be said, especially in regard to the North-West, in favor of a Dominion contribution proving useful. But I ask the representatives from the older Provinces, where agriculture has been developed for many years and where enterprise has shown itself, what are the net results to the Dominion from this additional expenditure of money? If the amount is given to encourage the development of the North-West Territories and British Columbia, then I am in favor of the proposal; but so far as the experience of the older Provinces goes the time has come to consider whether that money is not perfectly wasted. What is the result in regard to the Provincial Exhibition? Is there not a strong feeling that with our local development and the wealth and enterprise manifested in our Province that the Provincial Exhibition has almost survived its day and become a thing of the past. If the Dominion grant is to be any benefit, it can only be by aiding enterprises in some of the newer Provinces in the Confederacy.

Mr. CARLING. I differ from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, as to the particular localities where the exhibitions are held getting the benefit. I do not think they receive any more benefit from $30,000 in prizes than from $20,000. These prizes are not paid to the localities; they are paid to the agriculturists and manufacturers from all parts of the Dominion. Last year when the exhibition was held in London, exhibitors came from Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and all the different Provinces. The show was not only a credit to the Province of Ontario, but a credit to the Dominion of Canada. The amount of prizes paid was something like $30,000, and the larger the amount of prize money offered the greater is the inducement to exhibitors as well as others, to attend from the different Provinces. I am quite sure that $10,000 added to the prize money of the Provincial Exhibition increases very much the number of the exhibits, and, of course, the exhibitors are chiefly from the agricultural districts.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). It simply amounts to this, that you offer the parties larger prizes, you help to draw a large local exhibit, and to the same extent a larger outside exhibit. But I ask any person familiar with the facts, what the number of exhibits was that was drawn to London, last year, from beyond the Province of Ontario. I venture to say it was but a small proportion of the exhibit. But this does not touch my objection, which is, that when we have paid our money, we have simply made the local exhibition a little larger; we have not succeeded in developing anything new in these exhibitions. So far as Ontario is concerned, the best guarantee of their success is to hold them in a densely populated part of the country and thereby draw large numbers of visitors. Everybody knows that the backbone of these exhibitions is the gate-money collected, and we all know that a week of pleasant weather, or the reverse, may mean all the difference between the success and failure of a show. The object was, when this grant originated, to give a Dominion character to these exhibitions, but I submit, from the way in which the Dominion is naturally placed, it is practically impossible to place any new feature in any exhibition in the Province of Ontario, by an additional grant of this kind, which it did not already possess in a very high degree, and it is for that reason that I begin to ask whether it is worth what it costs to the Dominion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it would be well, if the Minister of Agriculture feels it to be his duty to continue this grant, that the exhibition held in each Province each year should receive the entire sum which is going round the different Provinces, and that the prize list should be so arranged that a certain sum would be offered for a certain kind of exhibits from each of the Provinces. The money, as given at present, does not accomplish the end which is intended, that of giving it a Dominion character, though you may get a few more exhibits and a few more people. If you give a prize for the different classes of products of goods from each Province, it would undoubtedly have a

beneficial effect by showing the people what each of the Provinces can do. For instance, if the Minister were to stipulate that prizes should be offered for wheat, or pease, or cattle from British Columbia and the other Provinces, it would tend to bring together a large amount of produce of one kind and another; it would educate the people, by enabling them to compare the products of different Provinces. It would show, for instance, how far Ontario is ahead of Quebec, how far Quebec is ahead of the Maritime Provinces, and possibly how far British Columbia was behind the others in the matter of stock, cereals, root crops or other produce. If people in one Province were desirous of selling out and going to another, they could get a good idea, by going to the exhibition, what Province would suit them best, and it might be the means of some of our people going to British Columbia, for instance, instead of to the other side of the line. At present, I do not think the object intended is accomplished. I know there are many people who make a business of attending exhibitions, and at present it is an acknowledged fact, that when you have attended one of these exhibitions, whether in Montreal, or Toronto, or Ottawa, you see all that is to be seen. With regard to Stratford, I say it is undoubtedly the centre of a very desirable agricultural district, and it would be as well entitled to a share of the money as Sherbrooke, Montreal and other places. If you are going to distribute the money that way you had better divide it all round. I know towns in my own section which would be glad to get $100 as a help to their shows. In that way, by comparing the products of the different Provinces, the people would get educated, and competition between the different Provinces in the matter of products would be encouraged. But in dividing the money as you are doing, you are not going to accomplish anything.

Mr. HESSON. I am somewhat suprised at the remarks of the two gentlemen who have spoken last, especially those of the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), whose county has had the advantage of many a Dominion exhibition, and who now seems desirous of cutting all other places off. I do not think that is a fair spirit to exhibit. We all remember the fine exhibitions that have been held in Hamilton, the capital of the hon. gentleman's county. The last speaker says the grants have not accomplished any good. I differ from him in that. I think they have had the effect of developing stock of the very finest character. We have had exhibitors in Canada whose fame as the owners of stock has gone beyond the country. The hon. gentleman must admit that the aid granted has been an encouragement to those gentlemen to improve the quality of their stock, and if he has attended the exhibitions he must have marked the extraordinary improvement in the stock from time to time. That in itself is a sufficient answer to his statement. The proposition of the hon. gentleman, that stock should be brought from British Columbia, is most absurd, even if it should get the prize. I think our experience in the past, of the anxiety shown in different parts of the country, from time to time, to get the benefit of this expenditure, is of itself a sufficient justification for it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Of course the prize list would have to be arranged so that you would offer a prize for a certain article, the product of British Columbia or the product of the Maritime Provinces, and in that way you would attract exhibits from the different Provinces. If the money was divided in that way, say in connection with the Toronto Exhibition or in connection with an exhibition at Montreal or here, it would be of advantage. If you had to give $10 for a bushel of wheat from British Columbia, it would still be an advantage, because it would let the people see what is raised there. But in arranging the list as you do, you simply increase the prize list for the little district where the exhibition takes place. I hope the Minister of Agriculture takes a note of my suggestion, and if he acts on it I think we shall have an exhibition that will fairly represent the whole Dominion, and for which our people would be willing to grant the money.

Mr. WILSON. I think there is a fair chance of the hon. member for North Perth having the exhibition in his town, for I understand that the city of London has sold its exhibition grounds, and will not, therefore, be able to have any more exhibitions. I understand that the Military College is to be established on those grounds. I imagine that the Minister of Agriculture is the only person who has any property in the neighborhood of the city of London suitable for an exhibition ground, and as he is now an agriculturist, he will no doubt be anxious to retain his property. I, of course, have no hopes that the exhibition will go to the city of St. Thomas, although we could afford it every accommodation, because the county of Elgin sends two members of the Opposition to this House. My hon. friend asks where St. Thomas is. It is in Western Ontario, and London is a little to the north on its outskirts. But without any jesting, I think that as the city of London has now no fair grounds, the Minister should state that the hon. member for North Perth will certainly have an opportunity of having the exhibition in his locality.

Mr. MACMILLAN. I wish to call the attention of the hon. member for East Elgin to the fact that when the old exhibition grounds in London were disposed of, much more convenient grounds were secured, being within 200 or 300 yards of the railway station. What is known as Salter's Grove was selected by an overwhelming vote, and that property is kept for that purpose, and that purpose only. It will afford much more convenient grounds than those we had previously. The railway track runs by them, and the cars can be unloaded right alongside, whereas formerly all the exhibits had to be carted for a distance of a half or three-quarters of a mile. So that it will be seen that we have as good, if not better, grounds than we had before, and certainly more convenient.

Mr. CARLING. I am surprised that the charge should be made that some favoritism has been shown the city of London. The grant was given to London last year simply because the exhibition of Ontario was held there, and on no other account. It was given to London, as it has been given in previous years to cities in New Brunswick and Lower Canada. As the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has said, the very idea he suggested was carried out, because representatives from the Ontario Agricultural Association were sent to all the different Provinces to induce them to send exhibits to this exhibition. Every inducement was given, and a portion of the amount was devoted to reducing rates, so as to enable goods from Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, to be sent forward at reduced rates.

Mr. ALLEN. The most central point in this Dominion, the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers, for this exhibition, is the town of Owen Sound. We can in Owen Sound offer facilities above those offered in any outlying places such as the Lower Provinces, Stratford, Winnipeg, St. Thomas, London, Sherbrooke, or British Columbia, or any other place, and I sincerely hope the Government will decide on holding this year's exhibition in Owen Sound, especially as the corporation of that town is putting up an exhibition building at a cost of $10,000 to $15,000. We expect to be able to accommodate the whole Province in that thriving town.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the Minister of Agriculture state what amount of exhibits were brought from the different Provinces to London last year?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot give the figures, but Mr. Wade, the secretary of the Agricultural Association of Toronto, visited the Maritime Provinces, and he told me the delegates had been very successful in inducing people to send exhibits to the London Exhibition.

Mr. McMULLEN. No doubt some may have come from the Maritime Provinces, but I think that the hon. gentleman will find that unless he adopts the system of increased prizes and facilities to exhibitors from the outlying Provinces, he will not get much representation from them. I am glad to know that advantages were offered, and I hope they will be increased, if we are going to continue the grant at all.

Health Statistics $10,000 00

Mr. WILSON. On several occasions we have asked for information in connection with health statistics. Last year we contended it was unreasonable to ask us to vote the amount then asked, $15,000, without giving us a detailed statement of the work done. During the year 1884-85, about $8,000 were used, and now we find the Government asking for $10,000. I have no objection that there should be expenditure on health statistics properly collected, but I would like to know if we are getting a proper return for our expenditure. It appears to me there is no system really adopted by the Department to make the new service efficient. It is confined wholly to cities and towns, and while we are anxious to have statistics from the cities and towns, we should not rely wholly upon their statistical reports, but we ought to have some means of getting reports from the rural sections as well.

Mr. CARLING. The total amount voted last year was $15,000, and the amount expended, $7,917, and we are only asking $10,000 this year. We are extending our enquiries to all the towns and cities where boards of health are appointed, and the amount of information to be obtained is increasing. We intend to extend our enquiries as far as we can.

Mr. WILSON. In what way is it intended to extend the system? Is it proposed to extend it to the rural sections?

Mr. JENKINS. I believe that the object of this vote is an excellent one, but my experience is that the money is not wisely expended. I believe it is worse than thrown away, because information on the subject, to be useful, must be thoroughly reliable and complete. The information we get is neither reliable nor complete, and I hope the Government will soon see its way to get up an efficient registration of births, marriages and deaths, as that is the only thing that can be of real value in this connection. The information received now is exceedingly imperfect, and therefore of very little value to the country at large. But I think an official registration of births, marriages and deaths, would give information which would be exceedingly valuable, and I hope the Government will see its way next Session to bring in a Bill for that purpose.

Mr. CARLING. I think the information so far as it goes, taken from the different towns and cities, is thoroughly reliable, and that we can depend upon the officer who collects the information in each city. As I mentioned to the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), it is the intention to collect information from other towns and cities as far as possible, but the amount of money asked for is not very large, and in the country districts there are no boards of health such as we have in the cities and towns. The hon. gentleman can rely upon everything being done by the Department to obtain all the accurate information they possibly can.

Mr. WILSON. I do not know how it may be in other Provinces, but in Ontario there are townships' boards of health in the greater portion of the townships.

Mr. CARLING. Not to any great extent.

Mr. WILSON. I know a number, and the Local Legislature has passed an Act empowering the municipal council to establish boards of health, to whom it would be very easy for the Minister to extend the collection of this information. I agree thoroughly with the remarks made by my hon. friend that they are not carrying out this efficiently at all, that the expenditure is worse than thrown away, because we have a statistical report that is unreliable in every particular and tends to mislead the general public. If we are going to have reports, they ought to be such as we could depend upon, but no one can place any confidence in the correctness of the reports from this bureau. I see items for travelling expenses. I see Dr. Tweedle, of St. Thomas, is credited with receiving a certain amount for travelling expenses. Now that city is very small, where has he been travelling? What has he been doing? Riding round the city in a cab, perhaps? I see that other physicians were paid for travelling expenses, and I would like to know what that was for. Were they called down here to receive their instructions? Could not the instructions have been sent? They must certainly lack ability to appreciate their duties if it was necessary that they should come to Ottawa to get instructions to collect a few health statistics. I also see charged to this item, so as to make the amount appear somewhat large, a sum for extra services. If we pay the fees of the different individuals, $10 a month, for collecting these vital statistics, I would like to know if we are to pay a similar amount for copying. It is nothing more nor less than utilising the money to spend it, perhaps, satisfactorily to their friends in the various Departments where they are serving.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. The boards of health in the different towns recommends a medical man for that position, and he has been invariably selected and appointed by the Government. With regard to the travelling expenses, it was thought proper by the Deputy of the Department, Dr. Taché, a very worthy man, a man of a great deal of experience, that, when these parties were appointed, they should be brought to the capital to receive their instructions and to receive the forms. I do not think there is anything very wrong in that. Either the officer had to come or some one would have had to be sent to him.

Mr. WILSON. I see an item here, R. Tracy, $32 for travelling expenses. He is not a physician. Perhaps the Minister will tell me who he is and were he is located.

Mr. BOWELL. He lives in Belleville.

Mr. CARLING. That took place in 1884, I think, and I cannot state now who R. Tracy was or what the $32 was paid for, but I can get the information.

Mr. AUGER. I see travelling expenses to Mrs. A. F. Lyster. Will the Minister tell us who she is and what she has been travelling about?

Mr. CARLING. Mrs. Lyster has been for some years the head of this branch, and in some cases she was sent to give instruction instead of the parties being brought to the capital. If expenses were paid to Mrs. Lyster to go to a particular city, no expenses were paid to the party to come here.

Mr. JENKINS. I can corroborate what has been said by the Minister as to the political character of the medical men appointed, because the gentleman chosen in Charlottetown is one of the most arrant Grits we have, but I think the statistics are utterly unreliable.

Mr. WILSON. I did not complain of the amount paid for collection, but of the amount paid for extra services in the Department.

Mr. CARLING. That is for clerks receiving $1 a day, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will object to that.

Mr. VAIL. The Minister will see that, where the whole item is $9,772, the amount of $2,803 is out of all proportion for extra services. If it belongs to the Agricultural Department it ought to be charged to that Department. Of course the Minister is not to blame for what took place two years ago in the Agricultural Department, but I hope he will see in future that the accounts are made out differently.

Mr. CARLING. If men are employed at $1 a day to compile these statistics for this branch, it is proper to charge it to that particular vote, and, if these parties are not required, their services can be dispensed with.

Mr. VAIL. Then the gentlemen who collect these statistics are not half paid. If the whole amount paid to collect the statistics is $2,366, and $2,803 is paid to compile them, it is certainly out of all proportion.

Mr. WILSON. My friend says I ought not to complain because these clerks receive only $1 a day. That may be true. We have not the various items separated so as to be in a position to tell very correctly. But I observe that C. Steacey, extra clerk, is paid for seven months at $400 a year, $223. The same individual is paid for 150 days at $1.25 a day, and the same individual for copying $148.50, or in all he received $569.

Mr. CARLING. It is often the case in making up the statistics at the end of the month, that parties have been employed at night work, and you cannot expect the men to work fifteen or eighteen hours a day without extra pay.

Mr. WILSON. Do they work at night enough to make up 150 days, at a cost of $148.50? This is one item. If you go through the Agriculture Department, you will find that a number of these clerks are employed at a certain extra amount per day, from $1 to $2.

Mr. CARLING. In some cases parties who are well up in writing and figures are employed at night, and they are paid so much a folio. I am told by the Secretary of the Department that is the way in which they have been paid. The hon. member spoke about R. Tracy's travelling expenses, he is the medical gentleman who collected the statistics at Belleville, and I suppose that is the meaning of the extra expense.

Mr BAIN. It gives our Public Accounts an unsatisfactory aspect to see large amounts credited to clerks in the way of extra services. It looks unsatisfactory to those of us outside, who are accustomed to employ officials to do a certain amount of work on the assumption that we employ them to do a reasonable day's work. Here we find officials putting in all the way to 400 days' work in the course of a year. There is no doubt the tendency to modern times is towards short hours of labor; but I think it is worth while for Ministers to consider whether there is not an opening here for parties to neglect their work during the day for the purpose of enabling them to secure more payment for extra work at night. It does seem to me that we have enough officials paid for in connection with public Departments here to be able, if they honestly do the work, to accomplish all the business of the Departments that requires to be done, within the regular office hours, except on occasions when there may be an unusual pressure of work. With reference to this matter of public health, I think, speaking from a non-professional standpoint, that the additional powers that were conferred two years ago by the Provincial Act of Ontario on local health boards, has done much to attract public attention in that direction. In my own riding I know that township boards of health have been established under this Act, and their influence is being felt for good in the localities. There is no doubt that, as the country grows older, and people get more into this artificial condition of society, circumstances may require, in the interest of the public health, some such organization as these boards of health, but I do not think they would be available for the purpose of collecting statistics with respect to the population. So far as the Province is concerned, the provincial authorities have taken a great deal of pains to secure a systematic return, not only of births, marriages and deaths, but also returns from medical men of the prevalence of certain diseases, and it is from that side that I think a good deal of information that would be of general practical value, could be readily acquired. I do not think it would be possible, without large expense, to extend the collection of these statistics, with our present machinery, with any degree of success to the rural population. There is no doubt that in the large centres a great deal of accurate information can be collected without its costing very much.

Colonial and Indian Exhibition..... $60,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will be the total cost of this?

Mr. CARLING. It is difficult to say, because the tonnage of goods that have been sent over, has been very large, amounting to something like 3,000 tons. At the Paris Exhibition the freight sent over amounted to 800 tons. The Paris Exhibition cost $116,000, and the total cost of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition may, perhaps, amount to $150,000 or $160,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you will have to apply for a supplementary vote. Is that $60,000 expended? I am not disposed to criticise very much. If this thing is done at all, I have always held that it should be done well. I am inclined to believe that a great deal of energy has been used in making a good display on the part of Canada. Still I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, if it is in his power, to submit a brief memorandum as to what cost has been incurred and any general information he can supply as to the doings in connection with that branch.

Mr. CARLING. Yes, I shall be glad to do it on concurrence.

Resolutions to be reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

~~FRIDAY~~ Thurs., 6th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GOVERNMENT SAVINGS BANK—INDEPENDENT ORDER OF FORESTERS.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Has the Independent Order of Foresters been allowed to deposit $10,000 in the Government Savings Bank Department?

Mr. McLELAN. Under the law, we are not permitted to disclose the names of depositors. There are a number of

large amounts in the Savings Banks. I think up to 1876 or 1877, there was no limit to the amount received; then it was limited by Order in Council to $10,000, and subsequently, in 1880, it was reduced to $3,000. I think the practice in England, and this country for some time, was to receive deposits of charitable societies for larger sums than the limit, on the ground that they are supposed to be the collection of savings of a number of individuals gathered together.

STANSTEAD, SHEFFORD AND CHAMBLY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BECHARD asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to order the demolition of the wharf which the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company have erected, without authorization, in the middle of the Chambly River, and occupying about two-thirds of the said river alongside of the bridge of the said company, in the vicinity of the towns of St. John's and Iberville?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In the absence of the Minister of Railways, I have the honor to say to the hon. member, that the attention of the Government has already been called to that matter.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say a word with reference to a state ment made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) in the discussion of the motion of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). That hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) is reported in *Hansard* to have said:

"I find, Sir, that the Ontario and Pacific Railway, running through Cornwall to Perth, has been bonused to the extent of $262,400, and that the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) and the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) are stockholders in that company."

Then the hon. gentleman said again:

"I find, Sir, that in 1885 this Parliament granted to the Ottawa, Waddington and Northern Transportation Railway $166,000, and that the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), the hon. members for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé and Mr. Mackintosh) are stockholders in the company."

I simply wish to say, in reference to those statements, that I am not now and never have been a stockholder in either of those companies. I regret I was temporarily absent when these statements were made, and was consequently unable to deny them then, but I take this, the first opportunity which presents itself, to make the denial.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to call attention to a matter in connection with the debate of the 4th inst. In giving a list of applicants for coal land leases, I mentioned the name of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) as one of the applicants, and the following words were exchanged between us, as reported in the *Hansard*:—

"Mr. HAGGART. An application that I made? For what?
"Mr. CHARLTON. A coal lease.
"Mr. HAGGART. No, I did not.
"Mr. CHARLTON. I found your name in the returns.
"Mr. HAGGART. No, you did not.
"Mr. CHARLTON. Well, we will hunt it up."

I have hunted it up, and this is the document:

"OTTAWA, December 9th, 1882.

"SIR,—I have the honor to apply for a mining location, being west half of Section 16, Township 3, Range 9, west of second meridian, and I will comply with all the requirements of the Statute and the regulations of the Department.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"JOHN HAGGART.

"The Hon. the Minister of Interior,
"Ottawa."

Mr. MCLELAN.

"OTTAWA, December 15th, 1882.

"SIR,—I have the honor, by direction of the Minister of Interior, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th inst., applying for a coal mine location, being the west half of Section 16, Township 3, Range 9, west of the second principal meridian, North-West Territory.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"A. RUSSELL,
"For the Minister of Interior.

"JOHN HAGGART, Esq., M.P.,
"Perth, Ontario."

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

Mr. BLAKE. In pursuance of the Orders of the Day, and for the reasons I stated on Tuesday, no intimation having reached me from any member of the House that any portion of this motion is, in its form or substance, objectionable, I beg to move in the form of which I gave notice:

That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty to respectfully assure Her Majesty that the interest and concern felt by the Commons of Canada and the people whom they represent in the condition of Ireland, and their desire that some means may be found of meeting the expressed wishes of so many of Her Majesty's Irish subjects for the grant to Ireland of a measure of local self-government, still continue as warm and earnest as in the year 1882 when they were humbly signified to Her Majesty by an Address to which this House affirms its abiding adhesion;

Humbly to inform Her Majesty that this House hails with joy the submission by Her Majesty's Government to the Parliament of the United Kingdom of a measure recognising the principle of local self-government for Ireland;

And humbly to express to Her Majesty the earnest hope of this House that the principle of the said measure may be affirmed, and that it may form the basis for such a settlement of this great question as shall conduce to the peace, happiness and prosperity of the Empire.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Without referring to what has already taken place when this motion was brought before this House on a former occasion, I feel bound to offer a few re arks with regard to the position that I then took, and the position that I intend to take to-day on that subject. It is, no doubt, felt by many of our friends in different parts of the country that the Parliament of Canada ought to be again asked to express an opinion on the subject of Home Rule, or to express its sympathy with the people of Ireland in their efforts to obtain that system of government which we prize so highly in this country. It is no secret, nor did I intend that it should be, because full publicity was given to the facts, that representative men of one very prominent Irish society of this city called upon me, urging the propriety of moving some resolution on this question. Their object, of course, was not to consult wtih me as to the desirability, or otherwise, of taking that step, because those who have read the reports of the proceedings of the society will see that, in the first place, the society decided that that was the proper step to take, that some resolution should be moved, and they then decided that a committee should ask me to take that step. The reasons that I gave them, I think, hold good at present. I stated, and I repeat now, that, if on that occasion we had not been successful, and whether hopeful of success now or not, if we had failed on that occasion, we might and it would be our duty to make another attempt to gain an expression of sympathy from so important a body as this is. Then, having succeeded beyond, as I stated before, the most sanguine expectations of the most earnest Irishmen in this country, in obtaining a unanimous expression of sympathy from this Parliament in favor of the Irish people and the constitutional agitation they were carrying on for the attainment of that system of government and those constitutional privileges which we enjoy in this country and cherish so highly, I believed, for one, that it was not only not prudent or advisable, but that we had no just reason for asking Parliament to take this question up again. I noticed that in some of the city papers giving my reasons for refusing to move in that direction when I was called upon to do so, it was declared that I stated that my reason was that

I feared the defeat of the resolution. I deny ever having made such a statement. I entertain no such fear. I am quite satisfied that the Parliament of Canada, that the representative men in this country are always ready and willing to give an expression consistent with the privileges and the constitution under which we live, and that there is no man in Canada who would not be willing to see his fellow-men in any part of the globe enjoying the privileges of free and self-government which we enjoy in Canada. I did say, however, that, as we could not expect to get Parliament to give a stronger expression of opinion, what would be the object of introducing the question again, when the risk might be to get a weaker expression of opinion. I did not say that the question would be defeated. I did not entertain such a belief at all, but it is possible that some division might take place, that some one man or some two members, or three or four, if you will, might differ from the views taken by the majority of the House of Commons on that occasion, and therefore, to that extent, the expression would be that much weakened. I am not on this occasion going to make any allusions, or to impute motives either to the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution or to those gentlemen who, outside, have suggested that it should be moved. I am simply going to take the ground that I intend to discharge my duty faithfully and honestly in the interests of the country, and with a due regard to the expectations that my countrymen entertain of the manner in which I should discharge my duty here. I know that my motives have already been attacked; I must submit to that. I will not retaliate at present. I will confine myself particularly to the duty that I think devolves upon me now. That duty is, while I take the same ground that I took before, while I say I would not be responsible for bringing this question again before Parliament for the reasons I gave, that Parliament can give no stronger expression than it generously gave before, to see, as far as I can, now that it is forced upon Parliament, as a believer in the free institutions of this country, and one anxious and willing that those free institutions should be extended to our fellow-countrymen in Ireland, that no adverse vote shall be recorded on this question, no matter who is responsible for it. With that view, I propose to move an amendment to the motion placed in your hand by the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat. Before I do that, I must also give another ground which I stated at a very early stage when discussing this question with some friends outside. I stated that, in view of the reception with which the respectful Message sent by the Parliament of this country to Her Majesty met at the hands of the Government then, by the reply given by the Earl of Kimberley, I did not think it would be right to ask this Parliament to move another Address in view of the reply given at that time. Nor do I believe that, so far as that particular phase of the question is concerned, if it be brought in as an evidence of sympathy with our people, that our people care little in what form that Address shall come. All they want is an assurance that the Parliament of this country sympathise with their fellow-countrymen in Ireland in their efforts to obtain the rights which, as I said before, we prize so highly in this country. I, therefore, beg leave to move in amendment to the motion, seconded by Sir Hector Langevin:

That all the words after "That" be struck out, and the following added instead thereof:—the Commons of Canada desire to express their deep and abiding interest in the prosperity and happiness of their fellow-subjects in Ireland, and their adhesion to the sentiments expressed in the Joint Address to Her Majesty of both Houses of the Canadian Parliament passed in the Session of 1882;

That in such Address Parliament suggested that Canada and its inhabitants had prospered exceedingly under a Federal system, allowing to each Province of the Dominion considerable powers of self-government, and expressed a hope 'that if consistent with the integrity and well-being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority were fully protected and secured, some means might be found of meeting the expressed desires of so many of Her Majesty's Irish subjects in that regard.'

That in answer to the said Address the then Secretary of State for the Colonies was commanded to state that "Her Majesty will always gladly receive the advice of the Parliament of Canada on all matters relating to the Dominion and the administration of its affairs, but with respect to the questions referred to in the Address Her Majesty will, in accordance with the constitution of this country, have regard to the advice of the Imperial Parliament and Ministers, to whom all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain."

That this House, having reference to the tenor of the said answer, does not deem it expedient again to address Her Majesty on the subject, but earnestly hopes that such a measure or such measures may be adopted by the Imperial Parliament as will, while preserving the integrity and well-being of the Empire and the rights and status of the minority, be satisfactory to the people of Ireland, and permanently remove the discontent so long unhappily prevailing in that country.

Before resuming my seat, I would ask the privilege of adding a few words. I think, if the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution now before the House, to which this is an amendment, will consider this matter, he will acknowledge that the amendment will cover the grounds as well as his resolution, with the exception that it does not propose an Address to Her Majesty. I do not think that it will be asking the hon. gentleman to make too great a sacrifice if I say that I think he would do well to give his support even to the amendment, in order that it may have that strength which a united action alone can give it in its passage through this House. The hon. gentleman may object, on the ground that he still prefers the terms of his own resolution; but he must remember also, that, on a former occasion, when I moved the resolutions of 1882, he then found fault with their terms, as did many of his friends, and stated that they had been mutilated—in fact, emasculated, so that they were almost worthless. The hon. gentleman, the other day, in alluding to those resolutions, stated that on that occasion Parliament spoke, and spoke loudly. I think it did; I think it spoke loud enough, and I think that all reasonable-minded men will be satisfied if Parliament speaks in the same terms to-day. The fact of the resolutions being mutilated or emasculated did not prove that they were not the wisest that could have been submitted to the House. The object was to carry such resolutions as would embody the principles that we advocated at that time, and those resolutions did clearly embody those principles. They secured the most important end—they secured the unanimous support of that House, and the almost unanimous support of the Senate. More than that: after the action of Parliament had become known to the representative Irishmen on the other side of the water, those who, I suppose, were as deeply interested in this question as any man in this country can be, the Irish representatives in the Imperlial Parliament at that time, met and returned a vote of thanks—not to the political leader of the Conservative party, not to the political leader of the Liberal party, not to the mover or seconder of the resolutions, but they returned their sincere thanks to the Parliament of Canada for passing an Address which they considered the most important step that had been taken outside of the United Kingdom. With these remarks I will take my seat, earnestly hoping that this amendment, being a repetition of the sentiments expressed, and which were so acceptable to the people of this country in 1882, may be acceptable to the House now, and that it may pass now with the same unanimity that the resolutions did on that occasion.

Mr. CASEY. I have heard the remarks which have fallen from the Minister of Inland Revenue with regret that he should have seen fit to adopt the course he has taken. He adheres to his former argument, the argument which he said he used in speaking to the deputation which asked him to take charge of a measure of this kind: first, that the former expression of opinion was sufficient; and, next, that it was not prudent to bring it up now because he feared, not the defeat of the motion, but a less unanimous expression of opinion than that formerly given. He said: "Why should we bring it up now, why renew it? Was not the

expression of opinion which this House gave in 1882 quite sufficient?" If the hon. gentleman asks me for reasons why we should renew that expression of opinion, I have plenty to give him. First, because this is a new Parliament. After that expression of opinion in 1882 the members of this House went to their constituents, and if the constituents objected to the course taken in 1882 they had means of showing it. I do not think there is anything in the result of that election to show that they did object to that expression of opinion But we do wish to put on record the fact that this House of Commons, after the expression of opinion given by the former House of Commons and after consulting the constituencies, entertains the same opinion that the House held four years ago. That is one reason for renewing the expression of opinion. Another reason, and still stronger one, is, because now Home Rule is a practical issue. When we spoke before we were only urging the Government of Great Britain to take a step which it seemed almost hopeless to hope they would take so soon as they have taken it, for although my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition did express the almost certainty that the accession to power of the Liberal Government in Great Britain would bring about this result, it seemed more hopeless to the rest of us. We are glad to find that he has proved a truer prophet than our own fears. The accession of that Government to power has had the result which the hon. gentleman anticipated. At that time, I say, the resolution passed by this House was merely an expression of the vague opinion that something of the kind should be done and a vague hope that it might be done. Now, it is a practical issue; now, something has been proposed; now, a measure, however defective some of us may think it, has been submitted to the British House of Commons, and apparently it has a possibility, at least, of being adopted in principle, a measure adopting, at all events, the great theory of Home Rule, however we may differ from the details proposed in that measure. Now I say is the time when our renewed expression of opinion will be useful. The old resolution might possibly have been regarded as having been got up for a political object.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I say it might have been regarded at that time, when Home Rule was not a practical issue, as having been got up for a political object; but now, when Home Rule has ripened, when Home Rule is in process of being granted to Ireland, an expression of opinion coming from this House, of which the great majority is known to be Conservative, would not be looked upon as a political dodge, but as a sincere and earnest attempt to strengthen the hands of those who are working for justice to Ireland. And it would have that effect if it had come, in the first place, from the Minister of Inland Revenue, just as much as it will now, when the proposal has come from the leader on this side of the House. I deeply regret that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) has seen fit to throw objections in the way of approving a motion of this kind, and has repeated on the floor of this House his objections given to the deputation, and thereby weakened most appreciably the effect that will be produced by the resolution when it is adopted. After having told us that we should not have discussed the question at all, after having refused to introduce a proposal of this kind in the House, yet after the proposal has been introduced by another hon. member, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue goes on to propose an amendment to the resolution. That is not the course we would have expected him to adopt, from the language he used when the question was up on Tuesday. When the leader of the Opposition proposed this resolution, the Minister of Inland Revenue asked for time to consider the resolution and time to consult with the leader of the Opposition upon a form of words which would be acceptable to the whole House, if the form then proposed was not acceptable. The hon. gentleman asked for time, and he asked for liberty to make suggestions. The time was granted by the mover of the resolution; the liberty to make suggestions was also granted. Nay, he was invited to do so, and I certainly understood from the tenor of the Minister's remarks, that he was only waiting for an opportunity to make suggestions. Has he made suggestions? I do not know. Has he asked the leader of the Opposition to consult with him as to the wording of the resolution? I do not know; but it does not look like it. If he had consulted the leader of the Opposition, he would probably have stated so; if there had been differences as to the forms of words he would, no doubt, have stated so. But instead of taking advantage of the opportunity for which he asked, he has come down with an amendment proposing to proceed in a different manner from that proposed by the leader of the Opposition. I think this conduct is inconsistent with the expressions he used on Tuesday; inconsistent with his duty as one who has taken a prominent part in promoting the principle of Home Rule, and whose duty it is to see that everything should be done in such a manner as to secure the largest possible support to any legislation that could be introduced to secure that unanimity. He tells us that is his object in introducing this amendment. But, Sir, if he had that object in view intelligently, he must have seen that the way to secure unanimity, was not to bring in an amendment, of which no notice has been given to this side of the House, at this period of the discussion, but to consult with the leader of the Opposition, who had introduced the original motion, and try to agree with him on such a form of words as the House would unanimously accept. Of course, I am in no position to say whether the mover of the resolution will accept the amendment or not, but, without regard to anything he may do, I desire to express my own disapprobation of it, and my preference for the original motion. The sole reason which the hon. gentleman alleged for this change is contained in the Kimberley message, which he has incorporated in his amendment. Now, Sir, what is the effect of that resolution incorporating that message? I have not had time to carefully weigh and ponder every word in it, but it seems to me to amount to some such statement as this, to the British Government: "We asserted in 1882 our right to petition the Throne, in regard to a matter which we declared to be of Imperial significance, but which we declared to have material bearings on the prosperity of Canada as well. You snubbed us, and now we accept the snub. We accept the statement that we have no right to petition the Throne; we accept the position of outsiders, in which that message appears to put us." I say that the acceptance of that resolution by this House, appears to me to be an acceptance of the snub which was administered to this House by the then Secretary for the Colonies, at the time we sent the former resolution. If the hon. Minister does not mean it for that, it must have another signification. It must be an expression of sulkiness on the part of this House. If he does not mean to say: "We accept the snub," he can only mean: "You would not hear us before, when we offered advice on this subject; now your Premier has actually invited an expression of opinion from similar bodies, has rejoiced in receiving them not only from the Colonies but from outside of the Empire, and now, when you are willing to hear our advice, and when our advice is invited by the Premier and the English Government, we will get on our high horse and sulkily refuse an address to you. Instead of putting our opinions in the form of an address, directed to the quarter where they will have most effect, we will raise our eyes to Heaven and express a vague namby pamby hope that the Government of England will be led by the help of Providence, without assistance on our part, to do that which will be best for Ireland and the Empire." Now, I object to

take either position. I object to admitting that we have not the right to petition. Granting the right of petition, I object to taking the ground that, because they would not hear us before, we will not speak to them now, when they are willing to hear us. And I must refer—although it has been already referred to—to the remarks of Mr. Gladstone in his late manifesto and elsewhere. They have been presented to the House, but they do not seem to have made any impression on the mind of the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment. I hope they may now sink into his mind. Mr. Gladstone writes to the Legislative Assembly of Quebec:

"I am deeply grateful for the resolution adopted by your honorable body. It is my belief that the people of England, who have partial responsibility for the old misdeeds of the British Government, and the people of Scotland who have really none, will concur in the wise and liberal view entertained by the Quebec Assembly."

There is a distinct expression of thanks for an expression of opinion, not from the Dominion Parliament but from the Parliament of one of the Provinces, whose right to address the Crown on such a matter must be even *prima facie* less than ours, if there is any difference in rights at all. To the Mayor of Boston, in answer to a resolution, he cabled:

"I feel that American opinion, allied as it is with a regard and affection for the Old Country, affords Her Majesty's Government a powerful moral support."

That is not addressed to a British Legislative Assembly of any kind, not to a body representing 5,000,000 of British subjects. It is addressed to the mayor of an American city, and he says that even American public opinion must afford the Government powerful moral support. What, then, would be the support afforded to that Government by an expression of opinion by this Parliament, known to be composed of representatives of all races and all creeds, a Parliament known to contain a very large Conservative majority, so far as Canadian politics are concerned? Would not such an expression of opinion serve to show that men, not only of all races and creeds, but men of both political parties, recognised the fairness of the principle of Home Rule as applied to Ireland, and afford the most powerful moral support possible to the man who is risking so much to carry out that principle? Then, again, in his address delivered a few days ago, known generally as the Gladstone manifesto—his address to his own constituents—he said:

"Never have I known an occasion when a parliamentary event so rang through the world as the introduction of this Bill, under the auspices of the British Government. From public meetings and from the highest authorities in the colonies, from capitals such as Washington, Cincinnati, Boston, Quebec, and from the remotest districts lying beyond the reach of all ordinary political excitement, I receive the conclusive assurance that kindred people regard it with warm and fraternal sympathy. Our present effort is to settle, on an adequate scale, and once for all, the long-vexed and troubled relations between England and Ireland, which exhibit to us the one and only conspicuous failure of the political genius of our race to confront and master a difficulty, and to obtain in a reasonable degree the main ends of civilised life."

What is the meaning of those words? Is it not are cognition that not only Quebec, a French Province living under British rule, filled now with British sympathy and love for British constitutional Government, not only a French Province like Quebec, but even States entirely severed from the Empire, are members of the great British family council, composed of the offspring that have come from the loins of that great nation? Is it not a recognition of our fellow-citizenship in the British Empire? I say it is. It is more than a recognition of our right to speak in that family council. It is an invitation to lay our opinions before the head of that family, with the assurance that those opinions will be accepted with gratitude and regarded with the favor and respect that their importance deserves. Now, whatever may have been the effect of the Kimberley message, whatever may have been the meaning of it, whatever may be our constitutional and technical right to petition the Throne, these acknowledgments, coming not merely from a Colonial Secretary but from the Premier of Great Britain, take away utterly any effect that might be in that message tending to discourage colonial legislative bodies from expressing opinions on this great question. And if the Minister of Inland Revenue has nothing stronger to shelter himself behind, when he asks the House to depart from the usual constitutional method of addressing the Throne, and to express anxiety and great hopes and wishes to the skies and atmosphere, I say his defence is of the most flimsy character. Let me recall to your memory the fact that my hon. friend the proposer of this motion objected to the mutilated motion proposed by the hon. Minister on a former occasion: yet on that occasion my hon. friend accepted it because there was no opportunity of amending it, and because he did not wish to have any dissension in the House in connection with the matter. That conduct stands out in bold contrast to the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite. They did not, it appears, altogether relish the form in which this motion was proposed on Tuesday. Instead of accepting it for the purpose of avoiding division in the House on this great non-political question, they took a course which must necessarily lead to difference of opinion; whether it leads to difference of vote or not will depend on the self-sacrifice of the members of the House who hold contrary opinions. The hon. leader of the Government sneered at the resolution, and threw cold water on the whole proposal. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, who has always posed as the leader of this movement, also threw cold water on it by asking for delay. He has thrown more cold water on it to-day by asking us to abdicate our constitutional right of petition, and to accept a wishy-washy proposal of vague hope and sympathy. This course stands out in bold contrast to the sacrifice of individual opinion displayed by my hon. friend on the former occasion. I hope yet that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, having screwed his courage up to the point of proposing a resolution in that form, will go still further, and have the courage to adopt the form of petition, which we adopted in 1882—what we had a right to do then, and what we have a right to do now. He says the matter of the amendment is identical with that of the motion. I cannot say whether it is or not, because I have not had the opportunity of carefully reading it. If it is, there is simply a difference of manner and not of matter, and if that is the case I think he must show stronger reasons for departing from the precedent we have already set ourselves than he has yet shown. If it were necessary, Sir, to discuss the question of Home Rule itself, to discuss whether Canadians should support some resolution sympathising with that principle, I could do so with great pleasure, and at a length which I am afraid would not be pleasing to the House. I do not intend to do so at any length; but being on my feet, I feel that I cannot sit down without saying a few words on that subject, even though it may not be necessary for the conviction of hon. members of this House. Though of Irish descent, and though proud of that descent, I hope I shall be able to discuss this question rather as a Canadian than as an Irishman. I hold that Home Rule is as much a principle of the Canadian people, is a sentiment as dear to the Canadian heart, as it is to that of the native Irishman; I mean Home Rule in the general sense, not merely as applied to Ireland, but as applied to all isolated communities who claim the right to manage their own affairs. I should be as ready to support a proposal of Home Rule for Scotland or for Wales, if the people of those countries demanded it with the same unanimity, as I am to support the proposal of Home Rule for Ireland. We, in Canada, have been living under Home Rule for the last nineteen years; we know its effects, and we are generally agreed that those effects are good. I mean that since that time we have had Provincial Home Rule. We have had Home Rule as colonies for a still

longer time, and there are some of us old enough to remember what it cost us to obtain it. But for the last nineteen years we have been living under an enlarged system of Home Rule—Federal Home Rule, under which each Province has the right to manage its own affairs. Now, having once expressed our approval of that principle, it would ill-become us now to do other than unanimously reassert that approval. The right of these Provinces and of this Dominion to do what they like within their own constitutional bounds, is an axiom in the constitutional theory of Canada; and if we refuse to apply this axiom to the affairs of Ireland, we are not only doing a wrong with respect to Irish affairs, but committing ourselves to the position that the application of this axiom has not worked well in the affairs of Canada. And there is great similarity in some respects between the circumstances of Canada and those of the United Kingdom. Ireland is peopled by a race different in origin and religion from the mass of the people of the United Kingdom. Canada also has its Province, the majority of whose people differ in race and religion from those of the rest of the Dominion. Ireland and Quebec stand in somewhat similar circumstances in this regard. Troubles arose under the old Legislative Union of Upper and Lower Canada out of those differences of race and religion, and it was largely from those troubles that the proposal for Confederation grew. Has Confederation been a cure for those troubles? Ask the people of Quebec in Legislature assembled. They have given an almost unanimous declaration of opinion in favor of Home Rule, thereby implying that Home Rule has worked well with them. Another parallel exists in the fact that there is a large Protestant minority in Ireland whose rights some people fear will be injured by the concession of Home Rule to that country. There is also a large Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec. Has Home Rule in Quebec been disastrous to the Protestant minority? I do not think any member of this House will contend that it has. It is evident that the English-speaking members of the Quebec Assembly do not think it has, for they have given their assent to the principle of Home Rule. And is it to be asserted that the people of Ireland, with whom so many of us are allied by race, are less tolerant or less disposed to live at peace and harmony among themselves under Home Rule than the people of Quebec? I repudiate the assertion, if any one is hardy enough to make it. No doubt there have been quarrels and troubles in Ireland between the adherents of the two religions, more than in most countries; but why? Almost entirely because they have not had the opportunity of managing their domestic affairs, and because one section has been to a great extent, by the authority of the law, placed in a position of superiority over the other, and in a position to injure it. Irishmen are not disloyal to the law anywhere except in their native country; no man is naturally more loyal to a Government with which he is contented than an Irishman; and if this is not the case in Ireland, what is the cause of it, except that there Irishmen have not the right to rule themselves? If England goes halfway to meet Ireland, I believe Ireland will go more than halfway to meet England. I am afraid that is rather an Irish expression, because under those circumstances they would hardly meet, but if England goes any distance to meet Ireland, I believe Ireland will come twice as far to meet her; and the result of a fair attempt to meet Ireland will be to make Irishmen in their native land as loyal to the Government under which they live as they are in Canada or in the United States, or in any other country where they live under a Government which they have a share in managing. Besides, this principle, I contend, is in accord with the spirit of the age. We are told that the people of Ireland are not quite prepared to govern themselves. Well, a man cannot learn to swim until he gets into the water, and the people of Ireland cannot learn self-government until they have it. Let us take an instance and comparison. Are the people of Ireland any less prepared to govern themselves, are they any less prepared to swim without experience in the water of politics than were the people of Hungary, when it was a dependency of the Austrian Empire, and in a state of disaffection even greater than that in which Ireland has been for years? No one will assert that the Hungarians were better prepared to govern themselves, yet they were granted self-government by the Austrian Empire, and have managed to make it a very fair success. Take the other view of the question, that Home Rule in Ireland will lead to the disruption of the Empire. Is Austria to-day not a more united Empire, and stronger against all her foes, without and within, than she was before Home Rule was granted to Hungary? Is not Austro-Hungary to-day a greater force in the politics of Europe than was Austria, as an Empire, with her Hungarian Ireland to quell and keep in subjection, year after year? Of course she is. Therefore, I say this movement is in harmony with the spirit of the age, and will tend to promote the happiness of the people and the credit of the Empire. For that reason, not only those who favor local autonomy, but all true friends of the Empire, should support the measure which seems more likely than any other to secure for the Empire itself union, strength, and influence throughout the world. For all these reasons, I give my hearty support, in the first place, to the resolution introduced by my hon. friend and leader, and in the second place, if that resolution should not meet the acceptance of the House, to whatever form of words may be agreed upon by the House and to which we can give our unanimous support; while I maintain at the same time, a strong preference for the form of proceeding we have already adopted. In this, I believe I am only doing my duty, not as an Irishman, but as a Canadian. I believe the action this House will take will greatly strengthen the hands of the venerable statesman who is risking all the fruits of a great and long career to do what he conceives to be just to Ireland, and who is doing this at the risk of losing the support of many who have been his friends through life. In that position he demands the sympathy of the world, and I hope he will receive the sympathy, not only of Reformers but of Conservatives as well, throughout British countries. It should be remembered by all those who deal with this matter in British countries, that it requires to be dealt with in such a way that their action will do nothing to weaken his hands, but a good deal to strengthen them. This has been spoken by some as a Catholic question. I protest against any such insinuation. Protestants in Canada are Home Rulers to as great an extent as Catholics. Even in the Protestant part of Ireland, Ulster, the black North, as it is sometimes called, a majority of Home Rulers was elected at the last general elections, a small majority, to be sure; but I wish to show you, Sir, that the majority obtained at the polls there did not represent the real strength of the Home Rule vote cast in Ulster. In constituencies where there was not a sufficient number of Home Rulers to justify that party in bringing out candidates of their own, they supported the Conservative candidates. At that time the Conservative party in England were holding out the right hand of fellowship to Mr. Parnell, and led him and his party to believe something great would be done for them by the Conservatives if elected. Therefore, in counties where only Liberals and Conservatives were running, Home Rulers were requested by Mr. Parnell to vote for the Conservative candidates. I have even seen, in an Irish paper, a letter of Mr. Parnell's, directing the Home Rulers to vote for Mr. Johnston, of Ballykilbeg, the candidate of the Orangemen, and the most Orange of Orangemen; and the fact that he was returned is, to some extent, due to the existence of a Home Rule feeling in that county.

Mr. O'BRIEN. What does he think of it now?

Mr. CASEY. He has a different opinion now, but no doubt he was glad to receive the support of the Home Rulers then; and if his leader had introduced a measure of Home Rule, his opinions would have been modified; but, not imitating the generosity of the Home Rulers who supported him, he has shown himself since then much more bitter and outrageous in his conduct towards the mass of the people of Ireland than ever before. He has used in his speeches language which I would not be justified, with any regard to the propriety of the debate, in quoting. I hope the result of this discussion will be to adopt some resolution that will materially advance the prospects of Home Rule, and affirm in a dignified manner the right of the Canadian Parliament to approach and address the Crown.

Mr. CURRAN. The question now before the House is one of such vast importance, involving, as it does, so much, not only that concerns the material interests of Ireland, but the deepest and inmost feeling of a large section of the people of the Dominion, that I feel I would be wanting in my duty were I not to say a few words on this occasion, expressive of the sentiments I have always held—sentiments which have not been born within me since I entered political life, and which it might be, perhaps, to my advantage to parade, but sentiments which I have labored to promote, and which I shall continue to treasure until this question of Home Rule for Ireland is a settled fact. It has been the dream of my boyhood, the labor of my maturer years; and I trust I may live to witness, and that before long, before my old age has come, the people of Ireland contented and happy under Home Rule, and giving strength, power and prestige to the Empire at large. My first impression, on rising to address this House, however, is, I am bound to say, that I regret exceedingly a certain portion of the remarks which have fallen from the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I do not think that, whilst he has expressed himself to be a friend of Ireland and desirous of securing some expression of opinion from the House favorable to the principle of Home Rule, he has adopted the best means calculated to secure the result he says he desires so much. On the contrary, I think, when he opened his observations and counselled his leader, so far as he was concerned, to adhere to the original resolution which was laid upon the Table and not to accept the equally comprehensive but far more dignified course for this House that has been suggested by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, that he made a very great mistake indeed. As for myself, I feel that no one can question my motives or my sincerity in this matter. I can point to the fact, and I do so with pride, that in the city of Montreal there was organised the first Home Rule Association that ever was established on the continent of America; that the president of that association was my old and valued and patriotic friend, Mr. Edward Murphy; and that I had the honor of being, under that old patriot always true to the cause, the first vice-president of that association. Ever afterwards, whenever the occasion required, I felt that my course was plain, whatever my conduct might expose me to—and it did sometimes expose me to something that was not very pleasant for one who had political aspirations; that my duty was plain as a man, as the son of an Irish father and of an Irish mother, as one who had a deep interest in the welfare of the land of my forefathers, and who wished to see peace and harmony existing there and existing here in Canada amongst those of my race, and those of other races who have made this country our home, despite any inconvenience or unpopularity in certain quarters that my conduct might have exposed me to, whether it was on the occasion of the visit of Mr. Parnell to the city of Montreal, when he spoke in the Theatre Royal, and when I said in his presence what I say now in your presence and in the presence of the representatives of this country, that I hoped the time was not far distant when, by the labor of the patriotic sons of Ireland, the day might dawn when they could exclaim in one breath "God save Ireland" and "God save the Queen;" or when, again, Mr. Parnell was imprisoned by the Government of Mr. Gladstone in Kilmainham gaol, and my friends and myself called a meeting to express our sentiments on that occasion. However, it is not my desire to refer further to these facts, except in order to vindicate the position I take to-day, and to state here that I for one would not support the amendment that has been brought forward by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue if I did not feel that it was better calculated to serve the purpose that we have in view, that every good and honest citizen has in view, than the resolution which was proposed in the first place by the hon. the leader of the Opposition. I desire to approach this subject in a conciliatory spirit. I do not wish for one moment to cast any doubt upon the motives that may have inspired this action, but our motives have been attacked, our course, or rather the course which has been suggested by the representative of our people in this Government, has been attacked, and I think, without at all wishing to disparage in any way the motives of the hon. the leader of the Opposition, that there are some circumstances surrounding his action in this matter which are far more suspicious than anything which can be attributed to the hon. gentleman who has proposed the amendment. There is no doubt that parliamentary courtesy is perhaps the strongest prop to a man's faith. The hon. gentleman has said he is sincere in this matter so far as wishing to eliminate all party feeling and all party advantage therefrom. I am obliged, under parliamentary courtesy, to believe that, but my credulity is put to a very strong test. I think, after all, if we look at some of the circumstances surrounding the bringing in of this resolution, we will be struck very forcibly with a certain number of omissions which the hon. gentleman has made. In the first place, there are in this House a certain number of gentlemen of Irish extraction and Irishmen by birth as well, and he never consulted one of those gentlemen before bringing in this resolution. But there was more than that. The fact that this resolution was brought in as an amendment to going into Committee of Supply must have impressed everyone in this House that, after all, there was something about such a procedure that would cast a little doubt upon the sincerity of the hon. gentleman's motives. But there was a great deal more than that, and I think this is perhaps the gravest omission of all. That was not the fact that the Irish members were not approached, because, so far as the Irish Catholic members are concerned, unfortunately there are only eight of us in this House, and, perhaps, although I believe there is no personal ill-feeling between us and the gentlemen opposite, there might have been a hesitancy on the part of the hon. gentleman to approach us, as none of us are his political supporters, but there could not be anything like a hesitancy, there should not have been anything like a hesitancy, if there was an honest desire that that resolution should pass; it was absolutely necessary, in fact, that the hon. gentleman should have addressed himself, at all events, if not to the rank and file, to the leader of the French Canadian party in this House, without whose sanction and without whose approval, and without whose influence, perhaps, no such resolution could be carried at all. All these things were omitted. But we have still other circumstances that must attract very grave attention in this matter. We know that the *Globe* newspaper is supposed to be, to a very great extent, the organ of the hon. gentleman opposite, and that paper last week told us that the hon. the leader of the Opposition, not commanding a majority in this House, could not be expected to bring forward anything of this kind. He could not command a majority for anything he might bring forward, and there-

fore it was his duty not to bring it forward at all. But there was more than that in connection with this, and I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without drawing the attention of the House to it. There was, in the first place, as I have said, the statement of the *Globe*, but in the city of Montreal there is published what claims to be an Irish newspaper giving the views of Irishmen all over the Dominion. Its own constituency will not satisfy it; it professes to speak for Irishmen throughout the length and breadth of the land, and it especially speaks in praise of everything that is said and everything that is done by the hon. gentleman opposite; and what was the position that that particular organ of the Liberal party placed the hon. gentleman on this side of the House in, whose duty it is supposed to have been to propose this resolution? I will read a brief extract from that paper's Ottawa correspondence, published on the 15th April, 1886, only a couple of weeks ago. This is what is said:

"It is said that a resolution will be proposed in Parliament sympathising with Mr. Gladstone and the Irish people on the prospect of obtaining Home Rule for Ireland. Should this be proposed from the Ministerial side of the House it will be understood at once as a Tory dodge to win back Irish support. It is hard to see, however, in what way it can benefit them. * * * The Irish people are not to be humbugged. The records of both parties are before them. The press has shown the feeling prevailing in either camp. But the time has passed for resolutions of the kind."

That is what the Irish members of this House, at all events, were met with on this occasion. I do not think that I can let this opportunity pass without corroborating what has been said by the Minister of Inland Revenue with regard to our feeling on this subject. There is not one in this House who would not go to the utmost limit in voting for any resolution that might benefit Ireland in any sense that was considered the best by the truest friends of Ireland; and, Sir, in order that we might arrive at a just conclusion, the friends of the cause, those who were pointed to as having the duty imposed upon them of attending to this matter, met together; meeting together we discussed the question not in a party spirit, not in a spirit of seeking to achieve any party advantage, but every gentleman in this House, or in the Senate, who was present at that meeting, is to-day a living witness that the question at that meeting was: Will it be for the advantage of Ireland that such a resolution should be brought forward? In view of what has been said in the press, in view of the imputation which was cast upon us, in view, more particularly, of the unanimous vote cast in this House in 1882, a more emphatic expression than which this could not possibly have been given, we thought, Sir, it would be impossible for us to secure anything more forcible, and that it was desirable to let that matter stand before the world, before the eyes of Mr. Gladstone, who had received it and who had returned it in the contemptuous manner that has been referred to. That was the unanimous expression of this Parliament. It had never been appealed. No one had stood up in this Parliament and asked that a different opinion should be recorded, and we felt under the circumstances, and not only those gentlemen, but the best Home Rulers in this country whom I had consulted, those who had given their time, their money and their energy to the cause, also felt that unless we could secure a unanimous vote again in this House, or something tantamount thereto, it was in the interest of Ireland that the old resolutions should stand, which had been carried by a unanimous vote, and that they should not be disturbed. It was under these circumstances that we adopted the course we did. The hon. Minister was approached by one association in the Dominion of Canada, and that is the only association that has spoken throughout the length and breadth of the land upon this subject. No other Irish society, either Protestant or Catholic, had approached the hon. gentleman, either by delegation or by letter. Not one gentleman had ever approached me. I had gone to the city of Montreal, I had appeared on the public platform there at the meeting presided over by His Worship the Mayor of Montreal, when these resolutions of the city of Montreal were passed. I had taken part in that meeting, and not one man, not one president of an organisation, had sought to impress upon me the necessity of having an expression of opinion from this Parliament. As I have said, I went out of my way to consult the best friends of Home Rule, and if we did not proceed it was from motives of prudence, from a true, sincere and heartfelt desire that what had been well done for Ireland, should remain well done, and should stand before the world as the expression of opinion of the Parliament of Canada. Sir, we had the organisation to which I have referred; we had the Montreal *True Witness*, the weekly edition of the newspaper to which I have referred; and we had the expression by the *Catholic Record*, of London, as to what this Parliament should do under these circumstances; but I failed to gather in the resolutions of the leader of the Opposition anything like an attempt to follow the advice that was given by either of these organs of public opinion. The leader of the Opposition has undertaken to present a humble Address to Her Majesty. Now, Sir, neither one nor the other of those papers asked for a humble Address to Her Majesty. If we refer to the *Catholic Record*, in which an appeal was made to the Irish members of this House—certainly not couched in very inviting or courteous language, in a portion of it where we were told not to be "dumb brutes," but there was another portion of it which I will read, as I do not wish anything to go upon the *Hansard* which would in any way mar the effect of the proceedings of to-day, which, I trust, will end harmoniously. The London *Catholic Record* said

"It is now in order to the Dominion Parliament to follow up its resolutions of April 20th, 1882, to their logical conclusion, and give Mr. Gladstone the benefit of a hearty expression of sympathy."

According to this paper, it is a question of passing a resolution of sympathy with Mr. Gladstone himself; something, no doubt, in the form that has come to us to-day in the public press from the Province of Nova Scotia, where Attorney General White introduced a Government resolution referring to Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill, and resolved:

"That this House desires to record its warm sympathy with the noble efforts put forth by the Premier of Great Britain in the direction of giving Home Rule to Ireland, and expressess its sincere hope that his efforts may be crowned with success."

This body does not feel it necessary to present an Address to Her Majesty, but I may say that the course which has been adopted by the leader of the Opposition not only does not meet the views of those who may be supposed to speak for the Irish people of the Dominion, but it meets with their entire disapprobation, according to the statement of the *Post*. I think the House will admit that I am perfectly right in saying so when I refer them to the proceedings that took place a short time ago in the Quebec Legislature, when Mr. Carbray presented a resolution, probably a great deal more comprehensive than the one which has been presented by the leader of the Opposition in this House, and the resolution of Mr. Carbray was denounced as an act of toadyism, as an act of flunkeyism, as an act unworthy of the occasion. The resolution was as follows:—

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec, in Parliament assembled, desire, in our name and on behalf of the people whom we represent, to renew the expression of our unswerving loyalty and devotion to Your Majesty's person and Government:

"That this House, always sensible to everything aiding the greater welfare, progress and happiness of every section of the Empire, desires to record its warm appreciation and great pleasure on the initiation in the Imperial Parliament of legislation of a character to give a local government to Ireland, and the prospect of an early action with a view of an equitable settlement of the land question there, whereby the position of

the tillers of the soil will be improved to a large and beneficial extent, without injustice being done the present land owners. We pray that Your Majesty may be spared long years to reign over your devoted and loyal subjects."

Here, then, was a resolution embodying all the sentiments that are contained in the resolution proposed by the hon. gentleman opposite. Here was a resolution addressed to Her Majesty the Queen, just as his resolution is addressed to Her Majesty the Queen, and yet we find this organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, which assumes to speak for all the people of Canada so far as the Irish race is concerned, writing the following article in reference to the motion in question:

"The Legislature of Quebec is to be given an opportunity to express, in the name of the Canadian people, its sympathy with the struggles of the Irish race for self-government, and to extend to Mr. Gladstone its congratulations on having had the courage to introduce a Home Rule Bill in the British Parliament. Hon. Mr. Mercier has presented a set of resolutions which are to the point. Mr. Carbray has also moved in the matter, but his intention is to present an humble Address to Her Majesty the Queen. Now we would like to know what the Queen has got to do in this matter or why her name should be dragged in at all? Mr. Gladstone has had to fight against the Queen to bring in his Home Rule Bill. It is not Her Majesty that we have to thank for the Ministerial recognition of the principle of Home Rule for Ireland, it is Mr. Gladstone. Consequently it is the latter, and not the former, that should be made the object of our admiration and the recipient of our congratulations. Under the circumstances Mr. Carbray's proposed Address is out of order; it is not only uncalled for, it is undeserved.

That was the view expressed in this rather forcible language by the organ in question. We have on another date the following in an editorial article in the same paper:

"In view of this happy turn which events have taken, would it not be opportune and even beneficial to the cause of justice and freedom, which it has already pleaded, for the Dominion Parliament to imitate the example of Quebec and other Legislatures abroad, and send across to the Grand Old Man a message of sympathy and of encouragement in the great and noble work he has undertaken to accomplish in face of colossal difficulties and obstacles? *The Post* thinks it would be a meritorious act on the part of the Federal House to do so. Mr. Gladstone himself would esteem it so."

No doubt, the editor was in the confidence of Mr. Gladstone. Again, in another article, we find:

"Who will, then, move in the House that Gladstone is deserving of the thanks of the Canadian people for his scheme to give Ireland Home Rule?"

Again, in another article we find:

"Is there any reason why the Dominion Parliament should not follow in the footsteps of the Quebec Assembly and adopt resolutions of congratulation to Mr. Gladstone on the question of Home Rule for Ireland? There is no reason that we can see. The Federal Parliament has already placed itself on record as being in favor of self-government for the Irish people. This fact to our mind is a special reason why it should to-day tender the hand of sympathy and of encouragement to the statesman who had the courage to espouse the principle of Home Rule and advocate it from the Treasury benches in the British House of Commons."

The resolution proposed by Mr. Carbray in the Quebec Legislature, which corresponds with, but goes further than the resolution proposed by the leader of the Opposition, was withdrawn, and a special expression of the thanks of the Quebec Legislature was proposed to Mr. Gladstone on account of the stand he had taken. We, therefore, find, on referring to the journal from which I have been quoting, that the position taken by the leader of the Opposition on this subject is endorsed, whilst the very same motion and the very same action on the part of Mr. Carbray, who, by the way, is a Conservative in the Province of Quebec, was denounced in the most forcible language that the editor could call to his assistance. I say further that, in view of the statement made that if hon. members on this side of the House had brought forward a resolution asking this House to pronounce upon the question of Home Rule—we have it there in black and white—it would be a mere political dodge on our part. I say that if I or any other hon. member had come forward and proposed to this honorable House a resolution asking that a humble Address be sent to Her Majesty the Queen thanking her for what has taken place, I or any other hon. Irish Catholic member would have been denounced as a coward, as unworthy of the position of member in this House, as not representing the sentiments of the Irish people, that I should have proposed a resolution to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone and left Her Majesty aside altogether. If we proceed to consider this question further, I ask this House if there were not very great difficulties in the way of again presenting a reselution of this kind. I have spoken not merely to friends, but I have consulted gentlemen of different nationalities and races in this House as to the advisability of bringing forward a resolution on this subject. A very great difficulty indeed exists, as has been pointed out in such a plain manner by the Minister of Inland Revenue, in view of the reception which our last Address received, when Mr. Gladstone himself advised Her Majesty to tell us in plain language that while the Government of England would always be ready to receive any advice we might have to offer upon Canadian affairs, yet, so far as regards Imperial concerns, Canada had better mind her own business. Should we have attempted, without the assurance of carrying a resolution by a very large majority, in view of the opinion expressed by several hon. gentlemen who may be depended upon to support Home Rule, I ask would it have been prudent for us to have proceeded exactly in the same manner and in the very tracks we had gone before, when we were brought face to face with this snubbing that was given by the Imperial Government, and which remains to the present day. For, whilst Mr. Gladstone has upon many occasions of late, it appears, referred to congratulatory addresses forwarded to him in regard to the Home Rule question, there is one thing certain—that in all his sayings there is not one word as to what he stated to the Parliament of Canada when that answer was sent by his own Government, not a single reference to the Home Rule resolution of this Parliament. There is perhaps another view to take. We have that statement from the Earl of Kimberley before us. Every man in this Parliament, every man in this country, is aware of the existence of that answer, and it would look, perhaps, a little satirical were we to adopt a humble Address to Her Majesty to-day, after the strong position has been taken by him when we were told to mind our own business in Imperial affairs; we should again, by this very resolution, just remind the hon. gentleman of the little mistake he made in 1882, and remind him that after all the advice of Canada was not so bad, if he had taken it kindly at the time. Now, Sir, the substance of the hon. gentleman's resolution may be all right enough, but according to his own friends, according to common-sense ideas and a due regard for our own dignity, we cannot adopt by any possibility the form which he has adopted, the form which brought this answer from the Earl of Kimberley, whilst we have an equally effective mode, a mode that will involve no discourtesy towards this House, if it exists; a mode by which this Parliament places upon its records, and publishes to the world what its views are upon this question in its present state in the Imperial Parliament. Now, Sir, I think, under these circumstances, there is an admirable opportunity, if the hon. gentleman is sincere in the desire which he has expressed, to have unanimity on this question, to run no risk, to strengthen the cause of justice to Ireland—I say if the hon. gentleman is sincere, more particularly in view of the embodiment of the principles that are there enumerated in the amendment of my hon. friend—I say he has an admirable opportunity of showing that there is no desire upon his part to make this a party or political question, a question out of which political capital may be made, because it would show his anxiety to do good to the cause which he has espoused; and as we are all laboring together, and all claiming to be animated by the same spirit, nothing, I think, will evince that more than by the hon. gentleman subscribing to the amendment

which has been proposed by my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, despite the advice given him by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). Now, Sir, I think that there ought not to be any need, on an occasion of this kind, to address this House where Home Rule exists in the full plenitude of its beneficence any question, any word, any statement in advocacy of the principle that is now being laid before us. I trust, Sir, that there are not, at all events, many in this House who do not approve of Home Rule for Ireland. I do not believe that there are many gentlemen in this House who would stand up before their constituents in any part of the country and declare that they did not desire that the Irish people in Ireland should enjoy the privileges that are enjoyed by Irish, and English, and Scotch, and French in the Dominion of Canada. I do not believe that any man in this House would go before his constituents and be listened to approvingly in the utterance of such sentiments. I trust, therefore, that there will be, at all events as regards this amendment of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, unanimity or a strong majority in this House in its favor. I will say to those who may not believe in Home Rule for Ireland that, under existing circumstances, that question has become, you may say, a fixed factor in the politics of Great Britain. One of the greatest men in Ireland to-day, a member of the British Parliament, Justin McCarthy, has said in a letter recently published that this present measure now before the House, which, to use the words of Mr. Parnell himself, is one in which there are blots and blemishes, which must be removed ere it will be acceptable to the Irish people—I say Justin McCarthy has stated that in his opinion this Bill may not become law at present. But, Sir, as sure as there is a kind Providence which watches over the fate of nations, Ireland is destined to get justice in the matter of Home Rule. I would point out to those hon. gentlemen to whom I am now specially addressing myself, a statement made by a very distinguished statesman of England in 1880. I refer to Mr. Lowe, who had abandoned his former position with regard to the extension of the franchise, and who thus gave his reasons in a speech on his re-election for London University:

"You took me as your representative at a time when you knew that I differed from the mass of the Liberal party on the subject of the franchise. That was a kindness I shall never forget. What has happened with regard to that question of the franchise? Why, this. One-half of the subject has been settled by those with whom I acted at that time—the Tories themselves. You see that Sir Stafford Northcote has been complaining of the masses of people who have sprung up everywhere as if they were the dragon's teeth. But who sowed the dragon's teeth? This has to be said to the credit or discredit of the Tory Government—that this greater number of people have the franchise because the Tory Government, out-trumping the Whigs, gave it to them. Well, gentleman, now comes the question of the county franchise. I am a practical man. You know that I fought as long as there was a possibility of success, but I am now in this dilemma: if I go on any further I must unite with the Tories, who have already deceived and betrayed me—(laughter and cheers)—or else I must confess myself, as I humbly do, utterly beaten in this matter. I must confess that public opinion is entirely against me, and give up all opposition whatever. Gentlemen, I prefer the latter course. (Cheers). Politics are a practical science, and, as I have said from the first, what I desired was that the subject should be fairly brought before the country, and that we should have its decision upon the question. Well, it has been brought before the country in this election, and the decision of the Liberal party has been, so far as I know, absolutely unanimous. I, therefore, have nothing to do but to bow to that decision."

And, Mr. Speaker, what has taken place in the question referred to will take place with Home Rule. This has become a question of practical politics in the Imperial Parliament, and if this Bill of the Right Hon. Mr. Gladstone be not carried, the Tories will probably out-trump Mr. Gladstone at an early day, and a broader and more comprehensive Bill of Home Rule will be brought in by the Conservatives. I know it has been urged on many occasions that this question of Home Rule involves separation from the Empire. I have never believed that. I have given many years of study to this question in my own humble way, and I am convinced that the honor, the glory, the power and the prestige of England, Ireland and Scotland are bound up together. Just as in this country we cling to the prestige we have acquired by the joint exploits of the two great sections that make up our population, just as the English speaking people would now consent to allow the glory shed upon our history by our French Canadian brethern, from the days of Jacques Cartier to the present time, through their glorious struggle and achievements, recorded in *Les Relations des Jésuites* and in the opening pages of Garneau, I say, just as we could never allow that glory and that prestige to be taken away, so, with regard to the people of Ireland they feel that they have cast a halo of glory around the British Empire; they feel that they have embellished the literature of that Empire; they feel that their poets and their orators, their scholars and their statesmen, their men in every position of life, by their genius have enhanced the glory of that Empire. They feel, speaking the language of Richard Lalor Shiel, that on many a battle-field the blood of England, of Ireland, and of Scotland, has been shed together; in the same deep pits in many lands, their bodies have been deposited, and the green sward of spring now covers their commingled remains. The Irish people feel and know what they have contributed to the Empire, and they know what they would lose by total separation from that Empire; they know that England, Ireland and Scotland, as separate nations, could never possess that commanding influence in the world which they possess to-day. But the people of Ireland demand, and with God's blessing they will have, Home Rule there as we have Home Rule here; and in the words of the amendment that has been submitted by my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, the result will be that peace and contentment will reign in the land, that the Irish people will be happy and prosperous, and that the bonds of union between Ireland, England and Scotland, will be strengthened, not weakened thereby, and the future prosperity of the Empire secured.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it is right that any Irishman should get a groan in this House. I claim to be an Irishman just as much as the gentlemen who have already addressed the House on this question. I believe I am just as true an Irishman as any who sits within this Chamber. I was born on the old sod; I lived there for a good many years; I have visited it and travelled through it frequently. I love and reverence the green hills of Ireland just as much as any man in this House; and when I, in my humble way, rise to offer a few words in the interest of this important question I think I am just as fairly entitled to a hearing as any man who sits in this House. Now, Sir, I regret the course that hon. gentlemen opposite have deemed it proper to take on this occasion. I should have liked very much that the question had been received by hon. gentlemen opposite in the same spirit in which it was presented. I am quite sure the hon. leader of the Opposition took the position he did honestly and earnestly desirous of strengthening the hands of the Hon. Mr. Gladstone who has assumed the enormous task of endeavoring to secure Home Rule for Ireland. I believe hon. gentlemen opposite would have accepted the proposition had it not emanated from the hon. leader of the Opposition. If the hon. leader of the Government had presented that resolution, they would have held up their hands and yelled in joy that it had been presented to this House; but simply because the hon. leader of the Opposition brings it forward, after waiting for weeks—yes, for months—for hon. gentlemen opposite who have the majority of the members of this House at their backs, they refuse to support it. Why did they not take action themselves? Did they consider the question one of so little importance as to be not worthy of their attention? The hon. gentleman who has just sit down has told us that

the Irishmen of this House and the Irishmen of the Senate had a meeting and talked the whole question over; and he said that every Irishman in this House and in the Senate was present. Well, Sir, I claim to be an Irishman, and I was not there; I heard nothing of the meeting, and I do not believe there is an Irishman on this side of the House who heard anything of it. I would like to know if the hon. leader of the Opposition heard anything of it?

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. CURRAN. I spoke of Irish Catholic members and Senators.

Mr. BLAKE. It is a Catholic question, is it?

Mr. CURRAN. No, it is not, but you are trying to make a Grit question of it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is so exceedingly narrow-minded on this question. I would like to know if the resolution carried in this House in 1882 was carried only by the votes of Irish Catholic members. I would like to know if both Catholic and Protestant members did not support that resolution. Mr. Parnell is not a Catholic, and why should the hon. gentleman narrow the question down to Catholics? No doubt he wanted to feel, and find out quietly what would be the prospect of carrying this resolution by hon. gentlemen opposite, and what would be the political effect of introducing the question; and, after considering that, he probably decided in his own mind that it would be better simply to have the Minister of Inland Revenue send a despatch across the Atlantic on behalf of the Irishmen of Canada. I cannot understand why he should claim the right to send such a despatch on behalf of the Irishmen of Canada. At any rate, they thought it proper to jilt the matter in that way; and now, when the hon. leader of the Opposition, after two months for them to move, has brought forward the question, they find that the wind has been taken out of their sails, and they anxiously ask themselves: What course can we take; it will never do to go to the country with the leader of the Opposition. introducing a resolution for Home Rule for Ireland; it will never do to allow him to carry away the laurels; we must try if we cannot in some way share the glory and popularity of having passed such a resolution. And in order to do that, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has brought forward his amendment. Now, if we could take the resolution that has been presented by the hon leader of the Opposition and the amendment that has been presented by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue and place those two resolutions in the hands of Mr. Gladstone and in the hands of Mr. Parnell, I venture to say that their decision would be, let us have the resolution of the hon. leader of the Opposition. That is what suits our purpose. Why, in addressing Mr. Gladstone, do you think a resolution of this House would strengthen his hands or induce him more earnestly to give attention to the question? No; what he wants is a resolution asking the Queen and Crown of England to lend aid and encouragement to him in the tremendous struggle he has undertaken. We have had a little experience in this country with regard to the question of Home Rule, and are therefore in a position to speak with some authority on that subject. We know the differences that existed among our Provinces before Confederation; we can well remember the old political struggles that took place, when one Province was set against the other, and we are all glad to think that the days of those unfortunate differences are past, owing chiefly to Confederation. We are therefore in a better position to offer advice to the Crown than any other portion of her colonies, and it is only just to the people of Ireland that we should sympathise with the efforts made in their behalf, and show our sympathy and encouragement by petitioning the Crown to yield to those efforts. There is another point, Sir, to which I wish to call your attention. For many years we have been spending large sums in trying to bring out immigrants from Ireland and other portions of the British Isles, and I believe our efforts and our money have been to a great extent uselessly sacrificed, owing to the ill-feeling that existed in the minds of the Irish people with regard to British rule. I believe if years ago Ireland had got Home Rule, we would to-day have more Irishmen living in Canada, which would be a decided advantage to us. Any man who will travel through Ireland, as I have and witnessed the evidence of ancient greatness on every hand and the unfortunate condition of things to-day which stand out in strong contrast to those evidences of past grandeur, will come to the conclusion that something is wanted. He will easily see that Ireland has not been progressing and that there is evident necessity, and the evidence of the necessity that something should be granted in the way of Home Rule is to be seen on every hand and to be heard in the expressions of the people, giving vent to the almost unanimous desire for some change of that kind. If Ireland got Home Rule, she would use it cautiously and carefully, knowing that the eyes of the world would be turned upon her to see whether she would really use the privilege granted to her with prudence and care. I believe the Catholic majority would deal out to the Protestant minority an ample share of fair treatment, and that the latter would not suffer in the slightest. I shall never believe anything else until I see the measure of Home Rule proposed by Mr. Gladstone put in operation, and see it fail, which latter event, at present, I do not think at all probable. I believe it is the incumbent duty of this House to express our opinion on this question, and not to present our resolution in the emasculated style proposed by the Minister of Inland Revenue. The hon. gentleman who last spoke appeared to challenge the sincerity of the leader of the Opposition. I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman should challenge his sincerity. I think the leader of the Opposition has given ample evidence of his sincerity, first, by introducing the resolution in a broad and comprehensive style, and, second, by the very admirable speech which he delivered on that occasion. Is there a gentleman in this House who sympathises with the Irish movement, who could take exception to a single word in that speech? Did not the leader of the Opposition try to impress on the House the absolute necessity that its expression of opinion should be unanimous, not as a party question, but as an expression of Canadian public sentiment, with the object of strengthening Mr. Gladstone's hands by securing to him the prestige which would arise from our action and our experience in the mater of Home Rule. The hon. gentleman also stated that the leader of the Opposition had introduced the measure on his own responsibility, without consulting anybody in the House. That is not true. As far as I am concerned, I can speak as an Irishman, and I believe he did not confine his views to the Irishmen in the House or the Catholic Irishmen on this side as did the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman said he consulted the Catholics of the House and the Catholics of the Senate, but the leader of the Opposition did not confine his opinions to Catholics or Protestants. He is not accustomed to proceed in that way, and before the hon. gentleman should undertake to say that the leader of Opposition consulted nobody, he should have taken the trouble to enquire a little into the facts. Probably he thought that the leader of the Opposition proceeded in the way the hon. gentleman did himself. The hon. gentleman also spoke with regard to the attitude of the *Globe* and *Mail*. Well, any person who is in the habit of reading the *Globe* can come to no other conclusion than that the *Globe* is a consistent advocate of Home Rule. Its course on that question has been advocated in that bold and

liberal spirit which that newspaper agitates every question it takes in hand. But what has been the course of the *Mail*? The *Mail* played shy for a long time. It followed the course which is usually followed by the leader of the Government in an important question. It wanted, first, to see how the wind would blow, to see what course would be taken by its leaders, and after hesitating a long time, it mustered courage enough to come out and express opposition to Home Rule. Irishmen have not much to thank the *Mail* for. They will be able to see through the course taken by the *Mail* and by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and I do not believe they will be a party to this scheme of blinding the eyes of those who sympathise with Home Rule and hoodwinking the Irish population. The people will see through this thin garment of hypocrisy, and give the leader of the Opposition credit for his sincerity, notwithstanding the efforts made by hon. gentlemen opposite to decry and distort his motives. I am exceedingly sorry to see that hon. gentlemen opposite should play dog-in-the-manger in the way they are attempting to do, simply because they are not honored with having introduced the resolution, because they lost their opportunity. They waited day after day and week after week, they felt the pulse of the outside press, and no doubt they consulted their political leader. They studied the question, they were approached by Irishmen in the city of Ottawa and no doubt from elsewhere, they were written to, they were advised, they were encouraged, they were urged, they were pressed to bring in this resolution, but all the pressure and all the encouragement they got failed to have the desired effect. Then, when the resolution is introduced, they begin to see that they have lost a grand opportunity, they have thrown away their changes, they have sacrificed the opportunity of making themselves popular, and, in order, if possible, to turn the tide of venom and ill-feeling and contempt which they naturally deserve from the Irishmen outside of this House whom they claim to represent and to lead, they want now to kick up a little dust and try if they can get an amendment introduced, try to get some little change made, and try to persuade the people: "Did we not do the business after all; it was not Mr. Blake at all, it was we." Do you not see what has pinched the Minister of Inland Revenue? He feels that he is out-generalled. Look at the devoted utterances that hon. gentleman used on the occasion of this question being discussed in 1882. Read the utterances of the member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) on that occasion. Could anyone speak in a more patriotic and glowing style on the advantages of Home Rule in Ireland? Yes, they tried it to make capital out of it then, and no doubt they will try some more of the same kind. I suppose we shall have an address from others on that side of the House on this subject. No doubt the member for Montreal and the Minister of Inland Revenue will not be allowed to stand alone. No doubt the First Minister will address the House. We expect him to. No doubt we shall hear from the Minister of Customs, he is an Irishman.

Mr. BOWELL. You are wrong.

Mr. McMULLEN. We also expect the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to speak. Surely he is going to say a word on this question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. And the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White), surely we will have a word from him on this question.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I am opposed to it.

Mr. McMULLEN. All these men will rise, and they will deplore the unfortunate spirit that actuated the leader of the Opposition in introducing a question of this kind without consulting hon. gentlemen opposite. It was a sad thing, and on him must rest the responsibility of the defeat, if it is defeated. They are sorry he has placed it in the unfortunate position in which it is placed before the House, and that they have been compelled to take the stand they have, and it is only in the interest of Home Rule they are doing it. If it were not that they are so devoted to the cause of Home Rule and to the cause of Ireland, they would sacrifice a little to meet the views of the leader of the Opposition, but they are so devoted to that cause that they dare not allow this resolution to pass, they must amend it in some way, it is so crude, it is placed in such a position, they feel that the Queen would not be honored to receive an address based upon such a resolution without passing their glossy hands over it and putting it in proper shape. No doubt we shall hear a good deal in regard to that, and a great many expressions of regret that the hon. the leader of the Opposition did not take time. He did it too hurriedly, he got it up too quickly, it is badly worded, it is a pity it is presented in that shape, and a great many other faults of that kind will be found, and they will try to show that it is a deplorable thing that he should have permitted himself to be driven to bring in this resolution without consulting gentlemen opposite and getting them to put it in decent shape so that it might look creditable. I deplore the spirit that has been evinced by hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with this question. If they had accepted the action of the hon. the leader of the Opposition in the spirit in which it was tendered, I believe this question might have passed this House unanimously, and they would have had just as much credit by taking that course as they will have now by the course they have adopted, just as much credit by casting in their lot unanimously with the hon. the leader of the Opposition as by attempting in this cheese-paring kind of style to interfere and to dabble with the resolution, and to try to cut and carve it so that, when they go to the country in a few months, they will say: "Why, it was we, after all that prepared that resolution; had we permitted it to go home in the shape in which it was prepared by the leader of the Opposition it would have been deplorable, it would not have suited Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Parnell would have been horrified, the country would have risen, and said, are there no men in Canada able to prepare something decent to send to the Queen instead of sending a Home Rule resolution in this style, in place of something like the production of a man of brains and sense." But, no matter how they may talk, they have got into an unfortunate dilemma, and they will try to struggle out of it as best they can. They will all try to show willingness. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has given the cue, and according to that they will all preach and prattle the doctrine he has laid down as to the desirability of sending an address merely to Mr. Gladstone and not to the Queen. I am rather disposed to think that hon. gentlemen opposite, notwithstanding all their vaunted loyalty as Conservatives, are disposed to ignore the Queen in this question. They do not seem to be disposed to acknowledge the Queen. The idea of men led by the First Minister daring to petition the First Minister of England on a matter of this kind without sending it to the Queen! I am surprised. A knight, a man honored by the Queen, several of his colleagues honored by the Queen, to think that they would send it to the First Minister instead of the Queen, instead of to the Crown! Surely the First Minister has not had the concocting of this matter. Surely he has not been consulted. Surely he would not propose to ignore the Queen. He is disposed to express a great deal of loyalty, and, whenever any question comes up on which the Queen might be approached or the Government of England, he displays a great deal of loyalty and respect for the Crown and the Queen. We all do, and I am sorry that hon. gentlemen are disposed to reflect upon Her Majesty the Queen in connection

with this question. If we petition at all, is not the Queen the proper party to address? Certainly she is. If any other colonies of the Empire were to address a resolution to this House on a question of vital importance to this Dominion of ours, and that petition was sent to the First Minister of this House instead of to the Governor General in Council, I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite would say it was a very strange proceeding for these men to take, to address the First Minister; did they not know that we had a Governor General, a representative of the Queen? Why did they not address the petition to the representative of the Queen in the country? And they would stand up and hold up their hands in holy horror, to think we should dare to receive a petition of that kind. I am surprised, with all their boasted loyalty and boasted admiration for our Queen—and we have a noble Queen—that they should talk in this way. I think it would be a great pity to ignore her right to be approached on this occasion. They may claim that the answer we got before was not an answer such as we would like to get, but there has been a great deal of change in the feeling in Ireland and England on this question since that petition was sent home. The people of England have been dealing with that question; they have had a general election; that question has been one of the vital questions at that general election, and is now the question of paramount importance in England. I say, when that is the case, we have a perfect right, as a humble colony claiming loyalty to our Queen, and having had the experience we have, to offer our views humbly and courteously on this question. We have a right to exercise that right, and if we fail to do that, we are not doing justice to those who are in jeopardy, and who are trying to secure for themselves that measure of representation and self-government that we so much glory in ourselves. We boast of our system of home rule in Canada, and I believe it would have been a greater success than it has been if the Dominion had been presided over by men less disposed to dabble with questions that legitimately belong to the separate Provinces, and allowing them to exercise their home rule without interference. I hope that we shall have a general expression of opinion on this subject. For my part I have no hesitation in expressing myself cordially in unison with the view of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I believe that is the proper view. I believe the Irishmen of this country, if the question were submitted to them by counties, would endorse the view expressed by the leader of the Opposition, and I believe that is the view that will be most likely to assist Mr. Gladstone in his struggles on behalf of Home Rule. I think we should not allow these little bickerings to enter this discussion; I believe politics should have been banished from it. I am sure the leader of the Opposition was anxious that all political feeling should be set aside, and that we should all approach it in a spirit of anxious desire to assist Mr. Gladstone in the effort he is making. But hon. gentlemen opposite have chosen to take another course. Oh, politics is a terrible thing. A man cannot possibly introduce any question from this side of the House but he must be charged with a desire of making political capital. The hon. leader of the Opposition is charged with having some sinister design in view, with trying to strengthen the hands of his followers. Well, I am sure he did not steal a march on hon. gentlemen opposite. If he had introduced it in the very beginning of the Session, without allowing hon. gentlemen opposite an opportunity of acting, then he might fairly be charged with having stolen a march upon them. Did he do that? No, he has waited till the ninth week of this Session. He has given the hon. gentleman for Montreal (Mr. Curran) and his associates ample time to have moved. They have had eight or nine weeks to prepare their resolution, to consult their chief and his co-Ministers—they have waited all this time without taking any action. Still they have not moved. There must have been some secret cause at the bottom, and they did not think it worth while to move, but all at once the leader of the Opposition introduced his motion, and then they arose in their might and felt it their duty to express their earnest desire that something of a different kind should be introduced and carried through. They then became alive, they shook off the shackles of laziness and rose up. Then they were ready to act, but they were never ready to act before. I suppose if the leader of the Opposition had not acted, the probabilities are that you, Mr. Speaker, would have left the Chair for the last time and the Governor General would have given his assent to every Act we have passed here, before they would have acted; and if we had done that the probabilities are that they would have gone to the country and said: Well, we were afraid to move on that question, we were afraid of the leader of the Opposition, we did not know what course he would take, we were afraid of these fellows that were following him, and we began to think they were not going to support us, and we feared we could not carry a resolution through. But we have got the Minister of Inland Revenue the most prominent Irish member in this House to cable home a despatch urging and encouraging Mr. Parnell in his noble undertaking. We did all we could do, all that we possibly dared to risk, in order to promote the cause of Home Rule. But now they have an opportunity of joining hands across the floors of the House in the interests of a country that has been admittedly suffering. There is not a man in this House who will deny that poor, unfortunate Ireland has suffered for years for the want of that measure of Home Rule that we believe would be pleasant to her. They attack the resolution of the leader of the Opposition, and I am sorry to say that there are some men of Irish parentage who have been so neglectful of the honor they owe to their parent land, that in the moment of her struggles, and of Mr. Gladstone's efforts in her behalf, they have stood, while clothed with the honor of being representatives in this House, clothed with the privilege of discharging the duty of representative of constituencies that, in many cases, have a large number of Irishmen—they have stood still for nine weeks without offering one word of encouragement to the leaders of the Home Rule movement, or presenting any resolution in order to back up Mr. Gladstone in the enormous task he has undertaken.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the House rose, I was endeavoring to present some ideas with reference to what I conceived to be the duty of the representatives in this House on this important question. I endeavored to show what I conceived to be the reasons why the Government had chosen to take the course they have taken in interfering with the resolution that has been presented by the leader on this side of the House. I am sorry that hon. gentlemen opposite have not seen it to be their duty to go further in meeting the views of the leader of the Opposition, than by moving an amendment simply to confirm the resolution we adopted in 1882. I contend we ought to be in a position to go further than that. We have had the experience of four years. We have seen the unfortunate results of the disturbances that have existed in Ireland; we have read from year to year the unfortunate occurrences that have take place there. I am sure we must be convinced that there must be some necessity for a change in the system of Government, that would remove those unfortunate circumstances that have been so plainly brought before us, and that the House should

not say that after all the experiences we have had, after all the experiences we have had ourselves as a confederacy, we are not in a position to go further than simply confirm what we did in 1882. We have had ourselves four years more experience. We enjoy a measure of home rule, which has been a real advantage. It is conceded by each of the Provinces, notwithstanding unfortunate interferences that have taken place between the Dominion Government and the Provinces from time to time, that our condition is better than it was prior to Confederation. Well, then, after having those experiences, and after having seen what we have seen in regard to Ireland, are we not in a position to go further than to re-affirm what we did in 1882. I think we ought to be able to go further, and we are not discharging our duty as fellow-subjects with the people of Ireland if we are not prepared to do so. I would ask if the statesmen of England are not holding different opinions to-day to what they did in 1882. Are not the public men who were hostile to Home Rule then, who characterised it as breaking up the empire and even worse, admitting that some change is necessary? Is Mr. Gladstone of the same mind to-day as he was four years ago? He is not. He has come to the conclusion that the change is necessary. We have been eye-witnesses of those experiences in Ireland, and if we are not in a position to go further than simply confirm what we did in 1882 we have not been sensible of the incidents that have transpired in the meantime and not been faithful observers of what has passed before our eyes. I contend that we should go even further than the resolution itself. If the amendment had added force to the resolution it should have been seriously considered. I must again express regret that the question has not been approached in a spirit of liberality and fairness by hon. gentlemen opposite. I am sorry to think that little political bitternesses should influence members on this great question and should interfere with the decision of this House with respect to it. Simply because hon. gentlemen opposite think the leader of the Opposition might make a little capital out of this question, they interfere and actually risk the chance of reaching a conclusion on it such as would be satisfactory to our friends on the other side of the water and such as would in some measure strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone. I hope, whatever bitterness may have characterised the discussions so far, we will abandon those little political bickerings and deal with the question fairly, and let us get over the matter with that measure of credit to ourselves which we should like to claim. We may contend about our own political questions, but when a subject of this kind affecting a portion of the Empire is brought forward we should be able to bury our political differences and deal with it in a spirit of generosity, kindness and British fair play. Holding that feeling; and being deirous as an Irishman to do everything in my power to aid the efforts being put forth by Mr. Gladstone in favor of Home Rule, I beg to move in amendment to the amendment:

To leave out all the words in the amendment after "that" and insert the following words in addition thereto, after the word "adhesion:"

And that this House is confirmed and strengthened by the events which have occurred since the passage of the said address in its convictions that the true interests both of Ireland and the rest of the Empire will be served in the highest degree by the granting of Home Rule to Ireland.

Mr. BURNS. I am afraid, notwithstanding all the professions made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that his actions are not entirely uninfluenced by party considerations. The whole tenor and temper of the speech of the hon. gentleman could only leave the impression on one's mind that political considerations were largely at the bottom of his action and statements. I shall not in any way try to disprove what the hon. gentleman has stated, when he said he was actuated by the desire to secure as far as possible the passage of some measure which would go to strengthen the hands of those who are now endeavoring to strike the chains from off the feet of Ireland; but while giving him credit for being influenced by that motive, I cannot divest myself of the idea that within and behind there are also political considerations. The observations which he addressed to the House can leave no other impression on my mind, and because that impression is on my mind, I must so express myself. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech, has charged the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue with being derelict in his duty to his countryman in not bringing forward, for the consideration of the House, some resolution of this kind. It comes with very ill grace from the hon. gentleman, or from any hon. gentleman in this House, to charge the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue with being now or of ever having been derelict in his duty to his countryman. The record of that hon. gentleman, as an Irishman, stands to-day as high as that of any Irishman, or any man in the Dominion of Canada. In the Province to which he belongs, no name carries with it greater weight than the name of John Costigan, the Minister of Inland Revenue. He has from time to time proved his devotedness to his countrymen on every occasion which presented itself, he was not slow in advocating their interest when attacked. In 1882, in the face of opposition from his own party, he introduced into this House a series of resolutions, which were carried unanimously, or almost unanimously. What has the hon. gentleman to gain by the introduction of those resolutions? No political advantage for himself; he never sought for any political advantage——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BURNS. No, he never did. If he had sought for political advantages for himself these advantages might have accrued to him long before that. He was actuated, I am sure, by the sole desire of serving in some way the country he claimed as his own, though he was not a native of it. Prior to 1882 it can be said of him that he proved his devotedness to his countrymen, to their interests—their religious interests especially—on every occasion when they were attacked. Then, I say, it comes with a very poor grace from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down to charge the Minister of Inland Revenue with having in any way deserted his country, or the cause of his country. The facts are as stated by the Minister, that it was suggested to him that resolutions of this kind should be introduced, but after consultation with those with whom he was associated, with his countrymen if you will, it was deemed inexpedient, or unnecessary rather, that resolutions of this nature should be introduced, and why? Because in 1882 the Parliament of Canada had passed resolutions, and we knew the treatment they received. We know the reply which was given to the address; and therefore, in face of that fact, it was deemed unnecessary now, with that record of the opinion of the Canadian Parliament standing before the Imperial Government, to re-introduce similar resolutions. It was because of the conclusion arrived at that the hon. Minister deemed it unnecessary, I say, to take action in the matter. Was the action of the hon. leader of the Opposition a spontaneous action? He said in his speech that he had waited until the last moment, waited to hear from this side of the House. One would be led to infer from that statement that the action of the hon. gentleman was a spontaneous one. I would ask was it not after that hon. gentleman had been waited upon and asked to move those resolutions, that they were introduced. Was the action one of his own motion? I leave the question to him to answer. At all events current rumor has it that he did not move until he was moved, and we know that as the leader of a great party in the Dominion of Canada, he was very likely to be influenced by political considerations, if he thought his political interest and the interest of his party could be

served by bringing forward these resolutions, in order that he might catch the Irish vote of the Dominion of Canada. Well, the Irish vote of the Dominion of Canada is not so easily caught as that. The Irish voters of the Dominion of Canada can distinguish grain from chaff; they know who their real friends are, and are able to discriminate between those who are their real friends and those who are not. The fact stands to-day in the presence of the House, that not one Irish Catholic sits in the House except on the Conservative side. What the electors in 1882 did—that is the Irish Catholic portion of them—I feel satisfied they will repeat on the next occasion that presents itself, and therefore the efforts and labors of the hon. gentleman will have all been in vain. I do not wish to trouble the House with any lengthy remarks. No one feels more strongly than I do for the cause of Ireland, my native land. No one feels a stronger desire to see her relieved from the thraldom in which she has been enslaved. No one would go further in rendering a service to his country than I would. I have before my consideration to-night two resolutions. One resolution means the sending of an address to Her Majesty, referring to the Irish question, and expresses the sentiment of the Canadian Parliament thereon, and the other re-affirms the sentiments contained in the resolutions passed in 1882. I consider that the amendment moved by the Minister of Inland Revenue embodies the ideas and sentiments and feelings of the great majority of the Irishmen of this Dominion, and because I believe so I will support that amendment.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It seems, Sir, to be assumed by all who have yet spoken on this question, that this House is so unanimous in an expression of opinion in favor of Home Rule for Ireland, as embodied in the Bill brought in by Mr. Gladstone, or in some similar measure, as to pass in favor of that question by unanimous consent. Now, Sir, I, for one, view with the very gravest apprehension as to the result, not only to Ireland and the best interests of Ireland, but also to the Empire at large, of the measure introduced by Mr. Gladstone, and chiefly for this reason, that I do not believe any measure, which is the mere child of terror, forced on a man contrary to his convictions, contrary to the convictions of his own party and the nation at large, is likely to be attended with any great measure of success. Now, before proceeding further with that view of the question, I wish to claim the attention of the hon. mover of the first resolution, and I congratulate him upon this fact, that whatever the result of this motion may be, that hon. gentleman has shown that he has found one more point upon which he can stand and hold his party together, and carry them with him, in addition to the policy which was so fully developed the night before last, the policy of slander. On that occasion I noticed, whether from accident or design, he left the development of that policy to his able lieutenants, and certainly to one of them it was a congenial and suitable task. The hon. gentleman was not present to vote on that occasion. I can hardly suppose it was the result of design, but, at any rate, it had a singular appearance, when a proposition was laid before this House, a proposition which any member could hardly, in the abstract, have dissented from, that he was not present to take part in the discussion, a discussion, which, like everything else the hon. gentleman introduces, succeeded, by the personalities with which it was connected in the course of the debate which followed, in landing him, as it always will land that hon. gentleman, so long as he pursues the policy——

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. I would ask whether this is an allusion to a past debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Well, then, I congratulate the hon. gentleman upon the position in which he stands, and upon his peculiar suitability for the position that he has taken as the mover of this resolution. I hope this remark may not be considered out of order. He poses—I withdraw that word, because it implies a charge of insincerity; but that hon. gentleman stands in the position, among laymen, of a declared supporter of evangelical protestantism in Ontario; and yet he comes forward here as the champion of a measure which every Protestant in Ireland views as dangerous and perilous to his liberties.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No!

Mr. O'BRIEN. Before I have done I will bring forward strong evidence on that point. The hon. gentleman, I say, stands in that respect in a peculiarly happy position as the mover of this resolution. It might be supposed also that as a great lawyer, as a man who has gained his eminence in this country by his practice at the bar, and by his knowledge of constitutional law which is often boasted of, he would not be so ready to support a measure which sets all law at defiance. There never was a system of coercion in Ireland to be compared with the terrorism exercised by the Land League since Mr. Parnell has been occupying his present position; and it is somewhat singular that anyone can be found to support a body whose recognised agents have endeavored, and unfortunately too often successfully, to carry out their measures by the vilest crimes that any man can possibly conceive of. Hon. gentlemen will remember that upon this day four years ago, two men who landed in Ireland charged with a message of peace, which, if there had been time given to utter it, might have very much changed the position of affairs, were cut off by assassination before they were allowed to utter it. Now, I have a word to say to the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. That hon. gentleman has spoken throughout this debate as though he alone had a right to speak on behalf of the Irish members of this House. I should like to have that hon. gentleman's definition of what an Irish member is. I should like to know who are the Irish members of this House. Are they those who, like himself, are of the Roman Catholic religion, and are also supporters of Home Rule?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman is laboring under a misapprehension as to the position I assumed in speaking on my own behalf as mover of the Irish resolutions. I have assumed that position in face of the unanimous vote given in favor of that resolution; and, as I stated before, I do not believe that position is binding on anyone who dissents from the resolution which was then adopted.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I accept the hon. gentleman's explanation so far as it goes; but I desire to say this, that I utterly repudiate the idea that those gentlemen who support Mr. Parnell's doctrines as to what is best for the Government of Ireland, can be said to represent what is popularly called the Irish people, except so far as they speak for their own following in that country. I want that hon. gentleman to understand—and I think I am perfectly justified in making the remark—that there is a very large population in Ireland who have no sympathy with Mr. Parnell's doctrines or his movement, and who do not recognise him in any way as a leader. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether an Ulster Orangeman or a Protestant from the west of Ireland has not just as much right to speak in this House on behalf of that portion of the population of Ireland who are opposed to the principle of Home Rule, who look upon it as disastrous and perilous to their best interests, as anyone who believes in the position assumed by Mr. Parnell. Now, Sir, I, for one, occupy precisely the same position as the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. I

am the descendant of an Irish family, which at least has borne a not ignoble part in the history of that country; and I say, as representing that class of Irishmen to which I am now alluding, that I protest against any measure such as that introduced by Mr. Gladstone, which bristles with objectionable features, and which I think should be defeated on the ground that if it is passed something worse must follow. When the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue or other hon. gentlemen undertake to speak on behalf of the people of Ireland, I think it only fair to mention that at least one-third of the population of Ireland, including the great bulk of the Protestant population, and a large minority of Roman Catholics, who do not believe in the doctrines of Mr. Parnell, look on Mr. Gladstone's measure as disastrous to the country, and have protested and do protest in the strongest manner against it. They have taken very many occasions to express that opinion; and to show the depth of their feeling, I think I may be allowed to quote the remarks made by a member of the English House of Commons, whose name is historical, and who will, I think, be accepted as an authority on the subject. I allude to Mr. Plunkett, who, I think, is the member for the University of Dublin. At a public meeting recently held, that gentleman used the following language :—

"I wish I could realise for you the feelings of anxious grief, almost of despair, with which the loyalists of Ireland regard the present crisis. We foresee that our country, where we were born and bred, with which every hope and every affection and every tradition of our lives is bound up, will be committed to a condition of squalid poverty and violent social disorder which before long is almost certain to end in civil war."

These are serious words; they were uttered under a full sense of their importance, and I think they may be accepted as expressing the feeling of the minority of the people of Ireland towards the measure now before the Imperial House of Commons. But, Sir, the most serious objection to that measure, and the one which we, as Canadians, are most entitled to consider, apart from any sympathy which we may feel, as I do, with that Protestant minority, is that it is regarded by Mr. Parnell and his followers, whatever may be said to the contrary, as a mere lever by which they may accomplish what they really desire—that is, the complete isolation and independence of Ireland. In proof of that, I may cite no less an authority than Mr. Parnell himself, who, speaking at Cincinnati so long ago as 1880, said :

"None of us, whether in America or in Ireland, or wherever we may be, will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link that keeps Ireland bound to England."

And that language has been repeated time and again. It was repeated only the other day by Mr. Davitt, one of Mr. Parnell's most trusted lieutenants, who, when asked if he approved of the Bill now before Parliament, replied: "When a man gets his breakfast, is it to be said that he should not get his dinner ?"—meaning thus to illustrate his feeling towards that measure; and if it is carried, even with modifications, can anyone believe that those who support it in Ireland would stop short of claiming absolute independence ? Mr. Gladstone has put a weapon in their hands, which I am sure they will not be slow to use. Why, did not that hon. gentleman say, when speaking of the laws made for Ireland: "Laws might be good in themselves, but not be accepted by the people because they came in a foreign garb." He there laid down the doctrine, from which I most decidely dissent, that anything connected with England is foreign to Ireland. Now, what will be the necessary consequence, which will result from the absurd anomaly, looking at it from a constitutional point of view, no matter what one's politics may be, that taxation is to be unaccompanied by representation. The hon. gentleman proposes that the officials of what he himself said is a foreign country, shall hold possession of Ireland. If that is to be the case, how long will the Irish people consent to such foreign domination ? I consider it a great misfortune that Mr. Gladstone should have used that word; but it is not a misfortune in the sense that the use of it gave the people of the Empire to understand what will be the necessary and inevitable results of the measure he has introduced. Not to be tedious, I will briefly refer to another objection, which, from an Irish point of view, is a most serious objection. I cannot understand how an Irishman, with any ambition beyond a mere provincial ambition, can give his consent to a measure which will degrade Ireland from the position of an integral part of the Empire to that of a mere Province. This, in the converse form, was well put by Lord Clare at the time of the Union, and, though hon. gentlemen may criticise his conduct and say his opinion was of little value, he was a man of surpassing ability, whose opinions necessarily carried great weight, and who may fairly be given as an authority on this matter, when he asked, putting the converse of his proposition: "What Irishman and what man who valued the independence and welfare of his country, would wish it to be degraded from the position of being an integral and governing part of the Empire to that of a mere mercenary Province ?" That is precisely what Mr. Gladston's Bill will do, and I am astonished any man of ambition should support a measure which will cut him off from all Imperial employment and Imperial honors. How could any man in Ireland, no matter what his ability, expect promotion or employment in the Imperial service ? How could he expect to be anything better than the official of a mere Provincial Government, when he had no longer a voice or representation in the conduct of the affairs of the Empire. It is a matter, not of congratulation, but of humiliation, to think that there should be a party in Ireland which will declare to the English people that they want to shut themselves out from the dignity and responsibility attached to their position as citizens of an integral part of the Empire at large, and become degraded to the position of mere provincialists. Take our Provinces. Is it not considered a higher position to have a seat in this House, to have something to say in the management of the affairs of the Dominion, than to have a seat in one of our Provincial Legislatures ? Would any Irishman of ability be satisfied that he should be restricted to a mere provincial position ? Would he not desire to be enabled to gratify his legitimate ambition for a share in the management of the Empire ? Would he not consider it humiliating that it should be placed out of his power to take any part in the management of the Empire, and that his country should be reduced to the position of a large municipality ? For these reasons, I am disinclined to say anything, which, however remotely, may tend to strengthen Mr. Gladstone in this measure. Mr. Gladstone made a very singular statement in his manifesto the other day. He said the opposition to Home Rule came from a single class. But do we not know well, does not every gentleman who takes an interest in public proceedings know, that the opposition to Home Rule is not confined to any one class, is not confined to the hangers-on of any one particular class, as Mr. Gladstone politely put it ? Do we not find men like Mr. Goschen, Mr. Collings, Mr. Rylands, Mr. Chamberlain, to say nothing of Lord Hartington, Lord Derby, and Lord Salisbury, showing their faith in the true interests of the Empire by their opposition to this measure ? When we see leading Radicals casting their radicalism aside, and standing forward as champions of Imperial interests, it is certainly time to give this matter more serious consideration. How many hon. members here who are prepared to vote on the resolution proposed, really know anything, or have read anything, or have thought anything, about Irish affairs ? Have they considered the necessary consequences to Ireland which will result from the carrying out of this proposed measure ? Have they ever considered what will be the position of what is called the minority, and

what will be the effect, commercially, if this measure should pass? One of the great troubles of Ireland is that it is a poor country, but where has the money come from which has been employed in that country during the last century in the promotion of public works? It has come from England, and is it to be supposed that if this measure should pass and a great shock be given to the constitution of the country—is it to be supposed that if the Government of Ireland should be handed over to the 86 men who follow Mr. Parnell, English capital will continue to flow into Ireland? It is more than likely on the contrary it will flow out. This is a consideration that ought to weigh with those who profess, and no doubt honestly feel, an interest in the welfare of Ireland. It is a consideration which ought to make us pause, and which is well worth the consideration of those who desire, however earnestly, Home Rule. I think that a measure forced upon a man against his convictions, because it is only a few months ago that Mr. Gladstone, speaking of Mr. Parnell, said he was marching through rapine to dismemberment and disintegration, can hardly be said to be an honest, well considered measure. The humiliation of the country, by reducing it from the position of an integral governing part of a great Empire to that of a province, is one that ought to come home to men like my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), who, if in Ireland, would hardly be satisfied to occupy the position of a mere provincial. I heard the hon. gentleman's eloquent speech which we all admire and few can imitate, and I ask if men like him in Ireland would not feel very cheap if their abilities had to be restricted to parish politics.

Mr. CURRAN. I am a Home Ruler to the mast head.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The hon. gentleman is no doubt patriotic, and may to some extent be self-sacrificing. What would be the effect on English politics had Home Rule been granted half a century ago? How many Irishmen whose names are illustrious in the annals of the Empire would have been heard of? How many mute and inglorious Miltons would have gone down to obscure graves? What would have become of Lalor Shiel, Daniel O'Connell himself, Burke, Sheridan, Grattan, and a host of others? Those men would have had no voice in the British Parliament, and would have been compelled, I will not say to waste their sweetness on the desert air, but to waste their eloquence on the quarrels of the small, miserable factions such as existed in Ireland before the Union. What would have been the loss to the country had such a state of things been brought about half a century ago? The commercial question alone is one of serious moment, because we cannot believe that, if the revolutionary measures proposed by Mr. Gladstone be carried, English capital will continue to flow into Ireland. Talk of the country not being prosperous; will anyone who has read about the condition of Ireland half a century ago, and who has travelled through Ireland in these days, fail to recognise that it is a greatly improved country? There has, no doubt, been suffering there; so there has been everywhere else, but there has also been decided improvement in its condition. The people are not so poor, as many people would lead us to believe, great material progress has been made; and are we now to lose all chance of further progress? Are we to gratify the wishes of what I honestly believe to be nothing more than a faction, who have sincerity, no doubt, but are actuated by motives that fall short of anything like true patriotism. Holding these views, believing as I do that this measure is one that ought not to pass the Imperial Parliament, I raise my voice here in protest against it; and, as far as voting upon the resolutions now before the House is concerned, I shall vote for the amendment of Mr. Costigan, simply on this ground——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Hon. gentlemen may cheer, but let me finish my sentence—simply that it is just the one resolution of all the three that I think is likely to have the least effect.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I desire to address a few words to the House on this very important matter. The question of the government of Ireland is one that has engaged the attention of the greatest statesmen that have lived in Britain during the last half century. The minds of those statesmen have been engaged in striving to solve the problem for the better government of Ireland. It is well known that Ireland has been oppressed; it is well known that a system of landlordism has prevailed in Ireland that has disturbed the peace and marred the happiness and tranquillity that otherwise would have existed there. Various expedients have been thought of; various expedients have been devised with a view of ameliorating this condition and giving to Ireland control of her own affairs. Ireland has asked and sought for this, but she has always asked and sought in vain. A short time ago, you will remember that, when it was announced that that distinguished statesman who leads the Government of the British Empire, the Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone, was about to propose a measure for the amelioration of this condition of affairs in Ireland, that he had a measure to propose that he thought would bring about peace, would relieve the distress, and stay the crime that had marked itself in Ireland for the past half century or more, the nations of the world stood as it were on tip-toe anxiously awaiting the utterances of that distinguished statesman. No question introduced in the Parliament of Britian in the last century has moved the hearts of the people of the civilised world as much as that which has been proposed by the distinguished Premier of Britain; and when we read the oration which he delivered on that occasion, an oration which at once stamps him as a God-like man and a statesman without a peer in the civilised world to-day, the hearts of the people of Canada—not only the Irish hearts, but the Canadian hearts and the heart of every other true loyal Briton—went up in the refrain that Ireland might be reclaimed from the bondage under which she had suffered by the measures handed to the House by the distinguished Premier of Britain. And it is not to be wondered at. Ireland is great in many respects; she is renowned for her statesmen, her orators and her poets; she has a climate that is salubrious; she has vegetation that surpasses almost anything in the world, and the generous hearted people that inhabit Ireland have been oppressed and have sought for relief. Well, if they felt they were oppressed, had they not a right to say so, and, if they were misgoverned, had they not a right to amend this condition of things? Why, it is but the natural outcome, and crime is but the result of the misgovernment. It is not a trait of the Irish character, and the crimes that have been committed have not been committed by the Irish people themselves. They have been but a result of misgovernment and oppression. No wonder that there was a distinguished O'Connell, a Burke, a Curran and a Grattan, who rose up; but it was the times, to a great extent, that made these men; it was the oppression that rankled in their hearts that led them to stand forth as the champions of liberty and of freedom, and their names to-day are dear to Irishmen, and to every lover of liberty to whatever nation he belongs. Well, the nations of the world were moved when it was announced that Gladstone was to speak, and we read that speech, a speech distinguished for its statesmanship and its brilliancy, a speech that was unequalled in the British House of Parliament, with a measure that was generous and just. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) seems to think that every condition in the measure proposed is vital and essential. The Premier says, with regard to the representation in the Imperial Parliament, that it is not a vital principle,

it is liable to be amended, and all that the member for Muskoka has objected to in that respect—and that is the principal objection he used to the measure — is likely to be amended so that Irishmen will represent Ireland in the Imperial Parliament. The hearts of the Old Country people in this country and the hearts of the Canadians in this country go up in fervid accord, a united people in this country outside of this House, in hoping that Gladstone may be sustained and that his arms may be strengthened so that he may be enabled to give to Ireland what she has asked for many years past. It is the desire of every patriotic man in this House that the wrongs under which Ireland has suffered shall be redressed, that the landlordism that has existed and that has oppressed the poor tenants in that country shall be done away with, that eviction and coercions of every kind shall be taken away from the law that governs Ireland, and Ireland shall yet be free, shall have her own Parliament, shall make her own laws, shall have her own Home Rule in effect. Well, this is natural, that we should sympathise with the distinguished statesman who has brought in this measure, a measure which, by reason of the traditions, by reason of those conditions that have existed in the hearts of other parts of the British Empire—traditions that have been formed, prejudices that have been grounded in the people—has met with much opposition; but it is the desire of true Canadians and true Britons that Ireland may receive that measure of justice which she has clamored for, which she has demanded, and which she has a right to expect. Are the Irish people, because they ask liberty, to be stamped out as rebels? Are the Canadians who desire a change in our constitution to be said to be rebels? Are those who are now in this country seeking a change in our constitution and desiring Imperial Federation rebels? The First Minister himself is advocating radical changes in the constitution of this country, and for that is he a rebel? And is Mr. Gladstone, when he is redressing wrongs, stamping out injuries which have existed for centuries in Ireland, not deserving the support, the united support of this Parliament in the most important dependency of the British Empire, supposed to be represented by those who are true to the parent stem from whence we sprung? Now, Sir, in reference to the resolution introduced here some years ago, strongly as I felt that the wrongs of Ireland should be redressed, I saw that there was no practicable measure before the Imperial Parliament, and I thought it was inexpedient to introduce the question here, it appeared to me to be devised for the purpose of securing popularity to those who introduced it. It would not look to be a sincere and an honest thing. But to-day, when there is a practicable scheme, we see the author of the resolution in 1882 now shrinking from enforcing the principles he professes to admire. The member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) says he is a Home Ruler, and to-day he fears to urge this measure lest it might do some harm in one quarter or another. If the hon. gentleman was sincere in his efforts then for Home Rule and liberty to Ireland, he should be more so now, when there is a reasonable probability that the wrongs under which Ireland has labored so long are about to be redressed by the Liberal and enlightened measure of the distinguished statesman of Great Britain. When the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) spoke on that measure, he made a speech that will cause his name to live wherever the English language is spoken for all time to come. He based his speech on a broad and liberal platform, and it was characterised by that broad view which he brings to bear upon every question, and showed that he had made such an elaborate research into the affairs of Ireland, that it has endeared me to that hon. gentleman with stronger ties than ever I felt before. Well, Sir, the Minister of Inland Revenue was not in the Government then. He was then a humble follower, a private in the ranks. He introduced this resolution, and shortly afterwards, he entered the Government. Now, he thinks that all this should cease, that there is no necessity now for this House endeavoring to strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone and his Government, in the face of the opposition they meet with. At that time, there was no practical scheme before the British Parliament for the amelioration of the condition of Ireland, and yet that hon. gentleman moved the resolution. His utterances, to-day, give me an idea that he is not sincere, and that so soon as that gentleman got into office, the wrongs that had cried out for redress for a century, might continue to cry so long as that hon. gentleman enjoyed the spoils of office. Does it not look like that? So soon as he was transferred from the ranks into the Government, to use the words of one of Ireland's poets:

> "He forgot the dust from whence he grew,
> And thinks himself—the Lord knows who."

Now, that is the difference caused by the sweets of office, and it is a lamentable thing. I am glad the hon. gentleman is not entirely Irish. I would hate to see an Irishman give up the struggle for Ireland so long as a single wrong remained unredressed, and it is my great consolation to know that the Minister of Inland Revenue is not truly an Irishman, for otherwise he would not allow the charms of office, with the emoluments of office, to make him forget the wrongs that have cried out for redress so long. Now, Sir, Mr. Gladstone's scheme is capable of amendment. Mr. Gladstone indicates that it may be amended in committee, and that the principle of representation without taxation shall not be maintained. There is not an hon. gentleman opposite who should oppose the measure upon that ground. They have taxed the people in the North-West from year to year without representation. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), opposes that. The hon. member supports a Government that allowed that condition of things to exist until it bred rebellion in that country, and still he had not a single word to say against the Government that permitted that system. And here he condemns Mr. Gladstone, who has since stated, and other distinguished members of his Government have stated, that modifications may be made in order to meet the wishes of the people of Great Britain and Ireland. Now, Sir, when a society sent a deputation to wait on the Minister of Inland Revenue, he told them that it would be injudicious to introduce this measure now.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, I did not. If the hon. gentleman had been in the House he would have heard me correct that statement made by the newspapers. I made no such statement.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have just read it in the Ottawa *Citizen*, and that is the excuse given. I did not hear him deny that he had made that statement. Then if he had not this good excuse, in heaven's name, what excuse had he? What other excuse could he bring, when the wrongs of Ireland had gone on unredressed so long? If he had had the virtue of clinging to that excuse I would have given him some credit, but now he has taken away all the merit he might have, and has no other reason to offer than the fact that he is now in office and that it might possibly hurt the Government if he went on with it. Then the Government are responsible for what he did. He thinks this is extraordinary statesmanship, endorsed, no doubt, by the Premier, and the Minister of Public Works who seconded his amendment. They sent a telegram to Mr. Parnell. Parnell is not introducing this measure. Why not send it to Mr. Gladstone? If they do not desire to give it a party significance, why not approach the foot of the Throne? If ever the First Minister grows eloquent it is when he talks about the "foot of the Throne." I wonder why he did not lay this grievance at the foot of the Throne.

I think the member for Muskoka described Parnell as a robber, or something of that kind, and here we have the Government, through the Minister Inland Revenue, communicating with a gentleman whom the member for Muskoka dubs as a rebel, or something worse. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think all the lovers of freedom in this House will support the amendment to the amendment that has been moved by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I rather favor that. There is a word in the motion proposed by the leader of the Opposition which I would like to see left out. I will read the first sentence and point out the word, which I think might be left out because it gives it a narrowness which the motion ought not to have, I wish to see that one word "Irish" left out and "Her Majesty's subjects" inserted.

Mr. BLAKE. I would explain to the hon. gentleman that that word is in the original address, which I was following in that paragraph, and that is the reason it is there.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is the address passed in 1882?

Mr. BLAKE. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is quite satisfactory.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The explanation as given is somewhat satisfactory no doubt; but it is not quite satisfactory to my mind because it has a broader signification

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And if there was an error at that time in the address I do not see why it should not be corrected now. With the motion of the leader of the Opposition I am heartily in accord. I am also heartily in accord with the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I cannot understand that any gentleman who professes to be Irish, or any gentleman who professes to be liberal, anyone who professes to be loyal to Britain and British institutions, would refuse to pass the address at this time, when a Home Rule measure has been so far successful that in all human probability it will carry, and will become the law that will govern Ireland; a measure calculated, we must all admit, when we read the speech of the distinguished Mr. Gladstone, to cause us to wonder that statesmen of Britain had not devised a plan before. We wonder that Ireland should have been left so long crying for redress of its grievances. Mr. Gladstone's measure appears so simple, so statesmanlike, so broad, so much in accordance with the principles of liberty, freedom and eternal justice, that we wonder it was deferred so long, that the problem of the proper government of Ireland had been left to be solved by Mr. Gladstone in the zenith of his power, of his years and of his greatness, and that it had been left to him to introduce a measure comprehensive, liberal and just, a measure calculated to right the wrong that had existed so long, calculated to remove those grievances that had goaded the Irish people so long, calculated to remove the system of landlordism that had ground down the people of that country into a state of almost abject slavery. Is such a measure of statesmanship to be ignored by this House? I hope for the honor of the Canadian people this House will not come to such a decision. I speak here as a Canadian and a Protestant, and speaking from that standpoint I believe it is necessary in the interests of all the people in this country, irrespective of religion, creed or nationality, to come forward at this moment and assist Mr. Gladstone, and do all they can to strengthen his hands so that his statesmanlike measure may be carried into effect.

Mr. ORTON. I desire, before recording my vote on this very important question, to make a few brief remarks. Unlike many of the hon. members who have preceded me, I have not the honor of being an Irishman or the descendant of an Irishman, but I happen to be an English Canadian. At the same time I have for many years been in favor of Home Rule for Ireland. As far as my humble ability would allow me to judge, I have always held that to grant Home Rule to Ireland would be the best means of strengthening the British Empire and causing Ireland to be like what we desire Canada to be, more closely allied to the British Crown and the fortunes of the British Empire. I believe Home Rule for Ireland would have the effect of strengthening rather than weakening the British Empire. But while I hold these views I do not consider the system of Home Rule about to be inaugurated by Mr. Gladstone, is one that is calculated to strengthen the British Empire; it is not one calculated to elevate Ireland to the extent that Home Rule should elevate that country and improve its condition. In the first place, the reason why I am opposed to the resolution of the leader of the Opposition is because it endorses the Home Rule principle laid down by Mr. Gladstone.

An hon. MEMBER. No, it does not.

Mr. ORTON. I say that is not calculated to do good to Ireland. The principle laid down in the Home Rule proposition of Mr. Gladstone is one simply of local government in minor particulars and on minor points. It is not proposed to give to Ireland the management of her own customs revenue or her own Excise revenue, and I hold that the only way in which Ireland can ever be largely benefited is by giving to that country the management of its own customs duties, so that it can encourage its own manufactures and furnish additional channels for the employment of the people. That, in my opinion, is the only possible way in which a material improvement in the condition of the people can be brought about. One of the greatest causes of the misery and the unfortunate condition of affairs in Ireland to-day is because the Irish people are nearly altogether an agricultural people. They have no possibility of successfully competing with the accumulated capital of England and other manufacturing countries unless the Irish people have complete control over the Customs duties; and unless this is secured they can never hope to have large manufacturing establishments in Ireland. It is for this reason I cannot agree with the resolution of the leader of the Opposition. I do not feel the same fear as do some of my Protestant friends that the Protestant minority in Ireland will be oppressed. It is possible that such might occur under certain conditions, and I think a scheme should have been devised so as to have specially guarded their interests; while I am afraid the scheme of Mr. Gladstone is one that is devised to give opportunity for the oppression of the Protestant minority. We have seen the same thing in our own country, and I would like to see extended to the Protestant minority, in Ireland, the same principles that we extend to the Catholic minority in Ontario and the Dominion, and the same careful consideration of the minority as is conceded to the Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec. But that, in my opinion, is not provided for in the measure that has been submitted to the British House of Commons, and therefore I say that I cannot support the resolution of the leader of the Opposition, because it causes this House to accede to the principle laid down by Mr. Gladstone in his Home Rule resolutions, and those principles are not the principles which I would like to see carried out. I would like to see the people of Ireland more closely allied to the British Crown. I would like to see them have representation in the British House of Commons; I would like to see them partake in the expenditure for the peace and preser-

vation of the British Empire; I would like to see them contribute, as no doubt they will be able to contribute, to the support of the British army and navy; and I would like to see Irishmen join with Scotchmen and Englishmen, and all the other peoples that constitute the Empire, in sharing the glories of the British arms in defending the rights of British subjects. For that reason it is most essential to the prosperity of Ireland, most essential to the unity of the Empire, that there should be Irish representation in the British House of Commons. It is utterly impossible, considering the position which Ireland occupies, in such close proximity to England and Scotland, that she should be separated in the manner in which Mr. Gladstone proposes to separate her from England and Scotland. Therefore, Sir, I shall not vote for the resolution of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I say that the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is merely an addition to the resolution of his leader. It seems certainly a very singular position the hon. gentlemen occupy. First one hon. gentleman gets up and moves an amendment to his leader's resolution, and if that amendment means anything it means that he believes his leader is not in earnest, that he has not sufficiently strongly expressed his feelings in favor of Home Rule—the abstract principle of Home Rule—and he has moved this amendment to his leader's motion in order to make it more emphatic and perhaps more general in its character. Then again we find that another hon. gentleman on the same side has another objection. He objects to the expression of "Her Majesty's Irish subjects," and wants to give it a still broader meaning. Therefore, I say, that the position they occupy is not a united one; it is not one which is calculated to carry with it that weight and strength that such a resolution should do in this House and I must say that the amendment made by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is one we could all unite upon. It does not express approval of the exact character of the Home Rule introduced by Mr. Gladstone, but it does approve of a form of Home Rule which will unite Ireland more permanently to the British Crown, which will unite instead of trying to dissever Ireland from the British Empire, and, therefore, I say, it is more thoroughly British in its character; it is more in the interests of Ireland, and it is more in accord with the sentiments and feelings of the vast majority of the people of this country, who desire to see Ireland enjoy the same liberty and freedom that we enjoy in Canada under the British flag.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House on this subject more than a very few moments. It is one with reference to which I should have liked to have addressed the House after having had some opportunity of considering what I was going to say about it. I think the magnitude of the question is such as to demand that it should be discussed with the best ability that all the members of this House are able, individually, to direct to it, and, therefore, I have no intention at the present time of attempting to make a speech on the subject. I wish, however, briefly to explain what my views are on this subject, how I shall vote, and why I shall vote as I do. Before doing so, however, I should like to congratulate the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, on at last having discovered a policy. I am sorry, however, that I cannot congratulate him on the nature of the policy he has discovered. That policy is a policy of discord. The hon. gentleman knows as well as he knows that a soul is in his body that the people of this country, the people of the Dominion of Canada, entertain views with reference to this question as wide as the poles asunder. The hon. gentleman knows that in his own city of Toronto, the other day a meeting was held, attended by some of the best informed and most influential men in Canada, and that at that meeting views were expressed diametrically opposed to the views that hon. gentleman presented to us to-day. He knows, too, that the sentiments to which I have referred are sentiments which may very readily be stirred deeply in the breasts of the people of this country. He knows also that this question has excited such an agitation in England as neither he nor I have seen before. He knows that England, that Great Britain and Ireland are divided into hostile camps on this subject. He knows very well that Great Britain and Ireland are in the throes of such an agitation as they have never seen before, in reference to this very question, and that an agitation so fierce is in progress there that actually the fearful and awful words "civil war" are whispered from lip to lip.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but he knows that.

Mr. BLAKE. No, he does not.

Mr. McNEILL. Well, if he does not, he should read the newspapers or correspond with his friends in Ireland and he would know it. He knows that, and he knows how deeply that question may stir up feelings of animosity among men who are to-day neighbors and friends, and yet he had no hesitation in going out of his way to introduce this question and thrust it into the minds and hearts of the people of this country, irrespective altogether of the terrible results which may accrue. However, I do not mean to say the hon. gentleman is inconsistent, because we found the hon. gentleman the other day perfectly prepared to stir up or, at all events, to side with a movement which most people in this country deem likely to introduce inter-provincial strife in this country, and it is perfectly consistent with such a policy that the hon. gentleman should introduce into Canada the question and press home to the minds and hearts of the people the question which he has now introduced. Nevertheless, I think the hon. gentleman will find that he has not succeeded in doing anything so very clever as probably he supposes he is doing. At any rate, he has done something dangerous in the hope of doing something clever. Sir, I say the hon. gentleman has gone out of his way to do this, because on the last occasion when this question was before this House, at a time when it was very differently viewed and regarded both in this country and in the mother country from the manner in which it is regarded to-day, the Government of Mr. Gladstone, by the mouth of his Colonial Secretary, informed us that it was not a question with which we ought to intermeddle at all. Yet notwithstanding that the hon. gentleman proposes that we shall open up this question.

Mr. MILLS. He has changed his mind and we haven't.

Mr. McNEILL. Yes, Mr. Gladstone has changed his mind; and just because he has changed his mind under certain circumstances, we are now, forsooth, to go to him and say to him: Will you kindly allow us to advise you now, because it suits you, while before you told us in cool blood that it was not a thing we should meddle with? Mr. Gladstone at that time was able to advise us on the subject in cold blood. He finds himself to-day in a very different position. He finds that in his attempt introduce this question into the House of Commons, he has shattered his party in England; he has driven from his banner almost all the names that have shed lustre on the Liberal party of England during the latter part of this century. I ask: Where is Bright to be found to day? Where is Hartington? Where is Chamberlain? Where is Mr. Gladstone's late Attorney-General, James? Where is Dilke? Where is Goschen? Where is Roundel Palmer, his Lord Chancellor? Where Derby and Argyle? Where is Mr. Gladstone's late Irish Secretary, Mr. Trevelyan? Where is

that other Irish Secretary, that great man who up to the very last moment until his Imperial spirit fled, was found in opposition, as they all are, to this proposal of Mr. Gladstone? And because, forsooth, Mr. Gladstone finds himself in that position, and is glad to pick up any little crumbs of comfort that he can find here, there, and everywhere, we, the Canadian House of Commons, are to be asked to say to him: You would not accept our advice before—pray accept it to-day; and in order to place ourselves in that position, we have a question introduced which will sow discord throughout the length and breadth of Canada. But, for my part, I venture to say that I am as much entitled to speak here on behalf of Ireland as any man in this House. I am not merely an Irishman by descent, but by birth; I spent my childhood, my boyhood, and a part of my manhood in Ireland; and I do not speak of this matter from theory, but from actual knowledge. There is not any person inside or outside this House in Canada who loves Ireland more dearly than I do. My home was there, my father and mother are buried there, and I have dear relatives and friends there to-day. I claim to have as much right to speak on behalf of Ireland as any man in this House or this country, whatever he may call himself, and if I thought the measure introduced by Mr. Gladstone would be for the benefit of Ireland I would support it as heartily as anyone; but I do not support the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Blake's) resolution, because it practically supports that measure; it practically amounts to this, that if we pass it, we shall be endorsing Mr. Gladstone's action.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. Hon. gentlemen know perfectly well that if that resolution is sent over, it will simply be used by Mr. Gladstone as an argument to strengthen his position.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. I am glad to hear hon. gentlemen admit that. Now, what is that measure of Mr. Gladstone? It is not a measure which is calculated to settle the Irish question; it is not only very far from that, but if it is passed into law, we shall find that it will be only the beginning of trouble and discord in Ireland. It is not in any degree such a measure as this House expressed approval of in 1882; it is the very opposite. What was it that this House said in 1882? It was this, that if it was consistent with the safety of the Empire, and with the safe-guarding of the rights and privileges of the minority, some kind of Federal Home Rule would be advantageous for Ireland. Is it Federal Home Rule which is proposed now? It is the very opposite. So far from being a measure of a federal nature, a measure which would afford an opportunity to the different Provinces of Ireland to give effect to their own views and to pass their own laws, it is exactly similar to what a measure for legislative union would be in Canada. It is just as if we passed a measure which would prevent the people of the Province of Quebec from dealing with their own affairs. There exists in Ireland, as is very well known, a very curious parallel to the condition of things in this country. In the Province of Ulster in Ireland, there exists a condition of things very much like what we have in the Province of Quebec. The people of the Province of Ulster are dissimilar, to a great extent, in their sentiments, and their religion, and race from the bulk of the people of the other Provinces. Now, the measure proposed in this House in 1882 was a federal measure which would give those people an opportunity of safe-guarding their own interests as a separate Province. The measure the hon. gentleman is supporting is one of a perfectly different nature. It is one which will prevent those people from having any control over their own affairs, but which will put them under the heel of the people of the other three Provinces of Ireland. But, Sir, the measure proposed by Mr. Gladstone is a measure degrading to Ireland and the Irish people. It is a measure which deprives Ireland and the Irish people of any voice whatever in Imperial affairs. It reduces them to the rank of a mere Province, without the right to say one solitary word with reference to any Imperial question. But my main objection to the resolution the hon. gentleman has proposed is this, that the measure which Mr. Gladstone has introduced, so far from being the simple measure so eloquently described by the hon. member from Grey, is so complicated and so dangerous a measure that it has resulted in the disruption of Mr. Gladstone's own party, and has driven from his side many of his best and ablest supporters. Furthermore, if it should pass, it will simply enable those who desire to sever Ireland altogether from England, more strongly and more effectually to carry out their designs. I say this from my practical knowledge and experience of the feelings of many of the Irish people. I say it also because of the utterances of those who are called the Home Rulers in Ireland. I say it because of the mottoes which you find inscribed on banners and flags at Home Rule meetings. I say it because of the statements, more especially, that have fallen from the lips of the leader of the movement, Mr. Parnell himself, who stated, in Ireland, that he never would have taken off his coat to go at this work had it not been that by doing so he would be able to sever the last link that bound Ireland to England; and, moreover, because I know, from the expressions we have seen from time to time published in the press, that those are the views and sentiments of thousands in the United States who have lent to these people, not only the sinews of war in a monetary sense, but in another sense also. Therefore it is, that I cannot support the hon. gentleman's resolution, and that I shall feel obliged to support the amendment. I think the amendment of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) only makes the matter worse. I shall support the amendment of the Minister of Inland Revenue, because it expresses this view, that we do not ask the people of England to pass any measure of Home Rule for Ireland, of any kind or description, unless that measure can be passed in such a way as to secure the unity of the Empire, and at the same time safeguard the rights and privileges of the minority of Ireland. There are very few Irishmen, in or out of Ulster, who would not be glad to have some measure or other of greater local self-government for Ireland than we have at present, but under the circumstances, and for the reasons I have expressed, I shall vote against the resolution and in favor of the amendment as the better of the two.

Mr. HACKETT. Although the resolution before the House does not strictly affect Canadian interests, still I consider it my duty to make a few observations in regard to it. I believe Home Rule in Ireland would add to the strength of the Empire and unite the whole people of Great Britain and Ireland in one solid body. For this reason I support the principle of Home Rule. In 1882, when I had the honor of being a member of this House, a resolution was introduced by the Minister of Inland Revenue affirming the principle of Home Rule. An attempt is being made to make it appear that the hon gentleman then was actuated not by motives of sincerity, but by personal motives, in order to gain popularity with a certain class. Being fully cognisant of the facts connected with the introduction of those resolutions, I can speak with authority and I say that the hon. gentleman was not actuated by mercenary motives but by the high motives of patriotism. He believed that at that time, when Mr. Parnell and his small band of Home Rulers were struggling for Home Rule in Ireland, it was particularly becoming, in fact it was the duty of the Canadian Parliament, to move a resolution in favor of Home Rule, thereby encouraging Mr. Parnell in the noble fight he was making and strengthening his hands at a very

critical moment. That resolution passed unanimously, and was forwarded to Her Majesty. What was the answer of Mr. Gladstone? He said: Mind your own business; we are willing to take your advice on all matters connected with Canada, but on all Imperial affairs we can only consult the Imperial authority. He did not receive our address graciously, but now, owing to the skilful manner in which the agitation for Home Rule has been conducted by Mr. Parnell and his coadjutors, Mr. Gladstone is forced, by political exigencies, and not because of any strong feeling on his part for the Irish people, to introduce his measure. He has introduced it, mainly because he believed that Mr. Parnell would eventually force Home Rule on the Parliament of Britain, and that it was necessary to anticipate such an event. Believing that the resolution in 1882 was sent at a time when it would do the most benefit, I arrived at the conclusion, on consultation with other gentlemen of Irish extraction in this Parliament, that we should rest our record on that. We had there before the British Government the resolution of 1882, showing that the people of Canada were strongly in favor of Home Rule, and as no action has been taken since then, as our resolution has remained uncontradicted, we consider it was in the interests of Ireland that no resolution should now be introduced, which would not meet with unanimous support, as, instead of strengthening Mr. Gladstone's hands, such resolution would have a depressing effect. It was rather astonishing to find, the other evening, that the leader of the Opposition had introduced his motion as an amendment to go into Supply, and then compared his resolution with that of 1882. I maintain there is no comparison whatever. The Minister of Inland Revenue gave full notice of his resolution.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. HACKETT. The notice was considered sufficient.

Mr. MILLS. No, it was changed and another motion brought in.

Mr. HACKETT. Well, the motion affirmed the principle of Home Rule, and hon. gentlemen were fully aware it would be brought. It was found that owing to the business of the Session, it would be impossible to reach the motion in due course, and the right hon. the leader of the Government consented to allow the hon. gentleman to move it in amendment to Supply; but the leader of the Opposition introduced his resolution without giving notice. No hon. gentleman on this side had any intimation that the resolution would be introduced, but the hon. gentlemen asked: Why did not we consult with the Irish members of the Opposition. My experience of those gentlemen would not lead me to consult them on a matter of this kind. In 1882, when the Minister of Inland Revenue, in his zeal for the Irish cause, invited leading gentlemen on that side to meet him and discuss the matter, a meeting was held at which it was decided to appoint a committee composed of hon. gentlemen on both sides who would wait on the right hon. the leader of the Government and the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and endeavor to obtain their support to a resolution in favor of Home Rule. To our great surprise, when the committee was named, a prominent gentleman on that side, Mr. Anglin, who was placed on the committe said: I will have nothing further to do with you, and walked out of the room. That was the way a leading Irishman, who should have taken an active part in introducing the measure, acted. After being appointed to the committee to wait upon the leader of both great parties, the hon. gentleman would not consent to anything of the kind, and walked out of the room, leaving there gentlemen of less experience, and ability to endeavor, as best they could, to carry through this important resolution. Therefore I say the experience we had on that occasion would not lead us again to consult those hon. gentlemen on matters of so important a character. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue should have spoken now, that he should not have spoken before. Of course in that he was only repeating what was said by his leader. I say the time the resolution was sent over in 1882 was the most important time, that now when the victory is almost won, now at the very threshold of success, after they have been battling and contending with the great powers they had to contend against in Ireland, those gentlemen who have succeeded in obtaining this for Ireland, though we should congratulate them upon their great success, still 1882 was the time when they needed help and not now when they have almost obtained victory. Therefore, though the hon. gentleman is quite correct in that statement, that these resolutions may have a good effect, and may in some way strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone, the time to fight for liberty is not after the fetters have been struck off the feet of the slave; it is not then that you are to come forward to support him; the time to support him is when he is down, when he is struggling for liberty, and not when he has obtained it. The hon. gentlemen in opposition, pretend now to be very strongly in favor of Home Rule for Ireland; but during the five years they were in power what was done? Did they introduce a resolution in favor of Home Rule? Was not this question as important then as it is now? Did not Parnell in 1876, and Biggar, and those men who were contending with him at that time, and Mr. Butt, who was then the leader of the Home Rule movement, want that moral support from the people of Canada, and the whole world, that Gladstone wants now? Yes, they did. Those were the dark days, when every man in Ireland was struggling against the greatest odds. Those were the days when some support should have been given to them by the people of Canada. But during the five years that they were in power there was not one word about Home Rule; not one word in the Parliament of Canada to encourage those brave men who were fighting for Home Rule. But now they are boiling over with enthusiasm in favor of Home Rule, they are bursting with their fervor for Home Rule, after they see that Parnell and the men who co-operated with him have almost achieved success, when a measure has been introduced into the Imperial Parliament which will probably be carried through, although in its present shape it is not such a measure as I would care to see; because, I think, if the Irish people are not represented at Westminster, they are deprived of their representation in matters of great importance affecting their interests; and I hope to see before the Bill becomes law that it will be amended in that respect. I do not know that I need continue this subject further than to pass a remark on what was said by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). He spoke with great warmth, and I have no doubt with great sincerity. He said that no Protestant in Ireland was actually in favor of Home Rule. He must have read history astray. Is not Mr. Parnell a Protestant, as good a Protestant probably as the hon. member? Is he not the apostle of Home Rule in Ireland at this time? Is not Mr. Justin McCarthy a Protestant, and are not others of those who are battling for Home Rule in Ireland at this time, and fighting the battle with such great success, Protestants? They are Protestants, and it is for that reason that Irish Catholics should stand by them. There is, of course, a very respectable minority in Ireland opposed to Home Rule, but it is hoped and believed that this measure will afford to these people the same protection in their rights and privileges as is afforded to the minority in Quebec and to the minority in Ontario. It is a part of our Federal Government that could be very fairly put in force, and, with these amendments, I am sure that those people in the north of Ireland who are now opposed to Home Rule will be reconciled to it and will see eventually

that Mr. Parnell and those sincere Protestants who work with him are patriots as well, and are working in the interests of the whole country. But, after the snub we received in sending home the address of 1882, I think it would be quite improper again to send an address of a similar character. I think we should do as they did in the Parliament of Quebec, simply pass a resolution affirming the principle of Home Rule. They are proposing to pursue a similar course in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, and, in view of that fact, I support the resolution of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue in amendment to the main motion of the hon. the leader of the Opposition. I believe that resolution is more in accordance with the genius and spirit and the dignity of the people of Canada and that, after being treated in the insolent manner in which we were treated in 1882 after the passage of that address here and after having it sent to Her Majesty and after having received the very insolent reply from Lord Kimberley, we should not allow ourselves again perhaps to be treated in a similar way. I therefore support the motion of the Minister of Inland Revenue, as it affirms the principle of Home Rule as fully as the resolutions of 1882, which have been quoted so approvingly by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to say a few words on this important subject before the vote is taken, being an Irishman by birth, having lived in that country for nineteen years, knowing that oppression reigns in that country, knowing and believing by past experience that that country has been so managed that there have been grievances for the past five hundred years, that no statesman for the past two hundred years has been able to grapple with the affairs of that country. To-day we find that there is such a gentleman, Hon. W. E. Gladstone, who will stand up in the House of Parliament in England and advocate the rights of Ireland and the rights of Irishmen, while many in this country and in other countries deny the fact that Irishmen are competent or deserving to govern themselves. It is a slander which we do not deserve. Irishmen are able to take their position in all British dependencies in any part of the world. They are competent and able to take a position on every platform. We find them so in every department of life and commerce. I learned with a great deal of satisfaction and pleasure, a few weeks ago, that the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) had prepared a resolution on this very subject, which I was determined to support, if at all reasonable. I was very much disappointed when I heard afterwards that for some reason he had abandoned the idea. Later, I learned with pleasure that a deputation from an Irish society waited on the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, and that he was about to bring forward a resolution to the same effect. But, Sir, I was more than disappointed when I learned that he refused to bring forward this motion, which was, in some respects, similar to the one brought forward by him in 1882. The grievances of that lovely and down-trodden country is a matter of history, which I hope the present Imperial Parliament will settle to the satisfaction of Ireland and well-being of the Empire. If there had not been grievances in that country, it would be to-day the most lovely, fertile and happy country in the world. While we here enjoy Home Rule to our heart's content, are we willing to sit down and say that our mother country shall not enjoy the same privilege? We have a population in Canada of not quite 5,000,000 inhabitants, and we find that Ireland contains about the same number, 5,300,000. I hold in my hand a report of the last general election in Ireland, and I find in my native county, which has sent Conservative members to the English Parliament, probably for 30 years out of 40, in the north riding of that county, the Nationalist candidate received 5,268 votes, while the Conservative candidate, one of the most popular and honorable gentlemen in the county, received only 772. In the south division of the county of Sligo, of which I am a native, the Nationalist received 4,610, while the Conservative received only 541. This is in the north-west part of Ireland. But I will refer to the northern counties of Ireland. I find in the county of Cavan, one of the Protestant counties, that in the east division the Nationalist candidate was returned unopposed. In the west division the Nationalist received 6,425 votes, while the Conservative received only 1,779. In the county of Donegal the Nationalist received 4,597, while the Loyalist received only 952. In the east division of the same county, the Nationalist received 4,089, while the Liberal candidate received only 2,992. In the west division of the same county the Nationalist was returned unopposed. In the south division the Nationalist received 5,505, and the Loyalist, 1,379. In the county of Down, one of the most populous Protestant counties in Ireland, in the north division the Conservative received 4,315, and the Liberal 2,841. The most strongly Protestant county in Ireland is that wherein Belfast is situated. We find there that although the Protestants predominate, the Conservative majority was very small, that Mr. Johnston was the only gentleman in all Ireland who really received a large majority. He received 3,610, while the Liberal received only 990, and the Conservative, 871. So that Home Rule is not opposed by Protestants in Ireland as bitterly as represented in Canada. Now, if we turn from these to other counties, we find that in the county of Londonderry, another Protestant county, the Conservative only received 5,180 votes, while the Liberal received 3,017. In the south division a Nationalist was elected. In the county of Derry a Conservative was elected by 1,844 votes, and the Nationalist received 1,792. In the country of Tyrone a Conservative was elected in the north division. If we turn to the south of Ireland, we find that in the county of Cork, the Nationalist received 5,033, and the Unionist 106. But there are even larger majorities than that. In Mayo, south, 4,953 votes were given to the Nationalist, while the Conservative received only 75. Now, Sir, in a county of 5,300,000, where they give such a decided expression of a desire to govern themselves electing eighty-four Nationalists to seventeen Conservatives, where there has been such dissatisfaction with the Government of England, are they not entitled to some consideration under a constitutional government? Look at the results of the Government in past years. At the time of the disestablishment of the English Church in Ireland, the excitement was almost as great as it is now. It was stated then that the country was going to ruin, that it would bring separation from England and destroy harmony between Ireland and England. But I am glad to state on the best authority that the English Church in Ireland has never been so prosperous at it has been since it has been self-sustaining;—and I believe self government in Ireland in local matters will remove agitation and unite bonds of friendship which has not existed the past century. Sir, are we afraid or ashamed to stand up for our rights and again ask Her Majesty to consider a resolution from this House? Is it true that we have been insulted? Why, Sir, we are entitled to our rights as British subjects, and privileges as an independent people, and I say we should stand up for the same rights which we asked for in 1882, and again give our advice to the Home Government to take into consideration the question of justice to that country which we love so much. I hope this House will support unanimously the resolution as submitted, and I, for one, will support the resolution as submitted, or the amendment of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen).

Mr. WALLACE (York). I desire to make a few remarks on the resolution before the House. Two days ago, the hon. member for West Durham sprung a resolution upon the

House. He had evidently not sufficient time to prepare his resolution with sufficient care, because we find that he has had to avail himself of the literary abilities of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to assist him in perfecting his resolution. Sir, I do not think that the resolution proposed by the hon. member for West Durham will meet with the approval of this House, because it asks this House to affirm the principle of Mr. Gladstone's Bill giving a measure of Home Rule to Ireland. There are many people who will favor Home Rule if it is a fair and equitable measure, but who oppose the scheme of Mr. Gladstone because of its gross injustice, and the manifest failure that will attend it if it should become law. For myself, I can say that if Home Rule in Ireland means such home rule as we have in Canada, if it means those rights of local government which we find so beneficial in our own country, I favor such a measure of Home Rule. But if Home Rule in Ireland means, as many people believe it does, the dismemberment of the Empire, then Canada will be strongly opposed to such a measure. Mr. Parnell, who is at the head of the Home Rule party, is a man with great d rectness of purpose; he states his desires and wishes pretty plainly, and in his course he has not deviated very much from his first purpose. And what does he tell us? In a speech delivered by him at Cincinnati, on 23rd February, 1880, on the Irish question, he said:

"None of us, whether in America or in Ireland, or wherever we may be, will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England."

That was the policy which Mr. Parnell in 1880 enunciated when adressing the people of Cincinnatti. We find Mr. Parnell's course and policy since then have not varied. What was his policy then is evidently his policy to-day. I am afraid the measure proposed by Mr. Gladstone, which is supposed to be for the better government of Ireland will have the effect of carrying out Mr. Parnell's policy, for we find when we examine Mr. Gladstone's Bill, which we are asked by the resolution proposed by the leader of the Opposition to sanction and afford our moral support, indicates this. What do we find in the Bill? Mr. Davitt was asked:

"Whether Irishmen would be satisfied with these arrangements, and whether they would accept them as a permanent settlement of the question. He said that was as unreasonable as to ask him after he had had his breakfast to refrain from demanding his dinner and his supper. Sympathise with Mr. Davitt, but do not be led astray:

If Mr. Gladstone's measure becomes the law of the British Empire, then we will find in case of war that Ireland will have no interest in it, that the people will not have to pay a cent of money to defray the expenses, that they will have no voice in saying whether there should be war or peace, and that they would not be compelled to contribute their quota of men and means, and therefore Ireland would have no interest in the struggles which Great Britain may have for her very existence. What do we find further? That the foreign and colonial policy of the British Government will have no interest for the people of Ireland. No portion of the British Empire has done more to build up our foreign and colonial possessions than has the Irish race. No portion of the British Empire has contributed braver soldiers to assist in fighting the battles of Great Britain than has Ireland; yet, if this measure becomes law Irishmen will have no chance of obtaining position or promotion in the British forces, because by the law Ireland will not be called upon to take part in the defence of the British Empire, and instead of the people being active in assisting to maintain the supremacy of the British Empire, some may be found on the other side, because, having no direct and pecuniary interest in the result of the conflict, other circumstances may prevail which might cause them to take the other side. We find still further in Mr. Gladstone's Bill, which the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) asks us to approve, that while the whole control of Excise and Customs is taken from Ireland and centred in Great Britain, not an Irish member will be a representative in the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. The Parliament at Westminster will make many of the laws for Ireland, impose the taxes for revenue and do many other acts, but yet she will not have a voice at Westminster. How long will Ireland tolerate such a gross injustice? That one thing in itself contains the elements of dissolution of the union between Great Britain and Ireland, and the elements of discord which will sever the Empire if Mr. Gladstone's measure becomes law. But though we may in the abstract pass resolutions that we think may be of benefit to Ireland, yet the Irish people themselves are the best judges of their own position. What do we find? A large portion of the Irish people, 25 per cent. of the whole, and, practically, the whole Protestants of Ireland are bitterly opposed to Mr. Gladstone's scheme, while the Home Rulers themselves have not expressed approval, but have taken it, as Mr. Davitt says, as an instalment of what is to come. The Protestants, I repeat, have, with great unanimity, expressed their opposition to Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme. I have here the words of a distinguished English statesman, one of the leading members of the Liberal party, and whose opinions and statements I heartily endorse. He cannot support Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme; and he says:

"We have been accustomed, perhaps a little too much, to talk of Ireland as if it were one people. There are two nations in Ireland (hear, hear,) two communities separated by religion, by race, by politics, by social conditions. There are in Ireland at this moment something like one and a quarter millions of Protestants, most of them in the province of Ulster, a great number in Dublin, and others scattered up and down the country in little groups everywhere, working out their existence by becoming the centre of honest, praiseworthy industry and enterprise (cheers). This minority—it is not a small one (hear, hear), it is one quarter of the whole population—through good repute and evil repute has been loyal to the British connection (cheers). It has been industrious and it has been prosperous. They are bitterly opposed to this scheme, rightly or wrongly. Under the protection of the British Government they have lived on terms of amity with their Roman Catholic neighbors. They believe that their property, their religion, aye and their lives, could not safely be trusted to a Nationalist Parliament in Dublin (cheers). For my part, I hate coercion, and I am not disposed to coerce these men by British soldiers (hear, hear and cheers). I am not prepared to disregard altogether their wishes and their feelings (hear, hear). I think that they are entitled to some consideration from the British power that they have hitherto uniformly supported (hear, hear). We are asked now to pledge the credit of the British nation to the extent, as I shall show you directly, of 150 millions (hear, hear) for the benefit of the Irish landlords (oh, and shame) who, as Mr. Gladstone has shown himself in the speech wich he made in introducing the Land Purchase Bill, have not always had a blameless record in the past. We are told that this enormous liability is a duty laid upon us by the misdeeds of our ancestors—that is, an obligation of honor ("Not at all") But then is there no obligation of honor to that great Protestant minority of one and a half millions who, at all events in recent times, have never committed any act of oppression, who have never lent themselves to violence or disorder (cheers), whose patient industry has contributed more to the prosperity of Ireland than all the agitators that ever lived (loud cheers,) and who even now are giving in the shape of taxation, in the shape of enterprise in the shape of all that can come from enlightened citizenship as much as all the rest of the population put together."

That may be accepted as a correct statement of the case, and when we find that a large portion of the Irish people, the most enterprising and wealthy are directly opposed to Home Rule, when their interests are not considered in the scheme proposed by Mr. Gladstone, I think we should be chary, we should be very careful how we recommend motions of which we do not know the purport. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) on a recent occasion could not proceed with a resolution, could not take any action in a certain case which came before the House, because he had not sufficient papers. He was living in this country, was cognizant from day to day of the case as it progressed; he knew all the circumstances of it, but in consequence of a greater number of papers not being forthcoming he could not pronounce judgment. But in this most intricate question, one involving great issues, one involving the prosperity of a great country—because Ireland is a great country—he can make up his mind almost in a moment's notice and put resolutions on the

paper endorsing the scheme which has had to face the opposition of Mr. Gladstone's own political party. It looks to me—perhaps I am wrong—a good deal like toadying to Mr. Gladstone. There is one other matter to which I shall refer, which has already been referred to by the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), and that is the fact that in these resolutions of Mr. Glandstone, the Customs and Excise, the power of putting on taxation, the power of protecting the industries of the country, is not given to Ireland, but is retained by England. Well, I had occasion a few years ago, when this question was up for considération, to make some remarks, and I then said, and I repeat now, that I think the principal cause of Ireland's want of prosperity is the fact that they have no protection for the industries of the people. Mr. Speaker, no country ever became great or prosperous or wealthy without manufactures. There is no instance of a people becoming wealthy through agriculture alone. There are more people in Ireland than could cultivate perhaps twice as much ground as they have here, and in order that the people should have sufficient employment there must be manufactures in that country. They have very few manufactures there to-day, and those are mostly in the north of Ireland where we find the people most prosperous. What Ireland requires to-day to ensure her prosperity and give employment to her people, to make them prosperous, contented and satisfied is protection, and the encouragement to build up the manufacturing industries in their midst; and while these are lacking I venture to predict that Ireland will not have a career of great prosperity. I am sorry that, with all Mr. Gladstone's ability, he has been unable, and perhaps unwilling, to formulate a scheme by which manufactures might be encouraged in Ireland; because I am convinced, as I said before, that Ireland will never become a great, prosperous and contented people until employment is given to her population, until they have various manufactures in their country, and employment is given by manufactures as well as by agriculture to the people of that great country.

Mr. BLAKE. If the question which is the fittest motion to be made, which is the motion that would get the greatest measure of support in this House and yet accomplish the greatest measure of assistance for Ireland, is to be solved now, on the floor of this House, by discussion between hon. members and by public expressions of opinion on the different forms proposed, that responsibility does not lie at my door, because, when I was in a position in which I was able to obtain the decision of the House upon the precise proposition which I thought moderate and yet the best calculated to produce that result, I abandoned that position upon the statement of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue that, to take the other attitude and withdraw my motion and to accept the right of bringing forward my views in this form, might produce the result, after conference, of agreement. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue in inviting me to accede to the suggestion of the First Minister said:

"Therefore I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw it. Then there would be an opportunity given to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who, he thinks, have been lax in their duty, to consult with him. We do not claim that anything we may say will influence his views; we do not pretend to hope that; but I think we are entitled to say to him that, feeling as much interest as he possibly can in this question, it might be possible for us to agree upon a motion that would be passed unanimously by this House. We might possibly agree upon a motion to be submitted to the House and passed unanimously, and I am sure the hon. gentleman will agree with me that such a motion would be of more value than one which necessitated a division. I am not here to discuss what changes we might ask for; that could be discussed among those specially interested, and to whom the matter might be referred. If the hon. gentleman thinks that would at all meet his views, and that we could come to such an understanding, I will not continue my remarks; but if he thinks my request is one he cannot entertain, I will have to crave the indulgence of the House while I make further remarks on this subject."

I rose and, after making an observation or two, on other things, said:

"I may at once say that I am quite willing that whatever time is reasonable and consistent with the object of the resolution should be given at once to carry out the suggestion of those hon. gentlemen. My object is just what the hon. gentleman's is, to procure a unanimous motion; and because he tells me expects, by the course he proposes, to produce such a result, I am all the more ready to agree to that course."

At a subsequent part I said:

"In the meantime, as to the form in which the motion shall be presented, I shall only be too glad to meet the hon. gentleman, or any other hon. member, with the view of settling that point."

At a subsequent period, after recess, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue said:

"Whether the suggestion comes from one side of the House or the other, there are grounds, perhaps, upon which we can unite, and the suggestion that we should agree upon a resolution, is worthy of fair consideration."

"Hear, hear," said I. The hon. gentleman proceeded to say:

"And I think that the hon. gentleman who refuses that must assume considerable responsibility, if the vote is not as large as it might be made by a fair discussion of our views on the subject."

"Hear, hear," I said assentingly to that remark. Then, when the final arrangement was made, my last words were these:

"And I add to that, in response to the statement of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and to the suggestion rather than the statement of the First Minister, that if there be any opportunity in the meantime to accommodate matters with reference to the form of expression of that motion, I shall be only too glad to facilitate such a happy result."

Then the Minister of Inland Revenue said:

"Whatever difference of opinion may exist between the hon. gentleman and myself, I feel much pleased that he has taken this course, as I think it is the wisest course and one calculated to bring about, if possible, a solution of this question. I am glad the hon. gentleman has taken the course he has."

Now my motion was before the hon. gentleman; he had stated his desire to consult with me; he had stated his desire to make such suggestions as he hoped after conference might produce an agreement. I at once responded, twice and thrice responded, declaring that I would be most happy to concur in the steps he proposed to take, with a view to our arriving at that result. But the hon. gentleman, as I was obliged to say in offering my motion to-day—neither he nor any other hon. gentleman intimated to me the slightest dissatisfaction with the form of my motion. They made no suggestion or proposition for a change; they have invited me to no conference on the subject from the time the discussion closed down to this moment. Therefore, I say, if it be on the floor of this House, by the hon. gentleman bringing forward his proposition in opposition to mine, if it be on the floor of this House that we have to dispose of the question which is the fitter resolution, which is the more appropriate, the responsibility of that result, whatever may be the measure of it, lies not at my door. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue explained the reasons why he had not acted in this matter in the House; and he took occasion to say that one of those reasons was not what had been stated erroneously in one of the papers to be the case, a danger that the resolution would be defeated! Not at all; he never apprehended that; but a danger that there would be three or four dissentients. That was what the hon. gentleman said, that was the measure of the danger which prevented him from bringing up this question in this House! Now, Sir, we know from the proceedings which took place very shortly after the passage of the address in 1882, that there were three gentlemen who stood up and announced that they dissented on that occasion; though neither you nor I, as I had occasion to say at that time, had seen any expression of dissent. There was therefore a public avowal of dissent on that occasion. What the hon. gentleman has now declared is that after considering the whole situation, after analysing the feeling of the House, so far as he could judge it, and anxious as he was to go forward, after ascertaining what the feeling was, he believed that there might be three or four dissentients

out of the 211 members of this House; and that circumstance affrayed him from the enterprise. Well, we are glad to know that. In whatever quarter the hon. gentleman apprehended those three or four dissentients resided, it was not on this side, for he asked none of us our opinion on the subject; and we have tolerably well learned already, in the course of this debate, where it was the hon. gentleman found that the dissent existed. We have heard it from the outspoken utterances of some; we have heard it from the more veiled utterances of others; we know it was in the house of the hon. gentleman's own friends; and because there were three or four of his own supporters who disapproved of the measure, he chose—and that is his defence to the people of Canada—he chose to determine that no resolution ought to be moved here. But the hon. gentleman said: There was another reason; it is a useless thing to do in view of the circumstances of the former address, as well as a dangerous thing, because the new work could not be so thoroughly accomplished as the old. It was useless, although this was a new House; useless, although the conditions had changed so much between that time and this! I believe the feeling in Canada has changed; but my belief is that there has been a growing feeling in favor of Home Rule in Canada, and that feeling is very much stronger to-day than it was in 1882; and certainly that is not a change which should affright us who favor Home Rule from endeavoring to obtain the views of the representatives of the people on the subject. But there is another circumstance. The time is critical. Read the cabled reports in the newspapers of the impressions of the leading organs of public opinion and of those who take most interest in following public measures, and you find it impossible to say what the fate of the principle of Home Rule—because that is what Mr. Gladstone says he holds to be at stake on the second reading of the Bill—is to be; and, Sir, if there was no reason why some further action should be taken to-day by those who acted before, I want to know why the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue telegraphed to Mr. Parnell that he and the Irish members of this House still abided by that address. He gave Mr. Parnell that encouraging and flattering assurance, that assurance so calculated to cheer and elevate his mind, that the Irish Catholic members were really still true to Home Rule! What was the inference to be drawn from that message? Why, the inference was that of the other members he could not say the same. What other inference can you draw? He says to Mr. Parnell that the Irish members, by which I understand him to mean the Irish members of his own creed—nay, those of them who sit on his own side of the House—are of the same opinion as before. He treats it as an Irish Catholic question, as the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) treated it——

Mr. CURRAN. I beg your pardon, Sir. I did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; and so treating it, they got together a body of gentlemen from the Senate and the House of Commons who are Irish Catholics—no, not the Irish Catholics, but the Tory Irish Catholics. Did the hon. gentleman invite Senator Power to that meeting? Did he invite Senator Scott? Were they there? Did they take part in it? No; the Irish Tory Catholic clique meet together, in a little assembly, and they say, this is so purely an Irish Catholic question, and a Tory Irish Catholic question, that we alone are to decide whether a resolution is safe, or prudent, or advantageous to be introduced into the House. Sir, if there be a step which is calculated to prejudice the cause of Home Rule at home or abroad, so far as we can do it, it is this treatment of it by hon. gentlemen in the hon. member's position as an Irish Catholic question—as if it was not a general question in which all lovers of liberty throughout the world have an equal interest.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. HESSON. Where are the Irish Catholics on your side?

Mr. BLAKE. I have mentioned two Irish Catholics on my side of politics, members of Parliament, whom the hon. gentleman did not consult.

Mr. HESSON. Not members of this House.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say members of this House; I said members of Parliament. Now, Sir, I ask what inference must be drawn from the state of things to which I have referred. In 1882 an address passed unanimously by the Commons of Canada in favor of Home Rule. In 1886, the question being in a critical condition, in which the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue feels it necessary that something should be said on behalf of some portion of the Commons of Canada on the subject, to show that they are still true to the views they formerly expressed, he despatches his utterance on behalf of the Irish members of the Parliament of Canada. Now, here is the contrast that would be drawn. The enemies of the cause would say: Oh, in 1882, the Canadian Parliament, unanimously in the Commons and by a very large majority in the Senate, passed resolutions in favor of Home Rule. In 1886 a Minister of the Crown, the same Irish Catholic who moved before, is afraid to move a resolution in favor of Home Rule, and he sends forward, forsooth, his own cable despatch to Mr. Parnell, which is to be taken as equivalent to the voice of the Commons of Canada. No, it could not be equivalent. Is it a substitute? No, but it is a declaration by inference, that the other members of this House, beyond those for whom the hon. gentleman, by what authority I do not pretend to say, chose to speak, would not say what he said. I ask, did he apply to any of them to allow him to speak for a larger constituency than those for whom he assumed to speak? If he did, what answer did he get which discouraged him from speaking for more? That is the position in which the hon. gentleman's action put the question, so that the enemies of Home Rule could say: Canada will no longer speak in favor of that measure, and the best proof of that is, that the Minister who moved the resolution in 1882, does not move another resolution to-day, and does not profess to aver that the Canadian Parliament believes as it did then. Now we know the reason. The hon. gentleman stated it would be a dangerous thing to move again, because there would be some dissent, although he limits the dissentients to three or four. Again, the hon. gentleman says: "Oh, then, there is the difficulty about the form of another address which deterred me;" but still that does not appear to have been a very serious difficulty, because the hon gentleman has found another form which gets rid of that difficulty to-night, so that that could not have prevented him from earlier action, unless his wit has been spurred by the exigencies of the last day or two, and his zeal for the Irish cause was not sufficiently potent to enable him to find out what, under the pressure of necessity, which we all know is a powerful lever, he has since ascertained. He has proposed a method, he says, of getting over the difficulty. But circumstances now differ. We are not, under my motion, now doing what Lord Kimberley, unadvisedly, in my opinion, told us in effect we ought not to do; we are not now tendering advice to Her Majesty's Ministers as to the policy they ought to accomplish; but we propose to cheer and encourage them on in the course they have declared they will pursue. We are not offering advice, but we are adding the moral force and support of this House to them, to aid them in the course they are themselves pursuing.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I hope it won't.

Mr. BLAKE. Ah! there is one of the dissentients.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I have always been one.

Mr. BLAKE. I will have to settle an account presently with these three or four who have deterred the Minister of Inland Revenue, up to this day, from bringing forward his resolution. I say we were right, in 1882, in averring that the Commons of Canada had the right, and that it was our duty respectfully to address our Queen, the Queen of the Empire, tendering our loyal suggestions and opinions upon this question so interesting and important to us, as citizens of the Empire and as Canadians. I hope no hon. member of this House will declare to-day that we were not right in doing that, because, forsooth, a Colonial Secretary has been found to express a different opinion; I hope we are not going to abnegate that right as citizens of the Empire; I hope we are not going to derogate from that right as citizens of the Empire. I say our most dignified course is to pass on, and to speak again when the occasion again arises, as it is now arising, in which, not under similar circumstances, because, as I have said, we are not now tendering advice but are still expressing an opinion wherein we are fortunately able to say we abide by the views we expressed in 1882, which you did not think fit to adopt then but have since adopted and are now carrying out —I say no more fortunate occasion could be conjectured for this country to re-assert with dignity its right to address the Queen on this important subject, with the certainty that the right this time will not be repudiated but be gratefully acknowledged. The most dignified course for us is to re-assert in that way, not by any reference to Earl Kimberley, our right to speak to our Queen, to signify to her our views on this question, the occasion, as it is now admitted, calling for it. The hon. gentleman himself proposes that we should signify our opinions, although in an abortive fashion; and proposing that we should signify our opinions, I say the most dignified and the happiest method is simply to go forward and once again, in a constitutional manner—unless we are prepared to rescind our address, unless we are prepared to agree that we should do so no more—re-assert our sentiments, with such variations as the circumstances of the case may require. But if we do not choose to proceed by an address on this particular occasion —and that because we have been told formerly that we ought not to proceed by address to advise or suggest—I hope that we shall not fall so low as formally to record on our journals the agreement that we ought not to act for that reason. If the hon. gentleman's amendment is passed, we shall agree that, because Earl Kimberley chose to make this statement four years ago, therefore we do not choose to address the Crown; and that of course will apply to all cases of emergencies in which Imperial interests may be concerned. We shall be agreeing and in a formal manner assenting to the view of Earl Kimberley; we shall be acting upon that view, we shall be declaring he is right and we are wrong, and in thus agreeing we will close the door upon ourselves by our own resolution, from, at any future time, venturing a humble address to the Queen upon an Imperial question. Sir, there are, no doubt, exciting times ahead for the British Empire; there may be troublous, dangerous times ahead for the British Empire, and I shall never willingly agree to abandon the right of a British subject or of the House of Commons of any colony to approach the Queen and to tender her respectfully the advice and opinions of her subjects in foreign parts upon those questions which touch the interests of the Empire, which so nearly concern ourselves, although we are not able to speak directly by representation in the British House of Commons. I now turn to the substance of the hon. gentleman's resolution. It is a suspicious circumstance, it is a circumstance which ought to make the hon. gentleman himself suspicious of his resolution, that it finds so much favor with the enemies of Home Rule. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), with that frankness which commends itself so much to the confidence of this House, told us in the concluding, the most pungent, and, he will allow me to say, the most forcible phrase of his speech, that he would vote for the amendment of the Minister of Inland Revenue because it would do the least harm. Let me make an appropriate alteration in that phrase, if we are to put it in the mouth of the friends of Home Rule; and we would say: We would vote for either of the two other resolutions because they would do more good to the cause than the resolution of the Minister of Inland Revenue. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), is loyal to his party, and so he proposes to vote for the resolution of a Minister of the Government he follows, which resolution he does not approve. It is a harmful resolution, but even that one, colorless as it is, pallid as it is, hedged around as it is, built up as it is to satisfy, as far as possible, the susceptibilities of the hon. member for Muskoka, he is prepared to take, but to take only because it does the least harm of the three. The hon. gentleman has presented to him three different kinds of nauseous drugs of which he must take one. He smells at them, he sips them a little, he sets them up between him and the light, he puts down two rejected as the worst, and with a wry face he swallows the third. If these are the sentiments of the enemies of Home Rule held as to these different resolutions, what should be the sentiments of the friends of Home Rule? I am very sorry, for the cause of Home Rule, that the Minister of Inland Revenue, in the attempt to please his three or four dissentients, in the attempt not to wound their susceptibilities, should have proposed a resolution, which, by comparison, will be certainly less favorable than I should have desired, which will provoke unfavorable comparisons just where we want favorable comparisons to be put. I am very sorry that, in the attempt to combine the heterogeneous elements of which the hon. gentleman's following is composed, he should have given us a resolution which has produced these comments from the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), and practically, though in more veiled language, from other hon. members of his way of thinking. Now the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran), after having made a speech which I do not think really was very likely to conduce to harmony and good feeling—perhaps it was the hon. gentleman's mode of producing harmony; perhaps, an Irishman like myself, he thinks a good fight is the way to promote harmony and good feeling—uttered a fervent expression of trust that the proceedings might end harmoniously. After all our heads are broken, I suppose we are all to shake hands. And the hon. gentleman proceeded to apply his blackthorn to my unlucky pate, and to smash me as hard as he could. Well, I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman's arm is not quite long enough to reach me, and that I do not feel much the worse for the exhibition of prowess which he displayed on this occasion. He says that there are grounds for suspecting me. He will not suspect me; oh no, not he; but it makes a great draft on what he calls his credulity not to suspect me; and he proceeds, with the precision of a criminal lawyer trying to make out a case in a police court, to give the grounds upon which I am to be suspected, which grounds are not sufficient, with his candor and kindness and good feeling, to induce him actually to suspect me; but it is about as hard for the hon. gentleman not to suspect me as it is for the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) to swallow the resolution. He says the first ground is this: There were other Irishmen in the House, and did I consult them? Now, for a long time these hon. gentlemen, having their little clique together, got talking over this matter, trying to decide what should be done. I ask, did they consult me? Had I not helped them before? Had I not done my best to forward the cause? Had I not done my best to produce a happy result on the former occasion? And, if there was a question to be considered on this occa-

sion, might I not fairly have expected that before they reached a decision upon it they would have consulted me? I do not complain of their not consulting me unless they chose. I do not take the line of the hon. member for Montreal, but if it is a ground of complaint against me that I did not consult them after they had decided that it was too dangerous to move in the matter—though where the bomb-shells are to come from they know, not I; where the mines are to be exploded they know, not I; where the danger lies they know, not I—I should like to know with what reason they can complain of my not consulting them. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue was good enough to consult me on a former occasion, in a sense. He referred to it, though with an inaccurate recollection of the circumstances, the other night. He did not invite me to his committee. I suppose it is to be pardoned to him as to me, the making of these little slips, but he gave a new nationality to one hon. member. He said they had decided to bring all the Irishmen in the House to the committee except the First Minister and the leader of the Opposition. I know that "seven cities claim" the First Minister's birthplace. Sometimes we hear that he was born in Scotland, and sometimes in Canada.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me for a moment, I will say that he is correct in regard to what I stated. I remember that I committed that error in the words I used. What I intended to say was that we did not think it advisable at that time to invite any of the leaders of the House, and his being the leader of the Opposition was the reason why he was not invited.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought the hon. gentleman, with his superabundant loyalty to his chief, which he has exhibited on several occasions and notably on one occasion, in order to keep up that harmony on which he lays so much stress, was desirous to strengthen the First Minister's hold on the people of this country by declaring him an Irishman for the occasion, but he now tells me that it was one of those blunders that he and I as Irishmen are privileged to make. I say the hon. gentleman was good enough, in 1882, after having settled the form of this motion, to send it to me with a note to which I responded in general terms, but in the altered motion which the hon. gentleman afterwards brought forward I saw another hand. He knows who drew it. It was his brother Irishman, the First Minister. It is quite true he did not consult the First Minister early, but he consulted him late. He brought him at last into his committee, and, when the final blow was to be struck, when the hon. gentleman was at one bound to fix himself on the pinnacle as the representative of Irish sentiment in Canada, it was his brother Irishman, the First Minister, who helped him! This is the first reason why the member for Montreal (Mr. Curran), my prosecutor here, proposes to show that there are strong grounds, which only his great sense of generosity can induce him to say are inadequate, for suspecting me—that I did not consult him. The next is, that the resolution was brought in as an amendment to Committee of Supply. A dreadful sin; because I followed strictly the precedent of the last occasion, when the resolution was brought in as an amendment to Committee of Supply; because in 1882 it was brought in as an amendment to Committee of Supply, and in 1886 I proposed it in the same way, because the First Minister, when in Opposition, in 1878, had brought up the constitutional question of the Letellier case on amendment to the motion for Supply, not at all impugning the Government at the time, but simply bringing up the question, whether Lieutenant Governor Letellier had acted constitutionally in dismissing his Ministers, brought it up as a non-party question and stated so distinctly, because I thought these two precedents were ample justification, and served as a good reason for me to propose this resolution in amendment to Committee of Supply—particularly as there was no other way of getting at it at all; because I knew that hon. gentlemen thought it was too dangerous to touch, and of course would not help me to touch it; that they thought it ought not to be brought up, and of course would not give me facilities for bringing it up; and therefore, but for my bringing it up in that way, we would not have not have had it at all—because I did not perform impossibilities, only his great sense of generosity can lead him to consider the reasons inadequate for not suspecting me. Then he says that perhaps I ought not to have spoken to him, but at any rate I ought to have spoken to the Minister of Public Works, the leader of the French Conservative party, it was my business to have spoken to him, and because I did not the hon. gentleman feels grievously inclined, but for that superabundant good nature of his, to suspect me. Well, I have often had occasion to consult the Minister of Public Works, during the unfortunate absence of the First Minister, on the ordinary routine of public business and so forth, and our relations are always, I am happy to say, very pleasant; but what particular reason there was for consulting with the Minister of Public Works on this question I do not know. I suppose that the decision of the Minister of Inland Revenue and his friends was not taken without consulting with his colleagues and the Minister of Public Works. We know that all these gentlemen had decided that it was too dangerous to bring this question up. Well, then, the hon. gentleman says: Oh, but the *Globe* said some time ago—I do not know when—the *Globe* pointed out that I was in a minority, and I could not bring a resolution up; and because the *Globe* expressed an opinion, which I heard of for the first time, I must confess—for I am not so diligent a reader of my *Globe* as the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) is of his—I say, because the *Globe* expressed the opinion a fortnight ago, that being leader of the minority, I could not bring up this resolution, the hon. gentleman finds another ground which, to less credulous persons, would be a good ground for suspecting me. Then he goes further. He says that the Ottawa correspondent of the Montreal *Post* said that such a resolution, if moved here by the Conservatives, would be a Tory dodge, and because the Ottawa correspondent of the Montreal *Post*—I have no doubt a very respectable gentleman, but one whose acquaintance I have not the honor of having—said that a resolution moved by the Tories in this House upon this question, would be a Tory dodge, therefore I am to be suspected if anybody but the hon. member for Montreal Centre brings up the resolution! Well, under these circumstances it is that I am a suspected character, and that I presume, under the old coercion Act, I would have been liable to be sent to Kilmainham! Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that there should be no address, that it is contrary to the feelings of the Irish people—by which, I presume, he meant the Irish Catholic people—that we should address the Crown again upon this subject. I think the hon. gentleman mistook the feeling of the Irish people, whether Catholic or Protestant, I do not believe it. I think he is entirely mistaken. I should be very sorry to suppose that there is any reluctance on their part to the Commons of Canada submitting to the Queen of the Empire their opinions on this subject; and all I can say about that is that he and I are at issue there. The hon. gentleman states that he consulted a great many persons—of course on his side of the House; and he was told there would be a very great difficulty indeed in proceeding, because of the answer to the last address—very great difficulty. I daresay that the friends of the hon. gentleman who don't want Home Rule, did magnify the difficulties, and pointed out to him that the snub, as it is called, of Earl Kimberley, was a reason why this great step, in which he and I are so much interested, should not be taken by the Commons. Allow me to advise the hon. gentle-

man in the future, when he is trying to find out whether there are difficulties, rather to distrust the opinion of those who don't want the step to be taken. You know of the timorous man who generally finds a lion in his path. The hon. gentleman has found a good many lions in his path, I do not know whether they are colored orange, tawny, or what, but to my mind it looks very like—for I do not share the hon. gentleman's too generous feelings in a desire not to suspect—it looks uncommonly to my mind, considering the quarters in which he searched, as if he was in search of lions, as if he wanted some good cause to be afraid, as if he wanted to find a reason for not doing anything; and he went about among the alarmists, and the alarmists alarmed him, and, being properly alarmed, he held his tongue. Then he says, the address may be regarded as a satire upon Earl Kimberley. Earl Kimberley is a very respectable and able personage, and I am sure he would have too much good sense to suppose that it was a satire upon him. But those hon. gentlemen who think that we have been snubbed by Earl Kimberley's answer, I suppose, would not be very loath to reassert our rights and our dignity by addressing the Throne, even if it did happen to be a little satirical upon Earl Kimberley. I suppose it would not grieve their souls very much that we should be able to say: We were right then, and we saw a little further into the future than you did, and we now help you on to do that thing which, four years ago, we exhorted you to do. I do not think the hon. gentleman's pack of alarmists would, from that point of view, have great difficulty in supporting the address. Well, then, there were some other hon. gentlemen who referred to me—for, really, I have had so much attention paid to me to-night that I feel embarrassed properly to respond to the compliments I have received—there were some other hon. members to some of whose remarks I shall not pay any attention, but to one or two I shall. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) said that I had said that I had acted spontaneously. Was I not asked to move? he said; was I not forced forward? Sir, I have frankly stated that I waited until the last moment in the hope that some of the opposite side of the House would move. I felt satisfied that their apprehensions could not be due to my side, that they could not fear any opposition from me, knowing what I had done in 1882, and I hoped that they would be able so to compose the differences in their own ranks, so to create a unity of feeling on their side of the House, that, knowing that the solid Liberal force would be with them, they would not be afraid of their own friends, so far afraid of their own friends as not to propose a resolution. I hoped that happy result would ensue; I did hope we would find the Conservative party a unit with the Reform party in favor of this, and I waited until the last moment, in order not in the slightest degree to embarrass the efforts which I felt sure—and I now find I was right—that the Minister of Inland Revenue and the hon. member for Montreal were making, in order to achieve that happy result. It seems they failed to promote a unanimity of feeling amongst their friends, and that, therefore, they gave up the attempt. It was not until then, and until the question was, as I said the other day, almost at the door that I moved. Now, with reference to my being asked to move. I was not asked to move until after I had made up my mind that I was going to move, and when I was asked to move, I will tell the hon. gentleman the response which I made to those who asked me. I was asked by a deputation from a very respectable society here, the St. Patrick's Literary Society of Ottawa, and I told the gentlemen who were good enough to wait upon me that, highly as I felt the honor of the invitation, I could not accept any invitation from any body, speaking for any particular sect, or class, or nationality in this community, either to act or to abstain from acting, upon a question of this description. I said I believed that the question itself would be injured if it were treated from any such point of view, as the special property of one portion of the community. I said that it was as Canadians, as persons interested, from their experience of its blessings, in the principle of Home Rule and its extension, as Canadians, citizens and subjects of the Empire, interested in the prosperity of England, as free men, interested in the propagation of the cause of freedom, that we should act, and that I thought the strength and force of any such movement would be greatly diminished, and that prejudices would be excited which ought not to be excited, if it were attempted to be moved from one particular section of the population, or by any man as the exponent of one portion of the population. I decline altogether to agree to the position which some hon. gentlemen opposite arrogate to themselves in regard to this question. The Irish Catholic members in this House and in the other Chamber, and particularly the Tory Irish Catholic members, have no special part in this question—none whatever, and their cause suffers when they attempt to assume such a position. It is as Canadians they are to speak; it is as one whole body; with the exception of three or four individuals who have frightened the Minister of Inland Revenue, it is as Canadians speaking in favor of a common cause, moved by a common impulse and acting on a common principle, that, we are to succeed, and they who make difficulties for the cause are they who declare that this question is the special part and property of a particular class of the people. Then the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) said that I was trying to catch the Irish vote. I have been in public life a good many years. The Irish population of my Province is, of course, composed of the Irish Protestant population and the Irish Catholic population. I have endeavored to do my duty and to act upon what I believe were sound liberal principles towards all classes of the population. I have found myself opposed by a solid body, by the great majority, by the vast bulk of the Irish Protestants of Ontario. They are my strongest, and sternest, and fiercest political opponents to-day. I have found myself opposed by the great bulk of the Irish Catholics of Ontario. They also, with some noble exceptions, were amongst my opponents when I was defeated in South Bruce, during my absence from the country through ill-health, it was the Irish Catholics of that riding that rejected me, that deprived me of my seat in Parliament and obliged me to stand for another constituency at a subsequent date. I have endeavored, notwithstanding all that, to do my duty and to act according to my lights honestly, justly and fairly towards the Irish Catholics and towards the Irish Protestants, towards all classes. I make no distinction whatever in consequence of class or creed, and I extend no bid for the support of any class or creed. The position of the Irish Catholics and the Irish Protestants is this: They know that from the Liberal party they will obtain all they can justly claim, whether they give or refuse their support to that party. They know that the Liberal party will always act on the principle of justice, freedom and equal rights, because that is the plank upon which we stand. They know they have nothing whatever to gain by supporting us, because they will not gain one jot or tittle beyond what those principles of justice, freedom and equal rights require. They know they have nothing to lose by opposing us, because they know, however strenuous their opposition may be, it will not make us one whit less earnest or less active in the promotion of their interests and of the common interests according to the same principles of justice, liberty and equal rights. And therefore there is no need for them to turn their votes one way or the other in order that they may obtain from the Liberal party their meed of justice and of liberty. That is our relation to that class, as to which the hon. gentleman rather coarsely said I was attempting to catch their votes. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), who is an old personal friend of mine, and who I am sure must have been

very much excited to-night when he raised his blackthorn against me as did the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) used some expressions in regard to a former debate, for which he was called to order and to which I will not refer. He said later that I occupied a very peculiar position because I happened to be—he misstated my position—the leader of a party in religion. I am none such. I am certainly of the evangelical portion of the denomination to which I belong, and I am a member of the advanced wing perhaps of that party. That is quite true. And the hon. gentleman says because I am a Protestant, occupying that position I must know, if I have any Protestant friends in Ireland, that every Protestant in Ireland denounces Mr Gladstone's measure, and that I am inconsistent in my present course. I have some Protestant friends in Ireland and I have some in Canada, and the bulk of my Protestant friends in Ireland, and, though I regret it, it is perfectly natural considering their condition, circumstances and surroundings, are opposed to Home Rule. But I deny altogether the statement that every Protestant in Ireland denounces Home Rule. It is not so. The hon. gentleman will find that there are a very considerable number of Protestants who are for self government for Ireland. And it is not to be forgotten that such was the sentiment of the country at the very time at which that union took place, which is now thought such a sacred compact—that compact which was begotten in profligacy and corruption admittedly without a parallel, that compact which was certainly not a holy compact—it was opposed as strongly and earnestly by a large body of Protestants, aye by Orangemen too, as by the other classes of the population. Then the hon. gentleman from Muskoka said—and I quite approve of his observation, and I made one like it myself—that he claimed the right to speak for Ireland as well as the Minister of Inland Revenue. He is perfectly right. I quite accord the right to speak for Ireland to the hon. member for Muskoka; let each speak according to his lights. He thinks Home Rule will be disadvantageous to the country from which his people came, and I think it is an advantageous proposal for the country from which my people came. We are each of us I suppose entitled to our own views and are free to follow our own convictions. I quite agree that the hon. gentleman has as good a right to speak for Ireland as any other hon. member whose ancestors came from Ireland, but in each case it must depend upon the circumstances under which, and the degree of interest and thoroughness with which the hon. gentleman has studied the question, and after all any definite conclusion at which any of us may arrive may be erroneous. The member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) said he also had something to say about it. He endorsed the principle of Home Rule, but he found words to say that he would support the Ministry. I do not think it takes very much to induce the member for Centre Wellington to support the Administration. I pass him by. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said that I knew there was a great diversity of opinion in Ontario. I have no doubt there is a considerable number of persons absolutely, though a very small number relatively, I believe, in the Province who entertain strong opinions adverse to Home Rule; but I believe that the vast majority of the people of that Province, taken as a whole, are directly, thoroughly and irrevocably in favor of the principles of Home Rule as applied to Ireland. That is my opinion; I may be mistaken; the member for North Bruce may be right if he entertains a different opinion, but such at all events is my opinion. Then the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said that the motion would not do because it endorses the measure of Mr. Gladstone. What my motion does is to endorse the principle of that measure, which principle, as I pointed out to the House on Tuesday, the author of the Bill himself declares to be the principle of Local Government or autonomy for Ireland. The question of Irish representation for Imperial purposes at Westminster, Mr. Gladstone said, I put to one side; I do not ask you to vote for that on the second reading. There are other details in regard to internal matters, and in regard to them Mr. Gladstone says, I do not ask you to vote for them; but I ask you in voting for the second reading of the Bill to vote for the principle of self-government for Ireland and for this measure as calculated, at all events as far as the Local Government of Ireland is concerned, irrespective of the question of the measure of control Ireland should have in Imperial affairs and of some other questions, to form a basis for settlement. What the hon. gentleman from West York says is that the measure will not do. It does not suit his views. He is opposed to any large measure of Home Rule. He would like the Irish to have municipal institutions, but a large measure of Home Rule he is opposed to, and therefore he is opposed to my motion. That is the very reason I want my motion carried—because I am in favor of a large measure of Home Rule. He is opposed to my measure because it will aid, comfort and support the second reading of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, which he does not want to take place. But that is just what I do want—that the second reading of that Bill should be carried. I believe that the most important stage in the question of Home Rule for Ireland would be achieved by the second reading of that Bill. I do not believe the question will be ultimately settled in the terms of that Bll, but the most important stage in the settlement of it will have been passed if it is carried, and if it fails I do not choose to forecast the consequences. But I do say that the very reason which the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) who, with those other gentlemen, are, I suppose, the dissentients, to whom the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue referred—the very reason he and others give as a ground why the motion of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is preferable to the motion which I have offered—that they are prepared to support it, because it would do so little good to the cause of Home Rule and that it would do less harm to the opposition to Home Rule than the other, is the reason why my motion should receive the support of the House. Then the hon. gentleman says the question is a most intricate one. Undoubtedly, it is a vast question, an enormously intricate question in its details; and if we were offering an opinion on all its details I think we would require a great deal more study and perhaps a great deal more local knowledge, as to some of them, than we have had the opportunity of acquiring. But we are not asked to pronounce on the details of the measure. We are asked, as I have said and as I have established, to pronounce on the second reading of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, as an affirmation of the principle of Home Rule to Ireland. That is the best, the most sensible, the most practical step towards the accomplishment of the object which I believe a majority of this House has at heart, and that step we are asked not to take, that step we are asked to set aside in favor of this pale, this colorless resolution of the Minister of Inland Revenue, which is acceptable to hon. gentlemen who do not like Home Rule, because it is the least calculated to promote Home Rule! The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said it really looked to him is if I were toadying to Mr. Gladstone. Because I had not moved an address directly to Mr. Gladstone, because I had not asked the House to express its sympathy and admiration for Mr. Gladstone, as has been done by other bodies, because I preferred passing him by, and moving for an address to our Most Gracious Sovereign, I am supposed, forsooth, to be toadying to Mr. Gladstone! When in 1882 I ventured to point out the difficulties of Mr. Gladstone's attitude at that time, when I pointed out what he has since proved true by his action, that it was not a sufficient defence for him to say that a small minority which had grievances did not formulate a plan which they had no power to carry into effect; that if he admitted that there existed grievances, it was his duty,

who had the power, to formulate the best plan he could in order to remedy admitted grievances according to his lights, the First Minister said: Here is a gentleman criticising that great statesman, Mr. Gladstone, criticising him adversely, using harsh language towards him, telling him that he is mistaken, that he is wrong, that he ought to do some other thing; Mr. Gladstone, he said, though a great statesman, like other men, is human, and he will be annoyed when he sees the hon. gentleman's speech; I hope, he said, that the report containing the speech will be delayed in transmission; I hope that by some happy accident the mail steamer may be lost, so that the hon. gentleman's speech may not reach him, because, if it does, the good which the address will do will be defeated by what he has said of Mr. Gladstone! Yet the hon. member for West York finds to-day that I am toadying to Mr. Gladstone! Now, Sir, I believe it is extremely unfortunate that the proposals of the Minister of Inland Revenue as to an effort to agree upon the motion, in the interval between Tuesday and to-day, were not by him carried out. I think it would have been much better if that had been done; but we have now to settle the question in the ordinary way. I consider my motion preferable to the hon. gentleman's for the reasons I have stated. I consider the amendment which the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is proposing to introduce in it an improvement on my motion. I intend, therefore, to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Wellington.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is only one reason why I feel justified in trespassing on the indulgence of the House after the long debate we have had, and especially after the exceedingly able speech to which we have just listened, and that is the reason that I am one of the few members of the present Cabinet who have not had, previously to to-day, an opportunity of expressing an opinion on this question. I am one of the members of the party now in power who sympathise with the resolutions and the address which this House adopted in 1882. Although I had not then the honor of a seat in this House, I sympathised with those resolutions and with that address for reasons which I propose to state to this House in a very few words. They are mainly the reasons which induced the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), to impugn the wisdom, the policy and the good faith of those resolutions and of that address. The hon. member for South Grey in the observation which he addressed to the House a few moments ago, intimated that those resolutions and that address in 1882 were ill-timed. He told the House that at that time there was no practical measure before the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and that our words would have very little significance and very little effect. Now, Sir, the circumstances in which the Irish question stood in 1882 were the circumstances which induced me to feel proud, as one having some Irish blood in his veins, of the action taken by the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Minister of Inland Revenue, and to feel to some extent proud of the action of this House. The position of the Irish question in 1882 was such that the voice of friends, and courageous friends was called for. The people of Ireland in 1882, and especially the men who spoke for her, had few friends in the British Parliament, and they could feel that the voice of encouragement, coming from fellow-subjects on this side of the ocean, would bring to them sentiments of friendship and elements of strength which they greatly needed. A number of the representatives of the Irish people who had been struggling for Home Rule, and the amelioration of the land laws, were then in prison, and this Parliament was one of the first on this side of the Atlantic, if not the only Parliament within the British Empire, that raised a voice, not only to assist the national cause, but to ask clemency for the men who were then in Kilmainham prison. Let me ask this House where were the friends of liberty and freedom, who are so boastfully declaring this evening that only within their ranks are true liberals to be found? Where they were when those sentiments were pressed on this House, and why did they not meet as now and put forth their leader to ask the House to proclaim that the sentiments of liberty and freedom, they are so proud to advance to-night, should then be advanced in favor of the cause which had few friends, and of the men who were actually immured in dungeons in Ireland in 1882? These were the very reasons which induced the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to say that the resolution and the address then were ill-timed. These were the very reasons which led me to believe, as one having some sympathy with the cause in favor of which that address was sent forward, that the voice of this Parliament was a timely voice. The position in which that cause stands to-day is very different. It is the hour of success, notwithstanding that some hon. members on this side of the House doubt the immediate and perhaps the eventual success of the cause in favor of which this struggle has taken place. This much at least has been achieved, that the principle of some liberal measure of Home Rule for Ireland has received far wider acceptance in the United Kingdom than anyone anticipated in 1882. The friends of that cause, who were then imprisoned, are leading a most influential party, which actually holds the balance of power in the British Parliament; and it is only when the cause may be said to have triumphed—when at any rate it has advanced so far that the success of some such a measure, consistent with the safety of the Empire and the rights of all classes, is assured—then it is that those friends of freedom, who combine with their own ranks and caucus alone the sentiments of liberty, are willing to come forward and ask this House to adopt resolutions in sympathy with the cause which has achieved such triumph. Now, a reason given why the House should adopt this resolution is that it is the right of the House, in spite of the rebuke of the Earl of Kimberley, to assert its undoubted privilege of addressing the Throne. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that this has been altogether renounced in the resolution now offered to this House and in the speech of the hon. member for West Durham. That resolution and that speech assert no right. They simply express joy at the action of Mr. Gladstone in introducing the Home Rule measure; and the hon. member for West Durham says: "We are not approaching the Throne as we did before, we are not tendering advice to Her Majesty, or Her Majesty's advisers; we are cheering them on." Sir, the House in 1882, on motion of my friend the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, did cheer on a depressed, a downcast cause; and I humbly think it is beneath the dignity of this House, as I feel sure it is beneath the dignity of gentlemen expressing such a large love of liberty, to say that this action is taken only to cheer on the Imperial Government, because they have yielded a measure of justice to a portion of the United Kingdom. As an instance of the change of sentiment I may mention that I have under my hand a speech delivered by Mr. Gladstone not more than four months before that resolution and address were adopted by this House, in which he declared that the policy of Mr. Parnell and his Irish followers, which had been put forth by their friends as one of the points of Irish patriotism, was simply the "gospel of plunder." I think it was consistent with love of civil liberty, and love of personal liberty, that the voice of this Parliament should be raised then, as my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue asked Parliament to raise it under those circumstances. Now, Sir, the hon. member for West Durham let fall one remark in support of his contention that we are not sacrificing our dignity, which fell somewhat strangely on my ear. One of the reasons he has just advanced why this House should again approach the

Throne, or rather Her Majesty's Ministers, with an address expressing joy for what they have done, is that the action of Lord Kimberley in 1882 was "unadvised." The impression may be on the minds of some of the members of this House that for the tone of the reply sent to this Parliament Lord Kimberley alone was responsible. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that we are asked by the resolution before the House this evening to express our joy at the action of that "god-like statesman," as he was termed by the hon. member for South Grey, while not Lord Kimberley alone, but the "god-like statesman" himself declared in the British Parliament in 1882, not "unadvisedly," but deliberately, that this was a subject about which the Parliament of Canada had no right to interfere. Let me read from the English *Hansard* of 1st May, 1882:

"Mr. CALLAN asked leave to propose the following question, which has stood in his name on the notice paper:—

"To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the telegraphic despatch in the *Times* of April the 2nd, under date:

"'OTTAWA, 20th April.

"'In to-day's sitting of the House of Commons of the Dominion Mr. Costigan, a Conservative, moved that an address should be presented to the Queen, praying that a form of self-government should be granted to Ireland similar to that enjoyed by Canada, and that clemency should be extended to the political prisoners in Ireland. Mr. Blake, the leader of the Opposition, made a powerful speech in favor of Home Rule for Ireland. Sir John Macdonald, the Premier, also supported the resolution proposed by Mr. Costigan, which was unanimously adopted. Sir John Macdonald stated that he would see that the necessary steps were taken to have the address prepared, in order that it might be sent to the Senate for concurrence;'

"Whether he will have any objection to direct that a copy of the said address be laid upon the Table of the House; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter?"

"Mr. GLADSTONE. I think when such a question relating to a public body had been for some time on the paper, it is necessary that it should be answered as soon as possible, and I propose to answer, at any rate, so much of the question as is before us.

"Mr. CALLAN. I wish to make an addition to the question, and to ask whether the right hon. gentleman is aware that since my notice was first given, the Canadian Senate, or Upper House, has confirmed the resolution?

"Mr. GLADSTONE. No, Sir; I am not aware that the Senate had concurred in the proceedings of the Assembly. The Address was not transmitted in the regular manner. We are cognisant of the resolution having been passed, and of its contents, but only by a telegraphic report. We cannot present it to the House, because we are not in possession of the document. With regard to the substance of the resolution, the hon. gentleman has called upon me to enter upon a matter which is fitter for debate than a mere reply to a question; but, of course, I may observe that although, no doubt, the Assembly of Canada desired to assist our deliberations, the question referred to in the address appertains exclusively to the Imperial Parliament; and I may add, that so much of the subject matter as touches the discretion of the Executive Government—for this is part of the subject matter—had our close and constant attention before the intimation of the wish expressed in the address, either from that quarter or any other quarter, had reached us in the shape of any suggestion."

It will not be now said that the expression in the despatch by which the address of this Parliament was answered was an expression "unadvisedly" used by Lord Kimberley. It will now be seen that we are asked to sacrifice all dignity and self-respect to approach Mr. Gladstone, not for the purpose of advising, not for the purpose of giving practical assistance, but simply, to use the expression of the hon. member for West Durham a few minutes ago, for the purpose of cheering on the gentleman who said, in answer to our advice in 1882: "I wish you to understand that this is a matter which belongs exclusively to me, and with which you have nothing whatever to do." I do not profess to concur in that opinion at all. I agree in the statement of the hon. member for West Durham, that we have the right to express our opinion, as fellow-subjects of the Empire, on that or any other question; but I do say that before this House is asked to sacrifice its dignity by approaching again the very men who have declared they have no advice to take from us, that the matter is exclusively one for themselves to consider, and that they had formed their opinion before hearing from us, at least it should be shown that some practical useful purpose is to be served and somebody to be benefited. It is for these reasons that I am in sympathy with the Minister of Inland Revenue, in feeling indisposed to invite the action of Parliament upon that question again this Session. Now, however, that the subject is here, I feel no hesitation in voting for his resolution, inasmuch as it expresses the adherence of this House to the principles of the address of 1882, which looked to a measure for the pacification of Ireland, the gratification of the lawful ambition of a great body of its people, the preservation of the rights of the minority and the integrity of the Empire; but I do say, both as one who is entirely in sympathy with the address of 1882, and as a member of this House, that I am opposed to passing any address on this subject in view of all the circumstances, and that I think the dignity and self-respect of this House will be best maintained by simply asserting that what this House resolved in 1882 it adheres to to-night, and records its opinion, without undertaking to present an address on the subject to the man who spurned our address before, and from whom we have no reason to expect any change in this particular, although there may be a change in the question now before Parliament. There is no reason whatever for considering that Mr. Gladstone would deem the advice of the Parliament of Canada more useful or the administration of Irish affairs any less exclusively in the province of the Imperial Parliament in 1886 than in 1832. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) seems to have a contrary view, because he calls the attention of the House to the manifesto issued by Mr. Gladstone. I humbly differ from the hon. gentleman. I think that Mr. Gladstone did not, in that manifesto, invite an expression of the opinion of the Parliament of Canada, and I do not believe that the influence of the Parliament of Canada at this stage of the discussion will have any useful result. If he thought it would assist in the consideration of the question in the Imperial Parliament that the opinion of the Canadian Parliament should be known, Mr. Gladstone could call it up from the Colonial Office. He would find there the address of both Houses of Parliament—the unrescinded expression of Parliament, declared in the most formal way and conveyed to the Imperial authorities in the exercise of our rights as British subjects—and can use it if he pleases on the second reading of the Bill. The contention made by one of the hon. gentleman's supporters that because a new Parliament has come in it is necessary to reiterate all those resolutions, seems to me an extraordinary one. If that be so, it would be the duty of a new Parliament to adopt all the resolutions of the old one, excepting those dissented from and it would be our duty to re-enact all our old Statutes. But we have been accustomed to suppose that that which went forward deliberately and solemnly, by the unanimous votes of both Houses, is an expression of opinion which might be said to last, at any rate, until a contrary opinion is expressed. When the hon. member for West Durham moved his resolution two days ago, I confess it was with surprise I heard the statement, which I was bound to accept, that it was introduced in no party spirit. I felt surprised at that statement, because I supposed that the leader of the Opposition, in moving that resolution as an amendment to the motion to go into Supply, an amendment which the Government were bound, under the circumstances, to treat as a vote of want of confidence.—

Mr. MILLS. Not at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. I suppose the hon. gentleman would have avowed his position to be this, that he proposed to challenge on public grounds the attitude of the Government on this question. But the hon. gentleman chose to state at that stage of the discussion that it was introduced in no party spirit, and we were bound to accept that statement—

although, I must say, it was with considerable difficulty I accepted it. I am glad that the strain involved in the acceptance of that proposition is no longer upon us, because the hon. gentleman, in the pleasing speech which he made a few moments ago, gracefully threw off the mask, and declared, if not in so many words, in effect that this is being pushed on this House this evening as purely a party measure. The hon. gentleman evinced an ecstasy which I have not witnessed upon his countenance since I came to this House, and which I would be exceedingly gratified to see, if not in such a cause, in pointing out the gentlemen on this side who are unable to concur in the resolution. There he showed at once that one of the objects he had in bringing this resolution forward was to show that hon. gentlemen on this side were not a unit on this question. But I am sure nobody would accuse me in this House of being wanting in charity, in imputing any such motive to the hon. gentlemen, when they recall the words by which I regretted to hear him assail a number of gentlemen on this side led by the Minister of Inland Revenue—gentlemen who have justified their adhesion to the principles of personal freedom and civil liberty under many trying circumstances which that hon. gentleman has never had to undergo; gentlemen who have evinced their willingness to support this cause when the hon. member for West Durham and his friends, in the Liberal caucus, of freedom and liberty were mute in this House; men who raised their voices and induced this House unanimously to express an opinion in favor of Home Rule. He assailed these members in words which I think the hon. gentleman himself will regret to have on record, when he assailed them as the "Tory Irish Catholic clique." I suppose that, after words like that uttered against gentlemen on this side of the House for no other reason than that they felt unwilling to obtrude this question unnecessarily again, and because they were unwilling to support the hon. gentleman in an appeal to the Throne to cheer on the statesman, who told us in 1882, with a double voice, that this was a matter exclusively for himself, and that he was quite able to form an opinion upon it without hearing us at all, we are relieved from crediting any further the statement that the matter was not brought forward in a party spirit. When the hon. gentleman attacked the friends in this House who had brought this matter successfully forward before as the "Tory Irish Catholic clique," I thought I was justified in assuming that the strain he put on my credulity the day before yesterday would be altogether relieved to-night. There was one other reason which was perfectly obvious, both from his remarks and from the remarks of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), for the introduction of the resolution, and that was that it was to put, if possible, in a false position my hon. colleague, the Minister of Inland Revenue. One-half of the hon. gentleman's remarks two-thirds of the remarks of the hon. member for South Grey were given to an assault upon that gentleman's consistency. As I have said before under the circumstances which existed in 1882, when popular opinion was not to be gained, when the good graces of Mr. Gladstone were not to be gained by the expression of opinion on this question, my hon. friend who sits beside me asked this House to join in that expression of opinion at a time when those who claim that the principles of liberty are altogether in their keeping were unwilling to express an opinion upon it until they were led by the present Minister of Inland Revenue. Nobody knows better than I do the statement that was made in the London *Times* and read to the House of Commons that in 1882 the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) made a very able speech upon this subject, showed a great deal of ability, and went with the favorable gale which was then carrying that resolution through the House. I do not wish to detract from the contribution which an eloquent speech like that made to the business of the occasion; but I am still disposed, as one of the members of this House, agreeing with the amendment which has been moved this evening, to decline, notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's great eloquence and great fervor on that occasion, to agree with him in the attack he made on the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, who, without the aid of the hon. gentleman so freely tendered the day before yesterday, brought the question before the House and chose the time for doing it when the resolution of this House could do the most good, and we had not merely the agreeable task of cheering on Her Majesty's Prime Minister in a course which he has already adopted without the advice of Canada, and after informing Canada that she has nothing to do with the question. As one of the members of the House taking this view. Notwithstanding what has been said this evening, I declare my adhesion to the consistency and the sincerity of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, and I believe that the people throughout this country who sympathise with the principles expressed in this amendment, will prefer the course which the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue has adopted to the course the Opposition have adopted on this question, notwithstanding the desperate attempt that has been made to break down that gentleman's position as regards his consistency and his right to speak for his fellow countrymen and his co-religionists. But, if the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Blake's) words were not sufficient, when he pointed with such pleasure to the dissentients in this House, if his words were not sufficient when he assailed gentlemen on this side of the House who felt so warm an interest in this question that perhaps from pardonable zeal they thought the question entirely in their own keeping, I should suppose the words of the hon. mover of the amendment to the amendment this evening would be quite sufficient to show that this is being pushed upon the House as purely a party measure and purely to put the Government in a false position upon it, which I venture to say they shall not be able to do. I need not say the hon. member for West Durham is responsible for the statements of the mover of the amendment to the amendment, because he sat by and heard them all, he cheered them all, he failed to disallow any of them, and he declared at the end of his remarks that he intented to vote for the motion with which the hon. member for North Wellington closed his speech; and that gentleman perhaps at an earlier stage than his leader intended, disclosed the whole game by stating that we were angry on this side of the House, because "the wind had been taken out of our sails," and because we saw that "we had sacrificed an opportunity to make ourselves popular." Now, the hon. mover of the amendment to the amendment, with the tacit assent of his leader, has declared, in words in which it may be safely said he speaks for his party, that the object of bringing this whole question before the House, and especially in embarking the little resolution with which he concluded his remarks, is simply to outsail the Government, to outsail the members in favor of Home Rule on this side of the House, and to seize the opportunity which he thought we had sacrificed of cultivating popularity, making ourselves popular, although the expression of the opinion of this Parliament cannot serve any useful purpose other than that of making ourselves popular, and would be, in the way in which it is proposed to express it, a sacrifice of the dignity and the consistency of this Parliament.

Mr. COURSOL. Notwithstanding the lateness of the hour, I feel that I cannot give a silent vote on this question, representing, as I do, the largest and most populous division in the Dominion, inhabited by so many thousands

of Irishmen, true to their adopted land, and true to Ireland. I have had the occasion to attend meetings in favor of Home Rule, called by the most influential Irishmen of the city of Montreal. There was but one sentiment, and that was in favor of the scheme proposed by Mr. Gladstone, and then and there it was said that they hoped that every effort would be made by the friends of Ireland, whenever that occasion should come, in order to strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone at the present moment. It is indeed a great sight to see the Premier of the British Empire coming forward with a scheme to relieve Ireland from the grievances of centuries past, and it is not surprising that the attention of the world is now rivetted on the British Parliament. From every part of the globe Mr. Gladstone has received despatches and letters of congratulation; from every part of the globe Mr. Parnell, who has behaved so nobly in behalf of Ireland, has also received, probably, the same amount of congratulation. The Legislature of the Province of Quebec sent a resolution to Mr. Gladstone, which he acknowledged with pleasure, and it now remains for the House of Commons to do the same. I am sure that the 9,000,000 of Irishmen inhabiting this continent, believe that something ought to be done in this House. I think it is the opinion of all the Irishmen in Canada that something should be done here, and I believe they will be thankful to the mover of the resolution. This is no time to quarrel about politics. This is no time to say that it has been brought in by the leader of the Government or the leader of the Opposition. It is for us to decide whether the proposition before us deserves our approval, whether it will serve the purpose desired, whether it will show to England, to the British Empire, that Mr. Gladstone, in his Home Rule measure, has friends in Canada who are disposed to cheer him on in the course he has adopted. The measure may have many defects, it may not pass in its shape, but all we want to know is whether Ireland will be benefited and satisfied. If we find that the measure satisfies Irishmen, we also shall be satisfied. I am not an Irishman, but I have felt for Ireland ever since I read her history, and now at last, after so many centuries of oppression, so many centuries of persecution, at last one man steps forward and brings up the measure intended to remove her grievances, and that man is the Premier of England. We are told that Mr. Gladstone held different views some time ago. I do not care what views he may have held in the past, I care for his views of to-day. I take his proposition as I find it, and I think it deserves our hearty support. I believe the day is not far distant when he will achieve that great feat of repairing the injustices of the past, that he will receive the reward he deserves, and that his brilliant career will be closed by passing a law that will be a blessing to the people who have suffered so long. For my part, I do not view this as a party measure. If the proposition of the Minister of Inland Revenue had been alone before the House, I would gladly have supported it. But if I find something more to the point, something calculated to do more good, I am bound, as a friend of Ireland, as a lover of freedom, to support the second proposition. I know that the Minister of Inland Revenue has done all he possibly could for his country. I know the love he has for Ireland, he has proved it on many occasions, and I am sure that in this instance he has been moved by the purest motives of patriotism. But that alone should not prevent us from judging all the motions before us. We are bound to take them as we find them. I think the motion of the leader of the Opposition, coupled with the amendment, is calculated to do good, and that it will have the effect of showing the position of this House and the country. It is said we have received a rebuke from England. Well, Sir, so far as I am concerned, and I believe so far as the people of this country are concerned, it is a matter of indifference whether this House received a rebuke four years ago; all we want is to accomplish our object, the position is not the same now, circumstances have changed. Are we to be told that we British subjects living in this great Dominion, have no right to lay our views at the foot of the Throne? Are we not interested in this question—perhaps even more than any other colony of the Empire? Who knows the consequences which a refusal of Home Rule might entail upon this Dominion? Who knows where trouble might come from? We might have to defend our shores with our money and our blood. I know not what might be the consequences if that measure should be refused. But if it passes I believe it is calculated to bring peace and harmony, not only to England, but to the whole world, wherever there are Irishmen, and especially in this part of America. Now, Sir, the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition is couched in a calm, dignified tone, there is nothing in it to offend, and I am sure if it is sent by this Parliament to Mr. Gladstone, he will receive it with gratitude, and thereby correct the mistake that was made before. We ought not to think of that, if we can accomplish our end, our first object is to do good to Ireland, and we ought not to dispute about the terms, we need not be so punctillious about the terms; let us do our duty first about the cause of Ireland and of Home Rule, and if we succeed we shall be satisfied. If, on the contrary, the English Government should think fit to return such an answer as they did before, then Canada will know what she will have to do, but I presume no such thing will happen. I shall vote in favor of the amendment as it stands, hoping that it will be annexed to the motion of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to say but a few words on the subject that has engaged the attention of the House this afternoon and evening. I have waited until our Irish friends in the House have had an opportunity of expressing their views, and now that they have had full opportunity, and one of our French friends has found occasion to approve of the course of the leader of the Opposition and of the resolution which he has submitted, I, who cannot claim to be either Irish by birth or Irish by descent, recognize that fact, and at the same time venture to claim that I am in a position in which I may be permitted to say a few words on this question. I conceive this to be a question that is more than an Irish question. These resolutions are introduced into the Canadian Parliament, and as a Canadian, and as a representative in the Canadian Parliament, I feel I am at liberty to express my views in regard to the substance of them, and to intimate what my views are in that direction. I think it is eminently proper that in the Canadian Parliament, composed of the representatives of various Provinces, which enjoy to the full the privilege of local self-government, such resolutions should be introduced. I was one of those in the House, who, in 1882, was very glad, along with almost all the members in the House, to ratify by my assent and by my vote on that occasion what I believed to be a correct principle, that local self-government should be given to the people of Ireland, permitting them to manage their own local affairs as to them might seem right and proper. And therefore when the leader of the Opposition has to-day placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, a resolution declaring that we adhere to the principles we enunciated at that time and evidenced by our vote and that he desires further to express to Her Majesty our belief that the principles we then advocated have been incorporated in a measure that has been brought down by the Imperial Cabinet and submitted to the House of Commons, I feel that I desire to express my approval of that resolution and give it my support, and, if I have an opportunity, my vote. It is to be regretted very much, I think, that on a question of this great consequence, on a question on which it is so desirable that

we should all be united, an attempt should have been made to introduce an element of party strife. It is particularly to be regretted that the evident intention to introduce if possible party strife into the discussion of this question should come from those who have constituted themselves, as it were, the special champions of the Irish people and of the Irish cause. They have seen fit to accouse the leader of the Opposition of acting from party motives in introducing his resolution. The Minister of Justice has not thought it beneath him to charge upon the leader of the Opposition that he was actuated by purely party motives in introducing this resolution. I excuse some of the statements he made to-night, as I feel that the hon. gentleman understood he was in an awkward position when he intimated that he would vote down the proposal of the leader of the Opposition. His charge was that the hon. gentleman had moved it for purely party purposes. What was the evidence he gave? Can any hon. gentleman in the action or in the words of the leader of the Opposition point to a single word or a single circumstance that would corroborate such a statement? Hon. gentlemen opposite say the proof is to be found in the leader of the Opposition having moved this motion as an amendment on going into Committtee of Supply, when it became, as a matter of course, a vote of non-confidence in the Administration. The hon. gentleman knows that that statement is not correct. He knows that the leader of the Opposition moved the motion on that occasion, because it was only upon such an occasion that it was possible for him to move it during this Session; and more than that, the hon. gentleman took care, when he made the motion, to announce that it was not made in a party sense and not as a leader of a party, but in the hope that it would receive the unanimous approval of the House. It was only necessary for the Minister to act on the resolution in the spirit in which it was proposed, just as was done in 1882 when the Costigan resolutions were introduced at a precisely similar time, to have removed it entirely out of the region of party politics, had they been anxious to do so and united on their side of the House, and thus a unanimous vote on this occasion might have been secured as it was in 1882. When the leader of the House objected to the motion coming up as an amendment to Supply the hon. gentleman announced his willingness to withdraw his motion if a day was appointed and immediately the leader of the Opposition agreed. Subsequently, the leader of the Government made another stipulation that it should not be brought up as an amendment to go into Supply but as a substantive motion; and the leader of the Opposition signified his acquiescence. He did more than that. When the Minister of Inland Revenue suggested that by conference they could probably arrange a resolution that would secure the unanimous support of the House he said he desired a conference with the hon. gentlemen opposite, and that he would be happy to receive suggestions, and to arrive at some motion that would pass the House unanimously. Where then is the proof of the charge laid against the leader of the Opposition that he has introduced this resolution in a purely party spirit and for party gains and purposes? The Minister of Justice charged that when the Costigan resolutions were introduced, one of which expressed the hope that persons then confined in gaol might be released, the voice of the leader of the Opposition was not raised on that occasion. Does not the hon. gentleman know that on that very occasion the leader of the Opposition seconded the motion. Does not he know, and if he was not present has he not heard that such was the case? I well recall that his eloquent advocacy of the cause of local self-government for the Irish people captivated the entire parliamentary assembly, and that the cheers rang out not only from his supporters but from those who were politically opposed to him. I have here the testimony, in contradiction of the charge of the Minister of Justice that the leader of the Opposition had sat silent upon that occasion. I have the testimony of the Minister of Inland Revenue himself. In his speech delivered in this House the other day he said:

"Mr. Speaker, on a former occasion, when this same subject was discussed before this Parliament, no man who sat in this Chamber and listened to the hon. gentleman when he spoke on that occasion admired him more sincerely than I did, or was more ready to congratulate him upon the very able speech he delivered on that occasion."

And yet, Sir, the Minister of Justice rose and charged when these resolutions were passing through—alluding to one of them desiring the release of the persons then in prison—the leader of the Opposition had remained silent. I tell you, Sir, and I tell the House that long before the Costigan resolutions were introduced into this Parliament this measure of Home Rule for the people of Ireland was in the heart, and found expression from the lips, of the hon. leader of the Opposition. Two years and four days before the Costigan resolutions were introduced into this House, when my hon. friend was speaking of the Canadian Pacific Railway and of the probable immigration we would receive into our country, reciting the fact which he much regretted that we did not receive so large a number of immigrants from Ireland as he desired we might, he pointed out what he deeply regretted, that unfortunately the Irish Catholic population of Ireland, when they left their country, owing to the embittered feelings which existed between Ireland and England, instead of seeking our shores where they could find comfortable homes and work their fortunes, they sought the shores of another country and became settlers of, and helpers in building up, a foreign nation. Upon that occasion the leader of the Opposition, after deploring the fact I have pointed out, said this:

"But I hope for great things for Ireland and the Empire from the events of the last few days. I hope and trust that the advent to power of the Liberal party, supported by a great majority of decided Liberals and Radicals, will result in fresh measures of relief and justice to Ireland, which will tend still further to weaken her old feelings of hostility and disaffection, and to make the Empire in this regard an United Empire. I hope we shall see among other things a moderate measure of Home Rule for Ireland, and witness by the application of that measure the creation and maintenance of true and real bonds of Union between Ireland and the rest of the so-called United Kingdom."

That was the sentiment deep in the heart of the leader of the Opposition, a sentiment which found expression from his lips two years and four days before the Costigan resolutions were moved at all; and yet, although that is the record of the hon. gentleman, he is charged by hon. gentlemen on the other side, now that the desire of his heart in that respect seems to be approaching completion, now when he sees that by another effort it may become almost an accomplished fact, they say that after having waited, after having given them every opportunity to move from the other side, in order, if possible, that a unanimous vote might be secured, after waiting until he found from the newspapers that they would not move, he comes forward and moved his resolution—a resolution which is simply an affirmation of the one which was adopted by hon. gentlemen on both sides in 1882, and stating further that we desired to inform Her Majesty that this House hails with joy the submission by Her Majesty's Government to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, of a measure recognising the principle of local self-government for Ireland—they now find fault with him for moving this resolution. Is it not a meet and proper thing that he who desired it in 1880 and expressed a belief that through the restoration to power of a Liberal Administration this measure of Home Rule would become law—is it not fitting, now when he sees this measure actually submitted to the Imperial Parliament by that distinguished statesman and that it stands a chance of becoming the law of the land, that he should desire to place on record our approval of that principle, and lend the weight of the opinion of the Parliament of Canada in behalf of what we

conceive to be a principle that will be conducive of good and good only. And who, Sir, intercepts the motion of my hon. friend, and desires to prevent this House from stating that they hail with joy the introduction of this measure? Why, Sir, it remained for the man who moved the resolution in 1882, expressing a desire that this might be brought about —it remained for him, and a sad task it must have been, to seek to intercept the motion of the leader of the Opposition, giving us the opportunity of expressing our joy at seeing likely to be accomplished what we asked should be done by them And yet we find he takes shelter from that position, which is not, I venture to say, a creditable position, which is, I think, a position he must regret—though it is perhaps not too late for him to retrace his steps, by moving to withdraw his amendment in order that the resolution of the leader of the Opposition may be adopted—the excuse he gives for intercepting that resolution—and he embodies it in his resolution—is, that because when the resolutions of 1882 were sent to Her Majesty, Earl Kimberley replied in what he calls a snub to the Parliament of Canada, therefore, as the Minister of Justice said, it would be beneath our dignity to again adopt that course. Why, Sir, I am at a loss to perceive how it is a greater sacrifice of dignity upon our part respectfully to re-affirm the position we took at that time, and to express joy that those who differed from us at that time have embraced our views and are acting upon them, than that we should place on the journals of the House of Canada that we were snubbed, as they term it, by the Colonial Secretary, and that we desired to place it on the journals of the House and intend to make it our guide for all time to come, in order that we might take care that never more should we approach the foot of the Throne. I think the sacrifice of dignity on our part will be to carry the amendment of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, which is, in effect, to acknowledge that we received a snub —if snub it be—that we accept it as just, and that we claim the privilege of putting it on our journals, where it may always be before our eyes to prevent us from ever again doing such a thing, and prevent us from expressing our joy that a measure we approved of at that time and desired to see submitted has been submitted. And what is the position of the Minister of Inland Revenue upon this very question? Has he changed his views? No; he tells us that the reply of Earl Kimberley did not change his opinion at all. He said:

"I agree with the hon. gentleman in thinking that we had a perfect right to send the address we did send. It was couched in respectful language; it was moderate in its tone; it covered the principle involved; and as we took the ground that the question affected our interests in this country, we felt that we were acting within our clear right."

And still thinking we did nothing wrong, thinking that we were acting within our clear rights, he hesitates to stand upon his rights and desires to have entered on our journals the fact that what we considered to be our rights was denied to us by the Imperial Government, and the fact that they sent a reply of this kind he acquiesces in as a paramount reason why we should not again approach the Throne and express our views to Her Majesty. I say it is to be regretted that the hon. gentleman found himself obliged to take such a course; it is to be regretted that a gentleman to whom we will endeavor to give credit for heartily desiring that the principle of local self-government should be accorded to the Irish people, should himself be a party to intercept a motion which is calculated to strengthen the hands of the man who is endeavoring to give effect to the views which we then expressed. What will be the effect of the amendment of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue? It is simply a resolution saying we said so and so in 1882, we think so now, but Her Majesty's Government told us at that time that no matter what we thought we had no business to tell them, that therefore we will not tell them again what we do think in reference to this matter. But we will put it upon the journals of our own House, that notwithstanding what Earl Kimberley said in 1882, we think so still; and it is there. It is not to be transmitted to the British Government or to Mr. Gladstone or to Her Majesty; it is not to be sent beyond the four walls of this Chamber, unless some enterprising news-agent should see fit to cable it across, which would not be the act of this Parliament at all. Sir, I say that Canadians value the liberty of local self-government, as they do value it, having longed lived under and enjoyed that blessing, it is meet and right that we should signify that our feelings are unchanged in this respect, and signify it to Her Majesty's Government—should signify that we, who are in a position to know that the granting of local self-government, instead of weakening, strengthens to the greatest degree the tie that binds free people together, believe that as it has been in our case so it will be in the case of Ireland—that we believe that that country, misgoverned and downtrodden as she has been for many years, being once accorded the right which should be hers, to manage her own local affairs, instead of cherishing feelings of envy and bitterness toward those who have misgoverned it, will recognise that at last justice is about to be done, and that this will enkindle in the people of Ireland feelings of kindness, of unity and of regard towards the British Empire, which, instead of being weakened, will be strengthened in a very material degree. If no higher reason, based on principles of justice and right, existed, although that reason does exist, why the Irish people should have the rights and liberties we enjoy, we find a potent reason in the fact that our material interests are bound up in this question in no slight degree. As stated in the resolutions of 1882, we cannot hope while the present state of things and the present feelings exist in Ireland, to receive the immigration from that Island which we are entitled to receive. But once let peace, good will and unity be brought about between Ireland and the rest of the Empire, by the concession of justice in this respect, and then may we hope to have great accessions to our population from those who may leave the shores of that Island to seek their fortunes beyond the sea. We, Sir, are entitled to have them in our midst; we desire to have them here; we open our arms to them, and we say to them: Come over to us, we have fertile lands which we will give you free to settle on; and if they were animated by friendship and love for the mother land, I believe we should be successful in obtaining large numbers of them. I noticed one remark made by an hon. gentleman opposite, who announced himself as entirely opposed to this principle of local self-government for Ireland. He pointed out that we did not know what the result would be, although it was certain that the measure would be fraught with evil consequences; and he gave as a reason why he should vote for the amendment of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, that it would be productive of less ill-effect, in the direction in which he looked for ill-effect, than the others. I have only to remind you that when great constitutional changes have taken place in this country, there have been those who have hesitated and have seen danger in them. There are those living in Canada to-day who have seen great constitutional changes which they regarded as fraught with danger to the well-being, the peace of this country, and who, to-day, enjoying the blessings thus secured, would be the last to relinquish them. Is it not a matter of history that when it was first proposed to grant municipal institutions to the people of this country, there were those who denounced them as sucking republics, who said our safety as a people would be endangered if we allowed the control of municipal affairs to pass into the hands of the people? Municipal institutions, however, were granted; and to-day no institutions are more highly prized by the people of Ontario, and I believe by the people of the

other Provinces, than those municipal institutions. No man would willingly part with then; and yet as grave fears were expressed about the granting of those rights to the people as we have heard expressed about granting self-government to Ireland, There may be those who express alarm; but I am not one of those who can see where danger can arise. It is difficult for a Canadian to see how the Empire can be weakened by doing justice to one portion of it which has not received justice hitherto. It is impossible for a Canadian, who sees that by giving self-government to this Dominion, the Empire has bound it to itself by a stronger bond than before, and who sees that by giving self government to the Provinces, they have been more strongly united together than before—I say it is impossible for a Canadian who has seen all this, to see how danger can arise to the Empire from applying the same principle to that important portion of the Empire. I would be glad, if an opportunity were given to me, to vote for the resolution introduced by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I would desire to express my joy that now at last there has been a measure submitted to the Imperial Parliament by the Premier of the Empire, to secure that boon to the Irish people; and I am of the opinion expressed in the words of the amendment offered by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that the events that have taken place since 1882 have strengthened the conviction we then entertained, that it was a proper and a desirable thing to grant such a measure. I shall therefore have much pleasure in voting for the amendment of the hon. member for North Wellington, which will express to Her Majesty, as we have clearly a right to do that we hold the same views now that we held in 1882, and that we rejoice to know that those views are now embodied in a measure submitted to the Imperial Parliament for ratification and approval. I shall have much pleasure, Sir, in supporting this resolution, and I only regret that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has sought to supplant the original resolution by the introduction of a resolution that will not tend in any material degree, I fear, to strengthen the hands of the right hon. gentleman engaged in this great task, but whose hands would be most materially strengthened if the original resolution were to receive, as it ought in my opinion to receive, the approval of the members of this Chamber.

Mr. MITCHELL. At this late hour I will crave the indulgence of the House for but a very few minutes. I do it because it is the first time I have had an opportunity from my place in Parliament of expressing my opinion on the question of Home Rule for Ireland. It is useless to argue at this age of history the question of whether the Irish people should have Home Rule or not; it is universally admitted that grievances have existed and that the peace of Ireland has suffered from the want of that power of self-government within the Island itself, which is almost universally admitted to be now necessary. I will, therefore, not now discuss that side of the question, because I think there is but one opinion on all sides of this House, and that is that the action taken by the right hon. the First Minister of England, that the principle of the Bill which he submitted—I am not going so far as to say I will endorse all the details, I think there are many the right hon. gentleman knows he will require to alter—but I say the principle of the Bill is one which will be universally admitted in this House to be of absolute necessity in order to secure the peace of the Empire. Those who say to us that we are interfering with a subject which is outside the region and power and rights of this Parliament are but very few indeed. At one time that contention may have been sustained, but to-day it is almost universally admitted—certainly universally within this House, because the votes of hon. gentlemen will show this whether they vote for the resolution or for either of the amendments, and I presume every hon. gentleman will vote for one of them—and no one pretends that the Parliament of Canada, which has among its members numbers of Irishmen, both Protestants and Catholics, and a large number of men who depend upon Irishmen of both persuasions for their seats, has not the right to express its opinion on this matter to the Imperial Government. When we look at what the population of Canada is composed of, its mixed character, the varied influences, and when we consider the strong sympathies which all classes in the community feel in the agitation going on in the mother land, cannot doubt the propriety of the course we are about to take. Not only the peace of the Empire, but that of all the colonies, depends largely whether that vexed question will be settled satisfactorily or not. When we find the right hon. the First Minster of England is receiving assurances of sympathy from foreign land, from Irishmen south of the border, and from other British colonies, it is our duty, as well as our right, to give expression to the wish which in our heart we feel that every effort should be made to meet the just expectations of that country which has suffered so much from maladministration. I will say no more on this point, but simply express my opinion as to what is desirable we should do to sustain the hands of Mr. Gladstone. I regret very much to find that the reasonable motion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was not accepted by the Administration. Let anyone take up that resolution and let him take up the amendment moved by the Minister of Inland Revenue, and say whether there is any very substancial difference between the two, except this that the resolution of the hon. member for West Durham is more explicit, more to the point, conveys better the idea we desire to convey, conveys in the strongest manner possible the desire of our people through their representatives in Parliament to press upon Her Majesty, Her Majesty's advisors, and the people of England, the fact that we in Canada, comprising between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 people, admittedly the brightest gem in the crown of England, her foremost colony, one that has shown by her enterprise that she is prepared to receive the homeless millions of Europe—sympathise with Mr. Gladstone; and our opinion should be expressed in a manner in which there will be no uncertain sound or doubt. If the hon. member for West Durham had not moved his resolution, and the Minister of Inland Revenue had submitted his as an original proposition I would have supported it with pleasure; but in my opinion it is not as strong as the other, because it is simply an expression of the opinion of this Parliament, while the motion of the hon. member for West Durham is a direct address to the foot of the Throne. If the motion of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue had been presented in the first instance, I would have gladly supported it, and I feel that, after the unanimous expression of the opinion of this Parliament which we gave in 1882, when I had not the honor of being in Parliament, it is a matter of regret that on this occasion we should not act unanimously. If there be a division on the motion of the hon. member for West Durham, and if the House divides on the motion of the hon. member for Wellington and the amendment of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is carried, I suppose it will be carried on a divided House. That is a fact that I would very much regret. I feel that if we are sending an expression of opinion on so vital and important a question to a large number of our fellow subjects on the other side of the water, we ought to send an unanimous expression of opinion, and I would ask the Ministry whether, even at this late hour, they could not find that it would not derogate from their dignity or influence, but, on the contrary, lead them to be more respected in this House and country, if, in order to command unanimity, they should withdraw the motion of the Minister of Inland Revenue. The hon. member for West Wellington would then withdraw his and the first

resolution go as proposed. But if the Government are determined to press for a division, the country will hold them responsible for it. The hon. member for West Durham, who waited two months after the House opened before he submitted his resolution, I am sure, though I am not in his confidence, knew nothing of this motion, and would have been willing at once to accept the proposition of the Minister of Inland Revenue, if it had been submitted in the first instance. If, with so little difference between the two resolutions, a division is had, the country will hold the Administration of the day responsible for preventing that unanimity upon this question which we all desire. That is all I have to say. In sending home a resolution on this subject, I do not want to vote as the hon. member for Muskoka said he would for a resolution that will do the least good. I want to vote for the strongest resolution, and therefore I propose to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Wellington, and, failing that, for the motion of the hon. member for West Durham.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In the few remarks I offered in placing my motion in amendment to the motion made by the hon. member for West Durham, in your hands, Sir, I gave my reasons for moving that motion. I stated that I still adhered to the view I entertained, that I thought it would be better to leave that unanimous expression of the Parliament of Canada to have its full force and effect than to court a division and a debate such as we have had to-night creating division on the question and inevitably resulting in a divided vote of this House. I was sincere in taking that view. I was actuated by a desire to do that which was best in the interests of those who have at heart, above all their political feelings, the welfare of the Irish people and the success of their present struggle. The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution to which mine has been moved in amendment has in his usual eloquent terms tried to impress upon the House the great value of an expression of this new Parliament upon the question. He has pointed out what strength it would give to Mr. Gladstone in his present praiseworthy efforts to give to Ireland what has been so long withheld from that unhappy country. I wish to say to the House and to the country that there is no position in the gift of this country or any other country, there is no pecuniary consideration which would influence me or prevent me from taking that stand which would be best calculated to promote the interests of the Irish people and the heartfelt views of the Irish Canadians in this country. I listened with pain, as I have often had to do before, to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). In the first place, he stated with regard to the resolution moved in 1882 that there was no call for it, that it was inexpedient to move it then, though he thought it was quite expedient to move it now, and that moving it at that time looked as if it was moved for party purposes. Mr. Speaker, in moving it at that time, I labored under greater disadvantages than any gentleman who might propose a similar resolution at present. I agree with the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) that the feeling in Canada in favor of the movement in Ireland has not abated. I think the sentiment in Canada as well as in every other civilised country is growing daily in favor of Home Rule for Ireland. I have no doubt about that, but I say, if the expression of this Parliament is of any value to the leader of the Government who is now proposing to grant a measure of Home Rule to that country, let him refer to the unanimous verdict of this Parliament which is within his reach, the address passed by both Houses and presented to Her Majesty in 1882, and he can use that with authority. I need not repeat what I have already stated, and what has been better stated by my colleague the Minister of Justice, that the contention has been a little strained that, because a new Parliament has come in, that resolution is of no force unless it is renewed by this Parliament, I say it has all that force it had on the day it was passed until some adverse resolution is adopted by the Parliament of Canada. It is true that we are not the same in *personnel*, that we are not the same Parliament, but we were the voice of Canada at that time, and the expression of the people of Canada through their representatives has never been reversed up to the present time. It may be reversed to-night. It may be, if a vote is taken, that it will be weakened, I hope I shall not be held responsible for that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You certainly will.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Hon. gentlemen say that I certainly shall be. I am prepared to take the responsibility of any act I perform. I have always been prepared to do that, and before I finish, I will have a few words to say in regard to that responsibility. But I must say, in concluding the few remarks I have to make in reply to the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), that he stated that I was a private member of this House at that time, and that now I am a member of the Government, and that makes all the difference. Is that the value the hon. gentleman places upon a position to which a very considerable salary is attached? Does the hon. gentleman value the position of a Cabinet Minister, to which a considerable salary is attached, for the pecuniary advantages which it entails? I do not, and I have no hesitation in saying that the man who accepts a position as a Cabinet Minister and has to endure the slanders, the cowardly slanders which are uttered against him, will find that they more than compensate for the salary he receives. Some men may think that, because I am a poor man, the salary of $7,000 a year is a great item to me. Those who know me, know that it has not the slightest influence upon me, that to-morrow morning, I could step out of the Government of which I am a member, if I had reason to do so, and could trust in the health and constitution which God has given me to earn an honest and independent living. Yet these men who boast that they are the representatives of religious and national freedom in this country tell me I am cowardly now because I do not think as they do, because I do not choose to endorse the views they express here. With regard to the question of Home Rule, I have been what I am to-night, a sincere friend of that movement from the first day it started in Ireland and in this country. I can refer to the first prominent meeting that was held by an Irish organisation in this country in the city of Quebec, at a time when Home Rule was not so popular in this Dominion, when Irish sentiments were not so pleasant to the majority of gentlemen on that side of the House, when Irishmen were called Dogans. I was invited to go to that meeting in Quebec and to put in an appearance on a public platform in favor of Home Rule and a reform in the land system of that country. Other prominent Irishmen were invited. One gentleman who was a very prominent Irishman on that side of the House was invited, and he sent a statement that he was suffering under a bad cold and could not go. I was not suffering under a bad cold and I did go, and I was one of the first who stood on a platform in this country to advocate Home Rule for Ireland, while the hon. gentleman who sent the statement that he was suffering from a cold, spoke for three hours in this House on that very same night while I was speaking in Quebec in favor of Home Rule. And yet I am to be taunted, and my motives are to be accused, and I am to be told that I was a Home Ruler until I got into the Government. My position in the Government of the day is perhaps a peculiar one. I have confessed before that I do not owe it to any particular ability that I possess, to any extraordinary talents with which I have been endowed. It is true that I have served my country as a public man in a humble

capacity for a number of years. It is true that I have discharged my duty to the best of my ability, but I am quite free to admit that there are many men in Canada and in our party who are not in the Government who have abilities of a far higher order than mine. It is quite true, I am willing to confess that I owe my position to the fact that the leader of the Government believed that a portion of the people to which I belong, that is the Catholic people of this country, would have confidence in me as representing their special interests in that Government, that I would be true to their interests and would represent them faithfully as far as my abilities would enable me. From the day I entered that Cabinet until now, I have never forgotten the thoughts that occurred to me at the time my name was suggested. Let no one suppose that I entered it blindfolded; let no one suppose that I did not foresee the difficulties that loomed up before me, the cowardly attacks likely to be made upon me for political purposes. My only reason for entering the Cabinet, my only reason for remaining in it at present, is that, while, discharging my duties as a public man, and endeavoring to promote the peace and happiness of all classes so far as in my power lay, I might also specially benefit those whose interests it was my duty to advocate and to guard. Now, Sir, what treachery have I committed against the Irish people that I should be denounced by a newspaper because I did not fall in with a movement which called upon me to resign my seat on account of the unfortunate occurrences which followed the North-West rebellion. I committed no treason; I still believe that I was discharging my duty according to the well understood wishes of the large majority of those people whom I believe I represented; and I give you my word, Mr. Speaker, and I give the hon. gentleman opposite my word, that I have no desire to retain the position of honor and trust I hold now, one single hour longer than I can do so while enjoying the confidence of that people. If there is any fair and reasonable indication on the part of my Irish friends in this country that I no longer enjoy their confidence, without a word of complaint, without a regret at all, or feeling of disappointment, I will retire peacefully from the position I hold, and trust to my ability to earn the few crumbs that are necessary for my maintenance during the few days longer I may have to live. I represent the same constituency now for 25 years, and hon. gentlemen talk of my playing the part of a demagogue! No Irishman in my part of the country could have held that seat as I have held it—not because there were not Irishmen more able than I, more worthy of the confidence that has been reposed in me, but because circumstances were in my favor. I had been brought up in that county. My father before me did business in that county, and became associated with every French elector in that county, enjoyed the respect of the people. I came forward as a young man, grown up among the French people. It was the French people who elected me, not the Irish people, because the Irish people in my constituency, are a very small minority. Did I play the demagogue for the last twenty-five years in holding that constituency, even against candidates who were brought out against me from among the French people themselves? The question of nationality was raised by supporters of hon. gentleman opposite, and an opponent was selected from amongst the French residents, and the first time he appealed to the electors he said: I need no introduction to you, the blood that flows in my veins is the same blood which flows in your veins. You have been long enough represented by an Irishman, now is the time to show that you are worthy of the blood that flows in your veins and have a representative of your own. I answered that gentleman at a meeting of four or five hundred persons, among whom there were not forty-five English speaking electors, and I told him that I never knew how cowardly a man on that side of politics could be before. I said: You are addressing a purely French body of electors and you have not faith in your own nationality, and you are afraid to depend upon the sympathy which should properly exist between you and them in order to supplant you. You tell me now that an Irishman should not enjoy their confidence; I am proud of being an Irishman, and that as an Irishman I have been able to discharge my duties so well to the French electors in my county that I can come back with confidence and ask them to support me again. Well, Sir, I have always been proud to be able to say that I have never lost the confidence of the French people of that county, and they have continued to give me their support, notwithstanding the national appeals made against me. Therefore the attack that has been made upon me has no effect except to pain me to some extent. It is always painful when any man feels that he is trying to do what is best, that he is acting honestly, and still to be so misrepresented. I know this, that I have heard men make attacks upon me and impugn my motives, who knew in their hearts that they were making a cowardly and unjust attack, and they were doing it for paltry political purposes. I can assure the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) that the salary attached to the position of a public man is not so very tempting when he considers the slanders, the injustice and the unjust accusations to which he is liable, and which he cannot resent, as often I would like to resent it, in a more striking manner than in mere words. Now, with regard to this subject which has aroused the sympathies of hon. gentlemen opposite, with regard to that enthusiasm of which they boast when they wish to fly to the succor of every suffering people, and of every suffering class of people, I can only say what I said before, and repeat the saying of a man who had some experience, who had been deceived by a friend, and who said: "If he deceives me once, it is his fault; if he deceives me twice it is my fault." Hon. gentlemen opposite boast of their liberality. Let me remind them that they have proved false to their profession of liberality on more than one occasion. They talk of their love of freedom and fair play, and that it makes no difference to them what attitude the Catholics of this country may take with regard to them, because the Catholics know that they will get justice from the Liberal party whether they oppose them or not. These are fine sentiments, Mr. Speaker, in theory, but they do not tally with the practice of hon. gentlemen opposite. When they defeated the Government led by the present Premier in 1873, they knew that they had an Irishman in their ranks who had contributed to their victory and who, in point of ability and education was equal to their best man. They know that they were scarce in material in forming their Government, but scarce as they were of material—which was proved by the fact that they were obliged to go out of their ranks to fill up their Ministry—they were unable even then to extend to the Catholics that great, broad measure of justice to which the hon. gentleman just alluded. They refused to do justice to a distinguished Catholic who supported them, who had helped to bring them to power, to Mr. Anglin, who was a devoted follower of their own and as able as any man upon their side of the House; they had to exclude him because he was an Irish Catholic, and for no other reason. Now we are to be told that they alone can properly appreciate what belongs to true liberality and that they alone can give a fair distribution of justice to all classes and creeds in this country. I say that will not go down. I say more than that. If they will go back over their actions perhaps they will be able to see the error of their ways in the future; but I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that not only did they exclude one of their prominent supporters from the Government at that time because he was an Irish Catholic, but they knocked down every Irish Catholic they put in nomination in the

Province of Ontario, and they put them up to use the fact in other constituencies. The proof is they have not brought an Irish Catholic to Parliament. They have failed to prove that liberality of which they have boasted so much to-night. I might also refer to another fact that is worthy of some notice. The hon. gentlemen, who have vied with each other to-night to prove that my attachment to my people and my interest in my people is not so warm and sympathetic as it ought to be, belong principally to the Province of Ontario. It strikes me as a remarkable circumstance that in that Provincial Legislature, which is controlled so thoroughly, fully and completely, by the Liberals, some resolution was not offered congratulating Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Parnell, the Irish people or at all events somebody. Why were they silent? Why has there never been a resolution moved in that Assembly? As I told a member of that body, who said it was the duty of this Parliament to speak out on this great question, that it was strange no motion had been passed by that Legislature, and until it had spoken as plainly as the Dominion Parliament, they should not dictate to us. I said: You have remained silent up to the present and have never uttered a single word of congratulation to Mr. Gladstone for his Home Rule measure. Still, unless we take any motion that the leader of the Opposition chooses to offer to this side of the House our motives are to be called in question. I say with regard to the question now before the House that my earnest endeavors have been to prevent a discussion which would weaken the hands of Mr. Gladstone himself, if he chooses to use what we placed in his hands in 1882, the solid vote of this Parliament in favor of the principle of Home Rule. I said I was afraid any attempt to deal with this question again might not result as favorably as it did on that occasion. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake)—I did not choose to interrupt him—I am sorry to say did not fairly represent me when he alluded to the reasons I gave for not complying with the request of the deputation sent from St. Patrick's Literary Association. He said after counting the House, after counting noses, I came to the conclusion that there might be three who would not vote, and therefore on account of those three I was afraid to submit a motion to the House. The hon. gentleman surely knows I did not make use of any such language. The hon. gentleman heard me correct the false report of what I did say which appeared in the *Free Press;* he heard me rise and put the member for South Grey right on that subject, who was misstating what I said for the reason of course that he was not in the House and did not hear my explanation before. But the member for West Durham did hear it. I did not say that it was on account of three members or that I had counted noses or anything of that kind; but I did say there was a probability that a division might take place and we might not succeed in getting the unanimous vote we had in 1882, and if not, it would be much better not to disturb that vote or break its effect before the country or weaken its power in the hands of those who might legitimately use it. I feel that in this Parliament we are not all agreed upon any subject that comes before us. I feel that on few questions can we get a unanimous vote; but I feel that the proposition I have made is one so reasonable that if a unanimous vote can be reached at all it will be on that motion, which asks this new Parliament to re-affirm what was expressed in 1882, and to express further than that, which my resolution does, the hope that the British Parliament may pass a measure granting Home Rule to Ireland, and thus remove the cause of discontent which has unfortunately existed in that country. The adoption of my motion by a unanimous vote of the House will strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone far more, and will be a greater endorsation of the policy of Home Rule than the motion of the hon. member for West Durham or that of the hon. member for North Wellington, who proposed an amendment, which simply means cutting off my resolution and tacking the amendment to the amendment to the motion of the hon. member for West Durham. I am glad to know that even the hon. member for West Durham in some things is open to correction. He is so perfect in his idea of things; he criticises the actions of every hon. member so closely, and is so severe upon those who fail to attain perfection in every subject, that it is somewhat of a relief to my mind to find that even the hon. gentleman has failed to know what it was necessary to move on this occasion in order to express the views of the House on the subject of Home Rule for Ireland, and it was only after the hon. member for North Wellington had brought his genius to bear, and used that eloquence for which he is so well known in this House, that the hon. member for West Durham was convinced that he did not know how to prepare the motion on this subject. My duty will be to sustain the motion I put before the House and to take the consequences of it, and to take those consequences honestly. I will not do, as the hon. member for West Durham has done, refer to personal matters. The hon. gentleman alluded to an occasion when he found me sitting on the back benches and that afterwards I came and sat on the front bench, when it was a question of resigning my seat in the Government. The hon. gentleman has made considerable capital out of the matter and has ridiculed me considerably before this House. It has been his special duty, added to those great duties that he performs so ably, to criticise every act of mine since Parliament has been called together, not only to criticise every act of mine, but to do so in the most ungenerous way; to catechise me and criticise every word I say in regard to the business of the Department over which I preside, as if it were his business to show that I was entirely unfit for the position I hold. Well, I do not overestimate my own abilities. I do not think that whatever faults I have that hon. gentlemen in this House will say that I am wanting in sufficient modesty to acknowledge my own deficiencies. But while it is true that I did take a seat upon the back benches, while it is true that the question of whether I should remain in the Government or not was unsettled for a short time, the hon. gentleman should not have criticised me too severely for that. The reasons which impelled me to take the course I did, in offering to withdraw from the Government, were reasons which were honorable to myself, were reasons which would be satisfactory to my people, if I could make them known; and the reasons which induced me to reverse the decision and retain my seat were equally honorable to myself and the leader of the Government who offered to make that arrangement with me. But the hon. gentleman was liable to be found changing seats also. There was a time when he reminded me of a school to which I used to go, where the rule was that only one boy should go out at a time. A board was placed next the door, and a boy on going out had to turn this board, to show whether he was in or out. At one period of the hon. gentleman's history it appears to me that a board like that would have been useful to his friends, to tell them his position. It is true the hon. gentleman has changed since that time. Although there have been some indications of a little dissatisfaction, of a little cross pulling between himself and his followers, still he has not gone out. Well, the position is different; he has at last become leader of the party, since he came back into public life, and he has taken the position which was filled with credit by the hon. gentleman whom he supplanted. I say since that time he is not so restless; he has not gone in and out so often, although I daresay he feels sometimes as he did on an occasion not long ago, when he found himself and his party were divided on a question on which they thought they could ride into power, and I daresay on that occasion he thought of his old habit of playing in and out. But being the leader, the same

reasons did not exist. I daresay he did not feel comfortable amongst his own followers, to serve under any man as leader, and I think that was one of the reasons why he was so discontented—that he had to serve under another leader, and he is now more contented because he has the leadership in his own hands. I will vote against any amendment that may be proposed in order to reach my own motion. I believe that my motion will recommend itself to a majority of this House, and I think it will meet the reasonable expectations of every man who wishes to see harmony in this country as well as Ireland, which is the subject of our discussion to-night.

An hon. MEMBER. Harmony and peace on that side of the House, you mean.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Well, the harmony and peace we secure on this side. We do not know all the little differences that occur on that side. We have not the means of prying into secrets which were used in olden times to get the secrets of this side of the House. We do not intend to stoop to such means; but if we may judge by appearances there is room for a little of that kind of thing over there, and if I do not mistake it will give them all they can do to harmonise the differences which have occurred between certain gentlemen in their own party. I take the full responsibility of voting against any proposition made against the motion which I agreed to move in amendment of the motion made by the leader of the Opposition. I will not take the decision of the member for South Grey as to whether I represent the Irish element or not or any portion of it. I will not take the decision of the hon. leader of the Opposition as to whether I am doing that which I ought to do as an Irishman to strengthen the hands of my Irish friends who are advocating Home Rule. But if the day should come that it appears to the people most interested in this question that they have reason to believe I have failed in the proper discharge of my duty, I will pay the penalty of not having their confidence any longer by tendering my resignation. That is the proof I will give, when there is reason for them to believe that I no longer enjoy their confidence, and if the hon. gentlemen will make the same proposition and carry it out honestly the Reform ranks would be thinned wonderfully in this House.

House divided on amendment to amendment of Mr. McMullen:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Desaulniers (Maskin'é),	McMullen,
Amyot,	Desjardins,	Mills,
Armstrong,	Dupont,	Mitchell,
Auger,	Fairbank,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Béchard,	Forbes,	Platt,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Ray,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Glen,	Scriver,
Bourassa,	Guay,	Somerville (Brant),
Burpee,	Gunn,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Huron),	Harley,	Springer,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Holton,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Trow,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Irvine,	Vail,
Casey,	Jackson,	Watson,
Casgrain,	King,	Weldon,
Cook,	Kirk,	Wilson,
Coursol,	Landerkin,	Wright,
Davies,	McIntyre,	Yeo.—60.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Allison,	Gaudet,	O'Brien,
Bain (Soulanges),	Girouard,	Orton,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gordon,	Ouimet,
Baker (Victoria),	Grandbois,	Paint,
Barker,	Guilbault,	Patterson (Essex),
Barnard,	Guillet,	Pinsonneault,
Beaty,	Hackett,	Pruyn,
Bell,	Haggart,	Reid
Benoit,	Hall,	Riopel,
Blondeau,	Hay,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bourbeau,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hickey,	Royal,
Bryson,	Homer,	Rykert,
Burnham,	Hurteau,	Scott,
Burns,	Jamieson,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Jenkins,	Small,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kaulback,	Sproule,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Stairs,
Carling,	Kinney,	Taschereau,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kranz,	Tassé,
Cimon,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Landry (Kent),	Temple,
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Thompson,
Coughlin,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Townshend,
Curran,	Lesage,	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (King's),	Tyrwhitt,
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Valin,
Daoust,	Mackintosh,	Vanasse,
Dawson,	Macmaster,	Wallace (Albert),
Desaulniers (St. Maurice)	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wallace (York),
Dickinson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Ward,
Dodd,	McCallum,	White (Cardwell),
Dugas,	McCarthy,	White (Hastings),
Dundas,	McDougall (C. Breton),	White (Renfrew),
Everett,	McGreevy,	Wigle
Farrow,	McLelan,	Wood (Brockville),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McNeill,	Wood (Westm'l'd)—118.
Ferguson (Welland),	Massue,	
Fortin,	Moffat,	

Amendment negatived.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Costigan:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Foster,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gaudet,	Moffatt,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Girouard,	Montplaisir,
Baker (Victoria),	Gordon,	O'Brien,
Barker,	Grandbois,	Orton,
Barnard,	Guilbault,	Ouimet,
Beaty,	Guillet,	Paint,
Bell,	Hackett,	Patterson (Essex),
Benoit,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Blondeau,	Hall,	Pruyn,
Bourbeau,	Hay,	Reid,
Bowell,	Hesson,	Riopel,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Burnham,	Hilliard,	Robertson (Hastings),
Burns,	Homer,	Royal,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hurteau,	Rykert,
Cameron (Victoria),	Jamieson,	Scott,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Shakespeare,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Small,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kilvert,	Sproule,
Cimon,	Kinney,	Stairs,
Cochrane,	Kranz,	Taschereau,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Tassé,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Taylor,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Temple,
Cuthbert,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Thompson,
Daly,	Lesage,	Townshend,
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Tupper,
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers (St. Maurice)	Mackintosh,	Valin,
Dickinson,	Macmaster,	Vanasse,
Dodd,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wallace (Albert),
Dugas,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wallace (York),
Dundas,	McCallum,	Ward,
Everett,	McCarthy,	White (Cardwell),
Farrow,	McDougall (C Breton),	White (Renfrew),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McGreevy,	Wigle,
Ferguson (Welland),	McLelan,	Wood (Brockville),
Fortin,	McNeill,	Wood (Westm'l'd)—117.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Desjardins,	Mills,
Amyot,	Dupont,	Mitchell,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	Mulock,
Auger,	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Forbes,	Platt,
Béchard,	Gigault,	Ray,
Bergeron,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,

Bernier,	Glen,	Scriver,
Blake,	Guay,	Somerville (Brant),
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Somerville (Bruce),
Burpee,	Harley,	Springer,
Cameron (Huron),	Holton,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Trow,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Vail,
Cartwright (Sir Richard)	Jackson,	Watson,
Casey,	King,	Weldon,
Casgrain,	Kirk,	White (Hastings),
Cook,	Landerkin,	Wilson,
Coursol,	McIntyre,	Wright,
Davies,	McMullen,	Yeo.—61.
Desaulniers (Maskn'gé),		

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. However deeply I may regret, Sir, that the Commons of Canada should have decided to speak with a voice so vague and ineffective, and to add so slight an impulse to the movement I was hoping to advance, it is yet for me to consider what is the best use that can be made of that vague and ineffective voice and that slight impulse. The resolution we are to substitute for the original resolution is a simple expression of our opinion, to lie upon our journals. Weak and inadequate as it is, it is still better that it should do some good; and I therefore move to add to the motion, as amended, the words following:—

And that a copy of the resolution be communicated forthwith by Mr. Speaker to Mr. Gladstone.

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. I object to this amendment simply on the plain ground that it is in direct contravention to the resolution we have just passed. It is in effect an address.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I object to it on another ground. I think it is unworthy of the dignity of this House that we should append to a resolution such as we have passed a message requiring you as the Speaker of this House, to communicate it even to such a distinguished individual as Mr. Gladstone; and if by doing so, as I have no doubt my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition desires, we should give encouragement to his proposition for Home Rule for Ireland in the sense in which he has denunciated it, I demur to it on that ground also, as totally dissenting from any such proposition.

Mr. MITCHELL. I support it on this ground, that inasmuch as the minority of this House, who I believe will find their action endorsed by a majority in the country, have failed to get such a resolution as would fairly express in the strongest terms our approval of Home Rule for Ireland, and secure the greatest amount of good, I believe our next duty is to put the resolution adopted by this House into such a shape that the man who stands foremost in the world today, and is endeavoring to give Ireland the benefit of self-government, shall have his hands strengthened in every way in which we can do it; and I have much pleasure in seconding the resolution.

Mr. MILLS. The position the hon. First Minister has taken on this resolution shows very clearly to the House and the country what are his real feelings on this subject. It is well known that hon. gentlemen opposite are not sincere advocates of the principle of Home Rule. It is well known that the hon. leader of the Government has again and again declared himself against the principle of federation, against the principle of local self-government, and in favor of a legislative union. But those hon. gentlemen have not the courage of their convictions. While they profess to favor Home Rule, they propose a resolution that is addressed to nobody. Now, Sir, when my hon. friend proposes that that resolution should be sent to the Prime Minister of England, who is struggling with the aristocratic classes there to maintain the rights of the people of Ireland, then these hon. gentlemen say: We shall not consent that that resolution shall be sent to

Mr. Gladstone; we shall not consent that it shall be put into the hands of the man who is seeking to confer that benefit on the people of Ireland; but we will leave it on the journals of our House; if the Irish people of Canada attack us we will say, we voted in favor of this resolution; and if our Orange friends are disposed to attack us for voting for Home Rule, we will say, it is true, we attempted to conciliate a section of our followers by voting for that resolution, but we refused to forward it to Mr. Gladstone, because we did not intend that it should be of the slightest service to the people of Ireland.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I crave the attention of this House for a few moments. I beg to propose a resolution, and I ask the followers of Sir John A. Macdonald to back me up:

That a copy of this resolution be sent to Mr. Parnell.

The Irish people to-day owe this movement to Mr. Parnell. We would not be here to-night voting for this resolution if it had not been for the noble exertions of that noble man. If any credit is due to any person for the position of the question to-day, it is due to Mr. Parnell; and I ask my hon. friends on this side of the House to back me on this resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is moved by Mr. Coughlin to strike out the word "Gladstone" and insert the word "Parnell."

Mr. BLAKE. I should have been very glad if the hon. gentleman had proposed to add the words "and Mr. Parnell" to the words of the resolution; and I should have cordially acceded to that, recognising as I do the great services that Mr. Parnell has rendered to the cause of Home Rule. But at this moment I think it is the hands of Mr. Gladstone that want strenghtening, and I am not going to vote to strike out the name of Mr. Gladstone in order to substitute that of Mr. Parnell.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is well that the First Minister, at any rate, has thrown off the mask, and has shown us clearly and distinctly, what all of us who know him know, that he has no sympathy for Ireland, and no more sympathy for Home Rule in Ireland than he has for Home Rule in Canada. The hon. gentleman has been plotting, since the time he was sworn in as First Minister of Canada, against the Local Governments of this country. We know, Sir, that but for Sir George Cartier, when he was sent to England as a delegate some nineteen years ago, he would have misused and abused the power put into his hands to deprive us of our local liberties, and, Sir, now, thrown off his guard for a moment, he cannot help showing his real sentiments. He cannot help showing as far as lies in him that even this emasculated and miserable resolution, which the Minister of Inland Revenue, I regret to say, has allowed himself to be made a tool of to have placed on our journals ——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should not use that word.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, Sir, if you rule that to say that one Minister is the tool of another is out of order, I will withdraw that in deference to your ruling. I maintain my own opinion as to the use that has been made of the hon. gentleman by the First Minister on this particular occasion, as before: Sir, the hon. gentleman's resolution, I do not doubt in the least from the verbiage of it, has been conceived in the brain, if not traced by the hand of the First Minister; and Sir, if there could be a more contemptible, a more ridiculous, a more absurd proposition placed before this House, after formally passing a resolution—which if it has any meaning or object, if there is any conceivable sense in it, must be intended for the purpose of strengthening Mr. Gladstone in the struggle againt great odds that he is now

maintaining, for the bestowal of Home Rule upon Ireland —it is the refusal to adopt the sensible proposal of my hon. friend beside me, that that resolution should be sent to Mr. Gladstone. What position shall we be in —what attitude shall we assume—if it turns out that we are bold enough to pass a resolution here, but are not bold enough to send it where alone it would be of use—that we have dared to put it on our journals, but do not dare to communicate it to the Imperial House? For my own part, I say that we, as British subjects, have got a good right to advise the Empire on all points of Imperial policy such as this. There are greater issues contained in this question than the mere question of Home Rule for Ireland. From this will spring other results. I believe that one result which will spring from this will be that in substance, within a few years, the English people will have to adopt a system somewhat similar to that which we have here; because I believe that this doctrine of Home Rule cannot be applied to Ireland alone, that, in all human probability, there is comprised in it a Federate Parliament for the British Isles, and probably for the British Empire. It may be something more than that; it may be an alliance, if not a federation, of the whole British race, and it is because I believe the interest of the whole British Empire and British race depends to a large extent of doing away with these just causes of complaint which the Irish people have long had, that I am prepared to support my hon. friend's motion. But in any case, let us not commit the miserable absurdity of putting a resolution on our journals and yet not daring to communicate it to the Imperial Government.

Mr. McNEILL. There is no question of daring in the matter.

Mr. BURNS. No doubt, in a very few minutes, the action this House has taken will be cabled across the Atlantic, and not only Mr. Gladstone but everybody else in the British Islands will be aware of the action we have taken. I am in sympathy with the amendment of the hon. member for Middlesex, and I will support it. My reason is that the position of affairs to-day, as regards Ireland, is due to the action of Mr. Parnell as much as to the action of Mr. Gladstone. Year after year the Irish people, under various leaders, struggled to obtain something like independence, and of late years Mr. Parnell has led them to what may be called victory. In 1882, when this Parliament passed resolutions and sent them to Mr. Gladstone, we know what action Mr. Gladstone and his Government took. At that time, he and his associates with him were not disposed to listen to the advice offered them by Canada, but now, when Mr. Gladstone is brought face to face with the difficulty, when he finds that Ireland has returned an almost unanimous representation on the principle of Home Rule, he, in order to strengthen his hands, seeks the advice and sympathy of those whose sympathy and advice he repelled in times gone-bye. To Mr. Parnell is due more than to Mr. Gladstone the present position of affairs, and therefore I will vote for the amendment.

Mr. CURRAN. I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment of my hon. friend from Middlesex. I hear, on the other side of the House, a great many jeering remarks, but I want to say that, for my part, I look upon the sturdy perseverance with which Mr. Parnell has conducted his campaign, as being the cause of bringing Mr. Gladstone to the position he occupies, and if we are to give cheers, let us cheer the people who have done the fighting.

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel it is necessary to state the reason why I am going to support the amendment. I will support it, not because I think it is the best thing to be done in order to secure what the statesmen of England and Ireland are trying to secure for Ireland, but because it it the only thing open for us to do, after we have passed the resolution. This amendment is not in accordance with the dignity of the House, after having given expression to the opinions we have expressed, as to what the feelings and sentiments of this Parliament are upon the great question which is agitating our friends on the other side, but as this House, under the leadership of the right hon. gentleman, has chosen to refuse to send the resolution to Mr. Gladstone and to refuse to send the address to Her Majesty, as, while endorsing the sentiment he refuses to countenance its transmission, the proposition to send the resolution of the House to Mr. Parnell will receive my support. I have great satisfaction in endorsing what has been said about Mr. Parnell. He deserves every credit from his co-nationalists. By his perseverance, resolution and determination, he has done more than ordinary men could do, and I am pleased to be able to speak of him as I have, but to send the resolution to him alone, and not to Mr. Gladstone, is not in accordance with what I believe to be the true dignity of Parliament and the position of Canada.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have always objected to giving too much prominence to this question as a political question, either on this or the other side of the Atlantic. Hon. gentlemen have attacked and ridiculed me for presuming to send a cablegram to Mr. Parnell, and questioned my right to do so; they have questioned the importance of such a message coming from me on behalf of the Irish representatives of this House. I say this, that I objected to the address for the reasons I gave. I still hold that the Irish people at home and here are in doubt as to whether Mr. Parnell will approve of the measure before Parliament, as we may learn, in 10 or 15 days, that the measure proposed by Mr. Gladstone will be pronounced unsuitable for the Irish people by the men who have been fighting the battle from the first. In that case what position would we be in? I do not presume to go in advance of Mr. Parnell, but I am willing this House should convey, in the speediest manner possible, to Mr. Gladstone, to the leader of the Opposition, and to Mr. Parnell the hero of the struggle, the message stating what has taken place.

Mr. McNEILL. I cannot support the amendment to send this resolution, the expression of this House in favor of some measure of Home Rule, to the gentleman who said that he never would have taken off his coat to go to this work had he not expected by so doing to sever the last link between Ireland and England. So far as the other proposition is concerned, since Mr. Gladstone has told us in the most explicit manner to mind our own business, I will not support the proposal now made to send a resolution of sympathy to him when he feels himself in some difficulty.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). By the action of the House to-night——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I have kept very quiet and have interfered with no one, and I am only going to speak for a few moment. It looks, by the action of the House to-night, as if the people of Canada were unanimously in favor of Home Rule. I say it is not so. I say there are a large number of people in Canada who are not in favor of Home Rule. A large number of the Irish people are not favorable to Home Rule. Many gentleman have said to-night that they come from Ireland; well, I think I know a little about Ireland, and I contend that the people of Ireland, as they are governed to-day, will be more contented than they will after they get Home Rule, if they do get it. I am opposed to this House interfering directly or indirectly with the British people. Let them pass their own laws without any interference from us. I am opposed to every motion made, and shall vote against every motion made, no matter from which side of the House it comes.

Mr. CASEY. I think the remarks of the leader of the House on this proposition were particularly unfortunate. They will be regarded by everybody in this country as indicating that the hon. gentleman preferred to risk the utility of the resolution which we are about to pass, to risk its having no effect at all rather than to appear to add anything to the strength of a party leader who is opposed to him in politics. Everyone will believe, Irish people and those of all other nationalities, that the hon. gentleman's opposition to the amendment is dictated by a petty jealousy of the party leader in England. The motion of the hon. member for North Middlesex (Mr. Coughlin) is objectionable for the reason stated by my hon. friend the leader. If you are going to send it to anybody, you must send it to the person who has control of the Government. You must send it to headquarters. If you do not send it to the Queen direct, you must send it to the leader of the Government. I should be very happy to see it sent to Mr. Parnell also, as suggested by my leader. I agree with the eulogies which have been passed upon Mr. Parnell, as a statesman and as a manager of his party. I am willing that he should have the compliment paid him, and should be willing, as my leader said, to have his name added; and I should not have any great objection to the suggestion of the Minister of Inland Revenue that it should be sent to all three representatives of parties in the English House of Commons.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CASEY. Excuse me, I lead nobody and these are my personal opinions. I have no objection to its being sent to the leader of the Opposition as well as to the other two, but I wish to urge upon the hon. member for North Middlesex to consider the position in which he is placing his friends and the friends of Home Rule by proposing to strike out the name of Mr. Gladstone. Surely, if Mr. Parnell deserves to have it sent to him, and it can only be a compliment in his case, because he is not the leader of a Government or even a member of a Government. The leader of the Government of England, who is sacrificing so much and risking so much to carry out the views of Mr. Parnell, deserves to have it sent to him also. Surely my hon. friend does not wish to do this of his own desire. Surely it must have been put in his hands by somebody.

Mr. COUGHLIN. No, it was not.

Mr. CASEY. I accept the hon. gentleman's denial. Surely then he will accept the suggestion of his friend and leader the Minister of Inland Revenue, and will accept at all events his proposition or something else rather than the bald proposal to strike out the name of Gladstone and put in the name of Parnell. He will see, when he thinks it over, that he is putting himself and his friends and the cause of Home Rule in a very peculiar position.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not intend to notice the speech of the hon. gentleman from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), or his remarks respecting myself. I have heard a good deal from him before, and have treated it in the same way as I do now, with contemptuous silence The reason why I shortly objected to sending the resolution to Mr. Gladstone was that the whole of these resolutions, not only the resolution which was carried, but the original resolution moved by the hon. gentleman opposite, the amendment of my hon. friend, and the amendment to the amendment, will be sent by cable to England and known everywhere in England, by Mr. Gladstone, by Mr. Parnell, and by the leaders of the Opposition in both Houses, tomorrow. Therefore it would avoid the appearance of in fact sending an address to Mr. Gladstone instead of to Her Majesty. The information will go to England, it will have its effect in England completely and fully, and it will not have its full effect unless all the resolutions voted this evening should be sent at the same time. I have no objection that a resolution should be adopted and added that this resolution and the other resolutions on the same question voted upon shall be transmitted to the three gentlemen mentioned by my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not in order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not just now.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of Mr. Coughlin.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Lost.

Mr. BLAKE. Yeas and nays.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I will withdraw it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You cannot withdraw it.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Coughlin:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Barnard,	Guilbault,	Massue,
Burns,	Hackett,	Mitchell,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hurteau,	Montplaisir,
Coughlin,	Jenkins,	Patterson (Essex),
Curran,	Macdonald (King's),	Royal,
Fortin,	Mackintosh,	Shakespeare,
Girouard,	McGreevy,	Tassé.—22.
Grandbois,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Ferguson (Welland),	O'Brien,
Allison,	Fisher,	Orton,
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Ouimet,
Auger,	Foster,	Paint,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gigault,	Paterson (Brant),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gillmor,	Platt,
Baker (Victoria),	Glen,	Pruyn,
Barker,	Gordon,	Ray,
Beaty,	Guay,	Reid,
Béchard,	Guillet,	Rinfret,
Bell,	Gunn,	Riopel,
Benoit,	Haggart,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bernier,	Harley,	Rykert,
Blake,	Hay,	Scott,
Blondeau,	Hesson,	Scriver,
Bourassa,	Hickey,	Small,
Bourbeau,	Hilliard,	Somerville (Brant),
Bowell,	Holton,	Somerville (Bruce),
Bryson,	Homer,	Springer,
Burnham,	Innes,	Sproule,
Burpee,	Irvine,	Stairs,
Cameron (Huron),	Jackson,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jamieson,	Taschereau,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kaulbach,	Taylor,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kilvert,	Temple,
Campbell (Victoria),	King,	Thompson,
Carling,	Kirk,	Townshend,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kranz,	Trow,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Landerkin,	Tupper,
Casey,	Landry (Kent),	Tyrwhitt,
Casgrain,	Landry (Montmagny),	Vail,
Cimon,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Valin,
Cochrane,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Vanasse,
Cook,	Macmaster,	Wallace (Albert),
Costigan,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wallace (York),
Cuthbert,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Ward,
Daly,	McCallum,	Watson,
Davies,	McCarthy,	Weldon,
Dawson,	McDougall (C. Breton),	White (Cardwell),
Dickinson,	McIntyre,	White (Hastings),
Dodd,	McLelan,	White (Renfrew),
Dundas,	McMullen,	Wigle,
Dupont,	McNeill,	Wilson,
Everett,	Mills,	Wood (Brockville)
Fairbank,	Moffat,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	Mulock,	Yeo.—142.
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)		

Amendment negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I mentioned a little while ago that I would propose certain amendments, but it has been suggested to me, in order to avoid the appearance of partisanship, that I had better substitute the following motion; I therefore beg leave to move:

That all the words after the word "following" be struck out, and the following be inserted: And that a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the Speaker to the Speaker of the House of Commons in England.

Mr. BLAKE. This is another way of making the House speak with a dumb voice. This question arose with reference to the proper form of action in another assembly, an enquiry was made, and the result of the enquiry was that the Speaker of the House of Commons, in England, was deemed to have no authority to communicate to the House resolutions so transmitted to him. You, Sir, in the Chair, I think, will confirm that statement, so that if my motion is amended, as the hon. gentleman proposes, he will have accomplished his object. His object is to get rid of any communication across the water. He so stated. He said: We don't want to communicate. He then suggested that we should communicate to the Marquis of Salisbury the defeated motion, after he had found difficulty in the first place. Now he proposes we should communicate it to the person who will have no authority to communicate it to the House of Commons of England at all. It is an ingenious device to accomplish the objects of nullifying, as far as possible, the feeble effects of the resolution. I hope the House will not adopt that device, and I ask you to say whether I am not correct in that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Speaker has no power or authority to communicate it to the House. A communication like this was sent to me from the British Columbia Legislature, and I simply sent it to the Prime Minister as a private communication.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt that the Speaker of the House of Commons in England will take the same course you did. He will take steps to give it full publicity in England.

Mr. BLAKE. Why should he not send it to Mr. Gladstone directly.

Mr. MITCHELL. It looks very much like an attempt to burk the expression of opinion in this House. It is not only likely to result in the failure of the object of this discussion but it will bring discredit and disgrace upon the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. CURRAN. I have no desire that the expression of opinion by this House should remain, even by implication, a dead letter. We know very well that the proceedings of this House will be telegraphed immediately to England, and if communicating it to the Speaker would be the best means of making it known, I would be in favor of doing so. In accordance with the expressed desire of all the organs who have spoken on the subject of Home Rule, if the leader of the Opposition had brought a direct motion in favor of Mr. Gladstone's position in the first instance, I should have supported it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I wish there may be no misunderstanding about this. I stated, before the hon. gentleman moved to add some words to the resolution, that I was willing that we should take such steps as would secure the intelligence of the action of this House being placed before the persons most interested. The hon. gentleman moved that it be sent to Mr. Gladstone, and, my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Coughlin) was anxious that Mr. Parnell should also be communicated with. I stated then that I thought we might solve the difficulty by communicating it to the three leaders in the House of Commons, so that there may not be any party significance given to it, and I state now that if the channel which the right hon. gentleman has indicated, that is the Speaker of the House of Commons, is one that will, without doubt, answer the purpose, I am willing to accept it. But you, Mr. Speaker, indicate that there is a doubt, and that it might not reach the House of Commons through the Speaker. I do not want any doubt about it.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, the hon. gentleman need not say "hear, hear." The House of Commons having pronounced upon this question, there ought to be no bickering about the final steps to be taken now. I am willing to adopt any reasonable mode by which we can place this resolution before the people and Parliament of Great Britain, so that Mr. Gladstone shall have an opportunity of knowing what we have done, and that the leader of the English Opposition may also know, as well as Mr. Parnell. Mr. Speaker has questioned the competence of the House of Commons in England to communicate any message except through this House.

Mr. BLAKE. Then you had better persuade your leader to withdraw the motion.

Mr. THOMPSON. It seems to me the uneasiness manifested as to this resolution being known by those interested in this question is altogether misplaced. The House knows from the passage I read in the English *Hansard* this evening that on 1st May, 1882, before any official communication had reached Mr. Gladstone or the Colonial Office in London the proceedings of this House had not only appeared in the London *Times* but had been read in Mr. Gladstone's presence in the House of Commons. I undertake to say that before the news can be officially communicated by the officers of this House the proceedings of this afternoon will not only be published in London, but will be known to every member of the House of Commons, and therefore, the question of how we shall officially communicate is not one of essential importance.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman like other hon. gentlemen opposite this evening has declared that we do not want to communicate this resolution to anyone.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentlemen and also the First Minister have declared that on account of the despatch of Earl Kimberley it would be beneath the dignity of this House to communicate with Her Majesty. The hon. gentleman is afraid of sacrificing the dignity of Parliament by communicating anything to the Queen, and so when it was proposed to communicate the resolution to the Prime Minister of England, the Prime Minister of this country said we will not communicate the resolution to the Prime Minister, and he proposes to communicate it, to whom? To the Speaker, who cannot make known the communication officially to anyone. Hon. gentlemen object to communicate with the Prime Minister because it is beneath the dignity of this House to communicate with him. That is the only reason given. While hon. gentlemen opposite refuse to have a communication sent direct to the Prime Minister they wish to save our dignity by having the Speaker of the British House of Commons, after receiving the communication, communicate it to the Prime Minister, if he chooses. Of course, the hon. gentleman is proceeding on the assumption that he will choose to do so. That is the way the hon. gentleman proposes to get out of the difficulty, and I am sure the hon. gentleman's followers must be very highly pleased indeed with the demonstration made on this question this evening.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It seems to me that this matter is really becoming a burlesque. Perhaps some hon. gentlemen wish to make it such, but I desire if possible to bring the House back to a sense of its own dignity. It seems to me it is entirely inconsistent with the dignity of this House that it should condescend to send any resolution it may pass to any individual or in any other way than by the usual and constitutional usage. It is entirely inconsistent with the dignity of the House that we should pass a reso-

lution and add a rider that it should be sent to Tom, Dick or Harry.

Mr. BLAKE. His name is William Ewart.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Whether it is to Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Parnell or anybody else, so far as this Parliament are concerned they are Tom, Dick and Harry. We are degrading ourselves and losing sight of our dignity by sending the resolution to anyone or communicating anything except in a proper and constitutional manner. I trust any resolution communicating what we have done to-day will not be sent to anyone.

Mr. BLAKE. Let us expunge the resolution then.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). For all practical purposes I think the resolution might he expunged. In other words, the whole thing is buncomb. I think the leader of the Opposition in moving the resolution moved it as a buncomb resolution for the purpose of catching or strengthening his hold on the Irish Catholic people of Ontario, and the whole discussion from beginning to end has been conducted with that view, possibly by both sides of the House. I have no hesitation in saying so. It is all buncomb.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is an order for an hon. member to refer to a resolution of the House in that way.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I did not understand the resolution was yet passed.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman voted for it.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). If it is unparliamentary to declare that what the House has done is buncomb, I withdraw the expression. I have no desire to offend against the rules of the House even by telling what every hon. member knows is the solemn truth. We know the discussion is conducted with this point in view, and that the leader of the Opposition who has expressed strong sympathy with his fellow Irishmen on moving this motion had an ulterior object in view.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I have not finished my sentence. I was going on to say that the hon. gentleman had an ulterior object in view of increasing that popularity in which the Irishmen of the country esteem him. I think that is parliamentary. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe the principal reason why my friend brought forward this motion and raised the discussion to-night has been a desire and expectation that the Irish Catholic vote will be influenced by this discussion.

Mr. MITCHELL. You said that before.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. gentleman says I said that before. I think the hon. gentleman's observation and his votes too have been very largely influenced by the fact that there is a large Irish element in his constituency.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). To come back in all seriousness as to the right or propriety of transmitting the proceedings of this House to any other than a duly constituted assembly, or to Her Majesty, and that we should condescend to send them to individuals, even if they happened to be the leader of the British Government, or the leader of the Irish party.

Mr. MITCHELL. Half a loaf is better than no bread.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The public effect of the announcement, if it is deserving of any, will be given for what it is worth, and I think it is better to let the matter rest there.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After your strong expression of opinion, Sir, I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment to the amendment withdrawn.

Mr. MILLS. I beg leave to move in amendment to the amendment to add the name of Charles Stuart Parnell, M.P.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would suggest, inasmuch as hon. gentlemen opposite have not been willing to accede to the proposition of the Minister of Inland Revenue that the resolution should be communicated to the leaders of the various parties in the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh.

Mr. THOMPSON. I say that hon. gentlemen have manifested an unwillingness to do that, and there is no use in hon. gentlemen signifying their dissent. I will suggest as a motion, I will move in the event of this not being carried, that the resolutions be communicated to the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. BLAKE. After that statement, and the reason for it, I will state why I could not give my assent to this resolution being sent by the Parliament of Canada to the Marquis of Salisbury. The reason is that the Marquis of Salisbury is himself a bitter opponent of Home Rule in Parliament.

Mr. THOMPSON. He is leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BLAKE. Not in the House of Commons, and I suppose the leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons entertains the view of the leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords. On the 15th of April the Marquis of Salisbury expressed his views on this question, and he said:

"Home Rule, which a year ago was a chimera, has suddenly become a burning question. It needs no apology from us if, in presence of so great a calamity threatening our nation, we put aside all minor differences and join hands to defend that which is equally precious to us all."

A little later he said:

"Now this is, I hope, the commencement of a great many meetings which will take place in various parts of England. I hope, in the first instance, that these meetings will rouse up the people to study and appreciate the terrible gravity of the problem placed before them, and to resist this tremendous change in the constitution of their country. But I hope that such meetings will rouse them to do something."

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the view of the hon. member for Hastings.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And that is the reason he would like to have the resolution sent to the Marquis of Salisbury and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach. The Marquis of Salisbury said further:

"My belief is that the future Government of Ireland does not involve any such unmanageable difficulty, for the people of this country will be true to the Empire to which they belong. (Loud cheers.) We want a wise, firm, continuous administration of the law. (Cheers.) But you must support it, or it will not take place. We want a steady policy—that no considerations of weariness or difficulty at Westminster, that no considerations attaching to the manifold ties of party government under which we live, shall drive aside from its strong course the policy upon which the people of England have decided. It is not enough for them to decide it. They must watch over it when it is decided; they must, by their constant and steady support, by the overwhelming force of their will, sweep away this body of resistance which has hitherto, at Westminster, prevented anything like a steady, or constant, or wholesome policy for Ireland (cheers); for this matter, believe me, does not concern Ireland alone. There is a great responsibility upon you, and it will be a terrible thing if, through your weakness, the Irish people are abandoned to the anarchy under which assuredly they will fall. But there is something more which you, as owners of a vast Empire extending to the ends of the earth, must consider before you take this fatal step downwards to which your rulers are inviting you now. There has been a great contest between England and the discontented portions of the Irish people. It is a contest that has lasted through many generations past, through many vicissitude, and now you are asked to submit to a measure which is placed before you, and to end the contest by a complete and ignominious surrender."

Again he said:

"Your course is watched all over the world; if you consent to this great capitulation; if you mark it with these last signs of disgrace, that you abandoned those whom you induced to fight for you; if, like the Russian traveller, you lighten your sledge for your own flight by throwing out your defenders to the wolves, believe me that it will not be a mere sentimental punishment that you will suffer. Your enemies in every part of the world will be looking on what you do with exultation. Your friends, your supporters, your partisans will view it with shame, with confusion and with dismay, in every quarter of the globe."

And the Minister of Inland Revenue proposes that we should send the resolutions to the Marquis of Salisbury.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has given the very strongest possible reason why, from his standpoint, this resolution should be sent to the gentleman he mentioned. If in 1882 it was necessary to send the resolution to a Parliament which was hostile to Home Rule, in order to persuade those who are not so forward then, as they are now, it is from the hon. gentleman's own standpoint doubly necessary to express the opinion of this Parliament to the very able and very influential gentleman who does not happen to be so far forward as the leader of the Opposition in his Home Rule principles.

Mr. THOMPSON. Lest it should be supposed that I was proposing by what I said that I would move hereafter that the resolution should be sent to the three leaders, I wish to say that my statement was that if the amendment should not be adopted my motion will be to transmit the resolutions to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Mr. COSTIGAN. One remark in reply to the hon. leader of the Opposition. With regard to the Marquis of Salisbury he says that because that gentleman has expressed strong opinions against Home Rule we should not communicate the resolution to him, as it would only strengthen the hands of those who are opposed to Home Rule. I say that we should send the motion to the leader of the Opposition, because I think we should send it to enemies as well as to the friends of Home Rule. I voted against the motion to exclude Mr. Gladstone's name and substitute Mr. Parnell's alone, in the expectation of having an opportunity of having Mr. Parnell's name added to Mr. Gladstone's.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am opposed to sending any address to Mr. Parnell, and I shall vote against it no matter in what shape or form it may come up. I think I can give a very good reason for so doing by reading an extract from Mr. Gladstone's opinion about Mr. Parnell and his dealings with the Home Rule question given not long since. He said:

"Mr. Parnell has never uttered one word of disapproval or misgiving about the assassination literature of America, maintained by a knot of Irishmen who are not ashamed to point out how the ships of Her Majesty's navy ought to be blown into the air, and how gentlemen that they are pleased to select ought to be made the object of the knife of the assassin. You know that there have been some attempts of that kind made in this country. You have heard of the explosion of dynamite in Salford. Mr. Parnell said that occurrence appeared to him to bear the character of a practical joke."

I certainly shall not, sitting here in my place in this Parliament, vote to send a resolution to Mr. Parnell, who has thus been characterised, and I believe truly characterised, by Mr. Gladstone, for reasons now apparent to us all. I would also refuse to send it to Mr. Gladstone for this reason. I think our sending it to him would be, as the leader of the Opposition desired by his resolution, an approval of the measure submitted by Mr. Gladstone for the consideration of the Imperial Parliament. While I am in favor of a fair and reasonable scheme of Home Rule, which will secure the rights of the minority as well as the majority of the people of Ireland, I am not in favor, and I do not believe the majority of the people of Canada are in favor, of handing the minority over to the majority, and bringing about a worse state of things than existed before. I do not believe Mr. Gladstone's Bill is one that will be accepted by the people of Ireland. I believe it is accepted merely as a step in the direction of separation by the people who are advocating separation. I have good proof of that. I will read an extract from T. P. O'Connor's letter to the London *Times*, in which he speaks in very distinct terms of the measure Mr. Gladstone has presented to Parliament. He says:

"To tax Ireland for Imperial purposes and give Ireland no voice in Imperial affairs"——

That is the proposition in Mr. Gladstone's measure.—

Mr. MITCHELL. That is changed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Pardon me, it is not changed. The only change is the dropping of the Land Bill, but this has not been changed, and there will not be any change in so vital a principle of Mr. Gladstone's measure.—

"would be taxation without representation in a very aggravated form, and would be calculated to make the Empire odious instead of dear to the Irish people."

That is the measure now submitted, and that is the measure which Mr. Parnell has accepted as an instalment; but I think we all know that it is accepted with the view of carrying out the scheme Mr. Parnell has pursued for years, and has never attempted to deny, that is, the separation of Ireland and the dismemberment of the Empire. For these reasons I am opposed to sending this resolution to Mr. Parnell, and I am also opposed to sending it to Mr. Gladstone. I am not willing to go further than the House has gone in approving of a measure of Home Rule which is fair to all classes.

Mr. CURRAN. I very much regret that the last speaker should have read the statement made by Mr. Gladstone about Mr. Parnell. I am equally sorry that the hon. leader of the Opposition should have given the effusion that he gave from another English statesman. I do not think any great good can be done by the reading of these extracts from speeches. I think anyone who has read Irish history knows that there is scarcely a British statesman who has not said things which, after consideration, he will not sincerely regret. I have stated to-night that, just as Mr. Gladstone has changed his opinion from what it was when he put Mr. Parnell into prison, so I am satisfied that with the progress of ideas, and the change that will take place in the political atmosphere, we shall find the gentleman who made the speech alluded to by the hon. leader of the Opposition, changing his views and his policy. I believe, however, that we ought now really to try to get a solution of this question, as has been aptly said, to-night. It is not merely to the friends of Home Rule that we wish to communicate the views of the Parliament of Canada, but we wish to let every man whose opinion is worth influencing, know exactly what the state of opinion in the Dominion of Canada is. Therefore, I hope the hon. gentlemen will accept the suggestion to add this other name, and that this discussion will end by a unanimous vote on the subject.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mills.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Dodd,	McGreevy,
Amyot,	Dupont,	McIntyre,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Massue,
Béchard,	Forbes,	Mills,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Mitchell,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Moffat,
Bourassa,	Girouard,	Mulock,
Bourbeau,	Glen,	Paterson (Brant),
Burns,	Guay,	Patterson (Essex),
Burpee,	Guilbault,	Platt,
Cameron (Huron),	Gunn,	Ray,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Hackett,	Rinfret,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Harley,	Royal,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Casey,	Hurteau,	Somerville (Bruce),

Casgrain,	Innes,	Springer,
Cook,	Irvine,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Costigan,	Jackson,	Trow,
Coughlin,	King,	Vail,
Curran,	Kirk,	Watson,
Daly,	Landerkin,	Weldon,
Davies,	Macdonald (King's),	Wilson.—69.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Grandbois,	Pruyn,
Auger,	Guillet,	Reid,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Haggart,	Riopel,
Baker (Victoria),	Hall	Robertson (Hamilton),
Barker,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Barnard,	Hickey,	Rykert,
Beaty,	Hilliard,	Scott,
Bell,	Homer,	Shakespeare,
Benoit,	Jamieson,	Small,
Blondeau,	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Bowell,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Bryson,	Kilvert,	Tassé,
Burnham,	Kinney,	Taylor,
Cameron (Inverness),	Kranz,	Temple,
Cameron (Victoria),	Landry (Kent),	Thompson,
Campbell (Victoria),	Landry (Montmagny),	Townshend,
Carling,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Tupper,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tyrwhitt,
Cimon,	Mackintosh,	Valin,
Cochrane,	Macmaster,	Vanasse,
Cuthbert,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wallace (Albert)
Dawson,	McCarthy,	Wallace (York),
Dickinson,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Ward,
Dundas,	McLelan,	White (Cardwell),
Everett,	McNeill,	White (Hastings),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	O'Brien,	White (Renfrew),
Ferguson (Welland),	Orton,	Wigle,
Foster,	Ouimet,	Wood (Brockville)
Gordon,	Paint,	Wool (West'land).—87.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. THOMPSON. I made a suggestion a few moments ago as to a channel through which I thought this resolution might be communicated without any objection and without any loss of dignity. Since then it has been suggested that it would be desirable to have a more immediate and public communication on the matter. I therefore beg to move in amendment to substitute these words:

That the resolution be transmitted forthwith by the Speaker to the High Commissioner for Canada "——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am very glad that my motion seems to meet with very good humored approval by hon. members on the other side of the House; but I am afraid if they will allow me to finish reading it, that they will not be so well pleased.

"for the information of the members of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom."

Mr. COOK. For the information of the Minister of Justice I would inform him that the High Commissioner is the gentleman who has no confidence in the breed.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister of Justice says this is in order to obtain more immediate transmission of the resolution to the parties whom it concerns. Instead of sending it to the First Minister of Great Britain for the information of the House of Commons, he wishes to send it to the High Commissioner of Canada for the information of the British House of Commons. Sir Charles Tupper is a very great man, and in the estimation of the Minister of Justice he is a peculiarly great man. The Minister of Justice owes his position in the Cabinet and many other things to him, but to ask us to believe that Sir Charles Tupper has greater facilities for communicating this resolution to the House of Commons than has the First Minister of England is an absurdity. I believe the Minister of Justice claims to be Irish to some extent. By proposing this motion, he has only shown his capacity for committing a most stupendous Irish bull.

Mr. CURRAN.

Mr. ORTON. I wish to explain why I have, upon every occasion on which a vote has been taken in this House with reference to communicating with Mr. Gladstone, opposed the proposition. It is because I feel that as Canadians we ought to uphold the dignity of the country, and I feel it is wrong for the Parliament of Canada to communicate in any way with Mr. Gladstone, who replied to our communication sent him in 1882 by a direct insult. We had the right to appeal to the Throne of Great Britain, but in consequence of the advice of Mr. Gladstone, our appeal was received with a reproof. I have great pleasure in supporting the Minister of Justice, because it is a direct compliment to our representative in Great Britain, and an assertion of our own dignity.

Mr. BLAKE. The Minister of Justice in behalf of the Government, which, a little while ago, declared, through the mouth of the leader of the Government, that they were opposed to any communication whatever, is now so anxious there should be direct and immediate communication, that he proposes to facilitate the immediate communication which, at the beginning of the discussion, was thought objectionable, by a process which rather seems to be based on the belief in the old proverb that "the longest way round is the shortest way home." The most prompt way of communicating the resolution to the English House of Commons would be to communicate it to the leader of that House, but the hon. gentleman thinks he will get nearer and quicker to the House by communicating to Sir Charles Tupper who has not yet obtained a seat in that body, which some newspapers declared he was seeking. How then is he going to communicate it to the members of the House? By issuing circular letters, each containing a copy of the despatch, to the members, so that each member will find it in his box at the post office? Is that the way each individual member is to receive our communication from the High Commissioner? This is only another proof of the secret feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If this is to be cabled to the High Commissioner, let it be made "collect."

House divided on amendment of Mr. Thompson.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Hackett,	Paint,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Haggart,	Pruyn,
Barnard,	Hesson,	Reid,
Beaty,	Hickey,	Riopel,
Benoit,	Homer,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Blondeau,	Hurteau,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Jamieson,	Royal,
Bryson,	Kaulbach,	Scott,
Burnham,	Kilvert,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Kinney,	Small,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kranz,	Stairs,
Carling,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tassé,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Macdonald (King's),	Temple,
Costigan,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Thompson,
Cuthbert,	Mackintosh,	Townshend,
Daly,	Macmaster,	Tupper,
Dawson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Tyrwhitt,
Dickinson,	McCarthy,	Valin,
Dundas,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Vanasse,
Everett,	McLelan,	Wallace (Albert),
Ferguson (Welland),	McNeill,	Ward,
Fortin,	Moffat,	White (Cardwell),
Foster,	Montplaisir,	White (Renfrew),
Gordon,	O'Brien,	Wigle,
Grandbois,	Orton,	Wood (Brockville)—80.
Guillet,	Ouimet,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Dodd,	McMullen,
Amyot,	Dupont,	Mills,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	Mitchell,
Auger,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),
Baker (Victoria),	Forbes,	Patterson (Essex),

Barker,	Gigault,	Platt,
Béchard,	Gillmor,	Ray,
Bell,	Girouard,	Rinfret,
Bergeron,	Glen,	Rykert,
Blake,	Guay,	Somerville (Brant),
Bourassa,	Guilbault,	Somerville (Bruce),
Burns,	Gunn,	Springer,
Burpee,	Harley,	Sproule,
Cameron (Huron),	Hilliard,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cameron (*Middlesex*),	Holton,	Trow,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Vail,
Cartwright(Sir Rich'd),	Irvine,	Wallace (York),
Casey,	Jackson,	Watson,
Casgrain,	Jenkins,	Weldon,
Cook,	King,	White (Hastings),
Coughlin,	Landerkin,	Wilson,
Curran,	McIntyre,	Wood (West'land).—70.
Davies,		

House divided on the main motion of Mr. Blake, as amended:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	Moffat,
Allison,	Fortin,	Montplaisir,
Amyot,	Foster,	Mulock,
Armstrong,	Gigault,	O'Brien,
Auger,	Gilmor,	Orton,
Bain (Wentworth),	Glen,	Paint,
Baker, Missisquoi),	Gordon,	Patterson (Brant),
Barker,	Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Barnard,	Guay,	Platt,
Beaty,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Béchard,	Gunn,	Ray,
Bell,	Hackett,	Reid,
Benoit,	Haggart,	Rinfret,
Bergeron,	Harley,	Riopel,
Blake,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Blondeau,	Hickey,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourassa,	Hilliard,	Royal,
Bowell,	Holton,	Scott,
Bryson,	Homer,	Shakespeare,
Burnham,	Hurteau,	Small,
Burns,	Innes,	Sommerville (Brant),
Burpee,	Irvine,	Sommerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Huron),	Jackson,	Springer,
Cameron (Inverness),	Jamieson,	Sproule,
Cameron (*Middlesex*),	Jenkins,	Stairs,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kaulbach,	Tassé,
Carling,	Kilvert,	Taylor,
Caron, (Sir Adolphe).	King,	Temple,
Cartwright(Sir Richard)	Kinney,	Thompson,
Casey,	Kirk,	Townshend,
Casgrain,	Kranz,	Trow,
Cochrane,	Landerkin,	Tupper,
Cook,	Landry (Kent),	Tyrwhitt,
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Vail,
Coughlin,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Valin,
Curran,	Macdonald (King's),	Vanasse,
Cuthbert,	Macdonald. (Sir John),	Wallace (Albert),
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Wallace (York),
Davies,	Macmaster,	Ward,
Dawson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Watson,
Dickinson,	McCarthy,	Weldon,
Dodd,	McDougall(Cap Breton)	White (Cardwell),
Dundas,	McIntyre,	White (Renfrew),
Dupont,	McLelan,	Wigle,
Everett,	McMullen,	Wilson,
Fairbank,	McNeill,	Wood (Brockville).-140
Ferguson (Welland),	Mills,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Baker (Victoria),	Forbes,	Rykert,
Ferguson (Leeds&Gren)	Mitchell,	White (Hastings)—6.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is well now that we should know what course is to be taken by the High Commissioner in London when he receives this document.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing before the Chair.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is rather too late to discuss the subject now, but I think the Government ought to give the matter their serious attention, and direct the Commissioner how he will communicate it to the members of Parliament.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 4:30 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 7th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FRANCHISE ACT—FEES IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House will, on Tuesday next, resolve itself into Committee to take into consideration the following resolution:—

That inasmuch as, in view of the extension of the electoral franchise to the North-West Territories, and of the remoteness of certain portions of the said Territories, it may appear that the allowances for fees and disbursements provided by section one hundred and twenty-six of "The Dominion Elections Act, 1874," will be inadequate or insufficient for a fair and just but economical remuneration for the services performed, the Governor in Council may make a tariff of fees, costs and expenses, based, as nearly as may be, on the tariff of fees, costs and expenses in the said section set forth, to be paid and allowed to Returning Officers and other persons employed at or with respect to elections under the Act respecting the representation, in the Parliament of Canada, of the North-West Territories, and may, from time to time, revise and amend such tariff; and that a copy of every such tariff, and of every amendment thereof, shall be laid before the House of Commons at the then next Session thereof.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. HAGGART. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a personal explanation. When the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was moving his amendment the other evening, he stated that I had been an applicant for some coal lands in the North-West, and that I had urged the granting of licenses to a friend of mine, Mr. McLaren, of Perth, for some timber lands at Turtle Lake. I denied the statement at that time, stating that I had not been an applicant for any coal lands in the North-West, and that I had not urged the granting of a license to Mr. McLaren for timber lands at Turtle Lake. Yesterday, when I was not in the House, the hon. gentleman read a letter from me to the Department applying for a coal land license, and the answer of the Department to that letter. I was astonished when I heard of the letter being read, and went immediately to the Department for the purpose of seeing whether I had made an application or not. When I went down to the Department, I found that an application had been made in my name for a mining location, being the west half of section 16, township 3, range 9, west of the second meridian. I have no knowledge or remembrance of ever having made the application. The application is not in my handwriting, and I have no recollection, even to the present time, of ever having made it. The hon. member was perfectly justified in making his remarks, stating that an application had been made in my name. Before the debate came on, I read in the papers that I was accused of being an applicant for coal lands, and I asked the Minister of the Interior to enquire in his Department whether the statement was true or not. I received the following letter, which was from Mr. Burgess to Mr. White, and was handed to me before the debate commenced:—

"DEAR MR. WHITE,—There is no application from Mr. Haggart, and, of course, no grant to him, nor any application or grant made through Mr. Haggart acting for anyone else, for 320 acres or any other area of coal lands."

That confirmed my memory of the transaction, and upon this letter and my remembrance of the facts, I made the contradiction to the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk the other evening. At the same time, from the papers brought down he was perfectly justified in making the charge that he did make, because it appears from them that I had been an applicant for it. In reference to the other matter about Mr. McLaren, I asked Mr. White to get the letter I sent to the Department with the application of Messrs. McLaren and Sinclair for a timber license at Turtle Lake. The only letter of application that I ever sent to the Department, was this:

"March 29th, 1884.

"DEAR SIR,—Enclosed I send plan and description of limit applied for by Peter McLaren and A. C. Sinclair, sometime ago.

"Yours truly,
(Signed) "JOHN HAGGART.

"Hon. Minister of the Interior."

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In justice to the hon. gentleman I desire to say that when the debate was going on he came to me and asked if I knew anything about it. I said: I have no recollection of it, but I will find out; and from my place here I wrote over to Mr. Burgess, the Deputy Minister, and received an answer which I handed to the hon. member for South Lanark. I have since asked Mr. Burgess how the mistake came to occur, and he sent me Mr. Ryan's letter to him as follows:

"MY DEAR SIR,—You instructed me to report to you whether or not Mr. John Haggart, M.P., had made an application to this Department on behalf of himself or anyone else, for a coal mining location in Manitoba or the North-West Territories, and I reported to you that he had not. I now find that what I stated to you was incorrect, as the records of this Department show that on the 12th December, 1882, an application was received here from Mr. Haggart for a coal mining location of 320 acres. This location, however, was never granted to him, and no further correspondence than the application and acknowledgment appears in the records."

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I may state that the name of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) appears in the printed returns, printed in the blue-books for the last year, as being an applicant for, according to my recollection, two different locations; and if hon. gentlemen are misled, it is simply because a name appears in the blue-book. My information was taken from the blue-book.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is making a statement on a personal explanation of mine, with reference to distinct charges made against me by Mr. Charlton. If he has any charge to make against me this is the time. He did not do it before. Let him do it again, and I shall answer him. If he has a specific charge to make, let him make it, and if he makes these charges that he made up at Wingham against me, I shall make such an explanation as that, I think, hon. members would refuse to sit in the House with him who makes charges so untruthful as these.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I made no charges in Wingham or elsewhere that were not fortified by information obtained from public sources. I made no charge against the hon. gentleman now. I said that his name appears in the Sessional Papers for 1885 as an applicant, either once or twice, for coal lands in the North-West Territory.

Mr. HAGGART. Let me give a distinct denial to that statement. It may be that an application was made such as I have explained just now, an application for coal lands. But the gentleman made a statement in the country which was entirely different from that, when he said that I had been granted coal lands of 320 acres.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No.

Mr. HAGGART. That I was interested in contracts from the Government in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I did not say so. I say it was reported.

Mr. HAGGART. All that I have to say is, that it is cowardly.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Every word of it was true.

HALDIMAND—NEW WRIT.

Mr. LANDERKIN. On Wednesday I enquired of the leader of the Government when a writ would be issued for the county of Haldimand, and he replied that he would let me know on Friday who the returning officer was, and when the writ would be issued.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to wait till the First Minister is in his seat? If he will renew his question then, I am sure he will receive an answer.

THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. DAVIES. I desire to make a short statement across the floor with reference to something that occurred to-day at the meeting of the Public Accounts Committee. The committee was to have met to take evidence from some public officials who had been summoned with reference to the Inch Arran Hotel, and I was to examine those witnesses, but, unfortunately was not present, and some gentlemen present expressed dissatisfaction. I wish to explain how it was. This morning when the House adjourned a little after five o'clock, I went across the Chamber and spoke to the Finance Minister, and asked him if it was desirable that the meeting should be held at half-past ten to-day, and he said that as we would only have half an hour, it was not desirable, and that I had better inform the chairman of the committee. I went through the corridors everywhere in search of the chairman, but failed to find him. Of course, after the late night's work it was impossible for me to get there, and I am very sorry that I did not find the chairman and acquaint him with the understanding I had with the Minister. I hope an arrangement will be made that the committee may meet at an early day, and that we may get through these examinations. They will not be very long, such as they are. I am ready to go on at the earliest moment.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 103) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1883.—(Mr. Foster.)

RELIEF OF THE TOWN OF COBOURG.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 122) for the relief of the corporation of the town of Cobourg.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. VAIL. I would like to know the exact amount given to the town of Cobourg.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. $25,000.

Mr. VAIL. I know the amount of $25,000 is there mentioned, but this includes the interest, I see. I would like to know what the whole sum amounts to, with the principal.

Mr. McLELAN. The amounts are $25,000 and $19,295, respectively. The interest was paid to date.

Bill reported.

MANITOBA CLAIMS SETTLEMENT.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 123) to explain the Act 48 and 49 Vic., chap. 50, intituled: "An Act for the final settlement of the claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman was to have given the House some information as to the exact position of the debt and the total amount payable to Manitoba just now.

Mr. McLELAN. The amount that was at the credit of Manitoba as a capital sum, previous to the arrangement, was $662,272, and of this the Government has drawn $458,386. That is the amount to be chargeable against the capital sum, as provided under this arrangement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand that the sum total remaining to the credit, so to speak, of the Province of Manitoba, is a little under $200,000?

Mr. McLELAN. I thought the hon. gentleman asked as to how much they have drawn from their capital account. That sum was $458,000. They had at their credit, before this arrangement was made, $236,000. The hon. gentleman understands that this takes the place of all previous arrangements, so that under this there will be placed at the capital account about $4,000,000, from which will be deducted amounts which we had advanced previously on capital account and all sums for works of a local nature.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much will there be on capital account when this Bill becomes law?

Mr. McLELAN. The balance on capital account at their credit is $3,596,614, against which will be chargeable anything that may have been advanced to them that may be considered of a strictly local character, this being chargeable according to the terms of the arrangement. That matter has not, however, yet been settled.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Speaking generally, about $3,500,000 are at their credit. What rate of interest is payable under the present arrangement?

Mr. McLELAN. Five per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They will get then for future revenue $175,000 as interest, and under the arrangement so consummated last year, about how much is paid to them? What is their total revenue just now?

Mr. McLELAN. I have not looked into that matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take it to be about $400,000. But I should like to know exactly what it is, because we have been altering these arrangements many times, and it is impossible, without an authentic statement from the Department, to know exactly where we stand.

Mr. McLELAN. I will give such statement before the third reading.

Mr. WATSON. Can the Minister give us an idea of the quantity of public land to be transferred to Manitoba?

Mr. McLELAN. There is no information I can furnish.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That has reference to the swamp lands which it is proposed to hand over to the Province. Does the Minister recollect whether they are to be handed over free, or whether there is to be a nominal charge made upon them?

Mr. McLELAN. Nothing is mentioned as to whether they are to be free or not. No mention is made of any charge, it being simply stated that the swamp lands are to be handed over.

Mr. WATSON. I would suggest to the Government that some estimate of the quantity of land to be transferred should be made, and that as soon as possible. I suppose the Local Legislature has to take a hand in in deciding what are swamp lands. It is a mistake that the swamp lands were not defined before the final arrangements were made. The matter was discussed at length last year, and I had hoped, from what the Minister stated a few days ago, that he would have been able to give the House some approximate idea of the quantity of lands that will be transferred to Manitoba under the terms of last year. It seems strange there should have been no understanding with the Local Government as to the quantity of land that would be transferred, or what lands would be termed swamp lands.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman is not quite accurate in his statement that no understanding has been arrived at. When I was in Winnipeg last year I had an interview with members of the Local Government on this subject, and we agreed generally, subject, of course, to the decision of the Government, that we are to take the description of swamp lands as fixed by Act of the American Congress in similar circumstances. We agreed as to the time at which surveyors should be sent out, and I am now communicating with Mr. Norquay with regard to their being sent out in the spring, with a view of settling the whole question of the swamp lands.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister states that an agreement has been made on the basis of giving the Province of Manitoba what they call swamp lands in the American border States. What is that?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). What I stated was that we agreed generally that that would be a satisfactory arrangement. I have sent a letter reciting the facts and am expecting an answer daily. The plan they adopted in the United States as fixed by Statute, was, that where, for instance, a township or section was largely swamp land, as determined by the surveyors appointed for that purpose, the whole township or section should be considered as swamp lands. Where, on the contrary, a small proportion was swamp, then the whole section was considered as good land.

Mr. WATSON. I think the explanation of the hon. Minister is satisfactory, but it would be interesting to the House if he would explain, at the third reading of the Bill, what are to be termed swamp lands. He will probably remember that last Session, although perhaps he did not himself take an active part in the debate, the Minister of Customs stated that only lands which were continually covered by water would be so considered, and that, I contend, would be very unsatisfactory to the people of Manitoba.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman must not expect me to give a definite answer on the third reading, because both sides have not absolutely agreed on the basis of what may be recommended to Council, as the basis of an Order in Council, and as the matter is now before the Manitoba Government, until we get an answer from them, it is clear we cannot communicate the information.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman's memory does not serve him correctly as to what I stated last year. What I said—as he will find by referring to *Hansard*—was, that I was unable to give a distinct and positive answer as to the interpretation of the term "swamp" lands. A good deal was said about lands constantly covered with water, and those which were overflowed by the lake, but it was also said that that was a matter which would be decided in future between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba. I know the hon. gentleman tried to get me to define what was really meant by swamp lands, but if he remembers, he will acknowledge that I told him I was totally unable to say at that time what would

be considered swamp lands, but that my own impression was that those lands which were termed swamp lands in Ontario would be considered swamp lands in that country.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM STATIONS.

Mr. CARLING moved the second reading of Bill (No. 124) respecting experimental farm stations.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman should give us some idea of the character of those institutions which he proposes to establish—the extent of the farm, the kind of operations carried on, the kind of buildings and their probable cost, and what the hon. gentleman expects to accomplish by them that is not at the present time accomplished by the agricultural farms and colleges established under Provincial authority.

Mr. CARLING. When the resolutions were introduced, I stated that the intention of the Government was to establish a central station in the vicinity of the capital, with a farm of 400 or 500 acres. This is to be an experimental farm for testing different kinds of seeds and cereals, experimenting on stock, forestry, horticulture, etc., and the result of those experiments will be distributed to the public monthly, or oftener, by bulletins and through the press. The Bill also provides for the establishment of stations, one in the Lower Provinces, one in Manitoba, one in the North-West Territories and one in British Columbia. Tests will be made at these different stations and the results will be forwarded to the central station, which will then issue bulletins to the public, giving these results. The total cost, as I stated in introducing the resolution, for all these stations will be about $240,000. That is, the purchase of land, the erection of buildings, fencing, and all the other requirements of the farm. The annual cost, if all these places were established, would be $30,000 or $35,000.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has not given all the information we require. The practice of the United States, I believe, is that the consuls scattered throughout the world collect seeds and other materials and send them to the proper officer at the capital, who distributes them among the population, on condition that they will experiment with them; the persons receiving them report to Washington the results of their experiments, and upon those reports a report is made up, showing in what State and in what kind of soil and climate the experiment has succeeded, or whether it has failed. If we had consuls abroad to collect the cereals of other countries, to be sent here and distributed amongst our population, to see how far they could be successfully produced in this country, I could understand that that might be a benefit. But the hon. gentleman proposes, by means of experimental farms established in different parts of the country, to carry on these experiments under the direct supervision of the Government I think the hon. gentleman should have shown us that this official mode of proceeding would be superior to the voluntary mode in vogue for many years in the United States. When the hon. gentleman tells us that he proposes to establish an experimental farm of 500 acres in the vicinity of the capital, he ought to give us more information than he has given us on that subject. He tells us those farms will probably cost the country $240,000. How is that sum made up? How much is for land? What farms is he going to purchase? Of what nature and to what extent are the experiments to be carried on?

He spoke about forestry. What kind of trees is he going to try to grow in this climate—fruit trees or forest trees? We already know the kind of forest trees that can be grown in this climate—those that are indigenous to the climate. Does he intend to introduce others? What kinds of stock is he going to select? What knowledge does he propose to give the agricultural population that has not already been given by the Provincial farms and by private enterprise? If he is not going to accomplish anything beyond what has already been accomplished, the experiments would be altogether unnecessary. It is therefore desirable to know exactly the kind, the extent, and the cost of the operations the hon. gentleman intends to engage in. The hon. gentleman spoke about horticulture as well as agriculture. How are the seeds to be collected, and from what districts? The hon. gentleman tells us he has reached a certain conclusion; it may be he is right, but we want the data furnished us so that we may judge of the accuracy of that conclusion. The House must assume the responsibility of founding these experimental farms, which will be a serious charge on the public for all time to come. It is, therefore, of no little importance that the hon. gentleman, before entering on a policy which in a large degree points in the direction of a legislative union, should be able to give the House the information I have suggested.

Mr. CARLING. Had the hon. gentleman taken the trouble to read the report of the committee appointed in 1884, he would have obtained the information he now desires. That committee made a very full investigation into the working of agricultural colleges and schools of farming generally, and they suggested that the Government should take into favorable consideration the advisability of establishing a bureau of agriculture and an experimental farm under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture.

"CONCLUSION.

"Considering that the proper development of our agricultural resources is indispensible to the upbuilding and maintenance of our national wealth and prosperity, and that all progressive countries are at present making strenuous efforts for the introduction of improved methods of agriculture, your committee believe that no object is more deserving of the active and generous support of the Federal Government than that of fostering and promoting this great industry, and of prompting, guiding and co-operating with all local and provincial institutions formed for the furtherance of this object. Your committee, therefore, beg leave to submit the following recommendations:—

"That the Government take into earnest and favorable consideration the advisability of establishing a bureau of agriculture, and an experimental farm in connection therewith

"That this bureau be formed in connection with, and under the supervision of, the present Department of Agriculture.

"That the objects aimed at in the establishment of such bureau and farm be as follows:—

"1. To conduct such experiments in the introduction and culture of new varieties of seeds, plants, trees, etc., as will most efficiently aid in the advancement of Canadian agriculture; to institute experiments with regard to the comparative value of fertilizers, the proper testing of seeds as to vitality and purity, and the healthy preservation and productive conditions of plants and animals.

"2. To make careful investigation into the origin, distribution and habits of insects injurious and beneficial, and the contagious and other diseases to which animals and plants are subject, in order to arrive at the best method of destroying and counteracting them.

"3. To study the qualities of the various breeds of cattle and other domestic animals, with the view of reporting on the best means of improving them; of protecting them from parasites and epidemic diseases, of feeding them for the market, and on the treatment of milch cattle.

"4. To initiate and carry out a convenient and comprehensive system of gathering the latest and most useful information, statistical and otherwise.

"5 To publish and send to the press and the various agricultural and horticultural societies of the Dominion, at different periods of the year, bulletins giving the results of trials made on the experimental farm, and whatever other information the Bureau may consider useful, either in the prevention of the ravages of insects and of contagious diseases among animals, concerning improved methods of culture that have stood test, or for the special advancement of any line of agricultural pursuits.

"All of which is respectfully submitted, with the evidence herewith appended.

"G. A. GIGAULT, *Chairman.*"

many persons that there is room for improvement. Professor Arnold and Mr. Lynch, two witnesses heard by the Select Committee on Agriculture, declared that Canada was losing certainly annually $5,000,000 on account of the inferior quality of her butter. I am happy to say that the report of this select committee was commented upon favorably by Professor Fream in a lengthy article on Canadian agriculture, which was published in the journal of the Royal Agricultural Society of England. That professor, who is considered a good authority on agriculture, hopes that the conclusions of this committee will be put into effect. Here is what he says in that article:

"That some generally applicable system of instruction in the theory and practice of modern agriculture would exert a powerful influence for the better is beyond doubt. That the Canadian farmers recognise the weakness of their position in this respect is sufficiently evidenced by the tone of the replies obtained by the Select Committee on Agriculture, the majority of which were in favor of the establishment of a central bureau and of an agricultural experimental farm. * * * It is much to be hoped that before long these suggestions will be realised."

Speaking of the Canadian butter, the same writer says:

"The average price of butter in Canada may be put at 9d. per lb., but it varies from 7½d. or 8d. west of Toronto to 11d. at the creameries. Taking the average price of Danish butter on the English market at 15d. to 17d. per lb., it is thought that the Canadian butter would not command so high a price as Danish, yet by improvements in manufacture and in means of transport the average price of the Canadian product might be increased by at least 3d. per lb."

Another writer gives also a fair illustration of what experimental dairy stations will do here in Canada. He speaks of the influence exerted by the experimental dairy stations in Denmark, and he says:

"To sum up, the results of agricultural education in Denmark have been something extraordinary. Twenty years ago the butter sold in the market by the yeoman farmer was pronounced execrably bad; at present Danish butter in its season has practically no rival on the London market."

If we look at the cheese industry in Canada we find that in 1868 the exports of cheese from Ontario and Quebec, were only $617,943; while in 1883 the same two Provinces exported cheese for $8,177,757. Experienced farmers declare that if there had been an experimental dairy station under the control of the Government many years ago, that industry would have made much more progress than it has. In the United States the industry of wine making, and the culture of oranges and grape vines, are due chiefly to the action of experimental stations established in that country. The director of the experimental station of Roehampstead, in England, has been knighted on account of the great services he has rendered to agriculture. It is said by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that the establishment of these institutions should be left to the Provincial Legislatures. The resources of our Provinces are very limited, and many of them are not in a position to make the necessary expenditure for such institutions. It is the Federal Treasury which profits most by the increase of the agricultural production. When that production is considerable, when the farmers receive good prices, the imports of manufactured goods increase, there is a larger consumption of articles on which we receive Excise duties, and the Canadian Treasury is always overflowing with revenue accruing from Customs and Excise when the farmers are in a prospering condition. So I believe that it is chiefly the duty of the Federal Government to make the necessary expenditures for the improvement of agriculture. For many years past we have made many efforts to improve our manufacturing industries, but, notwithstanding those praiseworthy efforts, our exports of manufactured goods from 1868 to 1885 have increased only by $1,608,955. We find a different result as to agricultural products. During the same period the increase of exports in agricultural products has been more than $20,000,000. So we see that agriculture has always been, and will be for many years, the main industry in Canada, and the first one which should be fostered and protected by our Government. It is always interesting to read reports of directors of agricultural institutions in other countries. In France, Professor Grandeau, in a report of the experimental station which is under his control, ascertains one of the benefits which can be derived from such institutions. Speaking of the agricultural production in France, he says that it could be increased at least by 20 or 30 per cent. if the farmers of that country made a good choice of seeds for the cultivation of cereals. At the agricultural station under his control thirteen varieties of wheat were sown on thirteen different parcels of land. Each parcel was of the same quality, but no more fertilisers were employed for one parcel than for another; yet we see that the choice of seeds had a very large influence over the production. One variety of wheat produced 18 *hectolitres* per *hectare*, while another kind produced as much as 35 *hectolitres* per *hectare*. This is the best evidence that such institutions produce good results, and I am sure that they will help here, as in other countries, to increase our agricultural productions and to improve the quality of our agricultural products. If these institutions are well managed, the Minister of Agriculture will be entitled to the congratulations, not only of the agricultural class, but also of every class in our community, for the measure which he has proposed, because on the prosperity of agriculture depends our national prosperity.

Mr. BURPEE. I should like to obtain some information from the Minister. I understand from the Bill there is to be a central farm near the capital and four out-stations, one to be in the Maritime Provinces, one in Manitoba, one in British Columbia, and one in the North-West Territory; the cost of the central farm to be about $120,000, and a similar amount to be expended on the out-stations combined. At the central station there are to be experiments in stock, butter and cheese, field crops, fruits, vegetables, &c. Will all those experiments carried on at the central station be conducted likewise at the out-stations?

Mr. CARLING. No. At the central station arrangements will be made to have different officers to make tests, including chemical tests, and at the outlying stations there will be practical experiments made in the management of trees, the raising of fruit, cattle, &c. Arrangements will be made with the Post Office Department that all packages required to be tested from different sections of the country shall be sent through the Post office free. The bulletins will also be sent free. It is not intended at the outlying stations to make chemical tests as at the central station.

Mr. BURPEE. Is it intended to have farm stock and make experiments with them at the out-stations?

Mr. CARLING. It is not intended to have a stock farm, but experiments on the feeding of stock, the best kind of food and the breeds most suitable to the locality will be made. We must have a certain number of head of stock, but it is not intended to make it a stock-breeding farm.

Mr. BURPEE. We have already in New Brunswick an experimental stock farm, and the Local Government have expended a considerable amount of money, over $5,000 a year, on this farm, where they raise a good many cattle and experiment to some degree in regard to them. They have four or five different breeds; they had last year seventy-five acres of meadow land, and portions of land laid down with oats, wheat and so forth. They make experiments on those different subjects, but especially in regard to stock. At Prince Edward Island there is also an experimental stock farm, which has been very successful. Whether the out-stations proposed will come into competition with the experimental farm carried on by the Local Government, is a question. I think it

would be very much better if the Local Government and the Dominion Government would combine and establish one good experimental farm. To have two small experimental farms in one Province would not be of very much usefulness. And it would be a mistake to go on with the proposal without having some arrangement with the Local Government, which could carry out on the farm to very much greater advantage than the Dominion Government. However, I am not objecting to the establishment of an experimental farm; it will be experimental in every sense of the word, and I am willing the experiment shall be tried. But the Dominion Government, in establishing the out-stations should have some respect to the existing experimental farms already established in the different Provinces. As to experiments in shade trees, I do not think they would be any material benefit whatever so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, as we have too many of them already. As to fruit trees, we have enterprising nurserymen in those Provinces who have done much in experimenting and introducing the best description of fruit trees. May I ask if any locality in the Maritime Provinces has been selected for the location of the out-station ?

Mr. CARLING. I think I mentioned to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that no place had been decided on and no land had been selected.

Mr. BURPEE. There will be no difficulty, I think, in obtaining a good farm in a central point of the Maritime Provinces at a fair rate. It will, however, be a great mistake to establish another small experimental farm, while there is one in operation, without amalgamating them, or, at least, consulting with the Local Government so as to divide the work between them. Let the local farm take one department of experiment and the Dominion out-station another. At all events, it will be a mistake to establish two experimental farms in one vicinity; their management should be combined in some way, I think.

Mr. DAVIES. The central station, where, in the first instance, the experiments will be carried on, will be established, I understand, near Ottawa, and it is intended to serve for the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The one in the North-West will, I suppose, be on a somewhat large scale, too. I shall say nothing about it, but I have no doubt it will be desirable to have an experimental station in that locality, as it is a new country, and many of the people who go there are not acquainted with the proper methods of farming, &c. With regard to the station in the Lower Provinces, I do not suppose the hon. gentleman has given a great deal of consideration to the matter yet, but he will see, on reflection, that if he desires, say, the Province of Prince Edward Island, to benefit by the scheme, it would be better to give assistance to the Local Government in maintaining the one which is already established in the island on a small scale. A farm station established in New Brunswick, or on the border between New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, though it might benefit the localities of the mainland, would certainly not benefit Prince Edward Island, as our system of farming is different, and I do not understand that any experiments carried on in the mainland would be of any great benefit to agriculture in the island. As we have already an excellent farm and experimental station, if the hon. gentleman desires to assist the agricultural interests of the Province, he could do so either by augmenting the local grant to the farm, or else by doing away with it altogether as a local concern and carrying it on under the auspices of the Dominion. I am glad my colleague has had his attention drawn to the matter, and I am quite sure he will agree with me.

Mr. TEMPLE. I wish to say a few words on this question, and not allow the lawyers to monopolise the discussion on agriculture altogether. I have done a good deal of farming myself in this country and I know a little about it. I think the scheme before the House is an excellent one, and that it reflects great credit upon the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I am satisfied it will be a very great benefit to the agriculturists throughout the length and breadth of the country. The Local Government of New Brunswick has had a stock farm for some years, although they have not been able to carry it on to as large an extent as I would like to see, but what they have done has been a great benefit to the Province. I cannot agree with the proposal of the hon. gentleman from Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) to unite those stations with those established by the Local Government, as I think the result would be much better if each Government is allowed to do its own work in this direction. I think the hon. member for Prince Edward Island is perfectly right in what he has said about the station for that Province, as they have a good stock farm there and they can raise good crops on the island, and if the object can be accomplished by assisting the farm they have there, I think it would be much better for the Province. With regard to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, I think it would be better that the stations of those Provinces should be carried on separately. As regards tree planting, so far as Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are concerned, experiments of that kind would be of no benefit, because we have plenty of trees and are cutting them down every day. But as regards fruit trees, they would be of very great benefit. I hope the Minister will be able to carry his scheme through, as I am satisfied the country will be largely benefited by it.

Mr. JENKINS. I cannot see that there is any force in the objection of the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) to the excellent scheme of the Minister of Agriculture, that there will be competition. I think if there was competition it would be a healthy competition, and would be rather an advantage than otherwise. I hail with great satisfaction the attempt being made by the Minister, because I am satisfied it will be of great service to the cause of agriculture in Canada. It is to agriculture that Canada must owe her wealth, at all events, her first great start, and although her manufactures and mines will assist greatly in adding to the wealth of Canada, still her mainstay for many years will be agriculture, and I think it will be satisfactory to the people of Canada that the general government is going to take the matter up. It is true, we have our stock farm in Prince Edward Island, which is very successful, but it is only a stock farm. The resources of the Province are limited, and we are not able to establish an experimental farm which would be of any great service. My hon. colleague has stated that Prince Edward Island occupies an exceptional position, and it is perfectly true; and if there is to be one experimental farm established for the three Maritime Provinces, it seems to me that Prince Edward Island is the proper place for it, because that Province adjoins both of the other Provinces, and our soil is better fitted for it than the soil of either of the other Provinces. I am sure that if it were placed either in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, the one Province would be jealous of the other, and it would be a practical solution of that difficulty to establish it in Prince Edward Island. The soil of that Province is very amenable to culture, and would show the benefits of improved farming better perhaps than any other soil in the Dominion. So far as the North-West is concerned, I think this is a step in the right direction. There is such a capacity for improvement in that country, and so small an opportunity for the local authorities to carry on improvements, that I think it absolutely necessary that the general government should lead the way. We know that that country is very fertile, but it has its drawbacks, among which are the severity of the winter and the want of water. If it were planted with trees, however I believe a very great improve-

ment in both of these respects would result. I think very great credit is due to the hon. Minister for bringing this subject forward.

Mr. MILLS. I am rather surprised at the observations of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) pointed out that the climate of Prince Edward Island, from its insulated position, was so different from that of the other Maritime Provinces, that the experiments carried on there would be altogether different from those carried on on the mainland, and that experiments on the mainland would not be sufficient for the Island. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has repudiated that position, and has declared that experiments on the Island would answer very well for the mainland, and it follows that experiments on the mainland would be quite sufficient for the Island. Now, I wish to make an observation or two with reference to the very excellent report of the committee appointed in 1882. No doubt a great deal of useful information and many valuable suggestions are contained in that report; but the question whether these experimental farms would be better conducted under the supervision of the Local Governments or the Federal Government is well worthy of the consideration of Parliament. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the great benefit these institutions have been in the United States; and yet he admits that every one of them is under State and not under Federal control. He has told us so much of the value of experiments carried on in the territory of Dakota, in reference to fruit trees and other trees, that one would almost be disposed to think Dakota was a paradise. I am afraid if such encomiums had been pronounced on that territory by anyone on this side of the House, he would be accused of trying to persuade our people to leave the Dominion and take up their residence there.

Mr. CARLING. Does the hon. gentleman say that I was passing encomiums on Dakota?

Mr. MILLS. What does the hon. gentleman call his remarks on the valuable experiments carried on there?

Mr. CARLING. I said that trees had been imported from Russia and successfully tested in Dakota, and that I was quite sure they would be equally successful in our North-West, where the climate was similar to that of Dakota.

Mr. MILLS. Well, all these experiments have been made by individul enterprise or under State supervision. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) says our Provinces are poor, and have not sufficient funds to carry on those experiments. In the United States the various States receive no aid from the Federal treasury.

Mr. CARLING. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The Federal Government granted large tracts of land to the various States, which amount now to the value of about $15,000,000.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is in too much hurry. I say the various States have received no revenue from the Federal treasury. They are not in the position of our Provinces, which receive subsidies from year to year, and it is in the power of the Local Governments to supplement those subsidies by direct taxation to any extent they think proper. It is quite possible for the Federal Government to do, with regard to these experimental farms, what they did years ago with regard to immigration. They entered into an arrangement by which they contributed a certain sum of money towards immigration to the different Provinces, and they could do the same thing with regard to the experimental farms. I admit that an experimental farm in the North-West, if properly conducted, would be of very considerable value. But under whose supervision should it be—the Territorial Government or this Government? The Government say that even the public lands cannot be properly managed from Ottawa, and they have established a Land Board in the North-West to manage them; and how is the hon. gentleman going to exercise supervision over his experimental farms in that country? Does he intend to establish an agricultural board up there for that purpose? I do not say that the hon. gentleman may not give a contribution from the public treasury in aid of agricultural societies, but I say there is a proper sphere in which the operations of this Government may be carried on, just as there is a proper sphere in which the operations of the Government at Washington are carried on; and there is a propher sphere which belongs to the Local Government. If the Local Governments, in the different Provinces, feel that they cannot establish institutions so large or so expensive as is required to secure the most beneficial results, that may be a reason why the Government here should aid the different Provinces in the establishment and working of those different establishments, but it is not a reason why we should undertake to establish institutions independent of the Provinces, and carry on operations, thousands of miles away from any oversight which it would be in our power to exercise. It seems to me we are called on to expend a large sum of money for work that can be better done by the Local Legislature than by us. I am not going further in opposition to this proposition, but wish to state here I have little or no doubt as to what the result of our proposed action will be. We have a federal system of Government, and each Government, both Federal and Provincial, has its proper sphere of action. The hon. gentleman by this proposition is encroaching on the authority of the Local Governments, and using the resources of this Government in doing that which, by law, should be undertaken by the Local Governments, and which we have not the necessary resources to efficiently carry out. If the Local Governments have not the necessary resources to establish those experimental institutions, that may be a reason for our supplementing the resources of the Local Governments, but not a reason for our undertaking to carry out work which ought to be left in their hands.

Mr. HESSON. I wish simply to point out the fact that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is never satisfied with any measure that the Government can possibly propose. The hon. gentleman finds fault with every measure proposed by the Government, whether in the interest of the people or not. He seems to think it is his sole business to find fault, and admirably he performs it. He would be satisfied that we should aid the Provincial Governments, but he is not prepared to put the administration of affairs in our hands, though we are to find the ways and means to administer them. Were his party in power, I have no doubt he would have full confidence that the Government here would administer these affairs in the most admirable manner, especially if he happened to be Minister of Agriculture. I think he ought to give credit to the Government for trying to do what is right in behalf of agricultural interests, and give credit to hon. members on this side for a sincere desire to promote the best interests of the country. I object to a vote being given in aid of provincial agricultural institutions, because it would be diverted, in all probability, from the purposes it was intended to carry out. Does the hon. gentleman say it is impossible for us to find experienced agriculturists to carry on this work? He knows well they can be found, and that there are enough people in the immediate neighborhood of those institutions, as for instance the Local and Federal representatives, who will be sufficiently interested in the matter to see that the expenditure is employed in the right direction. The hon. gentleman finds fault with the Minister for not entering into details. He wanted to know about the fencing and the number and des-

cription of trees and other matters of detail, but that is at present impossible. The Minister has done all he could in ascertaining, after careful enquiry, that certain results would in all probability follow the employment of certain methods in certain cases, and if neighboring countries have succeeded in accomplishing good work in the direction proposed by means of certain expenditure, it is only fair to assume that similar results will follow that expenditure here. The Government will be responsible for this expenditure, and be called to account for it, and will see that it is properly put to use.

Mr. MILLS. As is the case of the Indian farms.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman has had his say and he should allow me to have mine. He knows no more about what he is talking now than he often does. I do not believe he ever put his hand to the plough himself, he understands more about teaching school and studying law than he does about farming, but, as usual, he is prepared to discuss any question, no matter how remote it may be from his experience. My experience of agriculturists is different from that of the hon. gentleman. I believe that men can be chosen from that body who will carry out effectively the work entrusted to them. The object of this measure is undoubtedly a good one, and with the exception of the hon. gentleman, hon. members on both sides do not object to our aiding agricultural interests, in which this Government has a peculiar interest, an interest greater than that of any Provincial Government, from the fact that by the promotion of our agricultural interests and the consequent export of our agricultural products, an immense revenue is being created to the country at large. It is one in which he is interested as a representative of an agricultural constituency as well as myself, and I am sure that when we come down to the matter of expenditures required it will be time enough to find fault and to ask for particulars as to the number of trees to be put on each farm.

Mr FISHER I have taken a good deal of interest in this question. I had the honor of being a member of the committee of which my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault) two years ago was the chairman, and in the course of the investigations of that committee the members of it were fully impressed with the importance of something of the kind being undertaken by the Dominion Government. The committee obtained information from all the best sources, not only in this country, but also from the United States, and by means of letters and communications in some cases also from England, and we found, by the reports which were presented to us, that this undertaking was one for which we could find many examples, in almost all the best governed countries in the world. I think, therefore, it is quite proper for the Dominion Government to undertake to do this for the benefit of the agriculturists of this country. We all know perfectly well that agriculture in this country is passing through a change from the first stages of a new country, and that, in the older Provinces at all events, our agriculturists have to meet with all the disadvantages and difficulties that the agriculturists of Europe have to encounter. They are no longer in the position which the people of the Western States and the North-West of Canada are, in having the advantages of a virgin soil and a quick return for the labor they employ thereon. The result is that our agriculturists have to study the best methods of their business that they can possibly acquire. and I believe that in this they can be assisted very much by the Government. That commission obtained information with regard to the establishment of agricultural stations and experimental farms in other countries. Chiefly, of course, we looked to the United States, the circumstances of which country are more like our own than those of any other, but we also found it to our advantage to look to the agricultural stations and experiments in Europe, because we knew that these questions are more thoroughly and scientifically gone into in Europe than they are on this continent. We knew that in Germany and in France, which are in this respect far ahead of our own Mother Country, the best scientific minds are employed in investigating these matters and trying to find out by what means the agricultural classes may benefit best. There is one particular difference, however, which I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to, between the experimental agricultural stations in Germany and France and those in America. In Germany and France, the experiments and investigations carried on are of a purely scientific character. They are not what perhaps would be called by our farmers of a practical character. In the United States, the agricultural stations and experiments are more frequently on a large scale, and are carried on in what may be called a practical and a rougher method, and the result is that in many cases they have not been so accurate as those in Europe. I do not say that sweepingly of all the stations in the United States, because in a few of the stations there they have gentlemen of high scientific attainments who are able to carry out the experiments in the most scientific manner. But I want to warn the Minister of Agriculture and urge upon him strongly that in the experiments he wishes to carry out in this country he will rather take the example and the model of those in Europe than of those in the United States. What the farmers of this country want more than anything else is absolutely accurate information as to what they are able to do. This can only be acquired by men who have been trained in accurate scientific investigation. A farmer, a man who is accustomed to do the rough handiwork of the fields cannot possibly undertake these experiments; he has not the training which is necessary for accurate observation, he has not the delicacy of hand or the training of mind which is necessary to enable him to conduct a long series of careful experiments, and the only result which will come to our farmers if these experiments are not accurately and carefully conducted will be that the agricultural community will be led into mistakes and errors, and will lose more than they will gain by the experiments. This leads me to a point which I wish to urge upon the Minister of Agriculture with considerable force. I see that in this Bill he takes power to acquire a large tract of land in this immediate neighborhood, and also asks power to acquire large pieces of land in three or four other localities in the Dominion. I think, if the Minister will enquire into the state of affairs in those stations in Europe to which I referred, he will find the most accurate and famous and best known experiments in agricultural matters are carried on on comparatively small tracts of land. The Rothamstead experiments, which are conducted by Sir J. B. Lawes and Mr. Gilbert, have been conducted on very small plots of land. I think it is only a few acres which are occupied by these experiments, which have acquired a world-wide fame and have resulted in so much good to the whole agricultural people of the world. If the Minister will look at the report of the committee to which he has alluded, he will find several instances of questions put to the witnesses asking them what they thought would be necessary as the area of an agricultural experiment station here at Ottawa, and I find in one instance that a gentleman who is very well known to many of us and who is thoroughly well acquainted with the needs especially of the horticulture and forestry branch, Mr. Charles Gibb, of Abbottsford, said, that for a good time to come, at all event, a small plot of ground, perhaps ten acres in extent, would be sufficient for that portion of the experimental station to which he was referring, I mean in connection with agriculture and forestry and the trial of fruits and fruit trees. I think it is well for the Government and this Parliament to hasten slowly. We are trying a new thing. We are

inaugurating a branch of our governmental expenditure, and while I thoroughly endorse and sympathise with the movement, and am desirous that it should be conducted to a successful conclusion, I am very desirous also that no mistake should be made, and that the result should be entirely and absolutely satisfactory to our agricultural classes. To accomplish this, I think it is very necessary, as I said, that we should hasten slowly. I would urge upon the Minister of Agriculture that, instead of buying 400 or 600 acres in the neighborhood of this city, he should buy only a small area, 100 acres, or even less, which I am satisfied would be quite sufficient for what I consider necessary in this regard. The other branch of the subject, which has drawn forth remarks from my hon. friend the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and has been alluded to as interfering with the Local Governments and with the efforts of those Governments towards the improvement of agriculture in their various Provinces, I think ought to be very carefully looked into. I know that in regard to these careful investigations and scientific experiments to which I have been alluding, where they are once well conducted, it is quite sufficient for the whole country. It is not at all necessary that we should test a certain class of seeds here at Ottawa, and also down in New Brunswick and up in the North-West. If we test them carefully under the eyes of scientific investigators it can be done in a small way, and done nearly as well, at one point as another. When we come to ascertain whether these seeds are proper for general use throughout the country, it is true that we will have to test them in a different way, and I propose soon to suggest a scheme by which that can be done. But besides the question of testing seeds there is, for instance, the question of the investigation of the value of agricultural and artificial fertilisers. Now if a fertiliser is used in this country its value is the same in all the Provinces as at Ottawa, and the test of such a fertiliser, if carried on at Ottawa, would serve for the whole Dominion. The same way, also, with the test of the nutritive value of the different foods in connection with the feeding of cattle; the same also with the test of the manner and best methods of producing butter and cheese, so that our dairy interests may be improved, and our dairy products may acquire such a standing in Europe that they will command the highest prices. All these things can be best carried on in one central station, where we could command the services of men of high scientific attainment, upon whom we can depend to give us accurate results. Now I am going to make a suggestion to the Minister by which experiments all over the country may be more satisfactorily and cheaply carried on than by branch agricultural stations. Let us have a central staff who will have at their command a sufficient number of seeds, of fruit trees or trees for forestry purposes, and let them send these seeds or trees with which they wish to experiment, all over the country to, we will say, one individual in each constituency of the Dominion. Let the members of this Parliament recommend some reliable man in their constituency who is competent to make reports and to observe intelligently, I am quite sure that a number of such men can be found in all the constituencies of this country. Let that gentleman, that farmer, be paid for what he does, for the small amount of labor expended by him upon these experiments on his own farm. A few days' work in the year will be quite sufficient for him to test the success of any particular experiment, to test the success of a particular variety of potatoes, we will say, or something of that kind. Any practical farmer who is able to do a little writing, and observe a little more accurately than the majority of his neighbors, just such a man as can be found in every municipality, probably, would be able to undertake this business, and to carry on the tests. There should be a small central bureau to give him his instructions, absolute instructions which he should be obliged to follow, so that he would have no responsibility as to the manner in which the experiment was being conducted, except to do simply what he was told. Then that man could make his report. If it was an experiment which required to be reported periodically he could send in every month an exact state of the crop, for instance, or the result of whatever might be the subject of experiment. If it only required one report at the end of the year, as in the case of the product of a certain kind of grain, he could send in his report at the end of the year. It might also be well to have in each Province, or in every thickly populated centre, an inspector who would go around and carefully examine the results of the experiments in each locality, and in that way I think this inspector, whom I would suppose to be a man with some scientific attainments, would be able to give advice and to make an intelligent report of what he found in the different counties of the Dominion. Then these reports could be compiled and employed in making up an annual report which should be issued from the general bureau—about which I spoke. I think these branch establishments which the Minister has suggested would be likely, in some instances, to clash with the local provincial institutions, and I think they would be unnecessary alongside the local provincial institutions. These provincial institutions have to be supported by the Local Government or, in other words, by the people of the country, and the branch institutions which the Minister proposes to establish, will also have to be paid for by the people. The people, therefore, will have to pay for both, and though it does not matter very much whether they are carried on by the Dominion or Local Government, it does matter whether the people have to pay twice over for the same work. Therefore, I think that these branch institutions are practically unnecessary. I quite agree with the Minister that it is essential that we should have information as to the results of the tests from all over the Dominion, and I think the scheme which I have pointed out, and which I have discussed with various agriculturturist and other gentlemen who are interested in this question of the establishment of experimental stations, will meet the case for all practical purposes. Such men as Mr. Gibb, Prof. Penhallow, the Hon. Mr. Joly, of Quebec, to whom I have spoken, have endorsed the position I have taken on this question. I think by this means we might arrive at a more accurate result than we could possibly attain by the establishment of branch stations in two or three Provinces of the Dominion. I wish also to make one remark with regard to Manitoba and the North-West. I quite agree that in that region special experiments are required which cannot possibly be carried on at Ottawa, for example with regard to forestry. That is a question of enormous importance to the North-West, and, indeed, to the whole of Canada. We must find out what trees are best adapted for cultivation in that country, whether for verdure, or for fuel, or for wind-breaks, wherever they may be required. In our eastern Provinces we still boast of being a great lumber country, but before many years we shall be unable to make that boast any longer, and the question of forestry is also likely to become a vital one in the eastern Provinces. In the North-West, especially, it is absolutely essential that experiments should be conducted with a view to ascertaining the best way of cultivating trees for wind-breaks and other purposes. That cannot be done on a small scale, it cannot be done at Ottawa, and I believe that, also, will have to be done in the way I propose for other experiments, that is, all over the North-West. The Government should appoint in different parts of the North-West Territory individuals who may be depended upon, who have been recommended for their intelligence and for their eagerness in carrying out this work, who will have to be asked to try the experiment of plant-

ing in their own locality, whatever trees are most likely to flourish in that region. For instance, there is a certain tree, the willow—will that serve the purpose as a wind-break all over the North-West? Another of great importance to the North-West is the discovery of a kind of wheat which will ripen there without any danger from frost. There is no doubt that in certain parts of Russia such wheats have been found, and if they could be introduced into the North-West they would completely revolutionise the production of wheat there; I believe there can be no doubt that in a few years in the North-West, if the experiments are carried out and attempts made to raise different varieties of Russian wheat, there will be no danger of summer frost or of the evils attending a failure of our great staple crop in that Territory. This is a question of very great interest to the agriculturists of this country, and when I say that I mean to the people all over the country, because our whole prosperity is dependent upon our agricultural interests. I have taken upon myself to make these suggestions, because a great many hon. members have not waded through the lengthy report and the testimony of the special committee on agriculture. I am quite prepared to endorse the action of the Minister of Agriculture in embarking on this undertaking. I only desire again to urge upon him, in its inception, not to take too long a step at once. I am convinced as to its importance, and the sooner it is established the better, as results will more quickly flow from it; but there is danger that mistakes may be made, and I therefore urge the Minister to hasten slowly. I do not make this suggestion because I particularly lack confidence in the Minister, or in the Government of which he is a member. I am not dealing with the question in that sense, and I would give similar advice at any time to any Government. But it is important in entering upon this experiment that we should do so carefully and successfully. It is because anyone who undertakes a work of this character is liable to make a mistake and err in spending too much money at first, that I urge the Government to exercise caution; and I do so, not because I am particularly lacking in confidence in the hon. gentleman who now holds the portfolio of agriculture.

On section 3,

Mr. DAVIES. I trust the hon. Minister will take power to establish, in addition to a station in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island, one for Prince Edward Island in case that, after examination of the points I have suggested, it should appear to be desirable.

Mr. CARLING. From the statements made to day, it seems that one hon. gentleman thinks it is not necessary to have a station in New Brunswick, as it might come into competition with the provincial experimental farm. The same difficulty may extend to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIES. No.

Mr. CARLING. If the Government find that the people of the Maritime Provinces do not require these stations, the Government may not consider it necessary to incur the expenditure; but I take power to have one established for the three Provinces.

Mr. FISHER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to immediately establish the different stations?

Mr. CARLING. I have stated that we are taking the necessary powers, and it will depend on the House as to whether we shall go on with the undertaking at once or not.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the hon. gentleman recognises the force of the remarks I have made, and that to establish an experimental farm in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick might be of no benefit to Prince Edward Island. It cannot be of any benefit to Prince Edward Island if it is established in New Brunswick, because of the difference in the position of the Provinces. The hon. gentleman might take power to establish a station in the island.

Committee reported.

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

After Recess.

ST. GABRIEL LEVEE AND RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 116) to incorporate the St. Gabriel Levee and Railway Company.—(Mr. Curran.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MASSUE. It is not my intention to oppose this clause, but I should like that this company should be held responsible for any damage that may be done in keeping the water away from Montreal. It may overflow some of the parishes on the south shore, and the company should be held responsible for any damage produced in that way.

Mr. SHANLY. The area which it is proposed to save by the embankment is so small that it could not possibly raise the water more than a very few inches on the other side of the river. If a man's farm is covered with four or five feet of water the addition of half an inch or so would make little if any difference.

Bill read the third time and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 48) to amend the Act to incorporate the Niagara Frontier Bridge Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Haggart.)

Bill (No. 95) to incorporate the Victoria and Sault Ste. Marie Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Library of Parliament.....$31,850 00

Mr. SPEAKER. The two last items of contingencies of the Library, $2,500, and binding newspapers, &c., $2,000, include an increase of $500. Last year the vote for contingencies was $2,000, or $500 less than the year previous, but the Librarians have shown it is impossible to get on with that amount, and that it is necessary to go back to the old vote of $2,500. As regards the binding of newspapers, pamphlets and books, $1,000 was given to buy books on America. They are mostly old works, some not bound and others with old binding, and also they comprise a number of pamphlets which require to be bound, and this has increased the cost of binding.

Mr. MILLS. Last year, when the Government decided to appoint two Librarians, they stated that the increased efficiency which that change would give, would have the effect of cutting down the expense, but now it appears we are going back to the old figures.

Mr. SPEAKER. The salaries are reduced $1,600, and the only increases are in the binding, $600, and the contingencies, $500, so that there is a net diminution.

To meet probable amount for veterans of war of 1812.... $9,800 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. These gentlemen must average in number 100.

Mr. BOWELL. According to the Auditor-General's report the number is over 100. Before they are placed on the pension list, a full investigation is made.

Pensions payable on account of rebellion of 1885..... $20,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume the Minister of Militia will give us a statement of the rule that is adopted or to be adopted with respect to these, and also of the pensions granted. If I understand it, these are annual pensions and have nothing to do with the granting of gratuities.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Minister of Militia will lay before the House a statement of the pensions and the gratuities and of the rule adopted in coming to a conclusion. Certain rules have been adopted by the Government which are followed in every case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Although I am in favor of dealing very liberally with persons who have been disabled, under the circumstances, still I would call the attention of the Minister to this circumstance that apparently—I say only apparently, because we have not the information requisite on which to base a judgment—there have been considerable differences in the treatment awarded to different persons. Many statements have been made to me, according to which, apparently, men entitled to the same pensions have received different sums. The Minister will understand that the fullest possible discussion must be had whenever the question is brought up, and I understand the information required will be laid on the Table on Tuesday.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will. The treatment, of course, is different in different cases. For instance, a man has been wounded or rendered unfit for work for a time, and the amount given him will depend altogether on the length of time during which he has been unfit for work. In another case it is a wound. Well, if another man has the same sort of wound, he may not have the same pension, because the grade in the army was different. The treatment is different in that way, the same as in the regular service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not speaking of gratuities, but of pensions. This sum of $20,000 does not include gratuities, I understand.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Additional public building, Wellington street, Ottawa, $110,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of this work expected to be?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As I stated last year, the total cost, including the site, will be $594,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is equivalent to a rental of $24,000 a year. I must say that I think that, with the accommodation that we have in the two large buildings, $600,000 additional does appear a very large sum to provide for the number of clerks that are going to be accommodated there. How many employees does the hon. gentleman suppose will be lodged in that building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is very difficult to say. Besides the basement, there will be three regular storeys, including the ground floor, and besides that the attics. The attics, as far as I can see now, will be used for the model rooms, which will give plenty of space for that purpose, and these models will be put in such a position as to be able to be examined and to be of some use. Then, the archives will be in the basement, and that portion of the building is vaulted and will accommodate all the archives of the Departments. Then there will be three regular storeys, where three or four Departments will be accommodated, which will relieve the main buildings, and will thus give accommodation for the now overcrowded Departments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of the land that we have purchased? It was purchased, I think, in several parcels. Can the hon. gentleman give me the sums paid for each portion respectively?

Sir HECTOR LANGENIN. I cannot say exactly now. I gave it last year and we have not purchased anything since.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My recollection is that last year a portion was given. I think a sum of $20,000 was mentioned, but I think the actual cost of the site was a good deal more than that.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I gave the total cost last year which covered not only what had been purchased during the six months but before; it covered the whole ground.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see by a memorandum in the hon. gentleman's report, which I had not observed, that the total cost of the site purchased, interest, legal services, &c., is put at $90,555. I had been under the impression that it was pretty large, about $60,000, but I had no idea that it amounted to $90,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was under the impression that it was $95,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What quantity of land have we got, and were there buildings on it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The building is 280 feet on Wellington street, 110 feet on Elgin street, and 99 feet on Metcalfe street. That will give an average of about 100 feet in depth. I would say in round figures it would be about 28,000 square feet. That would be a little over $3 a square foot. That is not excessive.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the hon. gentleman's mode of calculation according to Montreal habit, but our habit here is so much per running foot. I should say that $300 per foot, which this amounts to, is a very high price indeed to pay for land in Ottawa on a street which cannot be considered a business street, as the hon. gentleman knows, although for certain purposes I admit the land there is of value.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Very valuable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. $300 a foot is approximating to Winnipeg prices.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There were certain buildings on the property.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I remember them perfectly.

Mr. WATSON. It is too far from Winnipeg to be worth that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the sum paid was much more than any other purchaser than Government would be likely to give, and I remember a very large charge was made by Mr. O'Connor, the legal gentleman who was employed, for his valuable services in getting us this land. I think to pay $300 a foot and several thousand dollars besides to your legal adviser for procuring it, is altogether too much.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, it was not considered too much. At the time we bought this property it was considered a very moderate sum. We understood that if the Government had not employed an agent, as they did, to purchase the land, the proprietors, knowing it was for the Government, would have demanded a larger sum. Of course we wanted to obtain it at the market rate. I think if the

hon. gentleman tried to purchase, for example, that property between the Club and Bank street, he would find that the price paid was very moderate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is just the reason why. I am interested in the Club, as one of the original proprietors of the concern, and I have had dealings in various ways, through other corporations, with some of the properties along that range; and although the hon. gentleman may be right enough in saying that when you come to buy you find it difficult to get a property, I can tell him that when you come to sell in the city of Ottawa there is great difficulty in realising approximately to this. I think that was a large commission to pay for the purchase. I do not think last year that the sum the hon. gentleman mentioned was at all as large. Did he not pay two or three thousand to Mr. O'Connor for obtaining this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not remember the exact amount now, but we paid him the ordinary commission on purchase.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a very heavy commission.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. After that, Mr. O'Connor was engaged by the Department of Justice to look after these titles. I think he was paid what he would have been paid by other firms.

Mr. WELDON. I see a sum of $6,386 paid to the corporation for a drain. Is that the whole expense?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We paid our share of the drain. We had to have a drain from Bank street, that is the street at the end of the property belonging to the Government, and the drain had to be cut from that street up to the building that is now being erected, in order to give the proper level.

Mr. DAVIES. Was not there a partial drain before?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, not for this building. It had to be deepened very much on account of the basement, in order to make it perfectly dry for the archives below.

Mr. DAVIES. I understand we paid the whole expense.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That was our share. I think it cost more than that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In looking over the expenditure for last last year, I observe that under this head occurs a charge which I hardly understand, "Salaries in Ottawa not charged to Civil Government." How did such an item as that come to be charged to the public buildings on Wellington street?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a staff of officers who are not permanent officials of the Department, the assistant architect, and other officers of that kind. Their salaries have to be distributed amongst the different buildings under control of the Department, and that is done according to the amount put on the building; because you cannot every day ascertain exactly what amount of work has been done on each building, and therefore that has to be apportioned on the different buildings, which has been the custom for a number of years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, but when the total expenditure was only $40,000 all told, $4,610 appears to be a large charge to put for a single year on the expenditure of $40,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It may happen to be a little more on this building than on another, but of course it has to be apportioned upon all the buildings.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How was it made up?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are only two or three of these officers who are permanent, all the others are temporary, and have been employed for various terms from two to twenty years, as the service required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not understand me. You see here above there is a charge for $1,000 for the clerk of works, and if these salaries are properly charged against these buildings, I want to know what work was done? Does this represent the drawing of the plans and all that kind of thing?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, there are one or two clerks who have permanent charge of the building itself. When that building is completed these officers will disappear. Besides that, you have overseers, and you have some one to make up the pay-list, and sometimes you have to despatch one of the officers to see how things are going. Sometimes there is a quarrel between the clerk of works or the local architect and the contractor, and an officer has to be sent from the Department to settle the difficulty. All these expenses are involved, and they have to be paid in some way. Well, this is apportioned on the different buildings as far as possible, according to the amount of work to be done, or the trouble incurred.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, it seems a large amount. Who is this gentleman, Mr. Charlebois, whose name I see here?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He is the contractor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is he the same personage who was once rather contumeliously spoken of by the hon. gentleman's predecessor.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think I answered that last year, and I answered yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then who is correct, the hon. gentleman or his predecessor? Because I recollect that the hon. gentleman's predecessor described Mr. Charlebois, if I remember aright, as a person he would not entrust with any contract whatever.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He has showed himself to be a good contractor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We ought to have had him up in British Columbia so as to save that $209,000 on the contract there.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken about that. I think the contractor had made what you would call a mistake, by depositing a cheque that was good only for three days, and therefore my predecessor rejected the cheque.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman's predecessor had a secretary, who had unfortunately been trained in business habits, and he telegraphed to find out if the cheque was good; and, finding it was so, was indiscreet enough to report it. I notice Mr. Daniel O'Connor received $5,718.37 for legal services, and 3 per cent. commission on land purchase, which amounts to $2,195. That was on the score of this purchase, I believe.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt it was correct. In regard to the commission, that was in my Department. As regards the legal fees, they, of course, were based on those allowed by the courts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know on what principle a commission of 3 per cent. could have been paid to a gentleman who was acting as solicitor for the Government at the time, and receiving nearly $7,000 for his legal services. In ordinary business, although a solicitor is very often employed to negotiate the purchase of property, I have no recollection in my private experience, which is moderately extensive, of ever paying a soli-

citor any such sum for negotiating a purchase for me, or do I know that it was ever paid. In case of sale the matter is different. Then, no doubt, a commission is often allowed to the solicitor; but to pay over $2,000 to a solicitor, who that very year had received $6,700 from the Government for legal fees, looks an outrage.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I know Mr. O'Connor had a good deal of trouble, and was employed a large part of his time in securing this property for the Government. In so far as regards his legal fees, Mr. O'Connor had to look over the titles and deeds, and had to follow the cases into the courts and see that the title was made good. The amount paid to him was fixed by the Department of Justice according to the established rates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not raising any question now as to whether the charges for legal services were right or wrong. I am pointing our the extreme awkwardness and inconvenience of paying a legal gentleman a heavy commission on the purchase of land. The thing appears to be contrary, not merely to professional custom and etiquette, but it is a temptation to a man to give more than what the property is worth, because the larger the amount the more his commission would reach.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The remuneration was fixed according to the work done by the gentleman. The Government saw that the property had been purchased at what they considered a very reasonable figure. If it had not been thus purchased, the public would have had probably to pay $50,000 or $60,000 more. That being so, we thought the agent of the Government should receive a reasonable amount of remuneration, and that 3 per cent. under the circumstances was not too much. If instead of employing Mr. O'Connor, we had employed another gentleman, he would have had to be paid the same amount, and Mr. O'Connor, who was afterwards employed to look over the titles, would have obtained his legal fees. We would have had in any case to pay the same amount whether we employed one party or two parties. The amount was considered reasonable and not too heavy.

Mr. DAVIES. I am sorry the hon. gentleman assumes a tone of apology for this charge.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not.

Mr. DAVIES. This matter was discussed last year, and it was admitted by both sides of the House to be totally indefensible. It is a totally wrong principle to pay a solicitor a commission. The amount of money paid for the land affords no index of the trouble in searching the title. During the discussion last year it was stated that in the Maritime Provinces such a charge for searching titles is never known. Some hon. members said there was a rule in Ontario, which had been followed by the Government in this case. It was then, however, stated that the amount of commission paid in this case was far in excess to the ordinary rate. I remember distinctly that the charges were acknowledged by the Government to be indefensible, and a promise was made by the Government that they should not be repeated. I should therefore regret if any language used by the Minister could be in any sense interpreted or twisted into a defence for what has been done in this case. The amount of money received by that gentleman was nearly $9,000, a good income for a couple of years for a practising lawyer. This matter was thoroughly discussed last year, but the Minister does not appear to be so strong in condemnation of the principle as he was last year. It must be remembered if this practice of paying commission is allowed in Ottawa the principle must be extended all over the Dominion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have nothing for which to apologise, and I will not apologise now. The charge made at the time was considered by the Government a proper charge, and we paid it. If the charge had to be paid again, and we thought it a reasonable one, we would pay it on our responsibility. As to the fees of which the hon. gentleman speaks, he will remember perfectly well, that at that time there was a long discussion about the fees, not only in this case, but in a number of others. Some were considered heavy, and I do not say that I did not consider some of them rather heavy myself, as I stated at the time. The Minister of Justice, or some of the other Ministers, stated that great care would be taken that these fees would be carefully looked into in the future, so that no error might occur. As to the commission granted to this gentleman, we thought, after the time and labor given and the capacity he showed in obtaining this properity at the rate he obtained it, he was entitled to the amount received.

Mr. VAIL. Those commissions seem to me to be rather high, and I do no not think my hon. friend could have taken the precaution of ascertaining what commissions are paid for the sale and purchase of property. It is generally understood that the commission paid for the sale of property is considerably higher than that paid for buying property. I know that I purchased some property myself, in Ottawa, at one time, and the commission charged for the purchase was 1 per cent., one-half by the seller and one half by the buyer, so that the commission in this case seems to have been 2 per cent. more than that usually paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My objection was not in this gentleman's legal fees. The reason I called attention to it was that this Government was a most excellent customer of Mr. D. O'Connor. As a matter of fact, when you happen to be doing a great deal of business with a solicitor, as the Government was in this case, the solicitor is only too happy, in a general way, to lend his services for the purchase of property, taking his profits out of the business it brings to his office, and the examination of titles and so on. I do not recollect of ever having paid a commission to the extent of 3 per cent. for the purchase of property, though I have known large fees to be charged for the sale of property.

Mr. WELDON. I see that this gentleman got $8,943 last year, and the firm of O'Connor and Hogg $660, making between $9,000 and $10,000 for them in one year. I do not know whether he is a relation of John O'Connor who got $5,000 or so, but if he is that family seems to be well treated.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are not relations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. One O'Connor family, would seem to be enough at this rate.

Esquimalt Graving Dock $45,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of that work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In round figures about $750,000 or $800,000, the British Government contributing £50,000 sterling.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I recollect aright the Minister stated in a former discussion on this subject that some alteration was to be made in the dock so as to take iron clads of larger dimension.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The dock is of the dimensions asked by the British Government when it was undertaken, and as I stated last year, it was so planned that another dock might be built at the end of this, so that we could have gone from one dock to another and extended the one to two or three docks. But as we were building only one, and the entrance was provided at the port end of the dock as well as the lower end of the dock, if instead of doing

that we were rounding the dock we would give about 50 feet more in length. We communicated the matter to the British Government and they agreed to that, but they insisted upon having the dock completed within the time so that their vessels might be docked then. The report we have about the dock is that it would be large enough for all purposes of the fleet there, and the fleet that visits that port. Representations have been made since, however, to induce the Government to increase the length of the dock, but we thought that inasmuch as we had a contract with the contractors and the dock was being built in accordance with the arrangement with the British Government, and as we were bound to complete the dock within a certain time, in order to receive from the British Government this sum of $250,000, we have been of opinion that we should not change the dimensions of the dock, but that if in future years the dimensions of the vessels on that coast should increase, then it would be quite time enough for us to increase the length of the dock.

Mr. VAIL. There is a statement in the Auditor General's report that the sum of $1,894 was expended for advertising. Surely that is a mistake.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, we had to call for tenders twice, and this being a large work we had to advertise not only in British Columbia but all over the Dominion in order to have the best competition possible, and that is the reason it came to that amount.

Mr. DAVIES. The £50,000 which the British Government are to contribute has been refunded, has it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to be paid by the 1st of January.

Mr. DAVIES. But we have paid British Columbia the $600,000 we voted to recoup their expenditure.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have paid about $250,000.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman, in his report on this graving dock, says that we voted over $600,000 to recoup the Local Government the money they expended on the work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not only that, but other amounts mentioned at the time of the settlement with British Columbia.

Mr. DAVIES. The money the British Government were to repay us has not come yet?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, it will not come till after the 1st of January.

Mr. DAVIES. Then, the total we shall pay will be $1,000,000, less the $250,000 contributed by the British Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. When does the hon. gentleman expect that that dock will be finished?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About the end of September.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you propose to pass to our account the $250,000 paid by the British Government, or simply apply it to the work? In other words, are you going to spend $300,000 in 1886-87 in addition to this $45,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We intend asking in the supplementary estimates for $250,000 to correspond with the $250,000 that will be paid in January next by the British Government. Of course, that being debt, it must go into the public coffers, and therefore we must have the authority of Parliament to draw it.

Amount required for construction of Port Arthur harbor and for Kaministiquia River..... $70,000 00

Mr. TROW. How is this sum apportioned?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention is to take not more than $20,000 to complete the works on the Kaministiquia River.

Mr. TROW. Can the hon. gentleman inform me of the width and depth of the cut at the mouth of the river?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The channel will be 100 feet wide, and of an average depth of 18 feet in the centre from the mouth of the river to the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will be the total cost of each?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work on the Kaministiquia will cost $35,000 or $40,000, and the Port Arthur works about $200,000, when the amount we are now asking will be expended.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the nature of the work at Port Arthur?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a large breakwater. I think we shall require about $50,000 more to complete the work. Then it will be a very perfect harbor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the size of the breakwater?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is from 24 to 30 feet wide, and 1,600 feet long. It is on the east side of the harbor, running about north-east.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice in the charge for the Kaministiquia River that the dredging is put down at 23 cents per cubic foot, which is a little over $6 per cubic yard. Is not that a rather excessive charge?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work is done by contract, and we accepted the lowest tender.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no rock, it is mud bottom, is it not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is hard clay.

Mr. SHANLY. The price is certainly high if it is clay dredging. Perhaps there is not a large quantity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was 120,000 feet dredged out.

Mr. TROW. I would ask whether the spring freshets cause accumulations in this cutting.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. It was thought at first that the bottom was quicksand, and engineers so reported; but on further examination it was found that there were three or four inches of sand and then hard clay. That clay, after being removed from the water and exposed to the atmosphere, becomes as hard as brick. There has been no filling in, so far as I have been informed, since the work has been done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman's late colleague, Lieutenant Governor Aikins, is quite satisfied with this expenditure on the Kaministiquia. When I was Minister of Finance I think that hon. gentleman had a committee of enquiry in the Senate to show the extravagance Mr. Mackenzie was guilty of in making use of the Kaministiquia at all, and it would be interesting to know if he approves of this expenditure.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman affirmatively; but I think if

Lieutenant Governor Aikins saw the work done he would be satisfied with the result.

Mr. DAWSON. As some hon. gentlemen were making enquiries about the position of the breakwater at Port Arthur, and as I am tolerably well acquainted with it, I may inform them that it extends in front of the town and parallel to the shore 2,000 feet, and that, inside this breakwater, there are a number of wharves built by private individuals who have laid out $100,000 thereon. These wharves run straight from the shore, and are protected by the breakwater which passes in front of them, half a mile outside. This breakwater will make Port Arthur a most magnificent harbor. It may be of some interest to the House to know that Port Arthur has grown within the last three years from being a village of 1,200 inhabitants, to a town of 6,000 inhabitants, and that its shipping has increased from 150,000 or 200,000 tons yearly, to 500,000 tons yearly. It is now the most important harbor in Ontario as regards shipping. My hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow) used to take a little pleasure in having a quiet joke about the differences regarding the Kaministiquia harbor, but now all are united. The people of the town and river are acting hand in hand in opening up their respective places, and are contemplating a street railway between the two. The population is increasing fast, and the whole country progressing wonderfully.

Cape Tormentine Harbor, N.B..... $130,000 00

Mr. DAVIES. A very large sum was expended, nearly $5,000, in obtaining a survey. Will the hon. Minister give some details of the results of that survey, as the report has not been brought down? and will he bring down the report without a formal notice? The report is going to assume an importance which was not, perhaps, thought of at the time, as the Railways and Canals Committee has now before it a Bill with reference to building a subway, and a good deal of discussion will take place on the subject, particularly with regard to the character of the bottom in and around Cape Tormentine, as to whether it is sandy or rocky, because the feasibility of a subway depends largely on that fact. Have the Government come to a conclusion as to the exact place where they are going to build this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The survey has cost a good deal, because we thought before locating the pier we ought to make sure of a proper location. There were two or three places suggested, and we thought we should have each place properly surveyed. I have no objection to bringing down such extracts of the report of the engineer who made the survey, as will give the information the hon. gentleman wants; but I cannot give the whole report because there are a number of matters in it for the information of the Government engineer who has to make a report, and whose report is the one that will be submitted to Parliament. I am not in a position to give the exact location because I have not the description here, but tenders were called for some time ago, and so many contractors from different portions of the Dominion wished to tender, that, seeing the delay was rather short, about eight or ten days before the time fixed for the acceptance of tenders I extended the time, to give a chance to all who wished to tender. I think to morrow is the last day. The tenders will be opened most likely on Monday. I expect there will be very keen competition, and we may expect to have good contractors to build the work.

Mr. DAVIES. The site chosen is directly opposite where the old cable house on Cape Tormentine stood, a little distance to the north of where the present cable house stands.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have the plan here, and if the hon. gentleman will cross the House I will show it to him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I object to the hon. gentleman crossing the House.

Mr. DAVIES. As it will be only temporary I hope the objection will be withdrawn.

Mr. McCARTHY. You would not like to lose him?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would not exchange him, I was about to say for a dozen, but if it was a case of three dozen, we might consider it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well we can afford that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We will all go over very soon to that side.

Mr. SHANLY. In speaking of the probable location of that pier, does the Minister of Public Works refer to it in connection with the possible subway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, it has no connection with the sub-way at all. It was determined upon before.

Mr. DAVIES. I only mentioned the subway because the report on the location of that wharf will give an idea of the bottom, and I wish to have that information when the Bill in reference to the subway comes before the Railway Committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The committee meets on Wednesday next, I will see my chief engineer and secure a copy of that portion of the report which relates to this, and I will have a copy for the House and a copy for the committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Supposing the work to be carried out, what is the total cost expected to be?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The tenders are not opened yet, and really I cannot say. The amount of $150,000 that was put in in the first instance was of course guesswork. It may cost a great deal more than that, for all I know.

Public Buildings, Nova Scotia..... $47,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the amount of $4,600 complete the work on the Amherst public building, and what has been the total cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This will complete it. The total cost will have been $41,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much of that was for site?

Mr. DAVIES. The site was granted by the town. The contract was only $27,000, I understand. What is going to make it cost $41,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount of the contract was $27,574. Then you have the furniture and fittings for the post office, custom house and so on, $3,359; architect, $1,000; clerk of works, $600.

Mr. DAVIES. That only makes $30,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total amount expended up to the 31st December, $24,000; estimated from 31st December to 1st July, $8,172; grant asked, $4,000; still required for grading footpath, superintendence, &c., $3,504. That makes a total of $40,933.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that one George Thompson is employed as clerk of works at $75 a month, that is at the rate of $900 a year. Is he an officer of the Department or a person resident on the spot, and selected?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He must be some person selected on the spot.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because the charges for clerk of works come to a very appreciable item of the total cost. Now, the expenditure of $12,000 would hardly necessitate, one would suppose, an annual charge for clerk

of works at $900. Really the total expense was probably all put in within two or three months.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We can hardly have a reliable clerk of works for less than $2.50 a day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So long as he is actually employed, I grant.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. You employ a clerk of works during the building season, and afterwards you pay him at a lower rate, if his work is lighter; for example, to look after the stone that is being cut, in regard to dimensions and so on, and to see that no bad stone or stone with some fault should be accepted. I think the amount paid is well invested for the interests of the Government.

Mr. WELDON. I find an item of legal services, the Hon. J. Armstrong, $10. The amount is not large, but I find the same thing in nearly every contract, in addition to the legal services of the agents of the Minister of Justice.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In these cases, it was when the Department of Justice was very overworked, and they could not look after the titles and so on, and we had to have a legal gentleman to look after those matters. He examined the papers and was paid his fee.

Mr. WELDON. Did this gentleman search the title with regard to the Amherst public building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That I cannot say.

Mr. WELDON. I see in the Bathurst public buildings the services of Mr. Harrison, the agent of the Minister of Justice, in connection with the site, $78, and also the Hon. J. Armstrong, $10. I find this all through the buildings. Is this gentleman in Ottawa?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That gentleman was going to the different places and examining the contracts. He had to see that they were prepared and properly signed.

Mr. WELDON. I see by the Auditor General's report that the whole amount is about $655.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps so; but the Department now has been organised in such a way that we have not to pay these amounts any more. The titles are being examined by the Department itself, and we have now a form for these contracts which curtails the expense very much, and thus the expense has about ceased.

Mr. WELDON. I understood it was the business of the agents of the Minister of Justice to look after these matters in St. John and Halifax.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A large number of these contracts having to be prepared, the Department of Justice could not possibly attend to them from press of work. We could not wait until they could attend to them, as the contracts would have to be delayed, and therefore we had to employ a legal gentlemen to prepare these contracts in the proper form. Besides that we have now a form by which these contracts can be prepared without any legal assistance.

Mr. DAVIES. I must say that I do not understand what this gentleman was paid for doing. I think that this particular account has appeared in the Public Accounts of previous years.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It has appeared.

Mr. DAVIES. That is the expense for last year. It appeared in every public contract let. There are two items which appear with unfailing regularity every year, that is for the names of C. S. MacLaughlin and the Hon. J. Armstrong. Now, so far as the Hon. J. Armstrong is concerned —and if he did any legal work, of course he ought to be paid for it—but we know that the contracts are prepared by the Minister of Justice, the forms have been settled long since, and everybody who has had anything to do with the contracts knows that the forms are all printed and there is nothing for a lawyer to do about them, all the agreements —everything has been settled upon long since, and these printed forms have only to be filled up by the officials of the Department. Now, what Mr. Armstrong did was simply to do a clerk's work. Talk about the Minister of Justice being overworked! I am surprised to hear that statement, because I remember very well that the deputy head was occupied in work outside of his Department, in consolidating the Statutes, and made $4,000 or $5,000 for it besides. So that, far from being overworked, the deputy head of that Department—I am throwing no aspersions upon the gentleman at all, no doubt he did his work very well—was paid $5,000 for doing extra work this very year; and it appears now that while he was doing that extra work, another gentleman was employed to do the work he ought to have done and the country pays $6,000 or $7,000 for it.

Mr. HESSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman's cheer mean an approval or a disapproval? I never knew him yet to disapprove any act the Government ever did.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Does the hon. gentleman who criticises these legal expenses remember his own $15,000? Does the hon. gentleman from St. John (Mr. Weldon) remember his $5,000? Mr. Speaker, I must say that the lawyers are a hard lot. The country that has to sustain the lawyers has a hard lot.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the case of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island we have not much cause to complain, for if we paid him handsomely for his services, we got four or five millions out of our American friends for it. However, we have here an illustration of the result of employing officers of a Department to do work that does not properly belong to it. The Deputy Minister of Justice, I believe, is a very excellent officer, but I call attention to the fact that he has been in receipt of $5,000 for extra work during two years. It appears, from what my hon. friend says, that the Department of Justice was not able, during that time, to overtake its own work, and consequently somebody else was employed to do work appertaining to the Department, at the very time when its regular head was adding $2,500 a year to his salary for extra work. Now, that is not business; it is not expedient, and it is not desirable that it should be done.

Mr. THOMPSON. As regards this sum paid in connection with the revision of the Statutes, I did not suppose the question would be raised this evening, and as it may come at some future stage I shall be prepared to give a fuller explanation than perhaps would be regular now. I think hon. gentlemen opposite will agree with me that it was desirable that this gentleman should be associated with the commission on the revision of the Statutes. Sir Alexander Campbell, my predecessor, sat upon that commission as head of the Department, of course, without remuneration. But the services which the head of the Department could render on that commission could necessarily not be so close and constant as were desirable, and I think, from what I know of the work and from what I have heard of it, that it was exceedingly desirable that the deputy should be one of the commission.

Mr. DAVIES. Do I understand the Minister of Public Works that there will not be a repetition of this charge the present year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, it has ceased now.

Mr. DAVIES. I would entirely relieve my mind if he would tell me now the particular legal services that gentleman did.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He looked over the contracts for the different works. Now, you have not only to look to the printed forms, but you have to look to the important matters in a new contract, which is not a printed form, as the hon. gentleman knows, and of course we had to see that it was properly drawn up, in order that there might be no difficulty afterwards. In a contract of $20,000 or $50,000 it was important to make sure that that document was properly executed, and we paid a small fee for it. But that has ceased now, the contracts now are being prepared by ourselves, and if we have any doubt about any additional form to be added to the contract, we shall consult the Department of Justice.

Mr. HESSON. When the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), was speaking, I was thinking how differently hon. gentlemen of the legal profession measure the value of their services. I remembered hearing a legal gentleman in this House saying that he was sacrificing an income from his profession of something like $25,000 a year. But we find other hon. gentlemen in this House valuing their services at $5,000 or $6,000 a year, so it is awkward for a non-professional gentleman to come to any conclusion as to what value we ought really to place upon their services.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The objection to paying this amount of $5,000 to the Deputy Minister of Justice is that it is paying two salaries. We pay him $4,000 a year, which may be enough or may not; but, over and above that amount, he has received $2,500 a year for two years for so-called extra services.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not want any hon. gentleman to think that in my opinion the Deputy Minister of Justice is overpaid. He is not so by any means.

Mr. BOWELL. Nor any other lawyer, I suppose.

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, in the case of Mr. O'Connor, who acted in regard to the new buildings.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is only right to say with respect to Mr. O'Connor's charges that his services in connection with that property were of a somewhat peculiar nature. He acted as the agent of the Department, and not in the capacity merely of a solicitor. He obtained the refusal of all the properties from a large number of owners, and he had to conduct that business in a special manner, of course without disclosing the fact that the Government would be the purchaser. In conducting those negotiations it became necessary for him to provide the purchase money until the transaction was completed.

Mr. WELDON. Three per cent. is charged for commission besides the legal charges.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the Minister of Justice aware that Mr. O'Connor fills another very important position in the city, namely, that of President of the Conservative Association? Did any of this money go to that particular fund? There is a nigger in the fence.

Mr. VAIL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give some information in regard to the vote of $8,000 asked for the New Glasgow public building.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That amount will complete the building. The total estimated cost, including heating, etc., is $42,000.

Mr. WELDON. What are these amounts which constantly appear as having been paid to S. J. MacLaughlin?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A photographer is employed in the Public Works Department. In order to save the travelling expenses of the chief architect or chief engineer, as the case may be, the photographer obtains the photograph of the building at a certain moment. The chief architect is able to judge of the progress of the building from the photograph, and thus saves his own time and travelling expenses. If there is any difficulty between the clerk of works and the local architect and contractor, the photograph is there and the chief architect can decide the matter. With respect to the North Sydney post office, custom house, &c., $15,000 more will be required to complete. The whole cost will be $25,000. With respect to South Sydney post office, custom house, &c., $3,500, the difficulty has been about the site. The total cost of the buildings will be $31,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far apart are North and South Sydney?

Mr. McDOUGALL. The distance by water is seven miles, by land seventeen miles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You give these places, a few miles apart, two post offices, two custom houses, and two *et ceteras*.

Mr. WELDON. Just as Pictou has two railways.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are very well taken care of. In spite of all that, the member in the Local House is to-day supporting a resolution for secession. A grateful people those Nova Scotians!

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With respect to the vote of $10,000 to the Yarmouth post office, custom house, &c, when this amount has been expended, $5,000 more will be required to complete. The total cost will be $41,000.

Public Buildings, P.E. I.	$41,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Looking at this, I find great difficulty in understanding on what principle the salaries in Ottawa, not charged to civil government, could have run up to the sum of $2,288, which is the amount according to the Auditor General's report.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There must be some mistake about that, as the information I have is that we have expended, up to the 1st of July, $44,597 on this building.

Mr. DAVIES. When the old custom house and post office was burned down at Charlottetown, the Department of Public Works rented the old bank of Prince Edward Island, and they expended in refitting that bank the enormous sum, as it appears to me, of $6,207. I find, however, on looking at page 249, that of this $1,587 was expended for a safe for the Assistant Receiver General's office. The salaries in Ottawa not charged to civil government is for the construction of the new building now going on. The whole amount is charged in the Auditor General's report to Charlottetown public buildings, but a portion of it relates to the new public buildings going up, while the other items consist of repairs, furniture, &c. I cannot see how in the world they spend $6,000 in alterations, and there must be some mistake about that, as I do not think so much was paid.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That may be, but the system followed is for the clerk of works or the architect on the spot to report what is wanted, give it in detail and put opposite each article his valuation, which of course varies according to the locality. We have in the Department sufficient data to allow the chief architect to see that the prices are reasonable, and if found reasonable, then they are ordered.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not at all complain of extravagance in that regard—in fact it is in the other direction, and although they have erected this new building, the building is so small that no reasonable expenditure could accommodate the people. In fact it is simply terrible the way the public are used in that building. There is no extravagance in that

matter; I think if there was a little more the public would be better satisfied.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am much pleased to have another good witness on that side of the House in that direction. Of course it is possible with these works scattered all over the Dominion that abuses may occur, but there is a great deal of care taken by the heads of the different branches, and they are honest, honorable and able men, men who do the best they can, and who I think generally succeed in taking care of the interests of the Department.

Mr. VALL. I do not think there could be very much danger of extravagance in Nova Scotia, simply because there is scarcely any money spent there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps when the secession resolutions are passed you will hear about that. What are these new Dominion buildings likely to cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $92,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I find here that salaries in Ottawa, not charged to civil government, amount to $2,288; and the total expenditure, exclusive of this, is about $3,800, after deducting the safe. Now, I understand, in a sort of fashion, how the hon. gentleman came to make a charge of $4,600, for a work which he expected to cost $600,000; but here is a work which will only cost some $90,000, and the proportion of salaries at Ottawa seems to be enormously large, because it is in addition to the charges for clerks of works, and architects.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As I said before, the total expenditure has to be divided into different works. The object of that is, by taking these men temporarily, when the works are completed you may discharge them, and thus you save not only the permanent salaries, but the superannuation afterwards.

Mr. DAVIES. On page 367 of the Auditor General's report you will find a list of salaries not charged to civil government which foot up to $52,404. At the foot there is an abstract showing the amount charged to the Public Works Department. What we want to know is by what rule is this division made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is impossible to define it according to rule, but one cannot know how long the different clerks have been employed on this or that work. It is divided among all these works. We follow the same rule that was followed before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this work equivalent to architect's work, such as preparing plans and specifications?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, a portion of it. For example, the chief architect prepares a certain plan or sketch and sends that to the local architect. But we cannot exactly divide the charges for such work to the dollar among the different works.

Mr. McINTYRE. I wish to know who is the contractor for the construction of the Montague post office and custom house.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. L. A. Wilmot.

Mr. McINTYRE. I see that $800 was paid for the site, which appears to me to be a large amount for a village like Montague. What are the dimensions of the site?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. 103 feet by 76 feet 6 inches.

Mr. McINTYRE. It appears to me it is an extraordinary sum to pay for a site of those dimensions in a village like Montague.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman know the village at all?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. DAVIES. I see that his report states that it was bought from Lambert's estate, but the money was paid to McEvoy.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's P.E.I.). I think I can explain that satisfactorily to the hon. gentleman. The property was bought from the Lambert estate, but it was bought through McEvoy as the administrator of the property. The price is not excessive at all, considering the price of other properties bought in the vicinity at the same time. Other properties as well situated could not be bought for less money.

Mr. McINTYRE. Is the work now going ahead? This amount of $4,800 was voted some three years ago, and as far as I have been able to ascertain nothing has been done towards the construction of the building up to the present time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work is going on. This amount, I think, will cover the whole cost.

Mr. McINTYRE. When does the hon. gentleman expect to have the building completed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The date fixed is the 6th of October, 1887.

Mr. DAVIES. I wish to ask whether a claim has been preferred by the contractors for the Summerside public building for a large sum above his contract, and whether that claim has been granted by the hon. Minister.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think a claim has come, but has not been decided.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman knows that the contractor, Mr. Doyle, was here for the larger part of the Session, and I thought probably, from the number of interviews the hon. gentleman had with him, that he had come to some conclusion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think I saw him twice. I do not remember to have come to any conclusion. If the claim is a large one, it is not likely that it is yet decided.

Mr. DAVIES. What was the amount he asked?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the total cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The building will cost altogether $35,500.

Mr. McINTYRE. Is the hon. gentleman sure he did not send away Mr. Doyle quite satisfied?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know; perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell me?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is a total expenditure of $11,000 in that year. The architect was paid $375, and that, no doubt, was exclusive of the work done at the headquarters, and the clerk of the works $925, or a total of $1,300, which is a large proportion for work to the amount of $11,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount paid to the architect is for the preparation of certain plans, and then he receives a certain commission on the amount of the work, which is paid as the work progresses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does not commission on expenditure include supervision?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He is obliged to visit the works. We have a clerk of the works who looks to details,

who sees that the stones are properly laid and the brick work and mortar are good and so on, but the architect has the general supervision and sees whether the work is well-performed or not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You are paying $1,300 for services and supervision in the strictest sense on an expenditure of $11,000, which really involves an enormous charge, about 12 per cent. on the expenditure. No private parties would allow the wages of supervision to amount to that. Probably this $11,000 has been expended in five or six months, unless the contractor is very dilatory.

Mr. DAVIES. What rate do you pay the clerk of the works?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The rate is about the same all round. It varies from $2.50 to $3 a day. I do not think the amount has gone beyond that.

Mr. DAVIES. It must have in this case, because it is a small building. The clerk of the works at Charlottetown got $75 a month, and the whole payment was $225; the architect in this case got $375.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That would be at $75 a month, if employed the whole year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In practice, the hon. gentleman will see that the contractor, in all likelihood, would not have many men at work except for five or six months.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They cannot work more than seven or eight months.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is the first year's work, and as the whole cost is $30,000, spread over three years, it is extremely improbable there was more done in this year than putting up the outside walls.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This work began in 1883. There was more progress made in 1885; and in 1886, up to 31st December, the expenditure was $8,010.

Mr. DAVIES. Is it probable the hon. gentleman will bring down a sum in the Supplementary Estimates to meet the claim Mr. Doyle makes?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If his claim is a proper one, I will have to ask my colleagues to let me put an extra amount in the Supplementary Estimates, and no doubt the hon. gentleman will agree with us that the amount must be paid; but I must say I am quite unaware of the amount he has claimed, and am pretty sure that unless he claims a very small amount, it will not be granted.

Public Works, New Brunswick.....$29,450 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Bathurst post office, custom house, &c., will cost in all $31,000; the Newcastle post office, custom house, &c., will cost, when completed, $43,000; the St. Stephens' post office, custom house, &c., will cost in all $30,000.

Public Works, Quebec.....$106,750 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The $2,000 for Hull post office and inland revenue office is for heating purposes. With regard to the new drill hall, Quebec, $15,000, the Quebec Government have also contributed $15,000. The Sorel public building will cost, altogether, $40,000. The St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, $19,500, is the ordinary vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you mean by that. Is it an annual charge?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the same charge as last year, and so far as that goes is an annual vote. The convicts there are employed as they are in other penitentiaries, as in Kingston. For example, they were employed in erecting certain buildings and in erecting the stone fence as well. Here it is for the same purpose. For example, they have the wooden fence to enclose a portion of the property of the penitentiary, $1,575. Then there are the general repairs to some of the buildings, $750; cement and sand, $800; wood for burning bricks, &c., $800; quarrying tools, $150, fuel for heating the buildings, $3,900.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Ought not these kind of things to be rather placed under the head of the ordinary expenses of the penitentiary than charged in public works?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They have been so charged for several years. Last year I know it was so, and I would not be surprised if we found it in the previous year, when the amount was much larger than this.

Mr. WELDON. From the Auditor General's report, it appears to be $28,037 for 1884-85.

Mr. DAVIES. If the hon. gentleman examines the items I do not think he will find they are covered at all by the items for which he asks the vote now.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was stopped; I have a number of other items.

Mr. DAVIES. It seems to me that the tools and so on for the use of convicts in construction have nothing to do with the items that cost $28,000 in 1884-85.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps not. Then there is blacksmith's coal, $200; tools for stone-cutters and other trades connected with the building, $1,000; tools, iron, steel, powder, &c., for quarrying, $300; fodder, harness and vehicles for the horses in the service of the Department of Public Works there, $1,000; then the salary of the clerk of works, the three trade instructors and the superintendents of stores, $3,900; piggery, twenty styes, $1,600; erection of dwelling house for keeper, $600; superintendence and contingencies, making altogether, $19,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much does the hon. gentleman expect to spend on St. Vincent de Paul before turning it out complete?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That I am unable to say, because I do not know what may be the requirements of the Department of Justice. They did not give me a statement of the requirements of the penitentiary, what they require to complete the buildings. We have erected certain buildings, but I am pretty sure, from the number of convicts that are there, that we will have to extend them. Then the fence will have to be built in stone. We have, I think, only a wooden fence all around that penitentiary. Last year we purchased a piece of ground, as the hon. gentleman remembers, authority having been given by Parliament, to complete the grounds of the penitentiary. That will have to be fenced in wood for the present, because it will require a large sum of money to build the wall in stone.

Mr. DAVIES. I see already a quarter of a million has been spent on the construction of St. Vincent de Paul—$250,674 for construction alone.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, it has been expended from year to year. Previous to 1878, from the beginning of the institution, the Government had expended $122,000; in 1878, $7,000 was expended; in 1879, $11,000; in 1880, $9,000; in 1881, $15,000; in 1882, $16,000; in 1883, $19,000; in 1884, $20,000; in 1885, $28,000; and now $20,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much are the Montreal armories, for which $45,000 is now asked, going to cost?

Mr. FISHER. On what details is this vote going to be laid out?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is not aware that we called for tenders for that work, and that the contractors are Messrs. Shirley, Brannen & Starrs. The amount of the contract is $15,617. That is for a portion of the work. Then we have to put on the roofs and complete the interior of the next building, the drill hall. This amount I think will suffice to complete, with the exception of about $4,000.

Mr. FISHER. Is this going to put down a floor in the drill hall?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, I do not think there is a floor. I think it is the soil.

Mr. WELDON. $92,000 have been already expended.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think so.

Mr. VAIL. How much did the city of Montreal pay towards that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They provided the grounds.

Mr. VAIL. I thought they agreed to pay a certain amount towards the building.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. VAIL. They offered to at one time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, the drill hall is a separate building.

Mr. VAIL. Will the amount of $5,500 complete the Quebec immigration building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; we shall require $3,500 more, and I think we shall have to ask for it in the Supplementary Estimates, because the work is proceeding fast and will be completed before the end of the year.

Public Buildings, Ontario..... $104,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the $1,500 complete the Amherstburg post office, custom house, &c.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is completed. This is for some wooden outhouses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the total sum spent there?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $33,000. The $3,000 for the Berlin post office is to complete. The total cost will be $36,500. The contract was for about $24,000.

Mr. TROW. What was the price of the site of the post office in Berlin.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $3,000. It was purchased from Mr. C. Heller.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask the Minister how it is that $1,500 are appropriated for the completion of the work at Chatham. I understood that building was completed a year ago.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We had to have a tower in that building, and this is to put in a clock.

Mr. WILSON. The $1,500 is to build a tower, and put in the clock?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, the tower is there, I understand.

Mr. WILSON. It seems to me that $1,500 will purchase a pretty good clock.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will be a striking clock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the $28,000 for the Hamilton post office and custom house complete the building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. How much has that cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have paid $268,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then $92,000 in the current year, and $28,000 besides?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A portion of the $92,000 is expended. The total cost will be $351,000.

Mr. O'BRIEN. That is a lot of money to spend on Hamilton.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Hamilton, Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax, are large cities.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see the hon. member for Hamilton present. I have no doubt he would fully appreciate the gentleman's putting Hamilton first. But really I think, although it is quite right that we should put a respectable building at Hamilton, I fail to see that the amount of business done there, can require $350,000 for a post office and custom house. It seems to me to be an enormous sum.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In these large cities we must make our public buildings correspond, in their architecture, to the street in which they are placed and the buildings around them. For example, in Montreal the post office is a beautiful building, and it must be so because it stands alongside the Bank of Montreal and other beautiful buildings. In Quebec we have not so fine a building, because in Quebec, although the buildings are good, their architecture is not so fine as in Montreal.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works to apply the same rule to the Supreme Court House in this city. This court is now housed in a miserable little building, altogether out of proportion to the importance of the work that court performs, and to its position at the capital of the Dominion. I think if he is going to lay down that rule with regard to the post office at Hamilton, he should, on some future occasion, apply it to the Supreme Court of this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have a strong impression on my mind that a good many hundreds of thousands of dollars are thrown away in erecting these public buildings for the supposed comfort and convenience of the public, which might just as well be saved. It seems to me that an immense deal of money is wasted in filigree work, that does not add much to the dignity and importance of the building, in a great many cases.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In large cities the Dominion should have its public offices built on a scale commensurate with the wealth and extent of the city. It is hardly dignified for the Dominion to have its public offices in a rented and poor building in large cities. If a stranger goes to the post office, and finds it in a miserable little building, it gives him a poor idea of the country. I have not seen the Hamilton building since its completion, but I am told it is a beautiful one, and a credit to the Dominion. I hope it will give sufficient revenue to recoup us for its erection. I am told the revenue from customs and post office is very large.

Mr. VAIL. It is an exorbitant amount to pay for a custom house and post office. When the building for custom house and post office purposes was taken by the Dominion Government at Halifax, at a cost of $80,000, it was considered exorbitant; and yet three or four times that amount is expended on a building for Hamilton, which city is about the same size as Halifax.

Mr. McMULLEN. While the Dominion should erect respectable buildings that would to a certain extent be cre-

ditable to the country, we should economise as much as possible. The amount invested in the Hamilton custom house is exorbitant. When the Mackenzie Government was in power strong efforts were made to induce it to erect a much larger building as a post office at Guelph than that which was erected. Mr. Mackenzie, however, refused to erect a larger building than was necessary for the accommodation required, without regard to adjacent buildings. Of course, in Hamilton there are respectable buildings, but the Mackenzie Government refused to spend enormous sums in putting up buildings much larger than were required. The Guelph post office is only two storeys high, being lower than many of the adjoining buildings.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt, the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) did all he could to save money to the country, as we do. When the St. John custom house was burned, Mr. Mackenzie gave to that city a very beautiful building, which is a credit to the Government and the country. I will give a few figures to show the importance of Hamilton. The postal revenue, last year, was $62,000; saving's bank deposits, $281,000; money orders issued and paid, $497,000; customs duties, $668,000; other revenues collected, $4,499; value of exports, $470,000; value of imports, nearly $4,000,000; excise, $275,000. So the hon. gentleman will see that if we have expended a large sum, we have a large revenue.

Kingston Penitentiary..... $17,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what is this amount wanted?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For a number of small items in connection with buildings and repairs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there telephone communication between Kingston penitentiary and the city.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is necessary to have such communication for in the event of any lamentable outbreak such as occurred in another penitentiary lately, it might be of very great service.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will make some explanation in regard to payments made to Mr. Bowes?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Bowes is architect of the penitantiary buildings, and his headquarters are at Ottawa.

Mr. WILSON. There are hotel expenses at $3.50 a day for 41 days, amounting to $143.50.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Those are expenses incurred by this officer when visiting the penitentiaries.

Mr. McMULLEN. There are also two trips costing $149.50.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt he was paid that amount.

Mr. WILSON. What about an item of $5,500 for Orangeville post office, &c.?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is to complete the building.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see the architect is down for nineteen days at $10 a day, in connection with this post office, and also this Mr. Armstrong, $10. Then there is Mr. Robert Hewitt, two months, $150. Who is he? Does he live in Orangeville?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He is clerk of works.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But there seemed to have been no work going on that year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Most likely the work began during those two months and continued the following year, and he was paid for the work the following year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With regard to the public buildings at Peterboro', I understand that the necessities, shall I say, of the public service have required, that whereas in all other cases the post office and custom house were put together, in Peterboro' they are rather widely separated, and two distinct sites have to be paid for. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell the House what has been paid for sites, and where, and wherefore?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I explained the other day, on a question being put by an hon. member that two sites had been bought, the one being the Sawyer lot, I think on Hunter street.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the religious persuasion of the Sawyer lot?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I never knew that a lot had a religious persuasion, and therefore I am unable to answer the hon. gentleman. That lot was purchased because it was near the village of Ashburnham which is next to Peterboro'. There is a bridge between the two, and that bridge leads to this street, and the post office will serve the requirements of both places. This lot was considered not a proper site for a custom house and inland revenue office, and we thought that, under the circumstances, another lot should be purchased in the interior of the town, in another place. That lot is called the Phalen lot, near the station, I believe, though I have not been there myself. Tenders have been called for the two buildings, and instructions have been given to the chief architect to prepare his plans and specifications in such a way that the cost of both buildings would not exceed that of one building, if we had erected only one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the price of the Phalen lot and what of the Sawyer lot?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think one lot cost $6,000 and the other something like $3,500 or $4,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost of the buildings to be?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About $30,000, each.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Peterboro' is a considerable town, and one which, if it does not now rank as a city, will soon rank as a city, and all the arguments advanced by the hon. gentleman recently as to erecting imposing buildings in towns of importance would apply very strongly to the erection of an imposing and useful building for the town of Peterboro'. The hon. gentleman will hardly himself maintain that a very much better building could not have been put up for $60,000, one which would be a much greater credit to the town of Peterboro' than the two buildings costing $30,000 each. Moreover, in all cases before this where the town is of considerable size, I think the custom house and post office have been combined. I think that has been the invariable practice of the Department in considerable towns.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not everywhere.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where are the departures?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Winnipeg, London, Toronto, Montreal, St. John, Quebec.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Most of those are very large towns.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I thought the hon. gentleman was trying to erect Peterboro' to the same rank?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Wherever they were of a size under 15,000 or 20,000 people, that was the custom, for the reason that you could erect a very much more imposing building for $60,000 than by dividing it into two buildings of $30,000 each. How far are these two lots apart.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say, but I know the Phalen lot is near the railway station, and near the market, whilst the post office is in another direction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman got possession of these two lots?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand the hon. gentleman has completed purchase and paid for both.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know whether there is any qualification in the deeds of these lots—whether they are deeded to the Government for a particular purpose in either case.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. In the deed for the purchase of the Phalen lot, the words "for post office and other buildings," were inserted. That was done without the consent of the Government. According to the Order in Council, it was for a public building; it did not mention a post office; and as soon as the deed was sent to me I sent it back in order that the matter might be investigated. I have not yet been able to ascertain how those words came to be put in the deed. I stated to the proprietor of the lot, who wished the post office to be built there instead of at the other place, and declared that he would never have sold it for the price paid, $3,900, if he had known it was not to be for a post office, that the Government were ready to return the lot to him provided he gave back the money, so that he would not suffer any loss from the sale. He has refused this, and has told me he would make a claim for damages. Under these circumstances, perhaps the hon. gentleman will not ask me to make any further explanation on that point.

Mr. McMULLEN. If I am rightly informed, the Government, in the first place, bought the Phalen lot, with the intention of erecting a post office and custom house on it. But there was a quarrel between the parties, as each wanted to sell his lot to the Government, so the Government thought to patch up the quarrel by buying both lots and putting up two separate buildings. I am quite satisfied that if an investigation were held, the statements I make could be proved. One of the men was down here, since Parliament has met, to demand that the Minister of Public Works erect the building on his lot. It is outrageous that the money of the country should be wasted in this way. That is the truth, and I challenge the Minister of Public Works to deny it,

Mr. THOMPSON. In regard to the conveyance, perhaps I might explain that the conveyance is not limited to the purpose mentioned, but there is a recital that the lot has been purchased for that purpose.

Mr. WILSON. Has the lot for the Prescott public building been purchased yet?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have not purchased the lot yet. This is an appropriation which has not been used.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a representation I made to him some time ago. I stated that the Government had led the caretaker of the St. Thomas public building to understand that rooms would be fitted up in the building in which he might live. Since last summer he has been compelled to rent a house at his own expense at some distance from the building. He is a very efficient and reliable man, and whereas in other places a caretaker and an engineer are employed for public buildings, he is obliged to act both as caretaker and engineer. In a town or city, the expense of living is high, and it is unfair that he should be obliged to take $150 for rent out of his salary of $400. I requested the Minister of Public Works to put a vote in the Estimates for fitting up rooms for him in the building; but the Estimates are down, and no vote is in them. Very likely the Government will allow the present state of things to continue until the building is burned down owing to the absence of the caretaker. I therefore think that the Minister of Public Works ought to put a reasonable amount in the Estimates, and allow the amount he has paid for rents during the time he has been kept out of these buildings.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Last year I put in something for this purpose, but the hon. gentleman, speaking of the expenses, frightened me so much that I dared not put in an amount this year. His manner, however, is so encouraging I will really have to take this into consideration.

Mr. WILSON. No doubt the hon. gentleman was considerate in reference to the expense of the building at St. Thomas, because in 1884-85 he paid the architect 3 per cent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think the hon. gentleman ought to raise that question now. He expects something in the Estimates of 1886-87, and if it appears there he will have the opportunity of saying that the Minister of Public Works has listened to him, and if not he will have the opportunity of referring to the grievance he wishes to bring up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the $12,000 for Toronto examining warehouse close it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It closes it for the present. In 1884-85, we decided to have a larger examining warehouse, and then asked the money to build a third of it. We are going on with that. Afterwards we had to add a building, which will be a portion of the second third for the hoisting apparatus, and this amount is to erect this building. If next year we are flush of money, we may go on with the balance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT What does that cost altogether?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $100,000, when completed.

Mr. VAIL. I would point out that the Minister of Public Works mentioned that the amount received for Customs at Hamilton was so large that it justified the expenditure of $300,000 on the custom house. Well, I find that, compared with Halifax, the amount is not large. While the Customs receipts from Hamiltom are $660,000, the receipts from Halifax are $1,363,000, and the custom house in Halifax only cost $80,000.

Mr. BOWELL. When was it built?

Mr. VAIL. In 1867.

Mr. BOWELL. That alters the matter, but the new warehouse we have rented there and are about preparing is costing quite as much in proportion as the Hamilton building.

Public Works, Manitoba..... $90,000 00

Mr. WATSON. I see there is no amount placed in the Estimates for the Winnipeg drill shed, although Colonel Houghton reports that a floor should be placed in it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That matter has been brought to my notice lately, and I think to-morrow I will have to look over all these matters.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much has been expended on the Manitoba penitentiary and Winnipeg post office.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount expended from the beginning is $291,000, and on the post office, $150,000. About $8,000 more will be required to complete the post office, and this year I believe it will be completed, as I understand the post office authorities have directed that the post office be removed there. The present temporary post office will be fitted up for the Department of the Interior.

Public Works, North-West Territories $31,000 00

Mr. O'BRIEN. I wish to say a word or two with regard to one item which is not included in the Estimates, that is the Industrial School at Qu'Appelle for the training of Indian boys. Having had an opportunity of visiting that school several times, I must say that if there is anything on which we can congratulate ourselves, it is the attempt being made in the North-West to educate the youth of the Indian tribes. It is quite evident we cannot do anything with the old men or the young men who have attained the age of maturity. Our only chance is to endeavor to educate the youths, the young boys and girls who are growing up in the different reserves, with them we may possibly do something. I admit that experience is not altogether favorable, for I found there, and we know in fact from our own experience in the Province of Ontario, that the Indian boys and girls who are trained with the greatest possible care at our various industrial schools or other institutions very often, after they have obtained a great deal of instruction, turn out to be after all mere savages; but at the same time the only hope we have, the only prespect we have, the only inducement we have to spend money upon the Indians is based upon the fact that upon the young, caught young in fact, we may possibly hope to obtain some influence which may be of benefit in future years. I took several opportunities of visiting that school at Qu'Appelle, and I was very much pleased with what is going on there. The expenditure in establishing that school has been very great. The buildings have cost a great deal of money, but I think they are worth all they have cost, and I desire to express my sense of the very great service the fathers in charge of that institution are giving to the people of the country. I am sure they are doing a great work. Among others there, I saw a grand son of Sitting Bull, a little boy, a bright little fellow, of just the class from whom the people of this country may hope something in the future. I hope the Indian Department will endeavor to encourage and develop these institutions, and I think the country will not begrudge any reasonable expenditure in developing them. I think they are the only hope we have of obtaining in the future anything like a grasp and a hold upon the Indian population. If we can give them some notion of our ideas of civilisation, some idea of cleanliness, of good clothing, of everything that we believe makes the benefits and comforts of civilisation, the country should not begrudge the expenditure; and, in regard to this particular institution, I beg to express my extreme sense of what this country owes to the clergy who are in charge of that institution and the excellent work they are doing in the management of it.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman will see that, on a following page, there is a vote of $41,836 for day schools and $52,500 for industrial schools, together making an increase of $31,700 over last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will the Regina goal and lunatic asylum and the post-office and custom house cost when they are finished?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The goal and lunatic asylum will cost $52,000. It will require $7,000 more to complete. The post office and custom house will be about completed with this sum of $3,500. At Prince Albert, there is a contract for the building of the court-house and goal for which this $15,500 is asked. The contractor is T. Doddridge, who is represented by Mr. Jellie, of Winnipeg.

Public Buildings, British Columbia..... $55,500 00.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this $50,000 to complete the penitentiary?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; it will not complete. That institution is increasing in regard to the number of convicts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under the National Policy?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; under the National Policy, whilst the population is increasing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you going to build the Vancouver quarantine station at all? I see this $5,500 is a revote.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The note I have here is this: "This is to make provision for the undermentioned works suggested by the agent under date of the 20th September and February, 1885, as being necessary to render the new quarantine buildings erected at Albert Head, suitable for the purpose for which it is intended."

Public Buildings generally..... $15,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is the ordinary vote.

Mr. KIRK. Where are the buildings?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is general. It is for the buildings of the whole Dominion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is the usual vote.

Mr. KIRK. Is it the intention to erect a custom house and post office in Guysboro' out of this vote?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is a good idea.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As the Minister of Public Works states that the Supplementary Estimates are to be considered in his Department to-morrow, I would mention one item to him. I mean the revote for the Joseph Brant monument of $5,000. It will expire in July, and I suppose the hon. gentleman will not pay the money before October, when the monument will be erected, so that it will be necessary to take a vote for it in 1886-87.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We can carry it for three months, or we can revote it. I thank the hon. gentleman.

Resolutions to be reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has our resolution been communicated to the Lord High Commissioner yet?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, it has gone; and I have no doubt the members of the House of Commons have received it, and are now considering it.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 12:05 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 10th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS—TIMBER LIMITS.

Mr. COOK. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a statement. On the 4th May the Minister of the Interior, speaking to the motion of my hon. friend for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), made this statement, speaking of the Scotch company in which I was interested:

"They seemed to prefer to take his recommendation, and they gave him an enormous sum of money in advance, as they thought he had a title. Now, that was a transaction where the money really passed."

I was in my seat, and I rose and said:

"I just wish to correct the hon. gentleman. The statement that he is making is false."

The same evening, after I had left the Chamber for a short time, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) had the presumption to make this statement:

"He stated that parties who got timber limits from the Government never intended to work them."

That is, referring to myself, that I had stated that other parties had got timber limits, and had not intended to work them. He went on to say:

"They could not do worse than did that hon. gentleman himself, if they sold them to some foreigners and cheated them out of a large amount of money. The poor unfortunate Scotchmen in Glasgow who paid him $450,000 have a lively recollection of the hon. gentleman and his timber limits."

This is a serious charge, and dare not be made by any responsible party outside of this House. It will be my duty now to repudiate the statement made by the hon. gentleman *in toto*, and to give a brief synopsis of the conduct of the Scotchmen in connection with this company. The company was formed in 1880. I was appointed its general manager. Mr. Lockie, the late manager of the Bank of Commerce in Toronto, was appointed the financial manager. For the first year I had unlimited control of the company's operations, and succeeded to the extent of making a profit of $137,000. The financial manager, immediataly afterwards, seeing that the company was likely to be a great success, interfered with my duties to such an extent that difficulties arose between us. I resigned my position as general manager of the company, and my resignation was accepted. The capital of the company was $1,000,000; $500,000 was held by gentlemen in Scotland and $500,000 was held by gentlemen in Canada. The $500,000 of shares held by the gentlemen in Scotland were termed "A" shares, and ranked as preference dividend to the extent of 10 per cent. "B" shares, held by Canadian gentlemen, were deferred to the extent of 10 per cent. dividend. The constitution of the company provided that any shares being transferred were not eligible to be voted on for seven weeks after the transfer. It also provided that a general extraordinary meeting could be called within forty days. Up to the time of my resignation I held $250,000 worth of shares in trust for other Canadian holders, which were all the shares held by me. Some time after my resignation and when I had nothing more to do with the company, I transferred the $250,000 worth of stock to the parties to whom it belonged. Immediately after this transfer the Scotch gentlemen called a general extraordinary meeting of the shareholders, with a view of passing a by-law to water the "A" shares to the extent of 50 per cent. This meeting convened in Edinburgh, Scotland. The Canadian shareholders sent a representative to the meeting, and stated to the gentlemen in Scotland that they were taking an unfair advantage of the Canadian shareholders; because of their inability to vote upon the $250,000 of shares that I had transferred. The Scotch gentlemen, no doubt expecting large returns from the company, attempted to swindle the Canadian shareholders to the extent that I have mentioned. Instead of having an equal proportion with the Canadian shareholders, they had, by this watering process, increased theirs to $750,000, and the Canadian shares were left in the same position as before; so that, before the Canadian shareholders could obtain any dividend at all, the company would have to pay the Scotch shareholders a dividend on $750,000 instead of $500,000. It also gave them complete control of the company, which control was placed in the hands of the financial manager, who knew nothing about the lumber trade whatever, and who was the cause of the disastrous results to the company. The disaster to the company was brought about directly by the action of the gentlemen in Scotland in taking out of the hands of practical lumbermen in Canada the management of this company. They did not alone injure themselves, but they injured the Canadian shareholders, and I may state here for the information of the gentleman who seems to take such a deep interest in this company, for the purpose of injuring me in the eyes of the public, that one of the principal shareholders—Cook & Brothers—put in $300,000 cash. I trust that these short explanations will be sufficient to satisfy my most bitter political enemy that he cannot make any capital against me on this charge. I would not have referred to the speech made by the hon. gentleman, but he is not known so well in the country as he is in this House, and bearing as it did the malicious and despicable utterance made by the Minister of the Interior in connection with this very same matter, when I characterised it at once as a false statement, I should have thought this would have been quite sufficient for any hon. gentleman in the House. I did not happen to be in my seat when the member for East Grey made his statement, or I should have characterised it there and then as I characterised the utterances made by the Minister of the Interior.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. COOK. I make this statement, and the hon. gentleman need not screw up his face or laugh. I am prepared to prove the statement I have made. I make this statement consciously, knowing what I am doing, and everyone who knows the Minister of the Interior as well as do some hon. members in this House, will not place a great deal of confidence in what he says.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

An hon. MEMBER. Take back that statement.

Mr. COOK. I take back nothing.

Mr. SPROULE. I should like to say, in regard to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, that I made a statement which was current in our part of the country. It was generally known, it was generally believed, that Cook Bros. took out of that transaction $450,000, for which those gentlemen gave little or nothing in return, and when they left the company Cook Bros. took out about all the good timber. As to the reference made about the hon. member for East Grey not being so well known in the country as in the House, I suppose the reverse is the fact. But I can only say that in the hon. member's case, he is a good deal better known in the country than in the House, and those gentlemen who have had occasion to have transactions with him, know him, and will know him to their sorrow, no matter what is said by him. I am glad he has succeeded in getting

some person to write out a plausible statement and read it to the House and the country, and I have no reason to complain if it satisfies his conscience and his constituents.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I am reported in the Ottawa *Free Press* of the 7th as voting against my own motion. The report is as follows:—

"Mr. Blake then moved in amendment to the main motion as amended, that Mr. Speaker be instructed to forward to Mr. Gladstone a copy of the resolution adopted by this House.

"Mr. Coughlin moved an amendment to the amendment, substituting the name of Mr. Parnell for Mr. Gladstone.

"While Mr. Coughlin was moving this amendment to the amendment, Mr. Curran was apparently seeking to obtain the Premier's consent. Sir John Macdonald appeared at first to consent, and it was not until he perceived that the substitution of one name for another in face of Mr. Blake's offer to accept Parnell's name in addition to Gladstone would be an insult, that

"Sir John then proposed in amendment that all the resolutions be forwarded to Gladstone, Parnell and Salisbury. This was ruled out of order, and a division forced on Mr. Coughlin's amendment by the Opposition, who declined to allow it to be withdrawn. Twenty then voted for the amendment to the amendment and 141 against."

I say this a malicious slander and falsehood, and the reporter must have known it.

INCOMPLETE RETURN.

Mr. MULOCK. In the absence of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), I beg to call the attention of the House to a return laid before the House on 21st April last. An Order of the House was passed on 2nd March, 1885, directing to be laid before Parliament a list of certain shareholders in certain companies, and the Order contained these words: "And the amount of stock held by each individually." In pursuance of that Order a return was laid before the House on the date mentioned, and that return purported to deal with the case of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company; but I submit it does not comply with the directions of the House in regard to the list of shareholders. There is a statement in the body of the return of the names of certain persons as shareholders, and it concludes as follows: "The total amount of stock held by the individuals is $300,000, $6,000 of which is held by George C. Boulon (or Boulton), and the balance is divided, as nearly as possible, equally among the other eight persons." I submit that the words "as nearly as possible" render it impossible to infer that the balance of the stock, $294,000, is divided evenly between the shareholders in question, and I therefore submit that the Order has not been complied with.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not see the return, which came from the Railway Department; but I will call the attention of the hon. Minister to the statement of the hon. gentleman.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I propose, first, to call the attention of the House to statements made by members of this House elsewhere, which, as reported in the Toronto *Globe*, reflect on my personal honor. In the second place, I desire to notice, by way of an explanation, some statements of similar import made during a recent debate on timber licenses in the North-West; and, Sir, allow me here to say, that my ideas are so old-fashioned if you will, that I make no distinction between political and personal honor, both of which have been unwarrantably assailed both in this House and outside of it. This conclusion will, I trust, be made clear before I close. The performance of this duty I consider imperative, not only in my own behalf, but equally so in respect of the important county which has honored me with its confidence, and of the integrity of this Parliament, which is of first public importance. In this connection I beg to draw the attention of the House to a short extract from the speech of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) made at Wingham, as given in the *Globe* of 12th July last. I see that the gentleman to whom I have referred has left the Chamber, and I very much regret it. Before, however, entering upon the subject, I wish to point out that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), save the mark, made this statement in a previous speech:

"This indictment is a grave and serious one, and no public man should, either in his place in Parliament or on the public platform, make allegations of this kind unless he is in a position to prove them."

That is the declaration he made before making the charge at Wingham, to which I am about to refer. The heading of that portion of his speech at Wingham was: "Why Tory Members of Parliament support the Government." He said:

"I purpose now for a little to direct your attention to the corrupt means by which corrupt Tory representatives of the people are induced to support a corrupt Tory Administration. I shall deal only with the Conservative supporters of the Government from Ontario. The Conservative supporters of this Government from the other Provinces are bad enough. The supporters of the Government from Ontario are moved in their support by no honest restraints, influenced by no pure motives, and guided by no patriotic convictions. The support is largely given and received from purely personal, mercenary and corrupt considerations."

It will be noted with what gusto and relish the hon. member referred to uses the word "corruption" and rolls it as if it were a sweet morsel under his tongue, as if it were his ordinary diet. This was the conclusion which was arrived at, at any rate, by a full bench of judges of our land on a certain occasion. Under the heading to which I have referred follow the names of forty members of this House, but I shall, of course, refer only to my own case, as those other hon. gentlemen can defend themselves. My name is the eighth on the list and he honored me by referring to me in this way:

"8. Moss Kent Dickinson is the Tory member for Russell. He was first elected in 1882. I find the first thing a Tory representative does is to look out for 'Number One,' and just here I must do Moss Kent the justice of saying that with marvellous success and in a wonderfully short space of time he learned the first and prime duty of a Tory member of Parliament. On the 13th October, 1882, less than four months after his election, he applied for fifty square miles of valuable timber limits, and his son applied for two other limits. Now, gentlemen, you can hardly expect that Moss Kent can vote against the Government who have so generously provided for him and his out of the public domain."

It is to be noted that the gravamen of the charge appears to be that I received that limit from the Government after I was a member of this House. The hon. gentleman has, I presume, had no other source of information as to dates except the returns which were brought down to this House. He made this gross charge, not in the presence of those whom he maligns but in their absence; he has not even had the hardihood to repeat that charge in the presence of those whom he has maligned, and I challenge him now to find in the returns any such statement, as to dates, *i.e.*, that I applied for a limit after I was elected As a matter of fact, I have never had the opportunity, or have never taken occasion to explain the matter, although on numerous occasions outside the House this charge has been brought against me. Now it will scarcely be credited that the application which he says was made on the 15th October, was really made on the 13th May, 1882—before the elections of 1882, as is well known. Not only so, but in my own case there was not the probability that I would be nominated as the candidate of the Liberal-Conservative party for the county, and the election did not take place until the 20th June. With respect to my son, to whom he refers as having got two limits, I would say that the hon. gentleman is also in error in that case, whether designedly or otherwise the House can judge, as his application was for one limit only, also made long before my

election or nomination, *i.e.*, 16th May. I presume, however, that his anxiety to multiply these cases of applications for timber limits was so great that a matter of one or two limits did not make much difference to him. Now, I think no fair or generous-minded man, no matter what his stripe of politics, would make any such falsified charge inside or outside of this House, for the mere gratification of obtaining, at the moment, perhaps, the cheer to the echo which, no doubt, the hon. gentleman received, from his deluded hearers, by making such false and calumnious statements with regard to fellow-members who were not present to defend themselves. I will now, with the permission of the House, refer to what took place on the 4th of May last, when this timber limit question was discussed in this House. The hon. member for North Norfolk, in his list of charges against members of Parliament in connection with timber limits, said that M. K. Dickinson, M.P., made application for G. L. Dickinson—to this I have already referred—and W. B. Dickinson. In respect to this case, I did not transmit the application. I will say nothing about the motives of the hon. gentleman. If I cannot find arguments in support of any position I take, I will never descend to tacitly acknowledge defeat by imputing motives. With a desire to magnify the territory covered by limits generally acquired either for or by the recommendation of members of this House, the hon. gentleman also mentioned that the application for J. J. Burrows was for fifty-six islands, whereas his application was for five small islands with a total area of fifty-six square miles, and was never made by me for him. I recommended it after my election, as he was one of my constituents, though he spent some time in the North-West; but until hearing the above statement, I never heard he had obtained a grant, and I had no interest whatever in it. Now, I will take the liberty of meeting the statement that has been so often made on the opposite side of this House, that the regulations under which the timber lands of the North-West are granted to applicants, are much less advantageous in point of revenue than the regulations prevailing in Ontario.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will confine himself to the personal explanation, and not go into the general question of timber limits.

Mr. DICKINSON. I will do so with all deference. Then, I have a further explanation to make with regard to a still graver charge that was made against myself during the recent debate. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) —pardon the misnomer—made the following comments with regard to myself. He started off with a grand sentiment as to the necessity of speaking the truth on all occasions. He said:

"It is highly improper for hon. members in this House to make statements that are false."

Now, Sir, before I sit down I think I shall prove that the statements made against myself are false. He said:

"Now, I only want to deal with one more gentleman. When the member for Cardwell *vid* Montreal, got up and attempted to attack me, he said it was a vile thing on my part to take a timber limit, but he turned around to his friend and said: 'My friend, Mr. Dickinson, who is an old-established lumberman, has a right to have timber limits.' Well, I do not know how long he has been lumbering. My impression is that he is not lumbering now. Are you?

"Mr. DICKINSON. Since 1852, unceasingly, more or less.

"Mr. COOK. The last time I heard of him he was lumbering in spools."

I do not think that a very grave accusation; it is not that I am referring to; but I will read until I come to a charge of a far graver character:

"I have no doubt that he is so wedded to the lumber trade that he will stick to it like old Mr. Marsh who had been a lumberman, and who was found one day shaving shingles."

The hon. gentleman used three words which the reporter omitted, but which I distinctly heard. He spoke of Mr. Marsh, who had been a lumberman, "who had failed." He went on:

"He was asked what he was doing now, and he said: 'I am in the lumber trade, and I am going to remain there even if I have to get down to wooden toothpicks.' I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has got down to wooden toothpicks yet, but he has two timber limits which are of wonderful value, for he professes that they have four hundred millions of timber on them."

The hon. gentleman is as much misinformed in reference to my being engaged in making spools as he is in reference to the more grave charges with which he has assailed me. I never made a spool——

Mr. COOK. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I wish to apologise. I take that back. It is not spools he is making; it is clothes-pins.

Mr. DICKINSON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken again; I have not made a clothes-pin, and have had no connection with clothes-pins.—

"Mr. COOK. That is the statement. He came to a party in Toronto to sell it, and when he was talking about the enormous amount of lumber on that limit—he was talking to a lumberman, mind you—when they saw Professor Macoun's report, which was given to him, no doubt, for no other purpose than to endeavor to sell his timber limit, stating that there were four hundred millions of timber on 100 miles—because he had to get one limit for himself of fifty miles and one for his son, he could not get it all in one, because Sir John had declared that he would not give more than fifty miles to one person, he changed that in order to get an excuse to cancel my timber limit."

On this latter point, it is pretty well known that there were other and better reasons for cancelling the limit referred to.

"He stated there were 400,000,000 on the two limits."

From my place in this House, recognising my responsibility, I say that I never made such a statement or anything approaching it, that I never attempted to give any definite idea or make any statement with reference to the quantity of timber upon that limit, either to the hon. member for East Simcoe or anyone else.

Mr. COOK. You got the limit, did you not?

Mr. DICKINSON. The hon. member for East Simcoe said further:

"Well, he stated there were 400,000,000 on the two limits, and when he said that that party in Toronto coolly said: 'I cannot have anything to do with it.' He was not talking to the marines."

I was not talking to the marines, but I apprehend that the conversation he refers to, is one he had with myself, and if he rests his statement upon anything I said, he is putting words into my mouth I never used. The hon. gentleman added:

"The statement was falsified, and he was going about with a false statement supplied by Professor Macoun of the Government here, of the Geological Department of this Government, he was going about trying to make people believe there was more timber on that limit than there was. He approached the hon. member for Welland; he went all the way to Niagara Falls to try to sell it. Then he said, if they would only take half of it, he would sell for $10,000. And it had 400,000,000 of timber on it. Why, if it was worth a cent, it was worth $400,000, and he was willing to sell one-half for $10,000"

This statement, containing a foul insinuation made against a most estimable and efficient public servant, that I was hawking about a false statement made up by Professor Macoun, would, even if I had no occasion to rise in my own self-defence, induce me to do so in order to resent that foul unfounded charge against Professor Macoun. There is not one word of truth in it, as I shall show before I sit down. The hon. gentleman continued:

"I would not refer personally to matters of this kind, but gentlemen say he is immaculate; he may have timber limits, he is a lumberman—in making spools; and then he tried to get rid of that limit by nothing more or less than a fraud, and I characterise it as such."

I desire that this last sentence be noticed particularly; and further, I claim that such a charge having been made by one member of this House against another, it is necessary, in the interest of the integrity of this Parliament, that it should be established beyond question whether myself or the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) is the culpable party. If this charge be correct, I am Sir, unworthy of a seat in this House, but if the hon. gentleman has made an unfounded, slanderous charge, which I assert to his teeth he has done in regard to myself, he is unworthy of a seat in this Chamber. I am not well acquainted with parliamentary law or usage, but with all deference to the House, I solicit an investigation at the hands of this Parliament into this matter.

Mr. COOK. Move for a committee.

Mr. DICKINSON. I would not keep this seat for one hour if I were in a position of uncertainty as to my qualification to fill it, so far as personal or political honor is concerned.

An hon. MEMBER. Have you sold the limit yet?

Mr. DICKINSON. In reference to the charge against Professor Macoun, I desire, in justice to that gentleman, to make a simple, plain statement of all that occurred between him and myself. The hon. gentleman seems very much amused.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am delighted.

Mr. DICKINSON. As I have already shown, I applied to the Department for this limit on the 13th of May, 1882. I received no information from any quarter except from the Official Report of 1881, containing Mr. Macoun's reports of his exploration in the North-West, on page 81. In describing the section in which the limit granted to me is situated, Mr. Macoun says:

"The character of the valley changed about four miles from the Etoimami, and fine groves of poplar with clumps of very large spruce, ranging from twenty to thirty-six inches, were frequently passed. As we proceeded up stream this changed, and the whole river valley for nearly eight miles was filled with the most magnificent forest of spruce. Fine, tall, straight trees, all growing, and often thirty-six inches in diameter, were standing close together, and did they extend any distance from the stream, would be invaluable. From my own cursory examination I was led to believe that this was the case, but later accounts show that the belt is less than half a mile wide for the most part."

I am more particular in respect to the charge against Mr. Macoun than I would be in regard to that against myself. It will be remembered that I read a statement made by the hon. member for East Simcoe in regard to Professor Macoun, whose report, he said, was false, that there were 400,000,000 of timber upon my own limit and that of my family. Let me say here that Professor Macoun never said anything of the kind, and that there was no examination of the timber limits granted to my sons. They were not referred to in any manner or mentioned in any conversation I had with the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook), if it is my conversation with him he refers to. Hence the hon. gentleman's statement in that respect is false, made entirely from whole cloth. With permission of the House, I desire to explain all and everything that Professor Macoun had to do in reference to the matter in question, and the circumstances under which I made the application to the Department. Then on calling at the Department and finding there were no applications in, covering the ground indicated by the paragraph I have just read, I put in my application for the same, and as I have already shown it was granted subsequently, upon the published conditions open to anyone who might apply for similar grants. Up to that time and until April of the following year, I had never met or had any correspondence of any nature whatever with Professor Macoun. During April of 1883, more than one year after obtaining the grant, I called on the professor, introduced myself, stating I had obtained the timber grant referred to, showing him the paragraph which I have read, and asked him if he could give any further particulars respecting the area of land which I described as embraced in my grant than that noted in his official report, and, if so, could he with propriety kindly favor me with any such in his possession of a practical character, obtained on the ground, in regard to requisite facilities for access and egress by water for the working and development of this limit. He stated he had made voluminous field notes while on the ground in respect to all his explorations made in the North-West and elsewhere, a synopsis of which was only practicable to include in his official reports, and had no doubt he would find he had done so in this case, and if he could give me any further information from his field notes on points I desired tending towards the settlement of our grand heritage in the North-West, he considered it was his duty to do so as a public officer. I gave him a memorandum of the several practical points, and subsequently he was kind enough to send me a communication of which the following is a copy. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook), now acknowledges—or at least I understood him to do so by assent—that he is the person to whom he refers in connection with the statement he made to the House. What I will now take the liberty of reading to the House is the document, and the only one, which I had over Professor Macoun's signature, and no statement did I make, directly or indirectly, in contravention of this statement in regard to the quantity of timber:

"OTTAWA, April 13th, 1883.

"M. K. DICKINSON, Esq.

"DEAR SIR,—Regarding the timber supply upon Little Swan River, N.W.T., 'commencing four miles from its mouth and extending up a distance of eight miles or thereabouts,' as contained in my official report, I may state—

"1st. That in my opinion the best part of the timber will be found within a mile of the river on each side. Of this I am not certain, but it is my belief, judging from observations taken from tree tops, I believe I am correct."

Then he goes on to give the varieties of timber, and continues:

"As regards the quantity per acre and size of the trees, the following extracts from my journal, written on the ground, will give my estimate made without bias."

I will not read some of the clauses, as the time of the House is valuable, and I do not desire to trespass upon it any further than is necessary in the defence of my personal honor, and that I claim I have a right to defend, as I think will be acknowledged by every fair-minded member of the House.

An hon. MEMBER. Have you sold the limit?

Mr. DICKINSON. This is the principal point:

"Regarding the amount of timber on the fifty square miles, I could scarcely give an estimate. The above extracts would assist a practical man to arrive at an approximate conclusion."

Now, that is the only statement that Professor Macoun has ever made in reference to the quantity upon the limit referred to, and that only as a matter of opinion. In the face of that, this so called hon. gentleman rises in this House and makes a distinct positive statement that, according to Professor Macoun's report, there were four hundred million feet on the two limits, whereas I have shown that Professor Macoun never saw or heard, to my knowledge, that my son had a limit or had anything to do with one.

An hon. MEMBER. Have you sold the limit?

Mr. DICKINSON. I can only reiterate the suggestion that I have made in reference to what I conceive to be the

duty of this House towards myself, particularly as I have contradicted from my place the charge that has been made, namely, that an opportunity should be given me to either be condemned or to be pronounced guilty.

An hon. MEMBER. Guilty.

Mr. DICKINSON. And, if it be the latter, I shall of course bow to the decision of the House. Mr. Speaker, I now beg to thank the House for its patient hearing, particularly the gentleman opposite, for the kind interest which he takes in what he seems to think a very laughable matter. When a member of the House is thus charged, those gentlemen value political or personal honor so lightly that they can make light of any gentleman who gets up to refute so serious a charge as that which I have explained has been made against myself.

Mr. COOK. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman's feelings have been wounded. If the hon. gentleman understands the constitutional way or method of obtaining what he says he desires, the means of having the thing investigated, he says he would be most happy to do so. Well, I will tell the hon. gentleman that the charges that I made on this occasion that he refers to, are true, and I can prove them under oath; and I would dare the hon. gentleman to ask for a committee of this House to investigate the matter. There is one thing I will take back. I stated that the hon. gentleman was lumbering in spools, and afterwards that he was lumbering in clothes-pins. I take back both these statements. What the hon. gentleman is lumbering in is barrel bungs.

Mr. SPEAKER. Orders of the Day.

THE WRIT FOR HALDIMAND.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to enquire of the Government if a decision has been arrived at in regard to the Haldimand election?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman put that question the other day, and I asked him to be good enough to wait until the First Minister was in his place. Afterwards, when the First Minister was in the House, the hon. gentleman was not in his place. To-day he renews the question, and the hon. Minister is out out of the House. I think, if he will wait a few minutes more, the First Minister will be in his place, and may be able to give him an answer.

WHARF AT CAPE TORMENTINE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The other day the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), wanted to have the plan of the wharf made for the Cape Tormentine breakwater, and I stated I would bring it down most likely on Monday. I have it here, and I called the attention of the chief engineer of my Department to what was said about the report of the engineer, and, without reading it now, I will lay upon the Table of the House this memorandum which he gives me, which covers not only what the local engineer may have obtained of data, but what the chief engineer himself has obtained after looking into the matter, so that this will cover the whole ground.

DREDGING THE KAMINISTIQUIA.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I wish also to correct a statement that was made, I think, by the same hon. gentleman, and by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), about the price of dredging on the Kaministiquia. It was stated that the price was 23 cents per cubic foot, or $6 per cubic yard. Well, I was astonished at the price as mentioned by the two hon. gentlemen, but I was not in a position to give a negative answer to that statement. I called the attention of the chief engineer of my Department to that statement, and he gives me this memorandum:

"With reference to this, I find in that report of the Auditor General for 1884-85, at page 245, this statement: that 121,560 cubic feet of dredging had been paid for. This is simply a blunder on the part of somebody outside of the Department, as the work done was measured, returned and paid for in cubic yards. For dredging done in 1884, the Department paid 23 cents per yard, not per foot, and for that done last year, 1885, we paid 19 cents per yard."

I wish this to be corrected at once, so that there may be no misunderstanding about it.

THE WRIT FOR HALDIMAND.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am not at all satisfied with the answer given by the acting leader of the Government to-day. A constituency has been open for some time. I think about two weeks ago I moved that you issue your warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, directing him to issue a writ for the election in the county of Haldimand. You, Sir, did your duty, as you generally do your duty, well, and you issued your warrant to that officer. That officer received the warrant nearly two weeks ago, and so far as I have been able to learn, the Government have not yet been able to arrive at a decision, or if the First Minister has arrived at a decision he has not taken his colleagues into his confidence, and imparted that decision to the House. I think it is not only trifling with the House, but it is trifling with the constituency that is unrepresented in this House, and is waiting the decision of the Government to bring on the election. I trust that the First Minister will have sufficient confidence in the acting leader of the Government to——

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman is in order, unless he is going to bring before the House some question of privilege, or is going to make a motion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I can easily do that if it is necessary.

THE SHUSWAP AND OKANAGAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. HOMER moved the second reading of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 33) to incorporate the Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Law Clerk certifies to me that these amendments are verbal and unimportant.

Mr. MITCHELL. Might I ask whether in all cases of this kind the Law Clerk gives a certificate where amendments have been made?—because I think it very important that should be done. Your Honor will have in recollection a case, some couple of years ago, in which alterations were made and were reported as unimportant, and afterwards turned out to be very important, and the House had to cancel and reconsider the legislation, and we have had very little satisfaction out of it since. I mention this fact now because I think it is well that these changes should be certified by the Law Clerk. The case I refer to is that of the Grand Trunk, at the time they cheated us in that legislation.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hold in my hand the memorandum from the Law Clerk.

Amendments concurred in.

RELIEF OF FLORA BIRRELL.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 129) for the relief of Flora Birrell.

House divided on motion.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Harley,	Pruyn,
Armstrong,	Hesson,	Ray,
Bain (Wentworth),	Hickey,	Reid,
Baker (Victoria),	Homer,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Barker,	Innes,	Robertson (Hastings),
Barnard,	Irvine,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bowell,	Jackson,	Scott,
Bryson,	Jenkins,	Shanly,
Burpee,	Kaulbach,	Small,
Cameron (Huron),	Kilvert,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Victoria),	Macdonald (Sir John),	Sproule,
Carling,	Mackenzie,	Stairs,
Cochrane,	Mackintosh,	Taylor,
Cook,	McCallum,	Temple,
Davies,	McCarthy,	Townshend,
Dickinson,	McLelan,	Trow,
Dodd,	McMullen,	Tupper,
Edgar,	McNeill,	Tyrwhitt,
Fairbank,	Mills,	Vail,
Farrow,	Mitchell,	Wallace (Albert),
Fisher,	Moffat,	Wallace (York),
Foster,	Mulock,	Ward,
Gillmor,	O'Brien,	Weldon,
Glen,	Orton,	White (Cardwell),
Gordon,	Paint,	Wilson,
Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),	Wood (Westm'l'd),
Haggart,	Patterson (Essex),	Yeo.—85.
Hall,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Costigan,	Kirk,
Auger,	Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),
Béchard,	Cuthbert,	Landry (Montmagny),
Bergeron,	Daly,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Blondeau,	Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),
Bourassa,	Dawson,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Cameron (Inverness),	Forbes,	Pinsonneault,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Fortin,	Riopel,
Casgrain,	Gagné,	Royal,
Chapleau,	Geoffrion,	Tassé,
Cimon,	Hackett,	Thompson.—33.

Bill read the second time.

THE VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION OF HALDIMAND.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask the First Minister if he can give me an answer with regard to the appointment of a returning officer for the county of Haldimand?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I told the hon. gentleman the other day that I would give him an answer on Friday last. When I was in my place he did not happen to be in his seat. Perhaps I sat up too long the night before. I was obliged to go home, and did not wait until his return, and so I did not give the answer then. The Government have not selected a returning officer. They do not think there is any very great hurry about it, and they will explain to the House why they think so. We have got a new franchise and the electors' lists are now being prepared, and there will be a very large addition to the electorate. There is no possibility of the member who is elected taking his seat during this Session—not the slightest, and therefore the election may as well stand over until the new lists can be used. There is an addition to the lists equal to 20 per cent. of the whole electors, I understand. In August the lists will be perfected and it would be rather absurd that a gentleman should be elected to represent in Parliament an electorate which is an effete electorate, based upon a voters' list which was abandoned a year ago. It would be well to postpone the election even if there were no new franchise, but when there is a new franchise and the electorate is largely increased, it would be something like an insult to those put on the list to find they were excluded from the election in their county of a member who is to represent their interest, after they have established the right to vote. That is the reason of the delay. If this matter is pressed I will ask the House for a resolution to suspend the issue of the writ.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. STAIRS asked, Have the proper authorities, whether magistrates or others, in those counties in which the Canada Temperance Act is in force, made returns to the Dominion Government of the amount of fines collected for infractions of the said Act? Has the Government received the half of such fines to which it is by law entitled? Is the Government aware that any such money have been used by counties for purposes other than those named in the Canada Temperance Act? and if so, what action does it intend to take thereon?

Mr. McLELAN. No returns have been made to the Dominion Government. There have been no money received. The Government is not aware that money have been used by counties for purposes other than those named in the Canada Temperance Act. It is intended to call on them to make their returns according to the Act.

FERRY BETWEEN NEW EDINBURGH AND GATINEAU POINT.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) asked, Who was the lessee or lessees of the ferry between the village of New Edinburgh and Gatineau Point for the years 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884 and 1885? What was the annual rental? What amount of said rental was paid in each of the five years respectively? Is there any part of the rent in arrears? If so, why has the ferry been again leased for a term of five years? If so, who is the lessee and what is the annual rental?

Mr. COSTIGAN. P. H. Chabot was the lessee of the New Edinburgh and Gatineau Ferry for the years 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, and 1885. The amount paid in those years was $230 for the year 1881. The balance due is $920. The ferry has been re-leased because the term of the old lease expired, and the law requires tenders to be called for in such cases. The present lessee is Thomas Mansfield, at an annual rental of $350.

LANDS IN NORTHERN AND WESTERN ONTARIO.

Mr. MILLS asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to acquiesce in the decision of the Court of Chancery and Court of Appeal in regard to the ownership of lands in the northern and western part of the Province of Ontario, or does it propose to further contest the question?

Mr. THOMPSON. The matter is still under consideration.

PRISONERS IN STONEY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY.

Mr. BERGERON (for Mr. DESJARDINS) asked, Whether the Government is aware that the health of several of the prisoners confined in the penitentiary at Stoney Mountain, for participation in the North-West rebellion, is seriously impaired? Whether it has been represented to them that further detention must endanger the lives of many of the said prisoners? And, if so, whether it is the intention of the Government to take steps to prevent that result?

Mr. THOMPSON. It was represented some time ago that the health of some of the prisoners was being impaired by confinement, and those in regard to whom that statement was made were released. I am informed that at a very recent date no such statement could be made in regard to those prisoners still confined. I think the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), who placed the question on the paper, is somewhat misinformed as the number of prisoners still detained, because the hon. gentleman has said "many of the said prisoners." There are only four Indians, one white and one half-breed still detained. The answer in regard to their health is that no such statement has been made as that their health is being impaired; but, on the contrary, the information as to those who remain is that their health has not been impaired.

LANDS, TIMBER AND MINERALS IN NORTHERN QUEBEC.

Mr. MILLS asked, Whether the Government has claimed, or intends to claim, through the Indian title, the lands, timber and minerals in the northern part of the Province of Quebec, in the same way and for the same reason that it makes claim to the lands in the northern and western part of Ontario? If not, why not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This question cannot be dealt with in the way indicated. There never has been a treaty with any Indians as to lands in the Province of Quebec, and there never has been any surrender.

POST OFFICES IN NORTH WELLINGTON.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether any petitions have been received from the residents of North Wellington, praying for the establishment of new post offices? If so, when is it the intention of the Government to have an inspection made with the view of ascertaining whether the necessity exists for the establishment of more post office accommodation? If so, when, or have they decided to open new post offices? If so, where?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The statement I have obtained from the Post Office Department in answer to this question is as follows: Petitions were received at the Post Office Department on 18th May, 1885, and 3rd April, 1886, praying for the establishment of more post offices at Fitch and Olivette respectively, both in the north riding of the County of Wellington. The inspector in his report upon the former applications states that there is no sufficient case. In the latter, the inspector's report is now under consideration.

MUTUAL RESERVE FUND LIFE ASSOCIATION.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Is the Government aware that the Mutual Reserve Fund Life Association issues certificates contrary to law, promising to pay an amount not exceeding "the sum mentioned in the certificate;" whereas the law says: "Every certificate shall contain a promise to pay the whole amount mentioned therein:" "There shall be inserted in each certificate a clause to the effect that no reduction shall be made, for any cause or reason whatsoever, on the amount of a policy lapsed through death?" Whether the Government is aware that the official report of the Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York shows that the Mutual Reserve Fund Association has already diverted $78,657.12 of the funds derived from death assessments, in order to meet its expenses, contrary to the law in force in Canada; and is it the intention of the Government to take any, and if so, what steps to protect persons insured in Canada against such unlawful acts of the said association?

Mr. McLELAN. The Government is not aware that the Mutual Reserve Fund Life Association issues certificates contrary to law. The words quoted in the second clause do not form a portion of the Statute relating to insurance, nor is it correct that there shall be inserted in each certificate a claim to the effect that no reduction shall be made for any cause whatsoever on the amount of a policy lapsed through death. The annual statement of the company is now before the Superintendent of Insurance, and is being examined with those of other companies; and sufficient steps will be taken to protect persons insured in said company in Canada, if anything should be found contrary to the Act.

WHARF AT LANORAIE.

Mr. AUGER (for M. BERNIER) asked, Has a contract been let for the construction of a wharf at Lanoraie, county of Berthier? If so, who is the contractor, and what is the contract price?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman I will say that a contract has been awarded for the construction of a wharf at Lanoraie. The contractor is Mr. J. P. Dusablon, and the amount of the contract is $4,500.

MATHEW ROCHE, OF LINGAN, N. S.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry that so long a time has elapsed since the 2nd of April, when this motion was placed on the paper, before it was possible to reach it, because we have now reached a stage of the Session, in which it is difficult to hope that an enquiry can be made. If it had not been a motion of this particular character I should have proposed to postpone it, but I think that would not be reasonable, in regard to such a motion, and therefore I proceed to state: That I am credibly informed, and believe I can establish by satisfactory evidence, that at and for many years before the 3rd July, 1884, the date of the last election for Cape Breton, one Mathew Roche, of Lingan, was a voter for the district and was also a Government official, as a member of the Pilotage Board comprising Sydney, one of the greatest ports in Canada, to which were attached two comparatively unimportant out-ports; That during the election, Murray Dodd, Esquire, then and now a member of this House for Cape Breton, pressed Mr. Roche to vote for Mr. McDougall because he was the Government candidate, brought out and selected by them to carry the county, if possible, in their interest; and stated to him, as a reason for his so voting, that it was the invariable rule that where a Government officer voted against the Government candidate he ran the risk of being turned out, and warned him that, if he should so vote, such would be the consequence in his case; that subsequently H. F. McDougall, Esquire, then and now a member of this House for Cape Breton, and Mr. Dodd, M.P., proposed to the Government that Mr. Roche, who they believed had, notwithstanding such warnings, voted against the Government candidate at the said election, should be, in consequence of his vote, superseded in his office, and some progress was made in the attempt; that rumours got abroad, and the Government was made aware of the facts and of the rumours, and hesitated to act; That Messrs. McDougall, M.P., and Dodd, M.P., continued to press for the removal of Mr. Roche; and in the end a plan was devised for the accomplishment of their object, by the remodelling of the Pilotage Board, and the creation of a new board for the comparatively unimportant out-ports, on which minor board Mr. Roche was to be put without his consent, and the constitution of a board for the great port of Sydney on which Mr. Roche's name was not to

appear; that having heard that he was by some such scheme to be turned out, Mr. Roche communicated with Mr. Dodd, M.P., who told him that the fact was so; reminded him of his requests and warnings about voting against the Government candidate, and told him that he must submit to the consequences; that the substance of this statement was communicated to the Government, which, however, proceeded to carry out the plan, and created the two boards accordingly; thus accomplishing the end sought of displacing Mr. Roche from the main functions of his office in pursuance of the threat of Mr. Dodd, M.P., and the determination of Mr. McDougall, M.P., to punish him for voting, as they believed he had voted, against the Government candidate. I beg to move:

That Mr. Blake, a member of this House, having made in his place the following statement:—

That he is credibly informed, and believes he can establish by satisfactory evidence, that at and for many years before the 3rd July, 1884, the date of the last election for Cape Breton, one Mathew Roche, of Lingan, was a voter for the district and was also a Government official, as a member of the Pilotage Board comprising Sydney, one of the greatest ports in Canada, to which were attached two comparatively unimportant out-ports;

That during the election, Murray Dodd, Esquire, then and now a member of this House for Cape Breton, pressed Mr. Roche to vote for Mr. McDougall because he was the Government candidate, brought out and selected by them to carry the county, if possible, in their interest; and stated to him, as a reason for his so voting, that it was the invariable rule that where a Government officer voted against the Government candidate he ran the risk of being turned out, and warned him that, if he should so vote, such would be the consequence in his case;

That subsequently H. F. McDougall, Esquire, then and now a member of this House for Cape Breton, and Mr. Dodd, M.P., proposed to the Government that Mr. Roche, who they believed had, notwithstanding such warnings, voted against the Government candidate at the said election, should be, in consequence of his vote, superseded in his office, and some progress was made in the attempt;

That rumours got abroad, and the Government was made aware of the facts and of the rumours, and hesitated to act;

That Messrs. McDougall, M.P., and Dodd, M.P., continued to press for the removal of Mr. Roche; and in the end a plan was devised for the accomplishment of their object, by the remodelling of the Pilotage Board, and the creation of a new board for the comparatively unimportant out-ports, on which minor board Mr. Roche was to be put without his consent, and the constitution of a board for the great port of Sydney on which Mr. Roche's name was not to appear;

That having heard that he was by some such scheme to be turned out, Mr. Roch communicated with Mr. Dodd, M.P., who told him that the fact was so; reminded him of his requests and warnings about voting against the Government candidate, and told him that he must submit to the consequences;

That the substance of this statement was communicated to the Government, which, however, proceeded to carry out the plan, and created the two boards accordingly; thus accomplishing the end sought of displacing Mr. Roche from the main functions of his office in pursuance of the threat of Mr. Dodd, M.P., and the determination of Mr. McDougall, M.P., to punish him for voting, as they believed he had voted, against the Government candidate;

A Select Committee be appointed to enquire into all the circumstances connected with the said charges, with power to send for persons, papers and records; and that the witnesses be examined on oath or affirmation, and that the committee do report in full the evidence taken before them, and their proceedings on the reference; and that Messrs. McCarthy, Davies, Colby, Cameron (Huron), Coursol, Langelier, O'Brien, Weldon and Townshend do compose the said committee.

Mr. DODD. I deem it my duty, before that motion is put to the House, to offer a few words of explanation. I have had this indictment hanging over my head for a period of four or five weeks; at last the shell has exploded, and I feel that I have not suffered very much from it. I am glad the time has arrived when I can state to my friends in this House and to my friends in the country that this charge is utterly unfounded. The hon. gentleman has prepared an indictment against me with my colleague, charging me, in the first instance, with uttering a threat. That I, in the clearest and most emphatic language, deny. Mr. Roche, the party mentioned in this charge, was a great personal and political friend of mine. In the election of my colleague in July, 1884, he spoke to me or I to him, I do not know which, in reference to his conduct in that election. I told him as a friend, as he then was a friend, and as he possibly may be still, that being a Government officer he might be subject to certain penalities, or might possibly imperil his position by taking an excessive, active part against my friend and colleague Mr. McDougall. Nothing further was done, so far as I am concerned or know of, for months afterwards. In the month of February, 1885, seven months after the election, during which interval of time Mr. Roche and I met and were the best of friends, he wrote me a letter, not stating that I had threatened or warned him, but in the most friendly terms asking me to become his friend here in case of the remodelling of the board which, for causes which I shall hereafter draw your attention to, was then contemplated. This letter is as follows:—

"LINGAN, 16th February, 1885.

"MR. MURRAY DODD:

"SIR,—It is rumored around here that you are going to remove me from the Board of Commissioners of Pilots, and I wish to lay a few facts before you. You are well aware that I always voted for you, and you also know that I got the ill-will of D. Link for doing so at recent last election, and if you consent to remove me without any reason, to please a few greedy grab-alls."——

I do not know who they were——

"I cannot help it, but it is more than I expected from you While on that board I acted fearlessly and without any favoritism, and I do not think it is right to dismiss a man without a reason. If you wish to find how I acted while on that board, I refer you to Mr. W. Purvis, and I consider him as good an authority as can be found. It seems that the whole trouble is that the pilots do not collect their pilotage. Sir, you will please look at the returns, and you will see that cannot be done very well. It is likely, if I could be twisted around by some of our nobility, there would be no complaints. Dear friend, there is not much gain in it directly; it is a little benefit to me in an indirect way. I never asked you for any political favor before now, and I ask you not to dismiss me when there is no reason on my part. If you do it is more than I expected from one of the Dodds.

"No more from yours,

"MATHEW ROCHE."

That is what I heard of this story. I told Mr. Roche what might be his danger, from what I conceived to be good authority. That I had foundation for making the statement, I will read a few extracts. The hon. gentleman who honors me by making this charge, the leader of the Opposition, is associated with a great party in this country; it has been a great party, and it is recognised by his followers as a great party; but there was a member of that party of the name of D. A. Macdonald, who was Postmaster General in the former Government, and who for his services to the party was afterwards made Lieutenant Governor of the great Province of Ontario. To the postmaster of Carillon he wrote in these words:

"You are reported to me as taking a very active part against the Government candidate for Argenteuil county. I will only add I think you are making a mistake. Government officials should not oppose the Government candidates."

That I conceive to be good authority for warning my personal friend that he ran a risk. But I do not need to go beyond our own Province for authority. The Hon. Wm. Ross, who was promoted for his services to the party to which the hon. gentleman who has made this motion belongs, the Hon. Mr. Ross, now the collector at Halifax, for whom I have the greatest amount of respect, writing, it is alleged, to a man by the name of Egan, at North Sydney, directly threatened him with dismissal from his office if he took an active part, in the election then being held, against the Government candidate, and instead of his action being condemned by the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite, he, in return for his activity, was made collector. We have further the judge in the county court in the county of Pictou, one of the *ad hoc* judges, as they were called, the hon. Mr. Johnston, in the trial of an election petition against Mr. Carmichael, then a substantional supporter of the hon. gentleman's party in this House, in which case it was proved that Mr. Carmichael had threatened the postmaster at Glengarry, held that the Government officer having been warned that in taking an active part in the election, he was liable to dismissal, that

was not sufficient ground for the annulling of Mr. Carmichael's election; and hon. gentlemen opposite rewarded Mr. Johnson by promoting him to a permanent position as one of the judges of the county courts of Nova Scotia. There are instances of judges in Nova Scotia giving like decisions, in that *ad hoc* court, in the election campaign of 1872, and notably one in my own county. I suppose nobody will dispute my authority when I quote the *Globe*, which gives a report of a discussion that took place in this House in 1874, and I am glad the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) is here, because it is not reported that he denied the statements attributed to him by Sir Charles Tupper, according to the *Globe* report. Sir Charles Tupper then used these words:

"Mr. TUPPER went on to say that during the late Dominion elections the hon member for Halifax had said at a public meeting in the Temperance Hall in that city, that if any official of the Government voted against him, it would be at his peril, and that Mr. Annand had come down there and said that he had just been at Ottawa and seen Mr. Mackenzie, and that gentleman had told him the same thing; and Mr. Jones—the then Minister of Militia—did not deny this, but spoke upon his own responsibility."

Now the leader of the then Government (Mr. Mackenzie) is reported also, in the discussion which arose out of the dismissal of the Arnprior slide master, to have said:

"They—referring to the Opposition—had allowed that forbearance to go a great deal too far in protecting men who had used their offices in order to injure the Government they serve, but he could tell the hon gentleman opposite and all such office holders that that was at an end."

This, therefore, was recognised in Nova Scotia as the Mackenzie doctrine.

Mr. KIRK. No, it was never so recognised.

Mr. DODD. It was recognised by the supporters of the Mackenzie Government that an office holder who took an active part in elections was liable to dismissal, and I thought, and I still think, that I was simply acting the part of a friend when I warned Mr. Roche that if he took an active part in the election he was liable to dismissal. Let us come to the facts. Mr. Roche, according to the indictment of the leader of the Opposition, would appear to have been dismissed from a particular office; but he has never been dismissed from any office, as he still occupies the position he did at the time of the election, that of commissioner of pilots for Lingan. But I will tell you why the commission of pilots was remodelled. While I was in Ottawa that year, a difficulty arose. Mr. Livingstone, who had for years been the collector of pilotage at that port, was dismissed at a formal meeting of the board, at which three of the five commissioners were present, and the brother of one of the commissioners was named in his place. The pilots, Liberal and Tory, Protestant and Catholic, petitioned, to a man, that Mr. Livingstone should be reinstated. His dismissal annoyed the business men of the port to such an extent that the secretary of the board threatened to resign. Every business man connected with the industries of that great port,—and in that, I think, the leader of the Opposition will agree—the great port of Sydney, petitioned against his resignation and that he should retain his place, because he alone understood the business of commission. This was brought to our notice, and we found from the fact that the collector had been dismissed and a new one, the brother of a commissioner, appointed, it was essential something should be done. The commission combined in two great ports, two lesser ports in the harbor of Sydney with the two great ports of Sydney North and Sydney, and the outer ports of Caledonia, Lingan and Little Glace Bay. As regards the outer port of Lingan, where Mr. Roche lived, we decided that the better way would be, in order that there might be no clash of opinion between the parties living in the outer ports and those living in the inner ports, that the outer ports should be amalgamated into one pilotage commission, so that the commissioners should live at the ports over which they had juridiction; the pilotage Commission declared emphatically by by-law that disputes arising with masters of vessels should be referred to the nearest pilotage authority, as it was impossible to expect a shipmaster to travel twenty or thirty miles in order to have a dispute settled. They decided, in the interest of the trade and commerce, and in the interests of shipping, that it was right, perfect and just, two boards should be formed, one of five men having the exclusive jurisdiction of the two great ports of Sydney and North Sydney and the minor ports within the harbor of Sydney, and the other composed of men living at or near Caledonia, Glace Bay and Lingan; and, in remodelling those ports, we left Mr. Roche at Lingan, where his property and business are situated, because in attending to the important port of Sydney he had to travel twelve miles. It is quite true a moderate remuneration is attached to the work; I do not know how much. The Act specifies none, but an allowance is made for travelling expenses and a small fee is allowed, and Mr. Roche gets the same small fee now, I presume, as he got then, and exercises the same jurisdiction as he did then over the harbor of Lingan, to which he was specially appointed. He knows no more of the harbor of Sydney than any hon. gentleman opposite; he is simply appointed for the harbor of Lingan to see that the pilots there are competent to discharge their duties, and that power he is exercising at present. Such is the position of the matter, and I am astonished that the leader of the Opposition should state that Mr. Roche was removed, and removed in the manner he alleges. We have done nothing but what we conceived to be our duty, under the circumstances; nothing but what we considered to be our right, and if, on account of the exercise of a little chicanery, and because of a little annoyance at circumstances, of which I did not know for months afterwards, I wrote a hasty letter, as is alleged here, it was not in furtherance of a threat or to carry out a threat, but because there were circumstances brought to my mind, which are specifically proved, which justified the course I took, and I regret the hon. gentleman has not been able to get his committee; circumstances which would convince any man in this House and in the Dominion of Canada, that Mr. Roche's dismissal would have been the most justifiable act that this Government could have done, or that I could have demanded. A man who travels from one end of his section to the other with the view to influence in a highly improper manner, as I have been informed he did, men to vote, should be dismissed and should not be permitted to retain his office, if he holds one under a Government. He has no right to do so; and, sustained by the authorities which I have quoted, and of which the reports of the House of Commons debates are full, and which can be sustained by dozens of other authorities unnecessary to quote, I consider that, under the circumstances which I have detailed of the going to pieces of our board there by the dismissal of this man, I was only exercising my right and doing my duty. I may say to the hon. the leader of the Opposition that Roche is not the man who was dismissed. Another man was left off the board, who had appointed his brother the collector, and, if he could discover and had gone to the depths of this thing, he would find that the trouble does not arise with Roche, who is perfectly satisfied, occupying to-day the position he has always occupied, but that it arises from a source of which no mention is made in this indictment.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I have nothing to add to what my hon. colleague has said except that, in any part I took in the matter, I acted for the best interests of the public. I felt that the conduct of certain members of that board was such as required the interference of the Government, and, in view of that fact, it became the duty of my

hon. colleague and myself to make such a recommendation as we thought would best serve the public interest. We have done so, and Mr. Roche, in whose behalf the hon. member has brought up this charge, is occupying a position to-day fully as lucrative as he occupied before our interference. This is all I have to say except that I do not object to the leader of the Opposition obtaining any comfort or satisfaction he can obtain from an investigation by a committee of this House or any other committee in reference to the matter.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not intend to trouble the House at any length on this question, on which, but for some of the words used by the hon. member for Cape Breton who first spoke (Mr. Dodd), I should have not said anything. The hon. member has, however, stated some things which seem to require a brief reference from me. First, he has stated that Mr. Roche is perfectly satisfied and contented, occupying as good a position as before, and that this comes up not at his instance but at the instance of some one else whose name has not been mentioned. I have in my possession letters addressed to myself from Mr. Roche conveying his statement of the circumstances, and requesting me to bring them under the attention of the House, so that, whether Mr. Roche himself, as he states in his note, be the correct exponent of his own views, or the hon. member for Cape Breton, I am not to judge. All I can say is that I have heard from Mr. Roche directly in a very different sense from that which the hon. member for Cape Breton puts forward. Then the hon. member for Cape Breton says that he warned Mr. Roche that, if he interfered actively in the election, certain unpleasant results might possibly happen, and he quotes a number of authorities which he thinks justified him amply in making any such statement. I do not know that these are very good authorities for the hon. gentleman. They might have been had such been his statement, had such been the circumstances, had those who made the statements been still in possession of the Treasury benches, but they were not in possession of the Treasury benches, and it is the policy of the hon. gentleman's own friends and leaders, which is really important to be looked at by him, to decide what advice or admonition he might extend to his friend and supporter, Mr. Roche. However, the statement I have made, and which is justified by the information I have received, is not a statement that Mr. Roche was informed by the hon. gentleman that, if he interfered actively, and, as the hon. gentleman now states improperly —because he states that he interfered improperly to influence voters—he would run any risk; that is not the statement contained in the motion which is before the Chair. The statement is a statement with reference to the act of voting. That is the statement upon which the charge is based. Then, the hon. gentleman says that, after all, nothing was done, that the circumstances which took place were circumstances due not at all to this consideration of the action of Mr. Roche, whatever it was; that they were due to the necessities, the commercial and other necessities, of the ports, and to certain events in the conduct of the business connected with the proposed retirement of some of the officials, which had rendered it fit that a change should take place. As I gathered, the conclusion which the hon. gentleman desired to bring the House to, it would be that what was done in the case of the remodelling of the board had no relation at all to, was in no sense consequent upon, Mr. Roche's conduct in the election or the threats, or advice, or admonition, or counsel, or exhortation, or what you please which the member for Cape Breton had been good enough to extend to Mr. Roche, but that it was due in fact to a desire to comfort Mr. Roche, to place him in a good position, in such a position that he would not have to travel twelve miles in order to do his business, but would find his business at his door. Now, my principal information upon the point, as to the circumstances under which this change took place and the reasons for it, is derived from a letter which has been supplied to me, written by the hon. member, purporting at any rate to be signed by the hon. member, and I believe signed by him, and received by Mr. Roche, which letter is dated the 21st April, 1885.

"HOUSE OF COMMONS, OTTAWA, 21st April, 1885.

"TO MR MATHEW ROCHE.
"Lingan, Cape Breton.

"DEAR SIR,—It is quite true that it is in view to remodel the pilotage commission. You must remember that it is the invariable rule, where a Government officer votes against the Government candidate, as you did in the case of the election of McDougall and Mr. McKay, that he runs the risk of being turned out. Mr. McDougall thinks that a friend of his should have the position which you hold, and I cannot object to him placing him there, for the reason that I personally told you what the consequence would be if you voted against him, and further asked you to vote for him because he was the Government candidate brought out and selected by them to carry the county, if possible, in their interests. Knowing all this, you assumed the responsibility of the course you pursued, and having done so I fear you must submit to the consequence.

"Yours very truly,
"MURRAY DODD."

Mr. McCALLUM. Does the hon. member who has just taken his seat mean to say that is a corrupt act? I would like to know that.

Mr. BLAKE. I do.

Mr. McCALLUM. Then you are equally guilty. Do you not remember the case of John B. Smyth, of the Welland Canal, who was suspended from his position, and who waited for four years on the Government of that day to know what were the charges against him? We do not find that they cautioned him, or that they ever even told him what was against him. Of course, when the Government changed in this country, the present Government did justice to Mr. Smyth by reinstating him in his former position. I do not look upon this myself as a very serious charge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh, no, certainly not.

Mr. McCALLUM. No, certainly not. They are not charges which should make it necessary for Mr. Dodd to get up in this House to defend himself against them, as you did in the Local Legislature—and I have got the evidence here in my hand—when you made charges and appointed your own commission. I refer to the time when Mr. Cameron got up in the House saying there was some undue influence brought to bear upon Mr. Wood. The hon. gentleman got up and amended his own charges. I will read what took place:

"The Hon. Mr. Cameron moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Carling, That a select committee be appointed to enquire whether any, and, if any, what corruption, inducement or offer was made to the Hon. E. B. Wood, a member of this House, to induce him to resign his position as Treasurer of the Province of Ontario, by the Hon. E. Blake or any other member of the present Administration, while members of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly, such committee to have power to send for persons, papers and documents, and to report thereon to this House; and that it be an instruction to such committee to return the evidence taken before it to this House.

"The motion as amended having been put,

"The Hon. Mr. Blake moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, That the words 'or any other member of the present Administration while members' be struck out and the following words be inserted in lieu thereof:"

You see what he wanted, he wanted to save himself. He would not allow it to cover other members of the Government. They might bribe as much as they liked. Then, Sir, he formulated charges against himself and he appointed his own judges. He is now very much offended because a man is being changed from one Pilotage Board to another. Oh! what a terrible charge. Why, Sir, I have known them to discharge a good many more members than that, but I do not think it is necessary to speak of it here, because they are not governing the country now. Of course when they were governing the country it was perfectly right to do anything at all, no matter whom they discharged. It is just as I said the other day: "purity, purity," when they are

in Opposition over there, and practice "corruption, corruption" when they are over here in power.

Mr. McNEILL. Prior to the general election of 1882, Mr. Grange was Divisional Court Clerk in Paisley. He was informed by a gentleman who took a very leading part against me at that election that if he voted for Mr. McNeill he would be "looked after." He said that he intended to vote as he had always done, for the Conservative candidate. He did so. Within a few hours afterwards—I think, if my memory serves me aright, within two days afterwards—a gentleman was sent down to investigate the affairs of his office, and he was dismissed.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman for Monck (Mr. McCallum) has given a very little text and a great deal of commentary. The hon. gentleman promised to read the motion but did not keep his promise, for while he referred to the amendment moved by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition on that occasion, the hon. gentleman did not read the amendment. Now, Sir, it is perfectly clear to the apprehension of the House what the reason of the hon. member was.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I did read it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman did not. The hon. gentleman declared that my hon. friend moved to leave out certain names, but he did not finish reading the motion.

Mr. McCALLUM. Do you want me to finish it now?

Mr. MILLS. If any hon. gentleman in this House were to say that some hon. member had violated the law in precisely the same way that it was stated certain members of the Local Government had violated it, everyone would see how unreasonable such a proposition was. The leader of the Opposition, on that occasion, made a specific charge against my hon. friend. Did he object that there should be an enquiry? Did he contend that there was nothing in that enquiry? My hon. friend objected to that resolution so far as it related to other members of the Government, without specifying who those members were. And I say that was a reasonable objection, the reasonableness of which would be recognised if the House were to listen to the charge of the leader of the Opposition against the hon. gentleman in the motion of enquiry that is now before the House. What is the statement made by the hon. gentleman? That the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Dodd) has warned a certain officer that if he voted in a particular way the result would be that he would be dismissed from his office. That is the statement. Now, what does the hon. gentleman say? First, he says the charge was unfounded, and in the next place he admitted the charge was true. He admitted that the letter had been written; he admitted that he warned the gentleman what would be the probable consequences of his action if he ventured to vote against the Administration. He told him that it was an invariable practice that when a man was entrusted with the franchise who, at the same time, was in possession of a Government office, that if he ventured to exercise his independence and to vote in accordance with his judgment, though he did not happen to be on the same side of politics, he was liable to be dismissed, and the hon. gentleman warned him that in all probability that would be the consequence of his action if he failed to vote for the Government candidate. Well, Sir, my hon. friend has read the letter written after this rumor went abroad by the hon. gentleman, and what does the letter show? Does it not show in the clearest possible light, that the statement is well founded, and that he did warn the man that if he voted against the Government candidate in all probability he would be dismissed, and that he could not interfere on his behalf, that he deserved his fate if the Government chose to remove him from office? Now, Sir, I say there is no practice better established than that when a Government or a candidate interferes with the freedom of an elector and uses undue influence and threatens him with dismissal if he votes in accordance with his convictions and against the Government candidate, it is an undue influence which, if brought forward in time and in the proper way, ought, at all events, to void an election. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman does not pretend to say that this charge is not well founded. His own letter shows that it is so. His own letter shows that this man Roche was practically removed from office because he ventured to support the candidate that was not the Government candidate.

Mr. McCALLUM. I would ask a question. What is the penalty if you prove all you say? Then why take up the time of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is one of the members of this House who think that it is right and proper that the officials of the Government should be entitled to exercise the elective franchise.

Mr. McCALLUM. No.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, the hon. gentleman supported that proposition last year, because that proposition was embraced in the Franchise Act which he supported. The hon. gentleman now says that those parties who hold office under the Government can only exercise their franchise when it is in consonance with the wishes of the Government, that they must support the Government candidate or they are liable to be dismissed from office. What chance is there in this city for the election of a man in opposition to the Government if every civil servant of the 600 entitled to the electoral franchise is told beforehand that if he votes against the candidate of the Government he will certainly be dismissed from office? That is the declaration which the hon. gentleman makes, and it is well the country should know the position which hon. gentlemen opposite occupy. What does the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) say? The hon. gentleman says it is a right and proper thing to do, it is the proper policy to pursue, that there is nothing whatever improper in it. And the hon. gentleman may have in his constituency many Government officials, and he may think it is the proper way to march them up to the polls as the retainers of the Government. Those are men who are in the public service; they are the dependents of the Administration, they hold their office during the pleasure of the Administration, and they are warned beforehand that unless they record their votes in favor of the Government candidate they are certain to be dismissed from office. I say that is a doctrine which I trust this House will not support. I hope this House, in giving the electoral franchise to Government officials, did not give it with the expectation and determination that those parties who were dependent on the Government and liable to dismissal by way of punishment would invariably support the candidates of the Government. That is the gravamen of the charge made in this motion moved by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and unless the Government are prepared to say that it is the right and proper thing to do, that those men who are dependent on the Government should be compelled to vote for the Govment and should not be at liberty to vote against Government candidates, they must dissent from the position taken by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Dodd), and must support the motion of the hon. member for West Durham.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The principle is a very obvious one. It was always understood that any civil servant and any officer of the Government should vote and should confine himself to a vote, that an officer of the

Government should not be a political partisan and go electioneering. That principle is affirmed in the strongest way by the adoption of the vote by ballot. Everyone knows that an official goes and votes as he likes, and no one knows whether he votes for the Government of which he is a servant or against it. But that is not the case here. This man, Mr. Roche, held an office of no pecuniary value, except that if he drove up to Sydney and returned he got his expenses paid. While he had no salary attached to his office he had a very considerable amount of influence over the different pilots whose certificates he controlled, and the warning given by the hon. member was this: If you go electioneering, if you go working——

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the statement of the hon. member. It is: If you go working and using the influence which this office gives you, judging from all the precedents, you are departing from the true principle laid down and you are running a risk. That, as I understand it, is the statement the hon. gentleman made in his place. The warning was given before the vote.

Mr. BLAKE. A warning after the vote would not have been beneficial.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, of course not. The warning was given before the vote, and the member for Cape Breton who spoke first, stated very truly that if the matter was looked into it would be found out, perhaps, that there was very strong reason for taking a stronger course with respect to Mr. Roche than was taken. Now, what happened? Mr. Roche wrote to Mr. Dodd as a friend. He did not feel he had been threatened by the hon. member, but he wrote him as a particular friend; he felt he had rendered himself liable, and he wrote him as a friend to save him, because, although it put no money into Mr. Roche's pocket, the position gave him a little consequence and a little standing. In regard to the course of the Government, my hon friend can explain it.

Mr. McLELAN. It would appear by the notice placed on the paper by the leader of the Opposition that the Government had taken this course with the sole view of displacing Mr. Roche. I beg to say I am responsible for the arrangement made, and I did it in what I considered to be the public interest. The hon. gentleman says that Sydney is one of the greatest ports in Nova Scotia; and so it is. There arose differences in the Pilotage Board of that port. The fact was brought to my notice. I found there were two collectors of Customs, brothers-in-law, upon that board. There was another gentleman, who had since his appointment changed his business in life and become a bridge builder, and was travelling round the country and was very seldom able to attend meetings of the board. There was one member of the board living at Lingan, 12 miles distant, and another at Cow Bay, one of the out-ports; and it was very seldom that all those gentlemen could meet together and conduct the business of the board properly. There had been a collector of the pilotage fees appointed in the port of Sydney, and a special meeting of the commissioners was called at which two or three attended, and they dismissed that officer and appointed another man. One of the members of the board resigned, Mr. Purves, and matters seemed to be at a standstill. I suggested that the outports be joined, and the large port of Sydney be independent, and that there be two boards appointed, one to look particularly after the port of Sydney, which includes North Sydney, and that the other board, with the members living at the out-ports, would be able to attend the management of the pilots of those out-ports. I mentioned to the representatives of Cape Breton that such was my view of the matter and it would be carried out; and I asked them to name gentlemen to constitute the Pilotage Board for the port of Sydney, gentlemen who would be able to attend the meetings of the board and look after Sydney's interest, and also to name a board for the outports. Two boards were appointed, and I believe they have been working satisfactorily. This was done in the public interest and not for the purpose of getting rid of Mr. Roche, or of inflicting any punishment upon anyone who took an active part in politics. I am not disposed to enter upon the question as to whether we should act upon the principle that hon. gentlemen opposite acted upon, as was shown by the hon. member for Cape Breton, that parties should be dismissed for political acts. But, as the First Minister has stated, if there are any men who should be dismissed for active political action, the men who issue certificates to pilots and are able to dismiss them or refuse to grant them certificates by which they earn their living, are those commissioners who ought to be prevented, if possible, from taking active political action. The First Minister has said he does not take any objection to a man voting, but the member for Cape Breton says he warned Mr. Roche that if he took an active part in politics, if he went into politics actively——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McLELAN. That is what the hon. gentleman stated.

Mr. BLAKE. Here is his letter.

Mr. McLELAN. His letter was written long after, and it is to this purport, that he had told him, that he had warned him that if he took an active part——

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Mr. McLELAN. He says now he warned him that if he took an active part in the election against Mr. McDougall, the Government candidate, he would be liable to be dismissed, because that was the policy which had been acted upon by the Mackenzie Government, and he supposed that policy was still in force and might be acted upon in his case. When Mr. Roche appealed to Mr. Dodd, after there were rumors that the pilotage commission was to be remodelled, when he appealed to him to save him upon the board, he replied in the letter which has been read by the leader of the Opposition, that he had warned him, and that he would not interfere in any action on his behalf. That is simply the ground for the charge—that he would not interfere. The whole charge seems to have dwindled, and have become nothing; it is all based on the letter from Mr. Dodd to Mr. Roche, that he would not interfere on his behalf, that he had warned him that if he took an active part——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; that is not the letter.

Mr. McLELAN—that he would not interfere in his behalf. I am surprised that so grave a charge should be made against hon. members of this House and against the Government, and held on the journals week after week and month after month, with the result that on reading the letter it simply amounts to this—that he had refused to interfere on his behalf. I took action on behalf of the Government as Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the public interest, and without reference to any political action that Mr. Roche had taken in the matter. The whole board of commissioners had become thoroughly disorganised, and I believed it was my duty to act, and that the best way to act was to divide the board and create a new one for Sydney and a new one for the out-ports.

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I wish to say a few words respecting a conversation which took place to-day in the

House when I was absent. I think the leader of the Opposition asked some question about the transmission of the resolution respecting Home Rule the other night. After the votes were taken in the morning I asked Reuter's agent here to transmit the vote——

Mr. MILLS. The *Mail's* agent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To send the whole thing, but lest there should be some mistake, I sent for him next morning, and he told me that he had misunderstood me. I meant that the Government should pay the expense, but he said that he had sent only the substance. I thereupon telegraphed *verbatim et literatim* the resolution passed in this House, and cabled also to Sir Charles Tupper to have it printed at once and sent to every member of the English House of Commons.

Mr. BLAKE. My understanding is, Sir, that when the House of Commons speaks, as it did on that occasion, it is under your direction and by your authority that the communication should be sent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That may be, but the information was given perhaps more speedily than if it had been sent by the Speaker, who has no right to use the telegraph.

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

After Recess.

INSOLVENT BANKS, INSURANCE COMPANIES, &c.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 15) further to amend an Act respecting insolvent banks, insurance companies, loan companies, build-ing societies and trading corporations.—(Mr. Edgar.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. THOMPSON. I feel bound to call the special attention of the committee to this clause because it strikes me, in the absence of some explanation as to its necessity, as being an unwise clause to adopt, and one likely to operate unfairly on existing rights. The committee have already passed a clause giving clerks a preference in companies which are being wound up, and this clause makes that provision retrospective. I do not know what companies are being wound up, but without good reason I do not think we should take away the rights of creditors to give preference to others. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman who has the Bill in charge that it is at the least a very extreme exercise of the powers of Parliament, and probably an overstepping of our powers; because when we undertake to deal with the rights of two classes of creditors, and to say that one shall give way and that the other shall be paid, it strikes me that we are interfering with civil rights to a greater extent than we would be warranted in doing in legislating on insolvency or on the winding up of companies. For both of these reasons it appears to me that the committee can hardly accept that clause.

Mr. EDGAR. Of course, it has been decided in more cases than one in our Supreme Court that, in matters relating to insolvency, this Parliament has jurisdiction over civil rights. The case of Valin *vs.* Langlois, and more recently that of Shields *vs.* Peake, have decided that. The Committee on Banking and Commerce, who considered this Bill, did not seem to think this second clause was unreasonable. Take the case of workingmen whose labor increases the value of the property in the hands of the liquidator; they are allowed now to an extent of less than three months' arrears of wages. It does not look unreasonable, so long as the property is in the hands of the liquidators, and the final dividend is undeclared, that these claims should apply.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not dispute at all that Parliament has the power to deal with civil rights in connection with the subject of insolvency. But the point I made was that this section, instead of dealing with the general subject, is dealing really with one or two cases, and is dealing with them only for the purpose of changing civil rights. But, apart from that, it seems to me that parties who are to get a preference under this clause can show no right to it and we may be interfering with vested rights of other persons. The second clause proposes to apply that principle in the case of all estates of companies that are being wound up where final dividends have not been paid; so that if existing creditors are entitled to a dividend of $500, it proposes to vote that money to persons who, up to this time, had no preference. Before we make a preference, some good claim ought to be estabilised on the part of those persons.

Section negatived.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I beg to move, that the said Bill be amended by adding the following section as section 3:—

3. Section eighteen of the said Act passed in the 45th year of Her Majesty's reign, and chaptered 23, is hereby amended by the addition of the following sub-sections:

(2.) Whenever the court is of opinion that it is just and equitable that the company should be wound up, they may make an order for that purpose upon application by petition on behalf of the company, or by any shareholder of the company, notwithstanding that such company is not insolvent.

(3.) When the application is made on behalf of a shareholder such application shall be made after notice to the company in the manner hereinbefore provided, and all the other provisions of this Act, so far as applicable, shall apply to the proceedings for winding up a company under this section.

(4.) Whenever the affairs of a company have been completely wound up under the said Act, the court may make an order that the company be dissolved from the date of such order, and the company shall be dissolved accordingly, and such order shall be forthwith reported by the liquidator to the Secretary of State (Imperial Act, 25-26 Victoria, chapter 89, section 111.)

(5.) The provisions of sub-sections, 2, 3 and 4 of this section shall apply to all companies now incorporated or hereafter to be incorporated under 'The Canada Joint Stock Companies' Act, 1877,' but shall not apply to any other companies or corporations.

I move these clauses because there is at present no Act under which the shareholders of an incorporated company desirous of having their business closed, can appoint liquidators, wind up their affairs and dissolve the company. The Imperial Act (25 and 26 Vic., chap. 89) provides for voluntary winding up as well as compulsory winding up. The Dominion Act (45 Vic., chap 43) known as the Act respecting insolvent banks, &c., only deals with compulsory proceedings, making no provision like the English Act, for winding up the company by means of liquidators under the control of the company. There are many cases where it is obvious the continuance of a company is useless, for instance many of the colonisation companies which have been established in Canada, many phosphate and mineral companies and such corporations. In numerous instances, too, the companies are not insolvent, because a large portion of the stock remains unpaid and subject to call, but there is no benefit to be derived from the companies pursuing their undertaking, because circumstances have made it obvious that they cannot now meet with success, and it is therefore desirable that an economical and speedy method of closing their affairs should be provided. It is true that the shareholders may, by resolution, wind up a company not desirous of continuing business, but they cannot thereby get rid of their corporate existence. The control of the company is liable, at any time thereafter, to pass into the hands of a few interested parties, who may act in a manner injurious to the others, and by injustice do a wrong under what has hitherto been considered a lawful Act. Under "The Canada Joint Stock Companies' Act of 1877," section 72, it is provided that:

"The charter of the company shall be forfeited by non-user during three consecutive years at any one time, or if the company do not go into actual operation within three years after it is granted."

Notwithstanding this enactment, no machinery has been provided by Parliament for declaring a forfeiture under this section. The words of the proposed amendment are the same as those used in the English Act, and my object in moving in this matter is that we may obtain the benefit of the decisions of the judiciary in the numerous cases that have arisen in England. In doing this, I propose to limit the power of the court to companies incorporated under the Joint Stock Companies' Act only; otherwise objection might reasonably be taken that the right of a shareholder to petition for the liquidation of a bank or insurance company not insolvent, might operate injuriously. The proposed amendment, therefore, deals only with companies incorporated under the Canada Joint Stock Companies' Act of 1877; and as Parliament, by section 73 of that Act, reserves power to itself to make further provision in respect of such companies any such objection must fail. Section 73 provides:

"The company shall be subject to such further and other provisions as Parliament may hereafter deem expedient."

It is clear, therefore, that it is quite within the competence of Parliament to deal with the matter. I followed as closely as possible the wording of the English Act of 1862, which provides, in section 79:

"A company under this Act may be wound up by the court as hereinafter defined under the following circumstances, that is to say:
"1. Whenever the company has passed a special resolution requiring the company to be wound up by the court.
"2. Whenever the company does not commence its business within a year from its incorporation or suspends its business for the space of a whole year.
"3. Whenever the members are reduced in number to less than seven.
"4. Whenever the company is unable to pay its debts.
"5. Whenever the court is of opinion that it is just and equitable that the company should be wound up."

For these reasons I ask the House to give statutory effect to the amendments now moved.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

House resumed the adjourned debate on motion of Mr McMullen, for:

Return showing the name and post office address of each person on the superannuated list of retired civil servants, on the 1st day of January, A.D. 1886.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should have very much preferred to have closed my remarks on this question when I had the opportunity of bringing it before the House, but, unfortunately, I was prevented from doing so under the rules of the House which did not permit me to go on after six o'clock. I then took occasion to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Government, in 1884, had retired under the Act 49 civil servants, and that the amount paid out during that year was something like $140,000 over that which the service had paid in to the suterannuation fund. The country had thus lost that amount. I pointed out that, in 1885, we had lost over $150,000 in the same way; and I now want to draw the attention of the House to some facts connected with the working of the Act under the Government of the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie as compared with its working under the present Government. Out of 423 on the list on the 1st January, 1886, 342 have been superannuated by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the remainder, 81, have been superannuated by the Mackenzie Government. Since November, 1878, when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, 453 have been superannuated by them, or an average of 65 a year, while the Mackenzie Government, during their five years' existence, superannuated 256, or 51 each year. This Government, in the first five years of their term of office, superannuated 351, or 95 more than the Mackenzie Government did in the same period. I want to draw the attention of the House to another very important fact in this connection. I claim that those who have been superannuated by hon. gentlemen opposite, cannot have been superannuated, owing to ill-health or old age, while those superannuated under the Mackenzie *régime* must have been, according to the facts before us now, superannuated for old age or infirmity. As I stated before, hon. gentlemen opposite have, since they came into office, superannuated 453, of which we have still on the list, on the 1st of January last, 351; so that only 25 per cent. of them have passed away. Take, on the other hand, the case of the Mackenzie Government, who were in power from 1874 to 1878. They superannuated 256, and on the 1st of January, as appears by the list, there were only eighty-one of those in existence; so that over 66 per cent. of them have passed away. That shows conclusively, that in their case the superannuations were on account of old age or ill-health, and that in the other case, they were to a large extent for political purposes, in order to make room for those anxious to get office. The average yearly allowance for each person on the superannuation list is $470. If you multiply that by 95, the increased number superannuated under the present *régime*, you will find the Government have added $44,650 to the annual charge of the revenue of the country; or, in other words, if the Mackenzie Government had remained in power the demand on the resources of the country, under the working of the superannuation system, taking the increases to the list in the same ratio as the increase during the time they were in power, would have been $158,000, while under the *régime* of hon. gentlemen opposite it is $203,000, a very decided increase. There is another point to which I wish to draw attention. During the time Mr. Mackenzie was in power, hon. gentlemen opposite abused him without stint, because of the number he had superannuated during his five years of Administration. The First Minister and his supporters took Mr. Mackenzie severely to task for what they called his extravagance; they vilified him without limit for the course he adopted, but if he was then liable to be called to answer for what hon. gentlemen called extravagance on his part in the working of the superannuation system, when he only superannuated 51 annually against 65 superannuated by hon. gentlemen opposite, and when the evidences I have given show that the superannuations in his case were mainly owing to ill health or old age; when, on the other hand, it is clear that those in the case of hon. gentlemen opposite were, to a great extent, the superannuations of people in the prime of health and quite capable of performing their duties, it will be seen that hon. gentlemen opposite have thus, out of their own mouths, fully condemned themselves. The Act was introduced in 1870 by Sir Francis Hincks, and, if it had remained as it was, when introduced, the drain upon the country's resources would have been very much less than it is at present. That Act provided for a deduction of 4 per cent. from all those civil servants who received a salary of $600 and over, and 2½ per cent. from those who received less than $600. If that Act had remained, we should have lost during the present year only about $100,000, whereas we have lost $150,000. In other words, notwithstanding the large number who have been placed on the retired list, the civil service would have contributed half the sum annually paid out, whereas now it only contributes 25 per cent. of that amount. The Act was amended by hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir Leonard Tilley, when Finance Minister, reduced the sum deducted from the salary of civil servants over $600 from 4 per cent. to 2 per cent. and from that below from 2½ per cent. to 1¼ per cent., so that the amount received from the civil service has been reduced one-half, while, on the other hand, owing to the abuses of the Act which I pointed out when I spoke on this subject before, the number placed on the list has been largely increased. There is no class of servants in the Dominion paid better than the civil servants, if you take the amount of salaries they

draw for the duties they perform, both in the inside and the outside service. A system of this kind tends rather to induce extravagance than anything else. It has been vastly abused, not only by the Government but by the civil service, themselves, because, in place of living economically, living within their means and laying by something for old age and infirmities, the system has rather tended to induce extravagance and to lead them to depend upon being pensioners at the country's expense when it becomes necessary for them to retire from the service or if they should happen to get sick. It is an injustice to the laboring classes and to the farming community to be called upon to contribute towards the demands of these men out of the Dominion Treasury. The farming class have hard struggling to make headway under the disadvantages under which they are laboring now, and the farmer who takes up a wild lot and hews out a home for himself in the forest, deserves more sympathy and assistance, in his honest efforts to secure something for himself to retire upon in old age. It requires more energy than any civil servants possess, or those of any other calling in life. And where there are items that can properly be disposed of and that we can get along without, we should cut them off and stop the drain upon the resources of the people. In the first place, the system by which civil servants are hired and the manner in which they are allowed to live and perform the business of the country is a wrong one. I have no objection to the civil service examination, but, when a servant is installed in the office, he is permitted to remain there whether he performs the duties or not as long as he lives or until he is unfitted for those duties. Unfortunately, most of the civil servants are installed in their offices on account of political influence being brought to bear upon the Government of the day; and, when once they get the office, they hold it whether they are capable of performing the duties or not. I admit that some are granted a gratuity if they have to retire, but that is mostly on account of sickness and when they themselves apply to be allowed to retire. There ought to be a board of inspection in a position something similar to that of our Auditor General, who would have the supervision of the civil service in every Department. That board should closely and carefully inspect the manner in which the duties are performed by these officers at the different points, and their dismissal should entirely depend upon the report of that board. If the board reported that they were not efficiently and faithfully performing the duties devolving upon them, they should have the power of dismissal and other men should be engaged in their place. I have no doubt that in many cases men are installed through political influence who are nothing short of a nuisance to those with whom they are associated in the performance of their duties; they drag along a miserable time with them, and at the end of ten years—because they cannot be superannuated before—they are placed on the superannuation list and allowed to draw superannuation to the end of their days. Hon. gentlemen find it awkward to dismiss them because they have been placed there through political influence, and it might be a source of offence to those whose influence was used to put them there. There should be a board of inspection completely free from political influence, placed in such a position that they could not be removed except by concurrent action of both Houses, and having the right to enter every Department, every office, every place where a civil servant was performing his duties, and to closely scrutinise, examine and investigate into everything he does; and, if he is found not to discharge the duties efficiently, faithfully and in the manner necessary to their proper performance, so that they can pass their inspection as proper and right, they should have the power to dismiss him, and then the Government might appoint another in his place. The system of engaging men and when once they are engaged, allowing them to remain until they are superannuated or die in the service, is a wrong system. No business man conducts his business in that way. A merchant will have many clerks that do not suit his business, and, when he finds one, he dismisses him. It is the same with bankers and wholesale merchants. You find in no business the same system that we have in connection with the civil service, which is that, when once a man can bring sufficient influence on the Government of the day, to be appointed to an office, no matter how he may discharge the duties, if he has a relative who is a member of the House who can exercise his influence in getting him installed in a Government office, he remains there comfortable and secure as long as he can perform the duties, no matter how imperfect, until he dies in the service or gets superannuated. I am satisfied that there are many in the Departments today who are incapable of performing the ordinary duties devolving upon them. I am glad to believe that we have many men who perform their duties faithfully and ably, but we have many who are not capable of doing that, and the best evidence of it is that so many are placed on the superannuation list, because that appears to be the only door by which to let them out when they are incapable of performing their duties, and it is often used in order to get rid of them. If the system I have suggested were adopted, it would do away with the necessity for using this plan to get rid of useless, inefficient and incompetent officers. I have no desire to occupy the time further in the discussion of this question. I am extremely sorry that I did not get the opportunity of presenting the balance of what I had to say on the occasion when I made my opening remarks, but I felt it my duty to present the balance of my remarks to the House, and I shall feel it my duty to follow this question up from time to time until we can make an impression on hon. gentlemen opposite in favor of the abolition of this system which I am satisfied is seriously increasing the annual outlay, and which will undoubtedly grow to very serious proportions if it is permitted to go on from year to year.

Mr. McLELAN. There is no objection to giving the hon. gentleman the return he asks for, with the exception that it would be a repetition of a return that was brought down a few days ago, and upon which the hon. gentleman has founded his remarks. In that return he had the names of all the persons upon the superannuation list, with the date when superannuated the amount they paid into the fund from the beginning, and the amount paid to each person from the superannuation fund, and I think it would be an unnecessary expense to repeat all this again for the mere purpose of having the post office addresses of the gentlemen who are on the superannuation list. I think when the hon. gentleman moved for the return b fore, he should have added to his motion all the information that he wanted to obtain, so that one return would have answered the purpose. I suppose it was only for the purpose—I do not say it was for the purpose—but the hon. gentleman has made a very lengthy address upon the return which was presented to him. I regret I did not hear all his remarks, but he has wound up by expressing the hope that the system would be abolished. The hon. gentleman, on the day of which he commenced his address, took the ground that because the men superannuated had paid into the fund very small amounts, and some of them had drawn out very large amounts, therefore it was improper and the system should be abolished. In England, where the system is in operation, it is maintained because it is believed to be in the public interest, and that when an officer becomes disabled from any cause, as age or illness, and it is desirable to replace him by a more active person, the

system of superannuation is provided to meet such cases; and they do it without calling on the civil servants to pay into the Treasury, from year to year, any money. They think it in the public interest to keep this system in operation without charging any tax upon the civil servants yearly. Now, the hon. gentleman, in his opening remarks the other day, pointed to a number of cases in which large sums have been paid out and comparative small sums received. He read over a number of those, and on one or two occasions I asked him to give the date. I find, from looking at the returns, that nearly all the large amounts mentioned there are for persons superannuated during the time that his friends held office, and I am sure that, if his friends sympathised with him, and if they believed with him that this is an improper system and should be abolished, they would not, in the year, 1875, when they held office, have used it to so large an extent. The hon. gentleman has given the figures of the total amount that has been paid to persons under the operation of this Act, amounting, as he said, to about a million dollars. Well, very nearly half of that sum has been paid to persons who have been superannuated by the hon. gentleman's own political friends. In going over the list roughly the other day, I calculated the amount that has been paid to persons on the superannuated list, placed there by his own political friends, at over $425,000. Some of these are for very large amounts. Nearly all the large amounts on the list are for persons superannuated by them. I find payments made to parties of the following amounts: $4,000, $18,000, $6,000, $24,000, $10,000, $13,000, $11,000, $8,000, $7,000, $18,000, $11,000, $16,000, all to persons superannuated by his own political friends. I do not mean to say that it was not in the public interest to superannuate these persons, because sometimes, under both Governments, it has been found that changes are necessary in the public interest, and that the services of an officer can be very well dispensed with and a saving effected by the change. I pointed out to the House some time ago that not only in the past year had there been a saving under the operation of this Act of $5,691, but if you go back to the date when the Superannuation Act was passed and take the case of every officer who has been superannuated, and the cases where the vacancy created by the superannuation has been filled by an officer at a less salary, and the cases, where it has not been found necessary in the public interest to fill the vacancy, taking all these savings up to the present time, you will find from the Public Accounts that they amount to an enormous sum. I may, perhaps, be allowed to repeat what I said on that occasion, that, taking every case upon the superannuation list up to 1882, there was a saving in the Finance Department of $18,540; Agriculture, $18,010; Inland Revenue, $42,570; Public Works, $21,014; Marine and Fisheries, $30,263; Secretary of State, $5,482; Interior, $6,893; Customs, $177,398, making a total of $350,183 of savings, against which in three Departments there was a loss, because all the vacancies created by superannuation it had been found necessary to fill again. In the Department of Railways and Canals there has been a loss of $23,000; in the Militia and Defence, $3,725; Post Office, $6,107 making a total loss of $22,857, which leaves a net saving, up to the 13th June, 1882, of $317,327. That was up to the date when the commission on the civil service made their calculation and went over the case of every officer that had been superannuated, and calculating all the saving and all the loss, they made the net result to be the sum I have stated. In my own Department I had the figures brought down to date, and the saving up to 18th March, 1886, was $40,553.51. So the hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in his statement that the Superannuation Act and the working of it has been nothing but a loss to the country. It is true that in some cases men have drawn pretty large amounts of money, those who have been superannuated from sickness or old age; and perhaps the hon. gentleman would sympathise with men in their old age and sickness and allow them a gratuity. On a consideration of the operation of the Act it is manifest there has been a large saving to the country. It would be a misfortune to the country and to the Government if this Act were abolished, and it was not in the power of the Government and the heads of the Departments, when they see that a change can be made so as to render the public service more efficient and a change made in the interest of economy, to effect this under the Superannuation Act. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press his resolution, because, with the exception of the post office address, which is not material, the hon. gentleman is already in possession of all the information asked.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened with some attention to the explanations given by the Minister of Finance in answer to the objections taken by the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, and I will refer to one detail, that in which the hon. gentleman stated that a saving to the extent of $365,000 has been effected since the establishment of this Act. The hon. gentleman has enumerated a number of departments in which savings were effected. I have not the figures, and I have not taken any trouble about the matter, such as looking into statistics; but when the hon. gentleman states that a saving of $30,000 has been effected in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, I should like the hon. gentleman to give in detail where those savings have been made. That is a Department in which I think very few superannuations have taken place, and I am sure the Department is more expensive to-day than it was when the Superannuation Act came into effect; and, if those two statements are facts, I do not see where a saving of $30,000 could have been effected. However, the hon. gentleman has gone into the statistics and I have not done so; I did not intend to take any part in the discussion. But there is a principle involved in this matter, and the discussion has taken a shape to which I always objected. What is the answer to the objections taken by the other side? The reply is: You did just as badly when you were in power. Now, it is about time that kind of argument should cease in this House. There is an independent feeling growing up in this House—it will be still greater after the next election—which will not accept as a satisfactory explanation the statement: You superannuated a larger number and gave larger amounts. The Superannuation Act was brought in at a time when it was thought the public interest called for it. It was only intended to superannuate old and effete officers, and this was to be done in the public interest and not to be abused. I have no hesitation in saying that the Superannuation Act has been abused and used for political and party purposes to make vacancies in the Departments and to appoint other officers. I have read the debate on this subject and listened to a portion of it, and I cannot do otherwise than come to this conclusion, from information I have and from my knowledge of public officers superannuated, men in this very city with whom I am acquainted and men who are in Toronto enjoying their full bodily vigor and the use of their faculties, and who with the experience of several years in the public service, should have been still more useful than younger men. I know of many cases where great abuses have been perpetrated, I will not say by this Government alone but very largely also by the other Government—one is as bad as the other I presume—but abuses exist. An enormous liability has been incurred, and money is paid out from year to year which should not be paid. It is time these abuses should cease. What are the rumors floating about now? From my county come rumors of new superannuations that are going to take place. From other parts of my own Province I hear the same rumor. Letters come to me from officers; an officer in a very important position in the county

of St. John is to be superannuated, and I hear two or three other superannuations are going to take place there of men just as competent as I am to perform public duty, and I do not think I fail in my duty when I am called on to do it in the public interest. If these abuses have occurred, as we know they have, and we hear rumors of many more about to take place, I feel that when such a discussion as the present is opened it is my duty to speak out plainly. Those abuses of the superannuation Act should be stopped, and no man fitted to perform the duties of his office should be superannuated. I mention this not for the purpose of protracting the debate or attacking the Government or the Opposition, but from a sense of public duty, feeling that those abuses do exist, that they are growing upon us, that I have seen no effort to check them, and hearing rumors of men likely to be superannuated who are as fit to perform the duty as any hon. Minister at the head of a Department. I hope that now the matter is before the House we shall hear less of the abuse of the system in the future than we have in the past. I am not one of those who have felt very strongly about the necessity of a Superannuation Act; but I admit there are cases where it is desirable that some method of giving relief to old and faithful servants should be provided by the public. At the same time it was never intended that the Superannuation Act should be used as it has been used during the last ten or fifteen years, as anyone knows who is acquainted with those superannuated and their capacity, and that many of them are occupying prominent positions before the public; it is time I say that those abuses were stopped.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a word in reply to the Minister of Finance. I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman state that last year $5,000 had been saved under the operation of the Act. In my statement I showed clearly and distinctly the operation of the Act last year I showed that under its operation forty-nine officers were superannuated that drew an annual salary of $42,384.09. Prior to these being superannuated, I showed the hon. gentleman had engaged twenty-five new officers to fill a portion of the offices, to whom they pay $15,763.75. I showed there were twenty-four offices yet to fill; and I presume the way the hon. gentleman tries to show he has made a saving is by taking those offices as vacant, and consequently no money is paid in regard to them. What is the fact? Eighty-one officers of the Department in Ottawa drew last year $49,000 for extra work, or an average of $750. These amounts are not charged to superannuation. The hon. gentleman gets credit for the salary which would be paid to those who would hold the vacant offices, and in that way he tries to show that a saving has been made. Allowing that those twenty-four offices were filled at a reduction of 25 per cent. in salaries, the amount would be $12,146.25, and during the time those offices are vacant the Government are paying that amount to clerks in the Department in the shape of extra work. Then, again, if you take these two together—the $15,763.75 and the $12,146.25—you have a total of $27,910. Add to that the amount granted for superannuation, $18,360.62, add the amount you have granted in gratuities, $2,568.03, and you have the gross amount of $48,838.65. Deduct from that the amount of the salaries paid to those you have engaged to fill the offices, and you have a net loss to the country of $6,454.65, or a net loss every year, if you deduct the gratuities, of $3,986.53. But simply because the hon. gentleman does not charge the amount paid to the servants for extra work, owing to the fact that those in the office have been superannuated, he tries to show that they have saved $50,000. I challenge the hon. gentleman to give the whole statement to any competent actuary in the Dominion, and if he will report that his statement is correct, I was going to say that I would not again open my mouth on the question of superannuation, but I say that no competent authority will say that his method is the proper way of calculating the matter. I looked through very carefully the report of the committee appointed a few years ago to examine into and report upon the superannuation system, and I say that anyone who will look into the report with a desire to get at the bottom of it will say that it was more for the purpose of bolstering up the system than to closely and carefully criticise it. I say that the whole system cannot bear investigation. Take the case my hon. friend referred to. What was the effect on that Department last year? Hon. gentlemen superannuated the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, who was getting $3,200 a year. They allowed him $1,008 and they put in another man at $3,200 a year. There was no reduction, and now we are paying that Deputy Minister and the superannuated Deputy Minister $4,208, instead of $3,200; and if you follow out other cases you will find they work out in the same way. I admit that in some cases they do engage men for smaller salaries, but I do not see why the Dominion should not have the right to dismiss a man if he is paid more money than he is worth, just as any ordinary employer would. I would like to know why we should not do the same as any ordinary man, and give our public servants to understand that as long as they discharge their duties faithfully and efficiently they may expect to be retained, but that when they arrive at old age or become otherwise incompetent for their work, they shall be dismissed and others engaged. When you reach that point you will teach these men to provide for their old age, and not allow themselves to be a burden to the country. I am glad the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has drawn the attention of the House to this subject, and I am satisfied it is one of those questions which, if probed to the bottom and thoroughly investigated, will convince any reasonable man that it is an actual fraud, so far as the country is concerned, that the people's money has been frittered away in providing for these men when they should be required to provide for themselves, and that the country should not be asked to support a system of that kind.

Mr. BOWELL. I have not given the attention to this question which is necessary, in order to discuss it fully, but I may say that if all the hon. gentleman's calculations are based on the same foundation as the one he made, when he addressed the House on the question the other night, I fear he has fallen into a number of errors. I think I heard him on that occasion instance the case of a superannuation that took place in Quebec, and he stated that a gentleman was superannuated who was receiving $1,600 a year, that he was retired upon an annual payment of $1,220, and that another gentleman was appointed to fill the position at $1,400. Now, that would leave the impression that the charge upon the revenue of the country, at the present moment, was the $1,400 given to the successor of the gentleman who was superannuated, and the $1,220 which he received. Now, what are the facts? They are that this gentleman was superannuated, and received an annuity of $1,220 per annum. He has been in the service over forty years, and was superannuated on account of his age. No new appointment was made, but another officer receiving $1,200 was promoted and given $1,400. I can give him the names if he thinks it necessary. A second was promoted who formerly received $1,000, and was given $1,200, and no new appointment was made. So that the whole charge upon the country, if you add the superannuation and the $400 given as an increase to the two officers promoted, was just $20 per annum; and yet, if my memory serves me right, he left the impression on the House and upon those who will read his speech, that instead of there being an addition of $20 per annum to the expenditure of the Customs Department at the city of Quebec, there was actually an addition of the difference between $1,600 and $2,600.

In other words, that $1,000 was added to the cost of conducting the Customs business in the city of Quebec instead of an actual additional outlay of $20. I give that as an illustration of one case with which I am familiar, and I hope that all his calculations are not based on such foundationless grounds as this one. I must confess that I am a little surprised at the remarks of my hon. and independent friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). He objected to the argument of the Finance Minister in referring to the superannuations which took place during the tenure of office of the hon. member for East York. I fear he was not present or else he forgot that the hon. gentleman who preceded him specially selected the superannuations which had taken place during the time the hon. member for East York was in office, justifying them on the ground that they were all made for the purpose of creating efficiency in the service and that they were superannuated either on account of sickness or old age. Well, I am not going to discuss that question just now. I quite agree with my hon. friend that it is no justification for this Government doing wrong that their predecessors did wrong; but I think it was quite justifiable for the Finance Minister to point out to the House that if there had been abuses in connection with this question they had existed to a greater extent under the reign of the hon. gentleman's friends than during the present Administration, particularly when the hon. gentleman selected that period and defended the superannuations which had taken place during the time the hon. member for East York was in office.

Mr. MITCHELL. All I objected to was that the Finance Minister should have mainly confined his answer to the statement: You are another; you did it. True it is, we are doing it, but——you are another. I admit that he went somewhat beyond that, but I should like to hear a more extended answer or explanation of the abuses existing than he has given. I object to their answering any charge of misconduct, or maladministration, or abuse of law, by saying: You did it before we came in.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I did not wish to justify what we did by what they had done alone. I said it was a proper thing to do. I said that the English Government did it without exacting any tax from the officer. I said the Mackenzie Government availed themselves of the Act to as large an extent as we had. I said that all three Governments availed themselves of it, and that it was in the public interests. I endeavored to show—and I think I did show, and what I said is corroborated by the instance mentioned by the Minister of Customs—that on the whole it was in the public interest and attended by economy.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should be sorry to have the practice in England set up for us.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to hear the hon. Minister of Finance declare that he is not imputing any blame to the late Government, and I think wisely, because a comparison of their superannuations with those of their successors will not result to their disadvantage. However, it is useless to enter into a discussion on that subject, because no specific charges have been made against the late Administration. What I would like to know is how the savings the hon. Minister of Finance speaks of, were made? He did not elaborate that part of his statement in which he declared that they had saved $300,000 or $400,000—I do not know whether he meant per annum, or altogether.

Mr. McLELAN. Altogether.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know, I confess, how that has been done when the total cost of the civil service at Ottawa has risen from $823,000 to $1,203,000 a year, and the other services in about equal proportion, and when the superannuation list has risen from $100,000 a year to over $200,000. The saving, if saving at all, I suppose, would be in the replacing of elderly gentlemen with younger and more efficient men at lower salaries; but I think, when the hon. gentleman puts together the superannuation allowance and the salary paid to the successor he can hardly show a saving. That point the hon. gentleman did not touch, and I think the House would like to have the process more fully explained.

Mr. MULOCK. The House is indebted to the hon. member for North Wellington for the attention he has given to this subject. It is quite clear that the Act is working against the interest of the country, not only in respect to the direct loss incurred, but having fallen into bad hands and being abused. It offers a direct temptation to members of the service to seek for superannuation. The sooner they get superannuated, the sooner they become secure in a certain income for life, while they are still able to pursue the calling of ordinary citizens. The hon. member for North Wellington has established beyond question that up to the present time we have disbursed under the Act about $1,250,000. In addition to that, we are now paying out annually about $200,000, and receiving in the way of insurance about $50,000, leaving a net loss to the country under the working of the Act of $150,000 a year. I think it is to be deplored under these circumstances that the Minister of Finance should defend the Act as he does, and that he is apparently willing to go further and adopt the Imperial Act, under which civil servants could be retired without paying anything at all.

Mr. McLELAN. I did not say that. I referred to the practice in England, where that was done.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman cited it with approval, so that there is but one inference to draw. Now, for my part, I never could understand on what principle civil servants are entitled to any better consideration than servants of individuals. Is there any person engaged in a business who deals with his employees on such principles? The salaries attaching to the various offices are quite equal to the value of the services rendered; in my opinion, in some cases, they far exceed it. Civil servants can be divided into two classes. One class discharge only the simplest clerical work—manual labor—as writers. There are a few others, such as deputy heads, pretty high up in the service, who have to bring a little more intelligence and education to bear in the discharge of their duties; but with the exception of these few, the vast army of the civil servants are simply engaged in manual work, and therefore should not come under any system of superannuation. Now, if it is admitted that the annual salary attaching to any office is equal in value to the service rendered, it follows that all we give in the way of bonus or gratuity is so much money paid in excess of the value of the service rendered. That being the case, if the Minister of Finance thinks that a civil servant should receive something when he retires, then deduct the money from his salary while he is in the service, and place it to his credit, and let him him have it when he leaves. In doing that, we would only be doing what he ought to do for himself, namely, laying up a portion of his income against a rainy day. I would like to know where men are as well paid as they are in the service of Canada. There are a few great prizes, of course; but compare the salaries paid today in the great monetary institutions with the salaries paid by this Government to their servants, and you will find that the latter compare most favorably with the former, and you will not find that the servants of these great institutions receive annuities at the expense of the institutions themselves. The experience of the working of the Act makes it imperative on the Government at the earliest possible moment to repeal it, and thus to some extent

show their desire for economy. The Minister of Customs, in citing cases of economy, forgot to point out that in some cases the Government have not simply filled vacancies and made promotions. For instance, the Department of Marine under the late Minister was administered with one deputy head; but a short time ago the present Minister found it necessary to have two deputy heads, and I suppose each deputy will be trying to increase his staff so that he may shortly preside over an army of officials. Then, last year it was found necessary to have two librarians, and I see by the public press that these two gentlemen are to go on a trip through the United States to visit every library in the Union in order to inform themselves how best to discharge their duties. I do not know whether they are to travel at the expense of the country or not; perhaps we shall find that out when the Supplementary Estimates come down, or, perhaps, next year we shall see some little item of contingencies to cover that expenditure. Wherever we increase the staff, there is a further permanent charge on the revenue of the country, and I can only say that the duty of Ministers in this matter is, in my judgment, absolutely clear, and that is, at the earliest possible day, to repeal this unsound measure and place this branch of the service on a proper business like footing.

Motion negatived.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 28) to amend the criminal law of Canada. He said: I do not know that I can add anything to what I said when I introduced the Bill. It is an Act to provide for the further punishment of a certain class of criminals known as burglars. There is at present a certain discretion given the judges, which allows them to punish these offences by sentences to imprisonment for periods varying from two years to imprisonment for life. This Bill is more stringent in its provisions. It provides that where parties are discovered having in their possession any implement known as a burglar's tool or any murderous weapon of what kind soever, he shall be sentenced to penitentiary for life, and further that if the accused is proved to have been already incarcerated for an offence of this character, and the second offence being proved against him, he shall be sent to penitentiary for life. I have also introduced the clause by which persons charged with the crime of burglary may be tried summarily before the senior, junior, or deputy judge of the county in which the offence has been committed. I think this measure is in the interests of the public, because the crime is on the increase, and it is necessary for the protection of our property and the lives of our families, that extreme punishment shall be meted out to these offenders. I am not aware of the opinion of the Minister of Justice on this subject, but I think the Bill is one that should commend itself to his consideration and that of the House, and therefore I ask that it should pass its second reading.

Mr. THOMPSON. Although the hon. gentleman has made plain his desire to promote this Bill, through the very laudible motive of suppressing what is undoubtedly a very serious offence, I think it is too stringent in its provisions. The great object of the Bill is to take away the discretion now vested in the judges, in imposing sentences for the offence of burglary. As it is sometime since the hon. gentleman introduced the Bill, the House may permit me to mention what the substance of the different sections is, for the purpose of seeing how radical a change it would make and how far such a change is demanded in the public interests. It is proposed by the first section that a burglar who has, at the time of committing the offence, any burglarious tools or any murderous weapon in his possession, shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life, and that the judge shall have no discretion. At present the punishment for that offence is a life sentence or any less term, in the discretion of the judge. It may be that the possession of a tool of that description at the time of the offence might be accounted for in some way consistent with an intent less criminal than what would be known as a murderous intent; but notwithstanding that, the hon. gentleman proposes to take away all discretion in the matter. Section 2 proposes to take away the judge's discretion, when the accused has been previously convicted of burglary. With regard to section 3, the existing law is this: That every person who is found with dangerous weapons, with intent to break into a dwelling house or other building and to commit any felony therein, or who has in his possession, without ample excuse, the proof of which shall be on him, any pick, lock, key or other burglarious tool, or is found with his face blackened or otherwise disguised, with the intent to commit felony, or is found in any dwelling house or other building, is guilty of burglary and liable to three years' imprisonment. It is proposed by this clause to take away the discretion of the judge and make the punishment a term of seven years. By section 4, it is provided that, after previous conviction of any such offence as that last mentioned, a prisoner shall be sentenced to ten years' imprisonment, without allowing the judge any discretion. I think it is not enough to induce the House to amend the law in so stringent a way, to say that crime of this description is on the increase. I presume there is no class in the community which could more accurately and efficiently judge of the increase of crime and the necessity of vigorous oppression, than the members of the judiciary, and I think I am correct in stating that the powers now given to them are not used to the full extent in any part of the country. If the hon. gentleman were able to show us that these powers had been exercised to their full extent, he would have made out a case, but I think it is unwise, in the absence of any evidence that the crime was so alarmingly on the increase, and that the powers of the judges are insufficient to deal with it, to take provisions which not only will enlarge the punishment, but which will take away the discretion of the judge. Under these circumstances I feel bound, as one, to oppose the second reading of this Bill as being not called for by any state of facts which have been shown to exist in any Province in the Dominion.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I am very sorry, indeed, at the conclusion the Minister of Justice has come to in regard to this matter. It is a notorious fact that this crime is immensely on the increase throughout Canada. It is a notorious fact that burglary has become a profession, and about the most unsafe place that a man can put his valuables in now is a safe. These professionals have become so expert that they defy the sheriff, the safemaker and the locksmith to safely keep valuables. Now, if this crime is largely increasing, is it not fair to presume that it is not being adequately punished, and the Minister of Justice has stated that the judges are not now exercising the law to the extent to which it is capable of being exercised. If that be so, it would be well to affirm the principle of the Bill, without perhaps carrying it out to the extent proposed, and so declare that the crime is not being adequately punished. We know that when crimes have advanced to an unbearable extent, an increased punishment has caused them almost to cease. When garrotting attained such headway in the Old Country, it was decided to punish it by flogging, and that caused it almost entirely to disappear. The crime of burglary is not disappearing, but is largely increasing, and I believe this is largely owing to the inadequacy of the punishment which is inflicted. I am very sorry the Minister of Justice has decided to oppose the principle of the Bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings). In view of what has been stated by the hon. the Minister of Justice, and the matter having been brought to the attention of the House, I hope that in future, if the Bill is declared lost, the judges will exercise their discretion by extending further punishment to this offence, as I do not think the punishment has been as severe as it should have been. I may probably take occasion to bring up this Bill at a future time if that has not been done.

Motion for second reading negatived.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved the second reading of Bill (No. 29) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1874.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr McCARTHY. I thought my hon. friends would understand the nature of the Bill, which is not very long. The object is to lengthen the hours of polling in cities until 8 o'clock in the afternoon. That is the whole and sole object of the Bill. I think, however, that if the Bill is found acceptable to the House, it would be well to amend it in this respect, to prolong the hours of polling not only in cities, but also in those electoral districts of which cities form a part. Of course, in most places, the city itself is the electoral district, but there are some electoral districts in which the city forms a portion and the rest is a part of the county. As to the necessity for this measure, my own experience has been that the laboring man is under a disadvantage when he has to ask his employer for leave to go and record his vote. I think he ought to be relieved from any such disadvantage. I think he should be perfectly free and should be able to go and record his vote without asking his employer. All of us must have noticed, I think, that in going into a place where a number of men are employed, asking them to vote against the politics of the employer, the men feel under a disadvantage, they feel under a compliment, and sometimes they do not like to put themselves under that compliment, if they are going to vote, as they ought to be entitled to do freely, against their employer.

Mr. MITCHELL. Let them vote at the dinner hour.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not always convenient. In large cities it cannot be done. In Toronto, for instance, men work at one end of the city and reside at the other, and it is impossible for them to record their votes without great inconvenience. I have communications from men employed by railway companies, and they find it almost impossible to get away during the ordinary hours of polling. This is not new or experimental legislation. Some years ago, a Bill of this kind was passed in England with regard to certain cities, and last year the hours of polling were made all over Great Britain to extend from, I think, eight o'clock in the morning until eight in the afternoon. I do not propose to go as far as that at present, but I do hope the House will accept the principle of this Bill, which has received the endorsation of the Labor Council of the city of Toronto and also, I think, of the city of St. Thomas.

Mr. GAULT. In the city of Montreal, no inconvenience whatever is felt. It all depends on the season of the year at which the elections are held. From nine to five is quite sufficient. I think the time given at present is ample to give the men the opportunity to vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. I object to the lengthening of the time for two reasons. In the first place, I think the reasons given by the mover are not at all applicable to the present condition of things in the labor market. If I know any thing about it, and I employ a good many hands, I find that the masters are under the control of their employees, and the employees are the people who dictate when they will work and when they will leave it alone. My hon. friend evidently does not represent a city. He has evidently never had anything to do with representing a city, or he would find that it is very difficult to keep men from going to vote if they choose to go and vote. They have more liberty than the masters have in that particular. Then look at the effect of this. An election occurs in the fall of the year, any time from October until March, and you get crowds of men collected in the streets and the polls, and perhaps a good deal of drinking going on, although it is prohibited by the Election Act; you get them excited, and you will find all kinds of troubles and disturbances and election riots will occur. I think it would be most impolitic to extend the hours of voting. Look at it from the standpoint of the candidates of their supporters and their friends. Anyone who has had anything to do with elections knows that they think it quite enough to be on the strain from eight o'clock in the morning until five. My hon. friend has been fortunate. He has gone in by acclamation all the time, I expect, and very likely they may let him do it again, if he and the hon. gentleman opposite meet at the same election. But at all events it does seem to me that no practical difficulty has arisen in relation to the present hours of polling, and that surely nine hours are long enough to keep the polls open. My hon. friend says, that men cannot go to their work, or that they are at their work. If he wants to extend the time, let him add another hour in the morning before the men go to their work, or when they are on their way to work. Then the dinner hour enables them to poll, and if they want to poll at any time of the day, they will leave their work and go and do it, whether their masters like it or not—that is my experience. Now he notes the experience in England. Sir, I think we have had experience enough to know better what will suit our condition of affairs in relation to elections than Englishmen. We go to England for too many of our precedents, and I, for one, am disposed to base our election legislation on our own experience in this Canada of ours, where we know just as much about it, I guess, as they do in England or any other country. I feel it my duty to oppose the Bill.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Besides that, only 200 electors are admitted to vote at the same poll; and I think nine hours are quite sufficient to allow them to register their names.

House divided on motion of Mr. McCarthy.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Blake,	Hickey,	McNeill,
Bowell,	Holton,	Mulock,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Homer,	Orton,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Paterson (Brant),
Casey,	Jenkins,	Robertson (Hastings),
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Scott,
Colby,	Landerkin,	Shakespeare,
Coughlin,	Macdonald (King's),	Small,
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	Springer,
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Sproule,
Dodd,	McCarthy,	Wallace (Albert),
Edgar,	McCraney,	Wallace (York),
Gordon,	McLelan,	Ward,
Guillet,	McMullen,	Wilson.—42.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Desjardins,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Amyot,	Dundas,	McIntyre,
Armstrong,	Dupont,	Massue,
Auger,	Everett,	Mills,
Bain (Soulanges),	Fairbank,	Mitchell,
Bain (Wentworth),	Farrow,	Paint,
Barker,	Fortin,	Pinsonneault,
Béchard,	Foster,	Platt,
Bell,	Gagné,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Gault,	Ray,
Bergeron,	Gillmor,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Girouard,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bourassa,	Grandbois,	Scriver,
Bryson,	Gunn,	Somerville (Brant),

Burpee,	Hackett,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Huron),	Harley,	Tassé,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Taylor,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Hurteau,	Thompson,
Campbell (Victoria),	Innes,	Townshend,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Irvine,	Trow,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd)	Jackson,	Tupper,
Casgrain,	Kaulbach,	Vail,
Chapleau,	King,	Watson,
Cimon,	Kirk,	Weldon,
Cook,	Labrosse,	Wells,
Daly,	Landry (Kent),	Wood (Brockville),
Daoust,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Davies,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Woodworth,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Laurier,	Yeo.—89.
Desaulniers (St. Maurice)	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	

Motion negatived.

SUBSTITUTES FOR BUTTER.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Taylor for Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution declaring it expedient to bring in a Bill to regulate the sale of oleomargarine, butterine, and other substitutes for butter.

Mr. TAYLOR. When this matter was up before, the Minister of Inland Revenue stated that he would bring in a Bill dealing with the manufacture of this article. The House was then discussing the propriety of placing an import duty of 10 cents per pound, and an Excise duty of 8 cents per pound, on this article. Since then the Government have dealt with the import duty in such a way as to prohibit the importation altogether. In conversation with the Minister of Inland Revenue a few days ago he told me that after the action the House had taken to prohibit the importation, he thought it would be better to allow the Minister of Customs to deal in the same way with the manufacture. I have not understood from the Minister of Customs that it was his intention to do so, it is my intention to bring in a Bill, which I have prepared, to prohibit the manufacture and sale of the article in the country altogether. Since the last discussion I have received a large number of letters from different parties in the Dominion as well as in the United States, which I intend to read to the House, although I believe the opinion of the House will support the Bill which I propose to bring in to prohibit the manufacture altogether. The first article I will read is from the *Journal of Commerce*, an authority as good as any that can be found in Canada. In its issue of the 23rd April that paper says:

"BOGUS BUTTER

"The action of the Canadian Government in prohibiting the importation of oleomargarine, butterine and like substitutes for butter, is an important step, being calculated to materially benefit and protect the farming interest and to secure to consumers a healthful article of food. The amended tariff imposing a duty of 10 cents per pound on all imitations of the genuine article, was in itself practically prohibitory, and, under a rigid system of inspection, would doubtless have proved effective, but the feeling of the House was in favor of even more decisive measures, and we fancy there will be little opposition to the final decision of the Government, which prohibits importations under a penalty of $200 for each offence.

"Two good and sufficient reasons have all along been advanced against the sale of artificial butter—firstly, that it is impure in most instances and deleterious to the public health, and, secondly, that it is fraudulently sold as an honest article, and therefore enters into unfair competition with farmers in the production of butter. Both these contentions have been combatted in the United States by the wealthy manufacturers of bogus butter, who have fought the representatives of the legitimate dairy interests even at their National Conventions, on the floor of Congress and in the columns of commercial journals, which claim to take the highest rank. To such an extent is the influence of these men felt, that few publications are found willing to expose them. The N.Y. *Commercial Bulletin*, replying to the charge of a correspondent, that instead of being a staunch friend of the dairy interest, it had, in a quiet way, supported the artificial butter makers, thus describes its dilemma:—'Between the two sides to the hotly contested competition betwixt butter and oleomargarine, this paper finds itself in a singularly unfortunate position. Both parties appear to think they are entitled to our warm espousal of their cause; and because neither get such support, both suspect us of sympathy with their enemy. Because we claim that oleomargarine should be sold on its merits, and simply for what it is and no more, the dairymen charge us with befriending the makers of that product. Because we protest against the oleomargarine makers mixing their article with butter and selling a spurious butter as genuine, the oleomargarine men charge us with being in league with the butter men. Will both sides please understand that the real purpose of this paper is not to please either one, but to get fair commercial justice for both; to protect the dairymen and public from spurious butter being sold as genuine, and to secure to manufacturers of oleomargarine their unquestionable right to make that product and to sell it for what it is.' This statement reads fair enough, but in view of the injurious substances generally used in manufacture and the frauds undoubtedly practised in selling the product as butter, at a price double its real value, would it not be more in the public interest to condemn its manufacture and sale outright?

"There is now a Bill in the hands of the House Committee on Agriculture at Washington which proposes to tax imitations of butter and cheese and give them a distinctive mark, and from the evidence of Dr. Taylor, the microscopist of the Smithsonian Institute, before this committee, and from the registered claims of various patentees, the constituents of oleomargarine, &c., are sugar of lead, bisulphate of lime, borax and boracic acid, salicylic, benzoic, sulphuric, nitric and other acids, cotton seed, almond, peanut, sunflower and mustard seed oils, flour, caustic potash, slippery elm bark and corn starch, stomach of pigs, calves and sheep, and the udder of cows, dry blood albumen and gastric juice, besides sundry others of allied nature, added to and compounded with the fat of various animals, with which is mixed a small quantity of genuine butter, and enough coloring matter to give the whole the necessary rich appearance. This mass is manufactured at a cost varying from eight to twelve cents a pound, and probably sold at twenty-five cents or even higher. In view of these facts, it must be admitted that the various agricultural and dairy associations throughout the United States, which are seeking to secure the taxing and branding of spurious butter and cheese, are, while working in their own behalf acting in the best interests of the public.

"The fraudulent disposal of the stuff is attested to by the evidence before the aforesaid congressional committee of Mr. Joseph H Reall, President of the American Agricultural and Dairy Association. He stated that all imitation butter, amounting now to 200,000,000 lbs. annually, was sold fraudulently, and that in three years, unless the sale of the bogus article was regulated, the production of genuine butter would be stopped. The question, he said, affected all the Northern and Western States, where dairying was a leading interest, while consumers everywhere were being humbugged and swindled. In conclusion he remarked: 'We want imitation butter under national law, because every rogue has a wholesome fear of the police power of the National Government. We want a tax of ten cents per pound put on imitation butter, because it costs twenty cents per pound to make good butter, while they can make butterine for ten cents, the price of lard and little butter added. State legislation has proved ineffective. Twenty States have laws against its manufacture and sale, but they are grossly defied. Fines of $100 are imposed, but dealers say they can pay this sum every month and go ahead with good profit, and many do it.'

"When such is the state of affairs in the United States, the Canadian farmers and dairymen, and consumers likewise, will appreciate the forethought of the Government in discouraging the importation and manufacture of bogus butter in Canada."

I may draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that at a meeting of the dairymen in your own county very strong resolutions were passed, and I presume they were sent to you to hand to the Government as expressing the opinion of the dairymen of the important county of Frontenac. I will read what was said on the subject:

"At a meeting of the Frontenac Dairymen's Board of Trade held on Saturday afternoon, the president in the chair, the question of the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine was discussed. Mr. Henry Bawden introduced the subject of the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine as one of the utmost importance to farmers. He referred to its having been placed upon the list of prohibited articles for importation to this country and stated that this was a step in the right direction and should be endorsed by the farmers. They should go further and demand that its manufacture in the Dominion should be prohibited. He alluded to a recent report to the English dairymen's association made by Mr. Barnum, a scientist, who had made a study of the subject, by which it was seen that in 1885 one-half of what went into England as butter was this spurious stuff and that the amount of oleomargarine that went into England and Scotland was equal to the produce in butter of 180,000 cows. It has also been reported that the manufacture of oleomargarine in the United States had driven out a number of butter makers, and that whereas there were 25,000,000 cows in the United States before the introduction of this substance there were now only 15,000,000. He advocated a motion, to be forwarded to the House of Commons, approving of the course they had already taken, and asking that the manufacture of oleomargarine be prohibited. Mr. Burrows claimed that the stuff was bad, not only for the farmers, but it was detrimental to health. He agreed with Mr. Bawden that the Legislature should prohibit the importation and manufacture of the stuff."

Resolutions were then passed by the meeting. An hon. member speaks of "beer and wine." Never mind beer and wine. It is as important to the farmers, the laboring classes, the mechanics and merchants, and the people

generally that they should have good butter to eat as bad beer to drink. It is all the same whether they die from eating bad butter or drinking bad beer or whiskey. When we get through this Bill we will deal with the whiskey Bill. I will thank the hon. member for East Toronto to allow me to proceed. On Saturday evening I received a communication from a gentleman who now resides in Chicago, and was formerly book-keeper in our establishment. He writes me as follows:

"4057 SOUTH HALSTED STREET,
"CHICAGO, 3rd May, 1886.

"GEO. TAYLOR, Esq., M.P., Gananoque.

"DEAR SIR,—Having seen in papers just received from home that you are having quite a struggle in the House on the matter of butterine and oleomargarine, I could not resist the temptation to write you on the matter. I have been employed here in a business that enabled me to see more, perhaps, of the manufacture of the stuff, than probably any of your constituents, all of whom I am quite certain were they in my place would not only thank you for the stand you have taken, but pray to Heaven that they might never be compelled to eat it. I have for some three months been almost every day through Armour & Co., and Fairbanks' packing houses, and also at different times through Swift & Sons, they three being the principal manufacturers of oleomargarine and butterine here. I have also been more or less through the following packing houses here, viz., The International Packing Co., W. H. Silberhorus, Jones & Styles, Hat-ly & Co., Morrell & Co., Botsford & Co., Fowler Bros., S. H. Oppenheimer, Johnston Packing Co, and nearly all the other smaller ones in and about the Union stock yards of Chicago, and I may say the *modus operandi* in all is very much the same, but carried out probably in a more systematic and extensive scale by Armour & Co. than any of the others. Butterine and oleomargarine is manufactured by them in three different grades called oleo., dairy and creamery, and retailed here at prices from 14 to 22 cents per pound, depending very much in price as to what part of the city it is sold in. I have seen it in the first three named places in almost every stage of its manufacture, and when I tell you I do not nor have not eat any butter on my bread for months, you may know what my opinion of it as a table luxury is, as here you cannot tell if it is butter or dead hogs' grease of the dirtiest and filthiest kind that you are eating. It is composed of all the worst kinds of dirty grease from the cutting floors and other parts of the packing house, melted down in large iron tanks.

"I have seen a small sized hog that died either in the pen or was suffocated or frozen to death, just ripped open and thrown into the tank, without even the hair being taken off or the inside removed, and boiled down with the rest. It is then run out into other tanks and there put through a course of purifying, but when it comes to the churning process, before being classified, it looks more like a huge kettle of rather light colored soft soap, and almost of that consistency. When it comes from the tanks purified it resembles a light colored oil, something like salad oil, but rather thicker; it is then ready for mixing, I believe, with genuine butter, a portion of which is used to give it a taste. It is also colored with carrots and other coloring matter. It is then run into the cooling room, which is a huge refrigerator, and kept over night to cool; the next morning it is taken out and packed in all shapes and sizes of packages. But I assure you if any farmer had seen it made once and thought that was the kind of butter his good wife was making for him to eat, he would take the first through fast train for Chicago and apply for immediate divorce on the ground that his life was in danger and you bet he would get it quick if his case could come before a jury in the same position as himself.

"I could go on and write you a thousand and one other things about what we eat from these packing houses, but think I have said enough on the subject to convince the most skeptical that total prohibition for oleomargarine and butterine, also whiskey, is the best thing that could possibly happen to the Dominion of Canada. I trust I have not tired you with this lengthy epistle, and that you will excuse the writing."

That is all he says with reference to this question, but I may say that he occupied the position of book-keeper for us and I can rely on all his statements. I may just read another letter which I received from a gentleman with whom I am not acquainted, but I presume there are hon. members in this House who know him, and know that he is a gentleman of standing and knows whereof he speaks.

"COUNTY MONTMAGNY,
"CAP ST. IGNACE, 3rd May, 1886.

"—— TAYLOR, M.P.,
"Ottawa.

"I have just read with great pleasure your speech in the House, in relation to the butter and cheese industry. I beg to offer you my most sincere thanks and those of my fellow-farmers.

"I trust your most accurate and practical views on this most important question may receive the support of all the friends of the farmer in Parliament.

"According to my idea such high duties should be imposed as would render it almost impossible to manufacture or import artificial butter or cheese. Let each butter or cheese factory be compelled to have a trade mark showing the quality and place of manufacture, so that when any article is exported to a foreign country the purchaser may be certain as to what he is buying. Inspectors should be appointed.

"Is it not deplorable to see Montreal exporters of butter and cheese, calling themselves Canadians, purchasing butter and cheese from the State of Illinois, and other places in the United States, which are quoted 20 to 30 per cent. lower in the English market, and shipping the same to England as Canadian product. It is highly important that the Government should at once take steps to put a stop to this abuse, if we do not want to lose the reputation of our cheese in the English market.

"As to the letter you quoted, from a farmer, I think he should have signed himself a speculator; for no farmer would entertain such views on the subject.

"I hope, Sir, that your efforts may be crowned with success, and that all true friends of the farmer will assist you to make a good law to protect us. You will thus be entitled to the gratitude, not only of the farmers, but of all the inhabitants of the Dominion.

"With cordial respect and gratitude of a devoted farmer.

"I am, &c.,
"C. SOLYME GAMACHE."

My hon. friend who represents that county says that this gentleman deals in butter as a business and knows whereof he speaks. I can only say that after having had this correspondence and after having read a great deal on the subject since the discussion came up, I am more convinced that ever that the question should be dealt with, and dealt with so that these articles should not be manufactured or sold, and as the importation is already provided for, I trust that when this discussion is over the committee will pass the Bill unanimously.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If I understood the hon. gentleman aright he said he proposed to bring in a Bill, founded on the resolution which he has been speaking to, to prohibit the manufacture of these substitutes for butter. It seems to me rather inconsistent that the hon. gentleman should have submitted to the House a resolution declaring that it is expedient to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, butterine and other substitutes for butter, and then coolly to tell us that the Bill he proposes to introduce is to prohibit it altogether, and to claim that that was his intention at the first. The hon. gentleman, in reply to the hon. member for East Toronto, who interrupted him by a remark with reference to a resolution pertaining to the liquor traffic, said it was time enough to deal with that by-and-bye. I would ask the hon. gentleman what he would think of an hon. member of this House, a prohibitionist, introducing a Bill to regulate the manufacture and sale of liquor. I think he would be considered rather a strange prohibitionist, but still that is the position in which he finds himself with reference to the article now under discussion. The fact of the matter is that the proposition of the Government, and the hon. gentleman expressed himself as being in the same line with them in reference to this matter, was to encourage the manufacture of this article in the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes. There was 10 cents import duty on it, and 8 cents Excise, and therefore there was 2 cents protection to the article to be made in this country, sufficient to induce the manufacture of it and to a very great extent. We know also that when the subject was under discussion on my amendment to prohibit its importation, the Minister rose and said that whilst they were prepared to consent to that, and to yield to the motion I offered on that occasion, they did not say that it necessarily followed that they would prohibit its manufacture. In fact the Minister of Customs, who was prominent in the debate, said he had no desire to prevent its manufacture in this country, provided it was exported out of the country. He did not think we would be justified in preventing its manufacture for exportation. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue expressed himself in the same direction, and the resolution of the hon. gentleman which we are now discussing would also lead in the same direction. True, he says, that he intended introducing a Bill to prohibit it altogether,

but that is entirely different from his resolution. I am entirely in accord with the proposition to prohibit its manufacture. But the hon. gentleman is taking a serious responsibility, because he is bringing in a Bill which, of course, the Ministers will not support, and I notice that not many motions in this House are carried without their support. He brings it in in direct contradiction to the Bill now before the House for several weeks, introduced by the Minister of Inland Revenue, in which provision is made for granting licenses and giving permission to manufacture these articles and to deal in them—permission even to deal in them without manufacturing them here for export alone. Therefore the hon. gentleman may find that he may not be able to carry his Bill, inasmuch as the Ministry will, in order to be consistent with their own Bill in the House, have to vote against it. But he may rely upon it that he will receive the support almost unanimously, and I believe unanimously, of hon. gentlemen on this side for the Bill which he now intends to introduce, though differing from the one of which he gave notice.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) should be the last one to complain because the hon. member for Leeds goes a little further in the right direction.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am not complaining.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood him so, and he should not complain, because he himself introduced an amendment even going further, and prohibiting the sale of these articles altogether. Since this question was before the House before, I have had occasion to visit my constituents and to consult with some——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order; he has spoken already on this question.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for Brant also spoke twice.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No.

Mr. HESSON. I think the hon. member for Grey did not speak after the hon. member for Brant made the motion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. HESSON. He spoke upon the introduction of the resolution, not after the amendment was proposed.

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say that if I am violating a rule of this House, I am doing what a number of others have done before. I think the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) spoke twice.

Mr. BLAKE. The question is whether the hon. member spoke on the motion of the hon. member for Leeds.

Mr. McCARTHY. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to say, when you ruled me out of order, that since this measure was introduced into the House, I have visited my constituency and consulted some of the leading agriculturists in that part of the country with reference to it; and the consensus of opinion was that this is one of the most important measures that has engaged, or can engage, our attention during the present Session, and that the Government should not simply regulate the manufacture of this article, but entirely prohibit it. There are two phases of this question that ought to engage our attention. First, there is the interest at stake—the existence of this article detracts from the profits of the agriculturists of this country, who represent a very large number of the people. The products of the agriculturists of the Dominion last year represented some $35,000,000, which is an indication of how important is any question that affects their interest. We know that for some years past the dairy products of the country have been going down rapidly in price, and it is curious to notice that the reduction in price just about corresponds with the amount of oleomargarine or butterine sold in this or the Old Country. It is becoming a very extensive industry on the other side of the line, and it operates against the interest of agriculturists in both countries. Twenty-one States have already legislated on this question, and have attempted in various ways to regulate it; but finding that useless they have gone further, and have endeavored to stop its manufacture entirely, though in that they have not quite succeeded. England, also, is to-day dealing with this question. Not long ago a Bill of similar character to this was introduced into the House of Commons. I think, therefore, it is not to be wondered at that we should attempt either to regulate or prohibit the manufacture of it in Canada. Then, another phase of the question, which I apprehend is equally, if not more important, relates to the health of the people. It is a fact known to medical men that one common source of disease is the kind of food taken into the human economy. Without wholesome food, it is impossible for people to be healthy, and I think if we medical men paid more attention to the analysis of food, we would find that a much larger percentage of the diseases of the country than we know of to-day are attributable to the kind of food that people eat. Why are analysts appointed to-day to examine the food we eat? We have them all over the country in order to prevent the adulteration of food. It is not because the adulteration is spurious, or because the adulterated article is cheaper than the pure article, but because the mixture is usually found to be injurious to health. It is generally known that if there is any line of food directly injurious to health it is that which contains some taint of putrefaction. It is utterly impossible, in the process that oleomargarine goes through, to eradicate from it those organisms that develop disease in the human economy; and when this is the case, how important is it that we should step in and prevent the production of that which must lead to the deterioration of the public health. Statistics show that a large number of diseases, not only zymotic but other classes, are attributable to these animal organisms, and analysis proves that they largely abide in these articles of food. I saw an analysis of butterine some time ago, which showed that there was not only in it the peculiar animal organism of one class, but many kinds which develop diseases to which the human family are subject; and the chemical ingredients usually employed to destroy disease-producing animalculæ, had no effect on those. Although immersed in them for twenty-four hours, they were moving around with all the evidence of life they had before. This being the case, how important is it that we should consider well before we allow the manufacture or the introduction into this country of an article of food so destructive to the human system. There is another reason why we should deal with this question at the present time, that is, because, so far as known, it is not now manufactured in the country; and there is no time that you can deal so well with such a matter as before vested interests are established. If we allowed manufactures of it to be built up, we would find parties coming here after a while and claiming that they had established vested rights, which we could not take away. Therefore, how important it is that we should deal with the matter now. I am glad to find that the hon. member for Leeds, who has introduced this resolution, has decided to move, not simply to regulate the manufacture of oleomargarine, but to entirely abolish it in the country if it is being manufactured to-day, and to prevent its manufacture if it is contemplated. I have received letters from merchants and farmers in Manitoba, and in various parts of Ontario, and I think the consensus of opinion is that the Government

should introduce a law to entirely prohibit the manufacture and importation of this article.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I have just a word or two to say on this subject. I know that there is a feeling on the part of some hon. members that gentlemen belonging to my profession ought not to say very much on subjects pertaining to the agricultural interests, on the ground that we are not supposed to know very much about them. But as I represent a constituency in part agricultural, I feel it my duty to add my testimony to the volume of evidence which has been given here against the manufacture of what is known as butterine or oleomargarine. I am bound to say, from the statements of my constituents and others with whom I have conversed on this subject, that the concensus of opinion, the weight of authority, favors the prohibition of this article in the country; and I do think, if it is found impossible to frame a Bill upon the resolution the hon. member for Leeds has now upon the motion paper, that it is the duty of this House to allow him to introduce his Bill, because that is the only way of surrounding the manufacture of the article with such restrictions as will practically prohibit it. Although the hon. member for Brant may be, strictly speaking, right in the objection he has taken to the resolution, that the hon. member for Leeds could not introduce a Bill to prohibit upon it, because it simply speaks of regulation, yet it is quite possible for such a Bill to be introduced and to receive the sanction of this House, as will, while regulatory in its nature, amount practically to be prohibitory. Now, I believe in the principle of prohibition in this case. If an excise duty of 10 cents is put upon the oleomargarine manufactured, it does not follow that the stuff will not be introduced, because it must be borne in mind that oleomargarine comes into competition with the higher grades of butter. It does not come into competition with the poorer grades of butter, and we all know that we have not yet established in Europe a market for our butter such as we would like. We have established a market in the Old Country, especially England, for our cheese, owing mainly to the fact that we have a uniform way of making cheese, but we have not a uniform system of making butter; and I must bear testimony, so far as my knowledge goes, to the good that the creameries are likely to do in this province. I have no hesitation in saying that the Government who originated that idea in Ontario deserve great credit. If once we can establish a uniform system of making butter, we can then hope to establish a good market for our Canadian butter in England. If you go into a store where butter is sold, and ask the grocer the price, he will not be able to answer you, without at the same time stating that there are different prices, and the price depends wholly on the quality of the butter. This is owing to the fact that few farmers make the same quality. A good article always brings a good price, 20 cents or more. If it is true, as alleged, that oleomargarine can be manufactured for 6 cents, I can see no reason for preventing the oleomargarine manufactured in the United states paying a duty of 10 cents import, and going into competition with the better grades of Canadian butter. If it is a fact, as alleged, and the evidence in every case is uncontradicted by anything we have heard, that oleomargarine is a dangerous article of food, it becomes our duty, not alone to regulate, but to prohibit its importation. I do not speak from any knowledge of my own as to the truth of the statements made here concerning the deleterious nature of the compound, but I have the right to pay a great deal of attention to the remarks of hon. gentlemen in the medical profession, such as the hon. member for Grey, the hon. member for Cornwall, and other gentlemen in this House, who, from their scientific knowledge, may be supposed to give a correct opinion on this important matter. I have also the right to attach great importance to the evidence given by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who deserves the thanks of the farmers for his efforts in their behalf. Taking all this into consideration, I see no reason why this Parliament should not deem it its duty to prohibit the manufacture of the stuff here. If it be manufactured for 5 cents, an Excise duty of 8 cents can enable the manufacturer to manufacture it in this country. The objection of the hon. member for Brant is this: That, if we do not go on with the Bill my hon. friend proposes to introduce, founded on a resolution now before the House, it is too late this Session to introduce a resolution of a prohibitory character; and if this Bill is allowed to be introduced, we can hedge its provisions as to the manufacture of the article itself around with such restrictions as will prevent its being manufactured in the country. Having regard to the great importance of the subject, and to the fact that the interests of agriculturists outweigh by all odds the interests of all other classes combined, I believe it to be the duty of this Parliament not to hesitate, but to proceed with the Bill which my hon. friend proposes to introduce.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is a notice now before the House that the debate be adjourned. I would prefer that we carried that motion, and wait to see what action, next week, the Government will take in the tariff resolutions.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Before the debate is closed, I would like to say a word or two in addition to what has been already stated. As far as I am personally concerned, I have no apprehension of the unwholesomeness of the food, as I never eat butter and consequently am not likely to be taken in by oleomargarine. To my mind, the most objectionable feature in permitting this article to be manufactured in this country at all, is simply this: Even if we hedge its manufacture with provisions, as was suggested by the Minister of Customs, and permitted the article to be exported, if you look at the export tables and see the quantity of butter we export and the grading which Canadian butter has acquired in the Liverpool market, you will find that only from 16 to 18 per cent. is graded No. 1. That is a sad commentary on the state of butter manufacturing in an agricultural country like Canada; and to allow any article to be substituted for or introduced with our butter, as a companion to it, would have the effect of still lowering its character. This should be regarded with grave apprehension. As to the nature of the stuff and its manufacture I can vouch, not from personal knowledge, but from the reliable testimony of butter dealers in this country, who have special knowledge of those manufactories in the neighborhood of Chicago and Boston. In the former debate I passed round a sample of oleomargarine, manufactured in and brought by a friend from Boston, of which he was offered any possible quantity, delivered at the line, at 7 cents a pound, and I may say, notwithstanding the precautions taken by our hotel caterers, that quantities of that article were sold in this city during this Session. I have that on the testimony of a butter dealer. To permit an article that can be so readily substituted for butter to be manufactured and put on the market is a dangerous policy. I go for complete exclusion and complete prevention; first, the exclusion, in order to protect our people from the deleterious effects upon their health, and then the prevention of the manufacture in order to prevent the deterioration of the character of our export butter. One reason why they are able to introduce butterine and to substitute it for genuine butter is that, when it is in this semi-fluid state which the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has referred to, a portion of genuine butter is introduced before the oil congeals in order to give it the butteric acid odor, which is a principle that cannot be produced artificially; so, to further deceive the public and the consumer, a small portion of genuine butter is introduced to give that flavor which could not be given in any

other manner. So they resort to all manner of schemes to cheat the public and the consumer. I claim that, if you allow it to be manufactured in the country at all, you can devise no system of branding to surround its manufacture for exportation which will prevent its being introduced into the consuming market of this country, and that is another reason why we should totally prohibit its manufacture. As to the reference which has been made to the diseased germs contained in this material, I believe that a large proportion of these minute, microscopic, germinating elements of disease from hogs and diseased cattle is carried through all the processes of its manufacture, and that they continue to germinate and increase in the oleomargarine. It is notorious that a large proportion of the Illinois and Chicago hogs die from hog cholera, and they are picked up along the way stations at from 1 cent to 1½ cents a pound, and dumped into the vats, and made into oleomargarine for the American market, for the Canadian public if we permit it, and for the British market as well; and I have no doubt that the diseased germs are carried through all the processes of manufacture. I think that in the interests of the community this article should be excluded; and that we should permit an article to be manufactured which would spread disease among our friends on the other side of the Atlantic, in whom we take so much interest just now, is neither humane nor patriotic.

Mr. BLAKE. I was rather surprised to hear the last proposal of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). He began by proposing that we should pass a law to regulate the sale and manufacture of oleomargarine, then he proposed to prohibit it altogether, and at a later stage he proposes that we shall take the third course, do nothing at all, because, if the proposition that the debate shall be adjourned, which was simply made in order that the member for Grey might have an opportunity of speaking twice on the subject, should be adopted, it is quite clear that he will be able to get no further.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I believe it would be well if we could establish the system in force in the Old Country, and, as Ireland is so prominently before this country just now, I may say that it makes the best butter in the world. The reason is that, when a man brings his butter into market, the gentleman who is appointed by the Government to test it goes around and marks it No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, or No. 4, which is according to the kind of butter, so that there is this protection, that they can get No. 1 quality at No. 1 price. But who is to go to the different markets in the different sections of the country to tell if we are to have this kind of butter or not? Who is to keep it out? Who is to watch it? Who is to test it? Who is to mark it? It is a matter the Government should take into their serious consideration. It is not a matter for a private member to deal with, but for the Government. The hon. member says that he is willing that the motion to postpone the Bill should be carried in order to see what the Government are going to do. It is a serious matter. If everything which has been said by different medical gentlemen is true, it is a matter that every member is interested in, irrespective of party or locality, and I think the Government should announce at once what they are going to do and how they are going to do it. It is not for members to do this as long as the Government is responsible for prohibiting it from being manufactured or from being brought into the country. I think the hon. gentleman is right to allow his Bill to lie over for the present to see what the Government is going to do; and members on both sides of the House and from each locality should impress upon the Government the necessity of dealing with it. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) who uses more butter perhaps than any other gentleman in the House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Yes, I am correct. He uses more butter, I believe, than any other member in the manufacture of the goods he sells throughout the country, and he sells a great deal in Hastings. In speaking of that matter, the hon. member does not think I am saying anything unfair or unjust to him; but he made a motion. What did we find? It was that the Reform party were to take the wind out of the sails of the Conservative party, as if this matter was to be made a party question. I contend it should not be made a party question or a locality question, but the Government should take note of it in that way and in that manner and in that shape which will protect the agriculturists of the country and protect the people against using what is so injurious to health, according to what the doctors on both sides have said.

Mr. GUILLET. I sympathise with the remarks of the member for East Hastings (Mr. White), but I feel assured that the hon. member who has introduced this resolution has great confidence in the Government, otherwise I do not think he would have consented to the adjournment of the debate. This is a very important subject. We have a country which has unlimited resources for the production of butter and cheese, and the production of these articles is yet in its infancy, and we should be very careful in allowing the importation or the manufacture of such an article as we have had described on both sides of the House. It is well known that it is impossible to place around the manufacture of oleomargarine such restrictions as will protect the consumer from imposition. It has been suggested that in the neighboring States where the matter has been discussed in the Legislatures, in the Legislature of New York, it was proposed that butterine should be of a color different from the natural color of butter, that it should be colored pink or blue, or some color which is not the natural color. That would be a good precaution, but it would not be sufficient, because it is easy for the dealer to work the oleomargarine over and color it afresh after it comes into his store, and then the article would be sold as genuine. Even if you put it in peculiarly shaped packages, it could be removed from those packages, and in no way that I can see can you guard the consumer by any precautions which will prevent his being imposed upon. It is well known that our cattle trade has obtained its enormous dimensions from the fact that none of these new diseases among cattle have been discovered in this country. Now that has been a very important circumstance for Canada, and has been the means of largely developing our cattle trade. The Government have taken precautions to prevent the introduction of disease, and if we take similar precautions to prevent the manufacture and importation of such an article as oleomargarine it will tend to improve the character of Canadian butter abroad. No doubt it will improve, it is improving now, and by the operation of these creameries in the west, and by the operation of the agricultural establishments that are now being promoted by the Dominion Government, I have no doubt that one result will be the improvement of the quality of our Canadian butter. But, if in the meantime, we allow its character to be compromised by the manufacture of such stuff as oleomargarine, to be sold abroad as Canadian butter, the effect will be to make our butter itself suspected in the minds of people who may buy it, and it is already being compromised by the manufacture and importation of this substitute. We know that disease does exist, to a large extent, among American hogs, that the disease of trichinosis as well as hog cholera, prevail extensively in the west, so much so that the German Government has prohibited the importation of American pork, and that fact has compromised their trade very considerably in Europe. Now if it becomes known that such an article as artificial butter is being manufactured in this country, which may contain the germs of disease, as it is liable to be manufactured

from diseased animals, then, of course, our butter trade abroad must be very seriously injured. I feel that I should be wanting in my duty to my constituents did I not raise my voice on the floor of this House and point out the danger to which our butter trade is exposed from this article. I do not think that I am more fastidious than other people, but since I have become acquainted with the character of oleomargarine, I have felt an irresistible suspicion, when butter was placed before me, that perhaps it was not after all the genuine article. It will really be a very serious annoyance when the people feel that they are liable to have such an article imposed upon them, and it will become a serious question indeed to our Canadian farmers, and will, I fear, prove very injurious to the public health, if such an article is made or imported into this country. I have much pleasure in supporting the proposition of my hon. friend, and I hope that if the Bill itself is not brought forward, some other proposition will be made by the Government which will exclude this article altogether from our commerce.

Mr. ORTON. I desire to endorse the action of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to a large extent. I am prepared to state as a medical man that the process by which oleomargarine is made, does not prevent the possibility of germs existing after the manufacture of that article, but I think that upon the broad principle that the public health requires the protection of the purity of an article like butter, we are justified in excluding oleomargarine from the country. I think that the Government ought, simply as a matter of protection to our agricultural interests, to take action in this matter. I am rather astonished after the discussion that has taken place, that the Government have not expressed their views, or indicated the action they are going to take upon this question, and I hope before the discussion ends they will give us an expression of their views. For the protection of our agricultural industries we ought to prohibit both the manufacture and the importation of this article. I also desire to endorse the sentiments of the hon. gentleman for East Hastings (Mr. White) with reference to the importance of the inspection of butter. I think it is highly important to agricultural interests as well as to the comfort and health of the public, that there should be at all the great market centres an inspector of butter appointed by the Government, with certain reasonable fees, so that people may be sure of purchasing good butter. I think by that means a great deal could be done to improve the manufacture of butter in this country, and it is important that the character of Canadian butter should be maintained at the highest possible point.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I am glad to see that the world moves in the direction it is doing now. I listened attentively to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), when he introduced this measure, when he, for the first time, brought the matter to our notice. If I recollect rightly, he congratulated the Government that they had taken steps to impose an import duty of 10 cents and an Excise duty of 8 cents per lb. upon this article, and I think he also told us that evening that he had previously waited upon the Government on behalf of some of the dairy associations, and proposed that they should put a uniform rate of 10 cents per lb., Customs and Excise, upon the article. I congratulate the hon. gentleman to-night that he has asked the Government to prohibit altogether the manufacture of this article. Whether that is in his original notice of motion or not, I think he is taking a wise step, and I think, after the graceful manner in which the Government conceded the entire prohibition of the importation of the article, it would only be a fair compliment to that action, for the Minister of Inland Revenue to put a prohibitory clause in his Bill, instead of the regulating clause they now propose.

Sir, we have heard a great deal to-night on this question from the farmers' standpoint. Well, that is an important side of the question, but if the statements of the medical men made here to-night receive the weight and influence to which they are entitled, I think it is plain that the health of the general public requires a little attention as well. There is no doubt that the manufacture of this article under hydraulic pressure, and at a low temperature, out of the—I shall not say polluted materials that have been referred to—but even the ordinary inferior materials that can be utilised in that way, I say that utilising that class of material at that low temperature, must give a product that will be a very unsatisfactory article of general consumption. One result will be, that oleomargarine made out of a really good article of fat would by no means be an unhealthy article of diet, but we all know by observation that it can be produced out of an inferior article so as to escape detection on the market, and you may be certain that the honesty and the prudence of some manufacturers in the country will be lost sight of in their anxiety to make money. We remember the efforts that are being made just now on the American side. It is not more than a fortnight ago that I saw in the Montreal *Gazette* an item setting forth that the Committee of Congress at Washington had reported another Bill imposing a license of $500 upon the manufacture of oleomargarine, and a license of $480 upon those who sell the article, with an addition of 10 cents per pound of Excise duty on every pound sent out of the factory; and that the importer should have to pay, in addition to the ordinary import duties on those classes of goods, internal revenue duty of 15 cents per pound. When we look at these restrictions imposed on the American side, I think it is wise for us to take a step in advance, and to prevent the article being manufactured in our midst. And there is this fact at the present moment that it seems to me makes it extremely desirable that the Government should take action in a prohibitory direction: The State of New York has been for the last 18 months making vigorous attempts to root out the manufacture altogether of this class of goods, and some of our dairymen have already received circulars from manufacturers over there offering to furnish them with the *modus operandi* by which they can conduct the manufacture of this spurious butter in their own domestic dairies and be able to turn it out as the finished article of good butter. In addition to that, those gentlemen whose factories have been stopped by the action of the State Legislature will naturally look round for a new field in which to embark their capital and continue their manufacture, and Canada will afford the readiest field for the development of their enterprise. For these reasons I think it would be wise for the Government on this occasion to accede to what is evidently the united voice of the House all round, without regard to political parties, and step out and entirely prohibit the manufacture of the article in our midst. It should be prohibited for the sake of the health of the citizens generally, as well as in the interests of the agriculturists; and not only should it be prevented from domestic consumption but also for export. It is unfair as a business principle that an article which we consider unhealthy for home consumption, should be encouraged to be manufactured here and placed on a foreign market. We talk about our relations to the British Empire, and on looking into this question only a few weeks ago I found that the British representative at Washington, in his correspondence with the Imperial authorities, stated that a large proportion of the 30,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine exported from the port of New York finds its way either directly to Great Britain to be manufactured into imitation butter, or to Holland, where it is made into butter and shipped to England. When we consider these facts it is not just to the people of the Mother

Country, without speaking of the interest of the Canadian farmer, that we should allow the manufacture of a deleterious article of this kind for purposes of exportation, and it would be wisdom on the part of the Government now to yield to what appears to be the united opinion of the House, and make provision for the entire prohibition of the manufacture of the article in our midst. It will be found by experience, even when the article is prohibited, that the Customs Department will have considerable difficulty to prevent the introduction of the article in various forms into the country; and unless care is taken to exclude the finished oil as well as the mixed product, I fear there are still some men in our midst who will attempt to manufacture the article for the sake of the profits it will give them.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) may congratulate himself on having brought this subject before Parliament, and he may congratulate himself more particularly on the fact that his proposals have met with universal approval. Not only has the House approved of his proposition, but the opinion has been expressed in favor of total prohibition. If the hon. gentleman proposed, in the first place, to regulate its manufacture in this country, and to ask the imposition of a duty that would be tantamount to prohibition, and afterwards found that the feeling of the House had gone beyond that, he was not at all, to my mind, inconsistent in acceding to the general expression which has been given in the House and going one step further and asking for total prohibition. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has consented to the adjournment of the debate. Had not that been done I intended to move a motion myself and ask the hon. gentleman to wait and see the proposition which the Government intended to make in regard to this very question when they consider the balance of the tariff resolutions which are now before Parliament. And if the proposition of the Government does not then meet his approval and the approval of the House, then he will be in a position to take further action. But I can assure the House the Government have not forgotten the expression of opinion which has been given by nearly every hon. member who has spoken on this question, and when the Government made the proposition to impose a duty of 10 cents per pound and 8 cents per pound Excise duty, they were under the impression, and believed from the information they had before them, that, in view of the cost of the manufacture, it would be virtually a prohibition of the article. But the expression of the House, and we are bound to believe that the expressions of opinion are not only those of the farmers, but of all the electors of the Dominion, is so strong upon this question that I think the hon. gentleman will be quite satisfied when the resolutions come down to accept the proposition of the Government, and not push his motion any further.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The question we have been discussing is not at all a new one before this House. Many years ago it was taken up by the then member for Stormont and several discussions were had on this question and much information was adduced before the House by the hon. gentleman. That hon. member took much pains at that time to place his views before the House, and the *Hansard* of that day will show the steps he took. We find not only a change in the view of the hon. gentleman who moved this motion, but in the view of the Government also since the discussion has taken place. I have the *Hansard* before me and I will make a few extracts to satisfy the House as to why the change of attitude is made by the Government. After the discussion had gone on upon the resolution proposed, viz., that a Customs and Excise duty be placed upon this article, in which the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Agriculture took part, the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) forestalled me in moving a resolution prohibiting the manufacture and sale in this country of an article supposed to be so deleterious to health.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is referring to the tariff debate.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I agreed with your ruling, Mr. Speaker, to-day, and as I have the *Hansard* in my hand I will read what I am referring to. I find that Mr. Taylor moved "that the House proceed to consider the following resolution declaring that it is expedient to bring in a Bill to regulate the manufacture and sale of the article used as a substitute for butter."

Mr. SPEAKER. That is quite right, but the hon. gentleman was referring to the amendment of the hon. member for South Brant, and that was moved during the tariff debate.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The point I am speaking to is the previous discussion on this adjourned debate. The hon. member for South Brant moved a resolution prohibiting the manufacture and importation of this article, which is regarded by medical men as injurious to public health.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not a word about manufacture.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I said manufacture.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I intended to move in the same direction, but the hon. member for South Brant relieved me of that duty. The hon. member (Mr. Taylor) who moved the resolution is reported in *Hansard* to have said:

"The Bill which I wish to introduce is intended to protect the agriculturists of Canada from one of the most glaring frauds ever perpetrated in this country. While it is intended to afford protection to the farmers and dairymen, it will not in any way injure the consumers of butter and cheese."

In another part he says:

"I asked, at the same time, that an Excise and Custom duty of 10 cents per pound be placed on all oleomargarine, either imported or manufactured in the country; and I am glad to say that the Government, true to its protective policy—the National Policy—came down with a resolution placing a Custom duty of 10 cents and an Excise duty of 8 cents per pound on all these substitutes. For this act I am sure they will receive the thanks of every farmer in Canada."

And having allowed for the fostering of this languishing industry, this foul industry, in this country, the Government are deserving, so the hon. member says, of the thanks of the farmers and the people of this country. I say that in placing this resolution, it was intended—I have heard it stated, by those who pretend to know—with a view of establishing a company to manufacture this deleterious article, and that it was for this purpose that the resolution was introduced.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Further on I find the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said, in speaking of the duty:

"I believe they are in the right direction, and if there are those in the country who wish to buy and use oleomargarine and butterine instead of butter, I think they should have the right to do so, but let it be distinctly understood that they know what they are buying."

In concluding his speech he said:

"I hope the resolution will be adopted, and that such a Bill will be introduced and passed as will give the necessary protection to the large class engaged in the manufacture of butter in the Dominion."

This again shows that it was the intention of the hon. member and of the Government at that time to place a duty on this article and protect this infant industry. The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) speaking on this question said:

"I think, therefore, the Bill is of great importance to the country, and ought to meet, as I believe it will meet, with the concurrence of the House and the assistance of the hon. gentleman in making it as perfect as possible."

That is a Customs and Excise duty he proposes would meet with the concurrence of the people of this country. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, who was one of those who should receive the thanks of the country for trying to foster the manufacture and sale of an article which the medical men of this House who have examined the subject, as well as others who have given a vast amount of information upon it, have pronouced injurious to health. And I would ask what can be more important to this House and the country than the preservation of public health; a question which has engaged a vast amount of interest and attention in this and every other civilised country? They pronounced strongly against it, and what did the Government through the Minister of Inland Revenue say:

"I might, while on my feet, state that the Customs duties have been imposed on the foreign article and the Excise duty on what may be manufactured in the country."

There you see that the policy of the Government was declared—that there was to be a Customs duty imposed on it, and an Excise duty on the article manufactured. Then the Minister of Agriculture who, he says, takes a deep interest in what relates to the farmers, made the following remark:

"The matter now before the House is one that has been fully considered by the Government as a whole, and I think they have shown that they take an interest in it by imposing a duty of 10 cents per pound, and an Excise duty of 8 cents per pound."

Then the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) in closing his remarks, after consenting to the adjournment of the debate, said:

"In the Bill that I purposed presenting I had made provision that not only the manufacturers and dealers, but hotel keepers and others who served this article of food on the table should serve it as some other article than butter, that parties dealing in it should give it some other name; but I am willing to accept the suggestion which has been made, and leave it to be dealt with in the Bill which the Minister will bring in. All I desire is to fully protect the dairy interests of the country."

Now it is gratifying to me to notice the revolution in the sentiments of the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution, as well as in the members and supporters of the Government who have spoken upon the question, and that the amendment proposed by my hon. friend for Brant has been the means of creating a more healthy tone with regard to the manufacture and sale of these deleterious compounds.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman states that the resolution of the hon. member for Brant referred to both the importation and the manufacture. Now here is the resolution and it does not say a word about that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You might have risen to a point of order when the hon. member for Brant spoke.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not a question of order.

Mr. TAYLOR. You are not stating the facts.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not a question of order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The facts stated by the hon. member for Brant I will just as well believe as the statement you make.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. Hon. gentlemen will please address the Chair.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I beg your pardon, Sir, but it was a digression, and I am hardly responsible for it. It appears that the Government who have fully considered this question, after the information given by the hon. member for Cornwall and others with regard to the manufacture of this article, and the ingredients which entered into its composition, that it was deleterious to the public health, that it was being unduly brought into competition with the farmers of this country, that it was placing an unhealthy article of diet before the people of this country—the Government states that their proposition was to build up the manufacture of the article in this country. I am glad to see a change in the sentiments of the Government after they had heard the views expressed on this side of the House.

Mr. COCHRANE. Speaking on behalf of agriculturists of this country I am sorry to notice that when a question of this kind is brought before this Parliament the hon. member for South Grey should endeavor to treat it in a way to make a little mushroom political popularity for himself. He says he is glad to see signs of a change of sentiment on this side of the House, but I think I see indications of change on the other side. For instance, I think the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) was in favor of the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine and he condemned the Government severely for interfering with it. I think the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Jackson) expressed himself in favor of its manufacture, and I do not think any man on this side went so far as he did, for he had the audacity to state in this House that he fed these compounds to his lumbermen. So it appears that there is a wonderful change of sentiment among hon. gentlemen on the other side. Now this is an important question, and I do not think we should drag party politics into it. I do not care what it is manufactured of, if it comes in competition with the butter of the farmers. I am a protectionist and I believe in giving protection to the farmers; and if such vile stuff is manufactured and brought into competition with the products of the farmer, I am opposed to it, and I think the Government should take a stand on this question and put on a Customs and Excise duty which would not only prevent the importation but the manufacture as well. Now if the statements and figures of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) are correct it is rather an alarming consideration that the number of cows in the United States has been reduced one-fourth by the manufacture of this stuff. If 20,000,000 lbs. of oleomargarine are manufactured in the United States, it not only injures the farmers of the United States, but those of Canada, because it comes into direct competition with the butter manufactured in the two countries, and drives that quantity of butter out of the market. This is a question upon which I think we should throw politics overboard, and legislate for the best interests of the country. I am in favor of prohibiting the manufacture of the article altogether.

Mr. JENKINS. I think the hon. member for South Grey has been what sportsmen call "running a back scent." He has made a very loud and energetic speech, but like a hound that goes over a back scent, it leads to nothing. I think my hon. friend's speech had no point whatever. If this House legislates on the subject at all, there is only one direction in which as an intelligent and enlightened body it can go, and that is in the direction of total prohibition. The object of legislation has been not to license or regulate the manufacture of adulterations in food, but to put a stop to them, and I do not see why the House should make any exception of oleomargarine. It is known to be a spurious and adulterated article; it is proved to be unwholesome; and it comes into competition with the wholesome product of the farm. Last Session we voted public money to encourage the better manufacture of butter; and having done that we should prohibit the manufacture of this spurious article, which comes into competition with butter. I think there is only one course we can pursue, and that is in the direction of total prohibition.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I wish only to detain the House a moment, to express my satisfaction at the assurance we have received from the Minister that this matter is to be dealt with in a manner that, no doubt, will meet with the approbation of both sides of the House. I feel great satisfaction in knowing that we are not to be deprived of the luxury of butter; for since the discussion of this subject began in the House, I have hardly been able to look an honest cow in the face. The importance of our exportation

of butter has already been touched upon, and it might be dealt with at greater length. As to the germ question, I leave that entirely to the doctors. I only hope the resolutions promised will be brought forward quickly, and I deem them of such importance that I hope when they are passed they will be telegraphed to the High Commissioner for the information of the butter makers of England.

Mr. PLATT. I shall not prolong the debate, because I do not intend to add anything to the general argument. I think enough has been said to convince the Government that it is their imperative duty to act promptly and effectively. I think it would be unfortunate if this Session should close without such legislation being had as will effectually prevent the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine into this country. As the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) has said, the prohibition of this article on the other side of the line will tend to encourage its manufacture in this country. In proof of that I have only to state that the Canadian manufacturers of butter are already in receipt of numerous circulars from the butterine makers on the other side of the line, offering inducements to them to go into the manufacture of oleomargarine in this country. A sample of such circulars I hold in my hand, and I will read it for the benefit of the House:—

"To Creamery Men:

"Having retired from the manufacture of creamery butterine, I offer for sale the formula of manufacturing butterine from cream, same as I have been using for the past two years. Will sell the same reasonably, and warrant it O.K.

"I invite your correspondence on same, and can start you very reasonably. All the machinery you will need is a barrel churn and three tanks, with jackets in the tanks. They all will not cost over $60 to $65, and then you can make an article superior to any Chicago manufacturer. It will also enable you to pay up for cream, as when I was manufacturing, I paid as high as 35 cents per inch for cream. Will also give you points, by corresponding with me. I will guarantee the formula O K.

"I also have a cream preservative which I will sell, reasonably, and put you on the track of doing the cream butterine biz correct. I am the only originator of the manufacture of butterine from cream, and can and will fix you up in good shape, reasonably.

"All correspondence relative to same will be attended to promptly."

Such circulars as this are being sent to the creamery men in this country. I think enough has been said to convince the Government of their duty, and I hope they will perform it this Session.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to know in what position we are in this matter. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has changed his mind very often. He introduced a resolution to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, and when the discussion goes on he states his desire to go further and prohibit its manufacture altogether. Now, however, we find him seconding the proposition that the debate be adjourned, the effect of which will be, as he knows well, to render it impossible for him, in all probability, to reach it this Session. It will therefore be impossible for him, if the debate be adjourned, to introduce a Bill prohibiting its manufacture. He consented to the adjournment of the debate before we had any announcement from the Government that they had altered their mind in the slightest degree. What is the policy of the Government? We have it embodied in their Bill. Is it that we should prohibit the manufacture of the article? No, Sir; it is to allow of a license being granted to any person, who has conformed to the provisions of the Bill, to manufacture oleomargarine. That is all the announcement which the hon. gentleman has as to the policy of the Government when he proposes to adjourn the discussion. True, the hon. member said he had been impressed, to some extent, by the statements made, but then the hon. member for Leeds had not even that assurance when he consented to an adjournment. Unless the Government are prepared to prohibit the manufacture of this article, it is the duty of the hon. gentleman to go on with his resolution, and obtain, if possible, permission of the House to introduce a prohibitory Bill and go on with that Bill. I have prepared an amendment which I am ready to move when the Government Bill comes up, to strike out the clause permitting the manufacture of oleomargarine and insert instead a prohibitory clause, and I have another one prepared, with the same object, in case the tariff amendments come up first. The hon. gentleman states that I said nothing about the manufacture of this article when I made my motion on a previous occasion to prohibit its importation, but if he will refer to the *Hansard*, page 802, he will see that I stated clearly that I could not move to prohibit its manufacture then, but that, as soon as I reached the item relating to its manufacture, I would deal with it. With reference to the statement of the Minister of Customs to-night that the imposition of 8 cents Excise duty was equivalent to the prohibition of its manufacture in this country, the hon. gentleman knows it would do nothing of the kind. Does he not know that if he imposed a duty of 20 cents a pound, that would not interfere with its manufacture, because the article, when exported, pays no Excise duty. Therefore this Excise duty would have no effect as regards the manufacture of oleomargarine for export, and we would still have the English market flooded with this false product, to the ruin of the butter trade of this country. There is only one sensible way of dealing with the question, and I propose, on the first opportunity, to move that we should deal with it in that way, and that is that the manufacture, as well as the importation of this article, should be entirely prohibited.

Mr. HESSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing who are the persons who respectively owe the balances on account of the slides and booms in the district of the Saguenay, to the amount of $5,850.54, as appears in the Report of the Department of Inland Revenue for the year 1885, at page 18?—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Return showing who are the persons who respectively owe the arrears of $43,860 95, which appear to be due according to the report of the Department of the Interior for the year 1885, at page 28?—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 12 o'clock, midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 11th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. BERGIN moved the adoption of the Fourth Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This report looks very like a censure on the Auditor, because he was not able to agree with the committee as to the terms on which he should sign a certificate; and I really think a censure on that officer should not be inflicted without very grave ground indeed. So far as I can understand the report, it appears that the accounts of two years have been mixed up together a

good deal, and that the Auditor simply recommended that each year should be made to pay its own way. If that be so, I think the demand of the Auditor was a reasonable one, and there ought to be no ground for refusing to continue the audit by the public officer. I suppose the hon. Minister of Finance has examined the report.

Mr. McLELAN. I understood from the Auditor that there was merely a misunderstanding between himself and Mr. Hartney with regard to certifying the accounts—that he expected, having met the sub-committee, that the accounts would be sent to him to be examined and certified, while Mr. Hartney expected that he would come over to his office and examine and certify them there. Through that misunderstanding a neglect occurred, and the accounts were not certified. I understand that there is no disposition on the part of the committee to censure the Auditor. I think they are perhaps a little hasty in making this report to take the matter out of his hands. I understand that some time ago a joint report of the Committee of both Houses recommended that the accounts of the Printing Committee should pass through the hands of the Auditor and be audited by him, and I understand from himself that he does not object to examining the statement prepared by Mr. Hartney and certifying it. He says:

"My report shows that the money voted by Parliament for the printing expenditure has been expended, and for the purposes intended. If the suggestion made by me in the letter printed in the report of the committee were adopted there would be no reason for my modifying Mr. Hartney's statement before signing it. In fact there would be no reason for Mr. Hartney making such a statement, as my report would contain an identical statement."

It seems that the difference has arisen wholly through a misunderstanding between Mr. McDougall and Mr. Hartney as to the mode of procedure.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad to hear the explanation of the hon. Minister of Finance, for I can hardly conceive it possible that there should have been any intention on the part of the Auditor General to decline to discharge his duty with reference to any matter that this House, or the Joint Committee on Printing, may send to him. We have been gradually endeavoring to include within the domain of the audit everything possible. The accounts of certain matters which were not specifically included, have, from time to time, by virtue of resolutions unanimously adopted by the Committee on Public Accounts, been sent to the Auditor General, and it is obviously highly important that every money transaction should be submitted to the same audit and the same rules. The reason for the passage of the Statute relating to this officer applies very largely to these cases. Now, after the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance, I do not think we ought at all to concur in the report of the Printing Committee so far as it proposes to deal with the question of audit for the future. I think the audit for the future, as was proposed by the Committee on Public Accounts and agreed to by the House, ought to remain with the Auditor General. The misunderstanding that exists between these two functionaries is no reason why a matter of public policy which we have decided upon should be departed from. Whosoever fault it is, it will, no doubt, be settled by two sensible persons; whoever has been at fault or made a mistake will, no doubt, remedy that, and the duty that requires to be discharged will be discharged according to the public interest. In no case can I agree to the House rescinding the resolution of the Committee on Public Accounts at the instance of another committee. I think the only way we can deal with this matter, if we are to put it into a train of further enquiry, is to refer that portion of the report for the consideration of the Committee on Public Accounts, which is the Finance Committee of the House. There is nothing special in the printing accounts which renders them more difficult to be audited by the Auditor General than any other accounts, and before the decision of the Public Accounts Committee is reversed, I think we ought to have the views of that committee before us. But after the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance, that this whole difficulty has arisen from a misunderstanding between the two gentlemen as to which should go to the other, I think there can be no reason at all for our even making such a reference. If I thought there was reason for the matter going further, I would suggest such a reference, and if it is to go further I hope some hon. gentleman will suggest such a reference, rather than we should decide as to whether the system of audit should in this case be departed from or not. I can hardly see any necessity for that after the statement of the Minister of Finance, and the best course would be to withdraw that portion of the report which gives this recommendation, or see that it be negatived.

Mr. McLELAN. I find I have a copy of a letter addressed by the Auditor General to Mr. Hartney upon this matter which is not among the papers brought down. The following is the letter:—

"AUDIT OFFICE, OTTAWA, May 1st, 1886.

"SIR,—I observe by a report of the Printing Committee, now before the House of Commons, that my position with reference to the certifying of your statement of last year's printing expenditure was misunderstood by the sub-committee before which I appeared to make an explanation. I thought that I was understood by the sub-committee to promise to do two things:

"(1.) To send a letter of suggestion as to the means to be adopted to enable the Queen's Printer to pay in each fiscal year for the parliamentary reports distributed by the Departments during that year.

"(2.) To certify the statement of printing expenditure with certain modifications.

"My letter of the 12th ult. carried out promise (1). With reference to promise (2), I expected you to send me the statement for my certificate. You apparently expected me to send for the statement. Please send it to me now that I may make the certificate.

"I have the honor to be,
"Your obedient servant,
"J. L. McDOUGALL,
"*Auditor General.*

"H. HARTNEY, Esq.,
"Clerk, Printing Committee,
"House of Commons."

Mr. BERGIN. The Auditor General appears to have given his version of the difficulty to the hon. gentlemen who have just addressed the House, but forgot to explain to them that it was not so much a misunderstanding between him and Mr. Hartney, an official of this House, as a refusal to obey the orders of the committee, or rather a refusal to meet the suggestion of the committee that he should certify to the correctness of an account which he admitted to the committee was correct. It had nothing whatever to do with the misunderstanding between Mr. Hartney and the Auditor General, but, when the clerk of the committee presented his account and reported that he had been unable to obtain a certificate of its correctness from the Auditor General, showing, at the same time, a letter which he had written to the Auditor General asking him for a certificate, the committee adjourned from the Tuesday to the Friday following to enable the Auditor General to make that certificate. The Auditor General, instead of certifying the account, instead of replying directly to the letter which was written by the clerk, at the direction of the committee, put a memorandum on the back of the account saying that he would be present at the meeting of the committee and explain. He did attend the meeting of the committee on the Friday following. The question was put to him whether the account was correct or not, and he admitted that it was, and expressed his intention of signing the certificate. Did he sign it? On the contrary, a few days afterwards he sent a letter, which the Minister of Finance has just read, declaring that it was a misunderstanding between him and the clerk of the committee—that he thought he was understood by the sub-committee to promise to do two things:

"(1) To send a letter of suggestion as to the means to be adopted to enable the Queen's Printer to pay in each fiscal year for the parliamentary reports distributed by the Departments during that year.

"(2) To certify the statement of printing expenditure with certain modifications."

I beg to say that the committee did not understand that he intended to send any such letter or suggestion. He did give them to understand that he would like to attach to the certificate an explanation of the reasons why there should be a change in the manner of making the account; and instead of giving the committee to understand that he would certify to the statement of expenditure with certain modifications, expecting the clerk to send him the account to be certified, he gave us to understand he would certify it immediately. If you will refer to the report, you will find that on the 12th April—the committee meeting, at which he was present, was held on the 9th—he writes:

"OTTAWA, April 12th, 1886.

"SIR,—I beg to call the attention of the committee to the insufficiency of the vote for miscellaneous printing, controlled by the Queen's Printer, to meet the cost of printing the portion distributed by the Departments of the departmental reports submitted to Parliament.

"I would suggest that the committee request the Secretary of State to make a recommendation to the Government for an additional estimate, so that the $9,454.83 now charged to the vote on account of last year's printing, and the whole of the cost of this year's printing, may be met by the whole appropriation. I presume that an additional estimate of $16,000 for this year, and about $6,000 for next year, would be necessary."

This was not an answer to the question of the committee or certifying the account. It was entirely ignoring the request of the committee, and leaving the account in its uncertified condition. The committee, finding he declined to certify the account, made the recommendation contained in this report. Since this letter of the 1st inst., which has just been read by the Minister of Finance, Mr. McDougall, the Auditor General, has written a letter to the clerk of the committee, attempting to explain the differences between his mode of making up the accounts and Mr. Hartney's; and yesterday he certified to the account. I saw no good reason, and the committee saw no good reason, why the Auditor General should not have certified the account as well before the report of the Printing Committee was made as to certify it only yesterday. I have not failed to observe, and I admit there is a good deal of force in the remarks of the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Blake), that a careful audit should be made of the accounts of this House, an audit as careful as that of any of the Departments of the Government, but I would remind hon. gentlemen that this does not come directly under the Audit Act——

Mr. MILLS. It ought to.

Mr. BERGIN—and that the auditing of the accounts of this House by the Auditor General during the last two or three years was the result of a motion made in the committee, which was submitted to this House and approved; but I do not suppose that because this House approved the report of this committee, that that report was sufficient reason why, when an officer of the Government refuses to pay attention to a committee of this House, and to do that which he admits it was his duty to have done—that is, to certify to an account which he admits to be correct—we should not determine to act without the Auditor General's certificate for the future.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is evident that there has been a misunderstanding, because I do not suppose that the Auditor General would have wished to offend a committee of this House and fail in his public duty by not obeying the orders of the committee, which are equivalent to the orders of the House. Therefore, I think, first in reference to the audit, that, though the law does not put the accounts of this House under the Auditor General, nevertheless, the Public Accounts Committee having reported in favor of that course and the House having assented to it, that is as good. As far as we are concerned, it is law, because it is our own free will. No doubt we could to-morrow change it and decide that the audit of these accounts should be made by a sub-committee of the Public Accounts Committee or of the Printing Committee, but I really believe that, having the Auditor General as the officer appointed by law to audit the accounts of all the Departments of the Government, it is only a natural consequence that the same officer should audit the accounts of this House. I cannot find fault—far from it—with the committee for having reported as they have reported, because there is no doubt that, up to the time that the committee reported, the Auditor General had not complied with the wishes of the committee, but it appears since, by the letter that the hon. the Minister of Finance has read, that the Auditor General either saw that he had not complied with the orders of the committee or that he had neglected it—at all events, he saw that he should go further, and I am informed now, and I think the hon. member who has just spoken has stated so, that, since then the Auditor General has given his certificate, and therefore has declared that the accounts of the officer of the Printing Committee are correct. Under those circumstances, I would suggest that, inasmuch as these matters have occurred since the report was laid before the committee, the motion of my hon. friend should be withdrawn, leaving it to the committee to examine the matter with the new light that must be thrown on the subject by that letter and by the certificate, and thus be in a position probably to come with an additional report to modify this one. I, therefore, suggest to my hon. friend that he should not insist on his motion to-day.

Mr. TROW. I think the suggestion offered by the hon. the Minister of Public Works is the proper course to pursue. There is not a member of the committee, as far as I am aware, who has any desire to censure the Auditor General—far from it; we consider him a worthy and efficient officer. Yet, at the same time, we were distinctly under the impression—at least I was, and I think other members of the sub-committee were—that the Auditor General intended and stated that he would certify to the report. I heard him say distinctly several times that the accounts were correct in each and every particular. Then why not certify them? It became imperative for the committee to report, and without the accounts being properly certified we could make no report, and the committee adjourned from day to day to get the Auditor's certificate. I do not consider that we have done any harm. I think we have done a little good. There is something unreasonable with some officials about this establishment, and I think we have done no harm. I think the suggestion of the Minister of Public Works is proper under the circumstances, and it is to be hoped that hereafter we shall have no unreasonable stiffness on the part of our officials, one to the other, but that they will be more reasonable and will certify to accounts when they find them correct.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I quite agree with the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Finance that, as there seems to be no substantial difference at all now between the Auditor and the committee, the best thing is to remodel the report; but the House will do well to remember that the whole value of the Auditor General depends upon his being an independent functionary. We have hedged round that office with every precaution with the view to make him independent, and we ourselves, either directly in the House, or through a committee of the House, ought to be the last people in the world to interfere to prevent his exercising an honest judgment on the accounts which are submitted to him. If you have an Auditor General who holds office during good behavior, you ought to take all pains to make him perfectly independent, and I say, with all due submission to my friends of the committee, that it is better that there

should be occasional differences of opinion between the Auditor General and ourselves even, or between the Auditor General and the Departments of the Government or the Departments of this House, than that he should cease to be an independent functionary, acting as we have directed him to act, acting for the purpose that we created him for, for the purpose as far as possible of having a perfectly independent audit and a perfectly independent judgment passed on the items submitted to him. From what I know of Mr. McDougall, I am quite sure that he could have no sort of desire or intention to act with any disrespect to the Committee on Printing. Now, it appears that no substantial difference exists. It must be remembered, as mentioned by the hon. gentleman, that a large and important committee of this House, the Committee on Public Accounts, was the committee which expressly requested this audit.

Mr. HAGGART. While we are on that question, let me draw the attention of the House to the two sets of returns that are now printed, one by the Auditor General and one by the different Departments—the Public Accounts. The accounts are supposed to be precisely similar, one set drawn out one way by the different Departments, and one another way by the Auditor General's Department, but both showing the same result. I think the publishing of the two sets of accounts, the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's report, is a useless expenditure of money. If the accounts in the different Departments are not kept in the manner in which they ought to be, the Auditor General should have them corrected and published in the manner in which they should be, and we should not have two different accounts showing the same result but drawn out differently.

Mr. McLELAN. I have discussed that with the deputy of my Department, and we expect to reduce the size of one of the volumes by next year.

Mr. BLAKE. No doubt the hon. gentleman from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is perfectly correct, that with the growth of the minuteness of detail and classification of the audit report, it is unnecessary for the Public Accounts to contain all the details which have been usually printed in them; but, from my view, it will be very useful to continue the Public Accounts themselves upon another system, giving more general information, in the view of the Departments themselves, but it is not necessary that these minute details should be doubled over.

Mr. BERGIN. I do not feel that I can withdraw the report as suggested by the Minister of Public Works, without referring it to the committee.

Mr. BLAKE. The only way is to refer the report back to the committee, and then they will deal with it as they see fit.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I thought my hon. friend would leave the report before the House, but withdraw his motion to adopt it until he had consulted the committee.

Mr. BERGIN. With the consent of the House, I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS BY MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before proceeding to the Orders of the Day, I desire to call the attention of hon. members to a practice which has been growing up which I fear, if not checked, will have a tendency to degrade the character and lower the dignity of the proceedings of this House. I allude to the abuse of the privilege accorded to hon. members of making personal explanations. These statements should be short and simple statements of fact or denials of any charge made, but should be couched in parliamentary language. Unfortunately, hon. members on both sides of the House have indulged in personalities and recriminations against other hon. members which are altogether out of place, and I feel myself that I have allowed too great latitude in this respect, but it was from a desire not to interrupt hon. members who were making statements when they felt personally aggrieved. I hope, however, that in the future I shall have the assistance of both sides of the House in confining hon. members who are accorded the indulgence of the House—because it is an indulgence—strictly to the rule.

PRIVILEGE—TIMBER LIMITS.

Mr. GAULT. I wish to correct a statement, made a few evenings ago by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who said that I had applied for two townships in the North-West. I immediately wrote to the Department, and received the following reply: —

"In reply to your note of the 4th inst., I beg to say that a careful search through the records of this Department discloses no application made by you on your own behalf for a colonisation tract, but I enclose herewith a copy of a letter addressed by you to the Minister of the Interior, dated the 25th of March, 1882, applying on behalf of Mr. J. C. Norsworthy and friends, for two certain townships for colonisation purposes. I may add that no grant was ever made to Norsworthy."

Here is the application I made on the 25th March, 1882, to the Minister of the Interior:

"I beg leave to apply for J. C. Norsworthy and friends, for two townships under plan of your regulations for colonisation purposes, viz., 23 and 24 in the 27th range, west of the 22nd meridian."

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I was in Ingersoll and was introduced to Mr. Norsworthy, and had not ten minutes' conversation with him, and why he sent this application to me I never could tell. But the moment I received that letter—there were so many other letters coming from all quarters—I immediately sent them to the Department, and never had a reply and never thought any more of the matter. I never was an applicant myself for a tract of land in the North-West.

An hon. MEMBER. Why should you not be?

Mr. GAULT. Why should I not? I had no interest whatever in the matter, but I do not see why I should not have applied as well as any person else. The lands were open to the public, and I do not see why members of Parliament have not a perfect right to apply like any other individuals.

PENSIONS TO VOLUNTEERS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who is leading the House, whether the particulars of the pensions assigned to parties who have served in the North-West, have yet been brought down? He may recollect that he said they would be laid on the Table at an early date, together with the rules and regulations.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. So far as I can recollect, my colleague, the Minister of Militia, stated they would be brought down in a day or two. He will be here in a short time, and then I will be able to answer the hon. gentleman.

GOVERNMENT MEASURES.

Mr. BLAKE. I would call attention to the Government notices on the paper. April the 16th, notice was given of a Bill entitled: "An Act further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act." Several days ago I enquired of the Government when they were going to introduce the Bill promised in the Speech from the Throne with reference to the trial of causes against the Crown, and the Minister of Justice answered that the Bill of which the notice was on the paper, was the Bill, and it was prepared, but he was waiting for the money resolution, I understood him.

Mr. THOMPSON. I was speaking on the resolution with reference to the North-West judges.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman stated this was the Bill, at any rate.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. We are now very close to the end of the Session, and I was told yesterday that a Minister had stated that the Government intended to prorogue in a fortnight, and still we have not got that important measure promised in the Speech from the Throne, and which was in such a state of forwardness last Session that it was actually introduced, and went, I think, to a second reading under the guiding hand of the Minister of Public Works. Then there is an Act to amend the Franchise Act, a very important measure of which notice was also given as long ago as the 16th April, but with which no further progress has been made. Then we find the Bill respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, promised in the Speech from the Throne, which still remains as a notice on the paper. I think it is time for these measures to be brought before us, if we are to have a reasonable opportunity of considering them during the Session in which it is expected they are to pass.

PRIVILEGE—TIMBER LIMITS.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to disclaim any intention of doing injustice to the hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault). My statement was copied from the Sessional returns in which his name appears as an applicant for two townships. In the report of the proceedings I see that he stated: "My name is found nowhere on the books." Well, Sir, I made the statement and I repeated it as I found it in the Sessional returns. But the hon. gentleman's explanation, of course, shows just what connection he had with the application.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 122) for the relief of the corporation of the Town of Cobourg.—(Mr. McLelan.)

MANITOBA CLAIMS SETTLEMENT.

Mr. McLELAN moved the third reading of Bill (No. 123) to explain the Act 48 and 49 Vic. chapter 50, intituled: "An Act for the final adjustment of the claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion." He said: Hon. members opposite asked for some figures respecting the accounts of Manitoba during the past year. The amount paid to them last year under the old arrangement was $229,858. They have since drawn an additional sum from their capital account, which would reduce it by $4,700, which would leave them, providing no change had been made in the terms, $215,000 as their revenue. I gave the hon. gentleman the other day the amount of the capital that had been drawn and which should be deducted from the amount given in this Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman also promised to inform us what is the present income allowed by the Dominion to Manitoba.

Mr. McLELAN. That cannot be ascertained until there is a settlement between the two Governments of the amounts that may be chargeable to the Government of Manitoba for local services; but the hon. gentleman will see, that it would amount to about $270,000. The charges apart from the capital sum would give them $270,000. Then, assuming there would be three millions and over, there would be $150,000 or so to add to that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About $430,000.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time, and passed.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 131) further to amend the Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time on a division, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 7,

Mr. DAWSON. As the Algoma branch, to which this clause of the Bill now before the House refers, will be entirely within the constituency which I represent, I shall, with the leave of the House, point out a few of the advantages sure to arise from the passing of this Act. It will, in the first place, be of material advantage in enabling the Pacific Railway Company to raise the funds necessary for the completion of this Algoma branch of 200 miles, and its being put in operation means the development of a very important and extensive section of the country, a section rich in the natural resources which give traffic to a railway, such as valuable minerals, pine forests of vast extent, and valleys which from their fertility must prove attractive in a high degree to the agriculturist. The line will, for a considerable distance, run along the coast of Lake Huron, crossing rivers which have their sources among the pine forests of the interior, and it will pass in front of the Manitoulin group of islands where settlement is advancing so rapidly that their traffic will of itself be a matter of no small importance to a railway. The growing settlements on these islands have hitherto been shut off from the outside world in winter, but the railway will bring about a new state of things, and from Manitowaning on the east, to Sault St. Marie on the west, an impetus will be given to development which must result in the country north of Lake Huron, and the beautiful and fertile islands of the Manitoulin in front of it, becoming one of the finest districts in the Dominion of Canada. But it is not alone in the development of eastern Algoma that this railway will be of advantage, for it will bring a stream of foreign traffic through the country, the magnitude of which it would be difficult to estimate. At Sault St. Marie it will connect with a United States line, now being constructed, and through it with the railway systems of the Western States. It will thus be in connection with the railways traversing the wide and fertile States of Minnesota and Dakota, and among these with the great Northern Pacific, now extending from the head of Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean. It is well known that the States of Minnesota and Dakota are among the finest wheat-producing countries on the continent, and the wheat of these vast regions must necessarily seek the shortest and cheapest route to an ocean port, and the shortest will be by way of Sault Ste. Marie and the Canadian Pacific system to Montreal, and the company will, no doubt, find it to their interest to make it the cheapest. What this traffic means may be imagined when it is considered that the surplus produce of the vast wheat-producing regions lying between Duluth and the Rocky Mountains, considerable as it is already, will, in a few years, as these regions become more and more densely peopled, tax the capacity of all the railways likely to be constructed to carry it to the ocean. But there is a traffic, and a very important one, in which, at certain seasons, the Algoma branch and the Canadian Pacific will be absolutely without competition, and, to make my meaning in this regard clear, I may say that in the fall the water-borne grain from Duluth must find its way over the railway from

Sault Ste. Marie eastward. In the fall the navigation is first interrupted by the freezing over of the narrow and shallow channels in the upper waters of Lake Huron, eastward of Sault Ste. Marie. Lake Superior remains open long after these channels have closed. In fact, that great inland sea is open, as a general rule, all through the winter, except in the bays. At all events, it is as open all through December as it is in June, but hitherto its navigation has of necessity closed with the freezing up of the channels in Lake Huron, to which I have referred. But the Algoma branch, when opened, will render it possible to bring grain by water from Duluth to Sault Ste. Marie, and have it there put on cars for Montreal, long after the navigation of Lake Huron shall have closed. Indeed, as I have said, Lake Superior, with its 400 miles of navigation, is open throughout the greater part of the winter. The importance of the growing trade of Duluth may be gathered from an official return from which I shall quote:

"The shipments of grain, by water, from the Lake Superior port of Duluth, Minn., have been as follows, during the last six seasons:—

	Bushels.
1880	1,453,674
1881	2,865,536
1882	3,235,498
1883	4,586,908
1884	11,488,497
1885	14,049,897

This shows a very rapid progressive increase in the shipments of grain by water from Duluth, and the cause is evident in the increased area brought under cultivation from year to year in the great prairies to the westward of that place. That this progressive increase will go on there can be no doubt, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway will derive a large traffic from this source may be regarded as a certainty; more especially, in the fall, after the closing of the navigation, to the eastward of Sault Ste. Marie. In the summer months it is quite likely that the bulk of the grain may go by the great lakes, but for such of it as is destined for Montreal, it is just a question whether a railway a little over 600 miles in length may not successfully compete with a navigation of nearly double that distance, and a lockage of 600 feet. In order that the railway may have the full advantage of the Duluth traffic, the Algoma branch should be extended to a point on the St. Mary's River, about six miles west of Sault Ste. Marie, where there is an excellent harbor; but this is a matter to which the company will, no doubt, give due attention. Taking this Algoma branch, all in all, its completion will be a fitting sequel to the great railway which, with its extensive branches and connections, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have now or soon will have in operation. It will, in the not distant future, be the means of bringing through the country a traffic equal to that anticipated for the main line itself. It will, in the first place, serve as a colonisation railway, developing the resources and leading to the settlement of a most important section of the country, and in the next it will be an international highway bringing through the country to Canadian ports an immense volume of foreign traffic. That this important work will be carried out with the energy and foresight which have hitherto characterized the operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I have not the least doubt.

Mr. BLAKE. I shall not enter into the larger questions which have been dwelt upon by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), but I want to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that the provision is, according to the language of the Bill, it would include the power of declaring that the amount of those bonds now to be issued, equivalent to the portion of the road already built, should be appropriated to that purpose. Now, what I understand is the real intention is that so much of that branch having been already built, the bonds should be issued on the road completed and to be completed, and the proceeds are to be devoted to the work on completion and equipment, and not to be set against the work already done. Therefore, if for the word "construction" you would insert the word "completion," I think it would carry out what the intention and understanding of Parliament was. I also call attention to the fact that in the last line of the page the intention of the draughtsman evidently has not been carried out, and that the word "on" should be substituted for "of" before the words "such rolling stock."

Mr. McLELAN. I do not think the words "construction" and "completion" differ very much; it is for the completion of the whole branch. I may say I have obtained a rough estimate of about ninety miles that we have not yet surveyed. It is only an approximate estimate to finish the part upon which the contract has already been let. It is as follows:—Ballasting, bridging, widening roadway and buildings required, $450,000; extension to the Sault Ste. Marie River, in sidings and buildings, about 100 miles, at $30,000 per mile, $3,000,000; at the Sault, bridges over the river and canal, and approaches, $650,000; equipment of the entire Algoma branch, 196 miles, at $3,000 per mile, $588,000; making $4,688,000; in addition to which there are several tracks to be laid into the mines which are now being worked. These will be in various lengths of from three to six miles, so that the margin left after these estimated expenditures would be very small.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the bonding power?

Mr McLELAN. I have no figures of that.

Mr. BLAKE. It is upon that that the question of margin depends. The whole mileage is somewhere about 200 miles.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, exclusive of the branches into the mines.

Mr. BLAKE. If the bonding power is $30,000 per mile, that would be $6,000,000, in round numbers. My apprehension is that unless the word "completion" is substituted for "construction" it would be possible to issue, for example, the two and a half millions that are authorised, and then set them against the work which is so far done, whereas the intention is that these bonds are to be applied to the further work to be done, in completing the branch, both the portion partially constructed and that remaining to be constructed, and, of course, the bridges, &c.

Mr. McLELAN. There can be no objection to the substitution of the word "completion" for "construction," if it carries out the idea in any fuller sense.

Mr. BLAKE. The latter part of the clause seems to me to be a very curious way of dealing with such an important subject as the allocation to a particular security of the rolling stock, plant, tolls and revenue. The proposition is that by-laws should be passed by the company which will define what rolling stock appertains to the branch, and is so covered by the mortgage, and also what portion of the tolls and revenues. That is, in truth, a transfer by by-law, for the purposes of a mortgage, to the mortgagees, of the rolling stock. I think the proper course would be that there should not be merely a by-law of the company declaring what rolling stock belongs to the branch, but also some instrument of the hypothecation of that rolling stock. There remains also the objection I took at a former stage to this clause—leaving it so that it is permissible for the company to appropriate some portion of the rolling stock to the branch, as between the branch and the main line, the effect of which will be to derogate to that extent from the existing security of the mortgagees of the main line.

Mr. McLELAN moved the insertion of the word "upon" instead of "of" in the last line of the first page.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the word "completion" be inserted on the fifth line of the second page, instead of the word "construction."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. BLAKE. This clause seems to me not to carry out the agreement made by the company as to the limitation of the security, in which it was stated that the rate for the land was not to exceed $2 per acre. This is an unlimited power altogether.

Mr. McLELAN. I think it is an omission by the printer.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, let us put it in. Although the continuance of the arrangement about a reserve might be calculated to raise some suspicion, I think the clause, as amended, practically removes the objection which was raised as to any apparent intention to interfere with the position of the holders of outstanding bonds who do not wish to have them redeemed. I think it right to mention that, as I raised the objection before.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 6,

Mr. BLAKE. This is a wholly new clause, about which we have heard nothing or seen a single paper to show what the Government have done with the money and the authority granted to them to enable them to carry out this arrangement. I think we ought to have a statement as to what was done by the Government with the public funds entrusted to them with which to obtain possession of the North Shore Railway, and as to what the arrangement was, and we ought to have the documents before us which were executed in order to carry it out.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know that that is very material just now. The instructions given by Parliament last Session were acted upon, and were not exceeded, and all the papers connected with the transaction will be submitted to the House.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentleman has not given any reason for the passage of this clause.

Mr. McLELAN. The principal reason, and the reason which I think the hon. gentleman will accept, is that it is desirable in the interest of the whole country that the North Shore Railway should form a portion of the Pacific Railway, so that there may be one perfect system from Quebec to the Pacific Ocean. That was the object the House had last Session in granting power to the Government to enable us to complete the system.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood that the Government asked from Parliament all the powers they thought necessary in order that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company might become the owners of the North Shore. Now, the hon. gentleman asks for some more parliamentary authority to complete the arrangement. In whose hands is the stock now, what price has been paid for it, what interest have the company in it, and what is necessary to be done now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The stock is in the hands of certain trustees. The easiest and best way by which the North Shore Railway may become a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway is by the stock being acquired by the company, and for that purpose this clause is inserted here. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, not having authority under their charter to acquire that stock, ask us to give them this authority. Then the North Shore will become legally, as well as in fact, a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the arrangement made by the Government did not include the possession by the Government, in behalf of the company, of the stock of the North Shore; or has the price of that stock been paid by the Government, and is this clause merely to get rid of the legal technical difficulty in the absence of power?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Simply that.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the stock has in effect been purchased by the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is so understood.

Mr. BLAKE. And the transaction is already closed, and this is simply to clothe the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with power to complete it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I really think we ought to have the documents brought down, so that we might see what the nature of that transaction is.

On the schedule,

Mr. BLAKE. In the third clause the hon. gentleman will find a provision that the excess of the land grant bond shall, under certain circumstances, be cancelled, and then there is a provision that the debenture stock of the Ontario and Quebec Railway shall be returned to the company. The hon. gentleman has taken express power to cancel the land grant bonds, but he has taken no express power to deal with the debenture stock, which I understand is under pledge to the Government. I do not know whether that method of distinguishing between the two classes of securities held by the Government may not lead afterwards to some confusion.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the first section, which ratifies the agreement, and authorises the Government and the company respectively to perform and carry out the conditions thereof.

Mr. BLAKE. I am aware of that, but I understood that there was a specific agreement made as to part of this.

Committee rose and reported.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR ONTARIO.

Mr. THOMPSON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 125) to amend the law relating to salaries of certain judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature for Ontario.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. THOMPSON. The object of this is to repeal the Act providing for the salaries, superannuation and travelling allowances of certain judges of certain provincial courts. The first section provides for the salary of the additional judge.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to an observation I addressed to the hon. gentleman some time ago, that there exists a considerable amount of inconvenience, both in reference to the discharge of the appellant functions and certain functions in other branches, I have received from persons qualified to judge statements corroborative of my remarks. There are a considerable number of cases which have been before the Court of Appeal for a very long time, and which cannot be tried for the want of what are called *ad hoc* judges. They are cases in which one or more judges of the court were concerned in the earlier stages of litigation, in their official capacity, and in which, therefore, it is not possible for them to sit. The addition proposed will give another judge to those out of whom

the selection of *ad hoc* judges can be made. With reference to the work in the High Court of Justice itself, I have been informed by practitioners of wide experience that there exists great difficulty in procuring judges to do the work. It is true the particular judge now to be appointed will belong to the Chancery division, but it is expected that his appointment will assist in the freeing of other judges. Amongst the cases presented to me as a practical instance of the difficulty, is this: A man had been arrested and was confined, and had pleaded for bail. His application having been refused before the master or judge of primary jurisdiction, the practitioner endeavored to procure a judge to hear the appeal, but he was unsuccessful, as the pressure of other business was so great that it was impossible for the judges to attend, and his client was confined pending the possibility of obtaining a judge. Under these circumstances, as the vacancy is now being filled, though not in the court in which the vacancy has occurred, and as there exists great inconvenience, no time should be lost in filling the vacancy.

Mr. THOMPSON. I had no such information when the hon. gentleman put his question, but one or two members of the House connected with the Ontario bar represented subsequently the inconvenience, and I presume the difficulty arose to a great extent from the long continued illness of Judge Morrison, and not through delay on the part of the Government in filling the office, because it was impossible to fill it until the vacancy occurred which was caused by the lamented death of Mr. Morrison, two or three months ago. There was no provision on the Statute-book to provide a salary for a judge or supply his place. The legislation in Ontario which enables us to add this judge to the Chancery division, was passed in the Session of 1885.

Committee rose and reported.

PUBLIC LANDS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 120) to make further provision respecting the administration of the public lands of Canada in British Columbia.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask whether the effect of extending the jurisdiction of the Dominion Lands Board is generally to extend the whole jurisdiction and system, and what change precisely will be made? At present these lands are under the charge of an official of the British Columbia Government, Mr. Trutch.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The lands at this moment are under charge chiefly of Mr. Trutch, the agent of the British Columbia Government. Now that there is railway communication, it is thought more desirable the lands should be more directly under the charge of the Dominion Board. Mr. Aikman has been removed to Westminster, where his office will be, and Mr. Trutch's services are to be dispensed with as regards our own land.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Aikman is to be under the control of the Dominion Land Board, and Mr. Trutch is no longer to have control?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Just so.

Mr. BLAKE. What is to become of Mr. Trutch, because I believe his services are very dear to the people of that Province, as we know they have been to the country. Is he to be superseded altogether?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think the hon. gentleman will have to give notice of that question.

Mr. BLAKE. This will include, in addition to the 40-mile railway belt, the lands given in the Peace River district?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It will embrace all the lands of the Dominion within British Columbia.

Mr. BLAKE. And, is it quite clear that, notwithstanding the completion of the railway, the distances will be such as to render this arrangement practically efficient, that the Dominion Lands Board can be at all fairly a local authority to administer these lands promptly?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think so.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to ask the Minister of the Interior whether there is any provision in the Bill for the pet of the Administration who has conducted the Dominion lands there up to this time, the Hon. Mr. Trutch, because I think it would be very unfair, after he has been petted and pampered by the Government so long, that he should not be provided for.

Mr. BLAKE. He will be.

Mr. MITCHELL. No doubt.

Committee rose and reported.

CROWN CASES RESERVED.

Mr. THOMPSON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 126) to amend the law respecting Crown cases reserved. He said: As I explained the other day, the Speedy Trials Acts are applicable to Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba, and in 1875 an Act was passed enabling the judge in Ontario who administers that law to state a question for the opinion of the justices of the superior courts who have jurisdiction in Crown cases reserved. An application has been made by some members of the judiciary of Quebec asking that the same power be extended to that Province, and the proposal in the Bill is that—

"Any judge, within the meaning of the Speedy Trials Act, trying any person under such Acts, may, in his discretion, reserve any question of law arising on such trial for the consideration of the justices of the court having, within the Province in which such trial takes place, jurisdiction to hear Crown cases reserved."

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WELDON. Is it intended to extend that to the Lower Provinces?

Mr. THOMPSON. I have not considered that question.

Mr. WELDON. I think the practice should be uniform in the different Provinces.

Committee rose and reported.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICIATURE FOR THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (page 1015) respecting the appointment of judges in the North-West Territories. He said: One of the objects of the present measure is to establish a Supreme Court for the North-West Territories by organising the present judges in the Territories, who are called stipendiary magistrates, into a court of appeal. Power is proposed to be taken to appoint an additional judge for the Territories. Representations have been made, partly on account of the growth of business in the Territories, and partly on account of the great distances these judges have to travel, it would be desirable to appoint an additional judge. We propose to fix the salaries at $4,000, and to provide that the travelling fees shall be such as shall be fixed by the Governor in

Council. As the House is aware, the salary at present allowed is $3,000 per annum. There is in addition to that an allowance of $1,000 to each judge for travelling expenses, and a further allowance to nearly all the judges of a sum in lieu of house rent. Mr. Rouleau was in occupation of a house which was erected at the public expense, and which was destroyed in the troubles of last spring, but the other judges were allowed $500 each in lieu of house rent, except Mr. Travis, who was made no allowance, though he claims he should have it made him in order to put him on an equality with the other judges. So that, while we are establishing the salaries permanently at $4,000 per annum, we are really making no substantial increase of the expenditure in connection with the judiciary of that country. So far as the emoluments allowed to the judges are concerned, it will be provided in the Bill that these officers shall hold no other office of emolument. Then it is proposed in these resolutions to enable the Governor in Council to divide the Territories into five judicial districts,and to appoint for each a sheriff and a clerk of the court. At present, there is but one sheriff for the North-West Territories, with deputies in each of the districts, and the emoluments allowed to that officer at present are equal to the expenditure which will be necessary to carry out this resolution. The officer receives $1,200 per annum, and an allowance of $800 per annum for travelling expenses, making $2,000 in all, and we propose that the sheriffs shall receive $500 each for their services, as a salary from the Government, and such fees as the Lieutenant Governor prescribes. When I said it made no increase, I was speaking as far as the present four districts are concerned. We propose to increase the number, and therefore there will be an addition to the expenditure in consequence. The clerks are at present appointed and dismissed by the judges, and it is proposed that they shall be appointed, like the other officers in the Territories, by the Governor in Council, and that they shall be paid by fees to be fixed in like manner to those of the sheriffs, and shall depend upon those for their emoluments.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says representations have been made as to the necessity of another judge. Would the hon. gentleman state where is to be the headquarters of the fifth judge?

Mr. THOMPSON. That will depend, to a great extent, on the division of the districts.

Mr. BLAKE. From what quarter do the representations come as to the necessity.

Mr. THOMPSON. Specially from Alberta.

Mr. BLAKE. The intention is to repeal the law under which the stipendiary magistrates hold office. Is it the intention to reappoint these four gentlemen as judges?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it the intention that they should hold office during good behavior?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE, Well, there may be a good deal to be said as to the propriety in all cases of appointing gentlemen who at present occupy benches as the permanent judges,holding their tenure during good behavior, which I quite agree is the proper tenure for a judge, and I think that subject ought to be considered to some extent. The hon. gentleman said something about appellate jurisdiction. Is it the idea that each of these judges will have separate jurisdiction, and that they will combine for a court of appeal?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is proposed to provide in the Bill that justice shall be administered by a Supreme Court in the North-West; that each of the judges, within his district, shall exercise the power of that court and that the court shall sit at certain periods for the despatch of appellate business.

Mr. WELDON. Where would the Supreme Court Appellate sit?

Mr. THOMPSON. At the seat of Government. The Bill states further on that the court shall sit *in banco* at the seat of Government in the Territories.

Mr. BLAKE. I entirely approve of the general spirit of the proposition that the people of the Territories should have, as one of the prime necessaries of good government, a supply of the best judicial power that we can give them. My own impression is that it is extremely difficult to forecast where the centres of population may be, and where the wants of the judicial power may most be found, to such an extent as to render it impossible to organise a very rigorous system there. I think we ought to keep our hands as free as possible, and to a certain extent await events. The proposal of the hon. gentleman is one which involves a very considerable expense for a very small population, but for my part I do not grudge any expense which may be necessary in order that the people of the Territories may have justice. I think, however, that the Government had better very fully consider before they decide how they will fill these offices, having regard to the existing tenure of office of the judges, of persons who now occupy these stations, before they give them permanent appointments.

Mr. THOMPSON. I meant to say that it is not intended by this Act necessarily to supersede persons who are now holding these offices, but I do not wish it to be understood that it would be the policy of the Government that these persons shall necessarily be appointed. In respect to one of the magistrates, as I stated to the House a short time ago, an investigation is now proceeding.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, it is necessarily involved in the Bill that their present functions cease, because the hon. gentleman proposes to repeal the law which gives them an existence; therefore, they will cease to be stipendiary magistrates. He proposes to create a new office, and the question is, who shall fill that office? I suppose, therefore, that we are to understand that it does not necessarily follow that they will not be appointed to the new office, and there is a certain probability that some of them will be appointed to the new offices. For my part, I must confess that before some of these gentlemen are appointed, I think some explanation should be given of their conduct. For my part, I was very much pained to read an account of the course pursued by one of these learned judges upon the occasion of the late outbreak, when, at a time which certainly required a certain amount of ability and staying power on the part of those who occupy the very high position of heads of the judiciary, we find a very sudden flight on the part of that gentleman from a post of danger, and a very effusive telegram announcing his arrival with "God save the Queen," I think, at the end of it, whom I think he would have been much better prepared to save if he had stayed at his post, instead of running away to a post of safety.

On resolution 2,

Mr. MILLS. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that after these parties were made judges of the Supreme Court, they could not be members of the North-West Council.

Mr. THOMPSON. I did not state that.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentleman did state that they would not be entitled to hold any other office of emolument, therefore, if they are members of the North-West Council, they could not be salaried members as at present.

Mr. THOMPSON. They do not receive salaries at present; one of them does, however, as law clerk of the North-West Council.

Mr. BLAKE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I think he will find, in the last Public Accounts, that more than one received salaries as members of the North-West Council. I think he will find Judge Richardson's name as a member of the North-West Council, as well as law adviser.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think not. But it is not material to the present enquiry.

Mr. BLAKE. Then there is to be no allowance for house rent, as I understand. The hon. gentleman made a statement, which did not coincide with my recollection of the Public Accounts, that there was an allowance for house rent for all of them, with the exception of Judge Rouleau, who had a house. That would make allowances received by Judge Richardson and Judge McLeod. I do not remember the latter's name appearing as a recipient of an allowance for house rent. In what quarter was he stationed?

Mr. THOMPSON. At Fort Macleod.

Mr. BLAKE. Did he not live in the public buildings?

Mr. THOMPSON. No; he received an allowance of $500.

Mr. BLAKE. The arrangement is to be that there will be no such allowances made, but there will be travelling allowances, of course? Is there any proposition to alter the scale of travelling allowances? I believe it is fixed at $1,000 a year.

Mr. THOMPSON. The present scale is $1,000 a year. I am not at liberty to say that there has been any policy adopted, but it is proposed that the travelling allowances should be the same as in Manitoba, which are, in addition to moving expenses, $5 a day while travelling.

On resolution 3,

Mr. BLAKE. It is understood that there is but one sheriff at present, and he is in receipt of a salary of $1,200 a year and $800 travelling expenses. There will be five sheriffs, each receiving $500 and such fees as the Lieutenant Governor prescribes. Are those fees to be paid out of the public chest?

Mr. THOMPSON. They are to be paid such travelling allowances and fees as are collected from suitors in the Provinces.

Mr. BLAKE. There is certain criminal business to be discharged. For example, we know that the execution of a capital sentence is a very expensive operation. In earlier days it cost I do not know how much to hang an important man there.

Mr. THOMPSON. There will be of necessity some expense in connection with the administration of criminal justice, but the allowance will be as nearly as possible the actual expenditure.

Resolutions reported.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 124) respecting experimental farm stations.—(Mr. Carling).

Mr. MILLS.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 101) in amendment of the Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883, and the Act amending the same.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 7,

Mr. COSTIGAN. I move to strike out the words "each case of removal or delivery" in the fourth line, to meet some objections which were raised by hon. gentlemen.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 8,

Mr. COSTIGAN. I move to add the following words at the end of the section "provided no increase of duties shall accrue therefrom.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 12,

Mr. COSTIGAN. The following clauses were introduced when it was thought necessary that my Department should take steps with regard to oleomargarine and other substitutes for butter. I therefore propose to strike out the remaining clauses.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman propose to prohibit the manufacture?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That will be dealt with by another measure.

Mr. DAVIES. Which the hon. gentleman intends to bring in this Session?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I had framed an amendment to prohibit the manufacture of these articles, but I understand the Minister intends to introduce a prohibitory Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No I did not say that I intended to introduce such a measure. I said that question would be dealt with by another measure, and then the hon. member for Queen's asked me if it would be brought in during this Session, and I said we proposed to deal with it during the Session.

Mr. MILLS. The striking out of these clauses will not prohibit the manufacture of oleomargarine in the country. It will leave every person free to manufacture as if the hon. gentleman had proposed nothing, but I think it is due to the House that the hon. gentleman should inform us what his intentions are. We know that some time ago the hon. gentleman proposed to put a tax on the importation of the article and an Excise duty on the article manufactured in the country. Now the policy of the Government, owing to the pressure from this side, has been changed, and there is to be an absolute prohibition instead of taxation. We are anxious to know whether the hon. gentleman and his colleagues propose to deal with the manufacture of the article in Canada in the same way; whether instead of imposing an Excise duty they propose to prohibit the manufacture. He has given us no information on this subject, and as it is late in the Session and as we are not anxious to protract it beyond what is absolutely necessary, it is important that the hon. gentleman should avail himself of this opportunity and communicate the intentions of the Government to the House. The House were invited by the Government to consider the question. The Government have struck out the clauses of the Bill dealing with this particular subject, and, having done so, I think it only respectful to the House to say what they intend to do. The hon. gentleman says it may be dealt with by another Bill.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It will be.

Mr. MILLS. And this Session?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Then the hon. gentleman should say whether it is to be a regulative or a prohibitory measure.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understood that the Minister of Customs, at the last sitting of the House, stated that it is the intention of the Government during this Session to submit to the House resolutions to have the effect of prohibiting the manufacture of oleomargarine and butterine. Of course, the importation was also referred to at the same time.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It was not so stated by the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Inland Revenue. If the Minister of Public Works had not made the statement he has just made, I had intended to move an amendment, and I do not know that it would be improper that we should now adopt such an amendment and affirm the principle instead of striking out these clauses by adding the following to section 12:—

"The manufacture within the Dominion of Canada of oleomargarine, butterine and other substitutes for butter, is hereby prohibited."

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think a resolution of that kind should be adopted when we are dealing with the Bill now before the committee. The very fact that the clauses dealing with the re-manufacture of that article in the country are to be struck out, is a proof that the manufacture is not intended to be allowed in the country; and I do not think the hon. gentleman should go so far as to press the resolution, before it has been decided in what particular way the Government shall carry out the prohibition once they have announced their intention to do so. I think the House will be willing to leave the matter in the hands of the Government.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, on the statement of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BOWELL. I am somewhat surprised at the statements made by the hon. member for Brant. I certainly stated last night, as plainly and clearly as I could, that this question would be dealt with to the satisfaction of the House. I stated that, immediately after the remarks of the hon. member for Leeds, in which he advocated the total prohibition of both the manufacture and importation of this article. I went further, and said that when the Government proposed to impose a duty of 10 cents on the imported article, and 8 cents on the manufactured article, they considered that that would be tantamount to prohibition. I think I was sufficiently explicit, and I am very glad my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has been still more explicit, if that were necessary. It certainly must be amusing to those who listened to the first debate on this question to hear the remarks made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who certainly took exception to interference with trade in matters of this kind, and who ably assisted my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), when he made one of his most effective speeches on this question. On any question before the House, no one can misapprehend what that hon. gentleman says or means; he generally speaks straight to the point, and I certainly understood the hon. member for Bothwell to approve of the remarks made by my free trade friend, not only in theory, but, perhaps, I might add in practice also. To hear him tell us now that we have been obliged to accede to the demands of the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, I think was, not to be disrespectful, somewhat cool.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman looks at what I said on that occasion, he will find nothing in consonance with the observations he makes now. I advocated prohibition in this case but I do not think I said anything inconsistent with the principles of free trade. The question before us has no connection with the freedom or the bondage of trade. It is a question with regard to a certain police regulation. The hon. gentleman knows that the objection to the production of oleomargarine has been based on the theory of the public health. Our laws relating to the adulteration of food do not touch the question of the freedom of trade; they simply relate to the protection of the public health. It is on that ground that our proposed policy with reference to this article is based, and not on the theory of free trade or the theory of restricted trade.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the hon. Minister of Customs or the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue had made a statement as explicit as that of the hon. Minister of Public Works, I should, of course, have received it with the same credence; but I maintain that neither of those gentlemen made so explicit a statement. The hon. Minister has repeated the words he used last night, that he thought the hon. member for Leeds would find that the Government would take a course which would likely meet his views; but the conflicting part of his remarks was what he has alluded to, that the Government thought they would accomplish prohibition by the imposition of the Excise duty. The House were likely to infer that their proposal might be to increase the duty from 8 cents to 50 cents a pound; but as I pointed out, it could not be accomplished in that way, because if they increased the duty to even $1 a pound, the article might still be manufactured and exported to a foreign country, because the duty in that case would not be paid. The Minister of Public Works, however, has spoken plainly and clearly, and his announcement is quite satisfactory.

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

After Recess.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 115) respecting the representation of the North-West Territories in the Parliament of Canada. He said: I mentioned, when I introduced this Bill, that its purpose was to give representation to the North-West Territories. It is proposed that Assiniboia, having the largest population, should have two members, and Alberta and Saskatchewan each one. The population would scarcely allow of so many members, but, although the settlers are very few in number, the country is large and has many different interests requiring different legislative measures, and, following the example set by giving representation to the Province of Manitoba, many years ago, when it had a very slight population, we propose to give those districts the representation I have mentioned. Under the Act giving power to the Dominion Parliament to make Provinces out of Territories, while we have the power to create Provinces and give them representation, we have not the power—in the absence of any statement, at all events—to give representation in the Dominion Parliament to Territories before they are established Provinces. There was passed, therefore, a resolution for an address to Her Majesty, praying that she should be pleased to cause a measure to be laid before the Imperial Parliament granting us that additional power, and no doubt it will be granted. As to the nature of our recommendation, it should be seen that the Imperial Parliament did not pass an Act otherwise than for that special purpose, and I would mention to the House the suggestion I made of a Bill which might properly be submitted for that purpose to the Imperial Parliament:

"Be it enacted by the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, and Com-

mons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same as follows:—The Parliament of Canada may, from time to time, make provision for the representation in the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, of any Territories forming, for the time being, part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any Province thereof.—Those are the words of the address already passed by this House—

"Any Act passed by the Parliament of Canada before the passing of this Act for the purpose mentioned in the next preceding section shall be and shall be deemed to have been valid and effectual from the date at which it received the assent, in Her Majesty's name, of the Governor General of Canada."

That is the sole content of the measure suggested to Her Majesty's Government. Several clauses of the Bill have been carefully prepared by the law clerk and assistant law clerk, for the purpose of applying, as far as possible, the elective system which obtains in the rest of the Dominion, with respect to the franchise and the mode of holding elections there. The Bill adopts the system which obtains there now for the election of the North-West Council. They, of course, know the circumstances of the country better than we possibly can, and have prepared the measure under which they now work, and which seems to work satisfactorily for representation in the North-West Council, which, I hope, will soon become a Legislative Assembly. I think they have 16 members elected, and as soon as they have 21, under the Bill of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), each nominative officer will drop out, and there will be an elective Assembly like the other Provincial Assemblies.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I must say that the hon. gentleman's explanations have neither been very full nor very clear. The only thing he has made clear is that it is proposed to add four members to the representation in this House. To that proposition nobody has any objection. I have very strongly advocated it in the past, and I am in favor of it now. For the last three years I have been constantly pressing on the attention of the Government the necessity of granting to the people of the North-West Territories, in the interest of the peace and harmony, the progress and prosperity that ought to prevail there, representation in this Parliament. I urged these views in the House, on more than one occasion, on the attention of Parliament, as best I could, and I pressed this question on the attention of the Government in every way known to the practice and the law of Parliament. I pointed out, on more than one occasion, to the Government the fact that the people of the North-West Territories, the representative bodies in the Territories, the press published in the Territories, and the leading men of the Territories, were pressing upon the Government, for two or three years, the absolute necessity of granting them representation in the Parliament of Canada, and I pointed out to the Government, two years ago, on different occasions, the absolute necessity of yielding to what I considered the fair and reasonable demand of the people of the North-West Territories. I say that for three years, on this side of the House, we pleaded with the Government, and, I regret, pleaded in vain, to grant to the North-West Territories representation in this Parliament. I pointed out the serious consequences that would be likely to ensue if this reasonable demand of the people was not acceded to; I pointed out that dissatisfaction and discontent prevailed to a large extent in the North-West Territories, that they had no representation on the floor of Parliament to express their views, formulate their complaints, and ask redress for the wrongs under which they contended they were suffering. On the 2nd March, 1884, I introduced a Bill to grant representation to the people of the North-West Territories. I then discussed the principle of the Bill, I discussed some of the details of the proposition I then submitted to the House, I asked the Government to deal with the matter in the interest of that peace and harmony which ought to prevail, and of the justice that should be dealt out by this Parliament to our fellow subjects in the North-West

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Territories. How was that proposition met? Was it met, as it ought to have been, by hon. gentlemen opposite in a spirit of fair play and an earnest desire to do right and justice to the people? No, it was not. The hon. gentleman who led the House answered, in his own peculiar style, my speech, and he is reported in the *Hansard* for 1884, at page 602, to have met the demands of the people of the North-West Territories for representation in this Parliament, in the following language:—

"It can answer no good purpose to discuss this subject until we see the hon. gentleman's Bill. Of course, we grant him the usual courtesy of introducing it, though from its terms, as the hon. gentleman substantially states, it is a measure which must be under the guidance of the Government of the day. However, when the Bill is introduced we will see what its provisions are. I merely wish to add, Mr. Speaker, and call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this—we do not know that it is in the Bill or not—but from the remarks of the hon. gentleman it is quite clear that he intends to be the next Minister of the Interior. He says he is strongly in favor of the Minister of the Interior living up there. Now, my hon. friend has made large investments in the North-West, and I am glad to learn, proper investments, and it is therefore quite clear that my hon. friend is going to live there. We must therefore consider this measure of his as an insidious attempt to take possession of the ground, and to cut out any of the hon. gentlemen opposite from the chance of being the next Minister of the Interior. I hope he will be as fortunate as any of my hon. friends on the other side. I wish him all prosperity when he is there. In the meantime we will consider my hon. friend's Bill."

I submitted seriously a proposition of the first possible importance to the Parliament of Canada, pointing out the necessity for making provision for the representation of the people of the North-West Territories in this Parliament, and the only answer I received, was the bantering answer I have just read, from the First Minister. That was not all that was done during that Session. On going into Supply, I moved that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the grievances of the people of the North-West Territories, and Manitoba. On that occasion, I pointed out again the necessity for this representation. I specially drew the attention of the Government to it. I think I quoted a minute of the North-West Council. I referred to public meetings that had been convened for the purpose of considering this question, and to remonstrances that were made to the Government by the people of the North-West Territories, but I failed to move the Government in the matter. The matter ended, for 1884, with that resolution, which, of course, was voted down. In the Session of 1885, I again introduced a Bill for the representation of the Territories in this Parliament. The House met, I think, on the 29th January, and on the 17th February I presented my Bill. On the 11th March, I moved the second reading, and I then took occasion to discuss at length the principle of the Bill and many of its details. The Government had then had twelve months to consider the whole question. The Government were perfectly aware, as we all were, of the uneasy, dissatisfied and discontented condition of the people in the North-West Territories, and their persistent demands for representation in this Parliament. A large portion of this discontent would, I believe, have been allayed by the granting of representation in this Parliament, where the representatives from the North-West Territories, conversant with the wants, the necessities, the claims and the demands of the people of the North-West Territories, would have had an opportunity of expressing their views. How did the Government act upon that occasion? Did they, as sensible, reasonable men ought to have acted, deal promptly with the matter that they must have known at no very distant day would become an absolute necessity? No, they did not so deal with the matter. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, who then led the House, in reply to my remarks upon that occasion, made use of the following language, which will be found in the *Hansard* of 1885, page 495:—

"I would have wished that the hon. gentleman, when he introduced this Bill, had favored us with the remarks which he has made this evening, as I would have then been prepared to answer the able argu-

ment he has just made. Under these circumstances, this being an important measure, I would beg to postpone my remarks to another day, and beg, therefore, to move that the debate be now adjourned."

When that motion was made, it was quite manifest, in the condition of public business then, that it was impossible to reach the discussion of this Bill during the Session of 1885, and so the propositions contained in my Bill were not disposed of by the Government. They expressed no opinion upon the question. They did not hold out the least hope to the people of the North-West Territories, that the Government of Canada were prepared to accede to their demands. Later on in that Session, and after fuller and more careful investigation of the whole question, the whole position, the mode in which this representation could be granted, I came to the conclusion that others came to, that the Parliament of Canada had no power by Bill to grant representation to the Territories. The object of my Bills of 1884 and 1885 was simply to draw the attention of the Government to this important question. I had doubts then, and these doubts were subsequently removed, as to the power of the Canadian Parliament to deal with the matter by Bill; but my main object was to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the necessity, the absolute necessity, of granting this representation, and granting it promptly. Now it is quite clear, I think, it is admitted now, that the power to grant representation to the Territories is not vested in the Parliament of Canada by the Union Act, or by the Act of 1871 amending the Union Act. The first section of the Act of 1871, which gave the Parliament of Canada the power to grant representation to a Province carved out of a Territory, is in the words following:—

"The Parliament of Canada may, from time to time, establish new Provinces in any Territories forming, for the time being, part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any Province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of any such Province, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such Province, and for its representation in the said Parliament."

But there is no provision in that Statute enabling the Parliament of Canada to grant representation to a Territory, and so, with these difficulties staring me in the face, and staring the Parliament of Canada in the face, and yet with the absolute necessity of granting this representation to the people of the North-West Territories thoroughly impressed on my own mind, on the 15th July, 1885, I moved, on going into Supply, the following resolution:—

"To leave out all the words after 'that,' and insert the following instead thereof: 'It is expedient, that at the earliest moment, provision should be made for the representation of the North-West Territories in the Parliament of Canada, in such manner as shall to that Parliament seem expedient; that it is doubtful whether the Parliament of Canada has power to provide for such representation, so long as the said Territories are not formed into Provinces, or otherwise than in the hitherto accustomed method; that, unless Imperial legislation is obtained, additional delays may take place in the granting of such representation; that it is expedient to address Her Majesty the Queen, praying that she may be pleased to move the Parliament of the United Kingdom to pass such legislation as may remove the doubts as to the Parliament of Canada to provide for such representation."

The Minister of Public Works, who then led the House, declared in his place in Parliament that this motion was premature, that I was proceeding entirely too rapidly, that we ought to wait until the census of the people of the North-West Territories was taken, and then it would be time enough to ask the Imperial Parliament to vest in the Parliament of Canada the power to grant representation to those people. Now we observe that the First Minister is doing to-day what I asked the Government to do twelve months ago, and which if the Government had done twelve months ago, the hon. gentlemen would not now be occupying the humiliating position they do occupy of asking the Parliament of Canada to pass a Bill to grant representation to the people of the North-West Territories in this Parliament which they have no power to do. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the Bill he is asking the assent of Parliament to is not worth the paper it is written on. He knows that this Parliament has no power to grant representation to the Territories, and the hon. gentleman is asking the assent of Parliament to this Bill in the expectation and in the hope that the Imperial Parliament will sanction or confirm or affirm this illegal legislation which he is now proposing. But, although the hon. gentleman has put the cart before the horse, although he is passing his Bill before he has the power to pass it, although he is depending entirely for the validity of this legislation upon the good will and sanction of the Imperial Parliament, still the Bill is before Parliament. The Bill is here, and we are now asked to sanction it. After reading over the Bill and examining its principles with some care, I must confess that I am a little amazed at the Bill itself—not at the provision granting representation, but at other provisions which the hon. gentleman has introduced. Now, Sir, we who have some knowledge of hon. gentlemen opposite, of how they gained and retained their places in Parliament and upon the Treasury benches in the past, have not much reason to hope that, when the reprsentation of the people in Parliament was to be added to, fair play and justice would be meted out to the electors. It looks marvellously like as if the rights of the people had to yield to the necessities of the party, and I think I can show you that such is the case in a moment or two. This Bill is entitled "A Bill with respect to the representation of the North-West Territories in the Parliament of Canada." I say that is a mistake; whoever drew up this Bill, whether it was the law clerk or a Minister, commits an entire mistake. This is not a Bill to grant representation to the people of the North-West Territories in the Parliament of Canada, it is a Bill to enable the Government of Canada to appoint four members to the Parliament of Canada to support the Government. That is the object of the Bill. It is a Bill to destroy the representation of the people in Parliament; it is a Bill that will take away from every honest voter the power and right to vote; it is a Bill to enable an individual called an enumerator to send to Parliament four members to support this Administration. Now let me consider some of the principles upon which this Bill is based. First, as to the qualifications of the voters, you will find in section 4:

"The persons qualified to vote at the election of such members shall be the *bonâ fide* male residents and householders of adult age who are not aliens or Indians, within the electoral district for at least twelve months immediately preceding the writ of election."

Here you will observe that the right to vote is limited to those who are male residents and householders of the Territory. Both conditions must exist, being a householder and being a resident. That is a different franchise to any that prevails in any other Province. A man may be a resident landholder in the Territories, yet if he is not a householder he cannot vote under this Bill. A man may own and pay taxes upon 20,000 acres in the North-West Territories, yet if he is not a householder, although he may live there, he is deprived of the franchise by this Bill. A man may have a house worth $10,000 in the North-West Territories, but if he is not a permanent resident there, he cannot vote. He cannot go from Manitoba or elsewhere and vote there, although he may have a house worth $10,000; he must be a resident householder before he is entitled to vote. Now, I say there are hundreds of men in the North-West Territories who have a freehold, who have valuable properties, yet who are disfranchised under this Bill. I say that is not fair to the people of the North-West Territories. Then you will find another objectionable principle in this Bill, in section 28, referring to the mode in which the voters' lists are to be prepared. Now, I look upon that as one of the most important things that exists with respect to representation. It is known that during the last Session of Parliament an Act was passed appointing a revising officer to prepare the voters' lists in the older Provinces. Where the revising officer is a bar-

rister, but not a judge, there is an appeal from his decision, but where he is a judge, there is no appeal; and it was argued with some appearance of fairness that the judges in all cases would do right. Whether they have done so or not, I am not going now to discuss. But under this Bill the Government undertake to appoint an individual who will discharge the duty of preparing the voters' list. Section 28 provides:

"The Governor General may appoint enumerators to make lists of the electors in the electoral districts; and if such appointments have not been made, the returning officer conjointly with any two justices of the peace, or with one justice of the peace and a notary public, or with any one of the residents in or near the electoral district and two electors of such district, neither of the number being a candidate, shall appoint under their hand a competent and reliable person to be enumerator for anyone or more polling divisions of such districts; and the returning officer shall see that no polling division is omitted to be included."

You will see that the Bill provides for the appointment by the Government of an enumerator whose business it is to prepare the voters' lists. Section 29 provides:

"Each such enumerator, immediately after the nomination day, if a poll is granted, shall carefully compile a list of the persons qualified as electors to vote at the election then pending, for the polling division, or each of the polling divisions, for which he has been appointed; and he shall make three plainly written copies of the same with the names of the voters alphabetically arranged, giving the occupation and residence of each voter, in the form J in the schedule to the Act."

Now, Sir, under the Franchise Act of 1885, the revising officer was the machine by which the Government intended to capture the constituencies one year afterwards, and under this Bill the enumerator is the officer which the hon. gentleman has selected for the same purpose. It is perfectly clear that the revising officer, and the machinery employed under the Bill of last year, is found to be cumbersome, and expensive, even to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House; and so, under the present Bill, instead of a revising officer, the hon. gentleman selects an enumerator to discharge the duty of preparing the lists in the North-West Territories. Now, looking at the clauses of the Bill, I must confess that I rather admire the plainness, and the simplicity of the machinery adopted by the First Minister for the purpose of attaining the object that he has evidently in view. There is no mystery about it, it is open, it is above board. It does not possess the merit of originality, because this Parliament has more than once seated a gentleman without the formality of receiving a majority of the votes of the electors. This proposition, however, has the merit of effecting the purpose for which it was designed. The Government appoints the enumerator, and the enumerator prepares the voters' lists, in other words, the Government, through the enumerator, appoint the member. The canvassing by the candidate, the nomination and the polling, are wholly superfluous. They serve no purpose, they waste time, they involve expense for no practical purpose, and that you will see clearly by referring to section 31:

"If any enumerator, at any time after posting up any voters' lists and before the polling day, is fully satisfied, from representations made to him by any credible persons, that the name of any qualified voter has been omitted from the voters' list of the polling division to which such voters belong, he shall add such name to the copy of the list in his possession below his own signature and shall attest such addition by his signature. If the enumerator, in like manner, is fully satisfied that there is on the list the name of any person who is not qualified as a voter in such polling division, he may draw erasing lines through such name and write his own initials opposite thereto in the column for "remarks;" and if the enumerator finds the occupation, addition or residence of any voter to be inaccurately stated in the list, he may make the necessary alteration and affix his initials thereto in like manner."

You will see, Mr. Speaker, at once the simplicity of the machinery provided by this Bill for the purpose intended. The Government appoints the enumerator, the enumerator prepares the voters' list; in other words, he elects the candidate. Under section 29, he cannot take the first step towards the preparation of the voters' list until after the nomination of candidates. The moment the nomination takes place he must set to work and prepare the voters' list. After having prepared the list, under section 33, if any person represents to the enumerator that there are names on the voters' list, 10, 20, 50 or 100 names, which should not be there, the simple formality of drawing what is called an erasing line through the names is gone through and the names disappear. There is no notice given, no evidence taken, no trial, no formality whatever, the names disappear. This is a proposal to place the sole, the supreme, the absolute, the unlimited power in the hands of the enumerator to do what he likes, when he likes, how he likes. Under the same section if it should turn out that any person informs the enumerator that two, ten, fifty, or 100 names, or 500 names ought to be upon the list that are not on the list, the enumerator does not hold any investigation, does not give any notice or take any evidence, but he simply places them on the list as a matter of course, especially if doing so would help the Conservative candidate. Here is an official appointed by the Government, and, of course, he is a friend of the Government, and desires to do all he can to benefit them, and help to secure the object the Government has in view, who is vested with power by this Bill that enables him, without notice to those affected by it, to manipulate the voters' list as he sees fit. If it should appear that there is a majority of Liberals on the voters' list, all some Conservative has to do is to tell the enumerator that certain names should not be on, and the enumerator is clothed with absolute power to strike every one of the names off the list. If it should turn out that forty or fifty or 100 or 200 names are required to be added to the voters' list, in order to effect the purpose in view, and make the election of a Conservative beyond all doubt, all any Conservative has to do is to tell the enumerator that those names should be on the voters' list and he can place them on it. That is an extraordinary provision of the law. I care not whether it is the law respecting the election of members to the North-West Council or not; I say no enumerator or officer of the Government should be vested with such wholesale and unlimited power as this enumerator has under the provisions of this Bill. Why, under this Bill all the securities, the safeguards that men usually have for the protection of their rights and property are absolutely swept away. The right a man has of voting, which is a right dear to every British subject, the right of the people to send representatives to the Parliament of Canada to represent the majority of the electors of a constituency, is under this Bill treated as a relic of a past age, the safeguards are all gone. An enumerator has the power vested in himself under section 33 to select, nominate and appoint and send to this Parliament just whom he pleases. That is not all. One would naturally imagine that under the provisions of this Bill, already referred to, the power would be unlimited enough to effect the purpose intended, but there are still further powers given to this enumerator. Under the provisions of this Bill, as I have explained, the enumerator cannot take the first step until the nomination, and he is bound between that time and polling, to prepare the voters' list. The provisions of the Bill go a little further. As I have said one would naturally imagine, under those provisions of the Bill to which I have referred, that ample power was given to the revising officer to effect the work intended to be done; but still there might be a bare possibility that the enumerator had not satisfactorily completed his work between nomination and polling day, and so, under another section, the enumerator is given power up to eight o'clock on the morning of polling day to add to or take from the voters' list just such names as the enumerator might see fit, and this also without notice, evidence or trial. That is a power no Minister should ask Parliament to sanction. But that is not all. Under another section another officer, called the deputy returning officer, is vested with equally unlimited power. If the enumerator does not do his duty, if he does not do it so as to satisfy the Conservative candidate, the deputy returning

officer is placed in a position where he can supplement anything which the enumerator had omitted. And so under section 44 of the Bill the deputy returning officer can record the votes of men whose names are not on the voters' list, whose names were not there, and whose names had never been put on it. So those two officials have thus unlimited power to return to this Parliament four representatives, and return such only as will support the Government. There are other objectionable features in this Bill, but I do not propose to discuss them until the Bill is in committee. So far as I am concerned I may say that I rose, from the examination and consideration of the provisions of the Bill, thoroughly impressed with this conviction, that hon. gentlemen opposite have now arrived at a point when they do not find it necessary to conceal the object they have in view in ambiguous language, for it is put in the plainest language that their object is not to grant representation to the people of the North-West, but to send from the North-West Territories four men apppointed by the enumerator and the deputy returning officer to support this Government. I say again that, in so far as I am personally concerned, I am strongly in favor of the representation of the Territories. I believe they should have had it years ago. I believe now we should give them representation, and give it to them promptly. I am in favor, therefore, of granting them representation; but I am not in favor of putting it in the power of an enumerator, an official appointed by this or any Government, to nominate exactly whom he likes and send to this Parliament exactly who he likes, and under this Bill that power is undoubtedly placed in his hands. I am now and I always have been in favor of representation being granted to the people of the North-West Territories, but I want it granted to the people and not to an enumerator appointed by this or any other Government; and unless the hon. gentleman sees fit to amend this provision of the Bill, so far as my humble ability goes, I shall oppose these objectionable portions of the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says we have introduced a Bill which is only waste paper. A little while before that he stated he had introduced a Bill, and I do not think there was any greater validity in his Bill than the one we have now before us. The hon. gentleman, after making that simple remark—I do not mean it satirically—that mere remark, attacked the qualification of voters. Well, they have got a qualification for voters up there now. They have a qualification for election to the Council. The qualification in the Bill is the same that enables the people to vote for a councillor to sit in the legislative body of the North-West Territories, and that clause was, after full consideration, inserted in the Act of 1875 by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). This is his clause copied word for word. In the Statute 38 Vic., chap. 49, passed in 1875, the hon. gentleman will see that this is the clause:

"The persons qualified to vote at such elections shall be the *bonâ fide* male residents and householders of adult age, not being aliens, or unenfranchised Indians, within the electoral district, and shall have respectively resided in such electoral district for at least twelve months immediately preceding the issue of the writ."

That was introduced when electoral institutions were to be provided for the North-West. That was the Bill introduced by the late Government, and I have in this case simply followed the precedent which was set then, and have provided in this Bill for the qualification which has existed ever since. This Bill of 1875 was consolidated and amended in 1880, and the same clause was continued by the Government of which I was a member. I did not find then that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) or the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) made any objection to this clause, and I have not heard from any portion of the North-West any objection to this qualification, or any expression of a desire for the extension, the limitation or the alteration of it in any way whatever. I think perhaps the hon. gentleman was not aware of the fact when he made that statement; I am sure he was not, or he would not have so attacked the franchise. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will say on recollection—I dare say he will, that he was aware of it.

Mr. MILLS. Order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not out of order. Now that it is recalled to his recollection he will say so. But I do not think there is any change between 1875 and 1880, and between 1880 and 1886. Then the hon. gentleman objects to the mode of election. Well, if the hon. gentleman will look at the note at the head of the Bill and at the references at the end of each clause, he will find that these clauses were prepared by the Local Assembly or Council. They, living on the spot, knowing the difficulties of collecting the suffrages of a people scattered over an enormous territory, they themselves, of their own mere motion, from the knowledge they acquired of the difficulties, and for the purpose of giving an opportunity to every man having a vote, they have provided this rough and ready way of doing it. There was no means of preparing voters' lists; there was no means of introducing the complicated machinery that exists, the perfect machinery, the organisation which exists in the other Provinces, so they themselves have provided this system, and in order to prevent any man from losing his vote they provided in a very unscientific way—it does not suit the ideas of the hon. gentleman—they provided a means by which a man, who may have to travel several hundred miles to vote, can come on the morning of the election and say to the deputy returning officer, "Here, I want my vote put in." This is their own system, adapted to their own circumstances, and until the circumstances change, until they have become an older settled population, until they have become Provinces, I had the humility to think they were much better judges of the best means of getting the suffrage and polling the votes of all the people in the North-West Territories than we were here, and that we would be defeating the great object they had in the drafting of their election ordinances, we would be defeating all we desired to have, if we laid down machinery which would prevent one-quarter of the votes being brought out. These people would not take the trouble of travelling 200, 300 or 500 miles for the purpose of having their names entered on the voters' list. The adoption of a system at all equivalent to the system which obtains in the other Provinces would be simply cutting off fully one-half of the persons who have a right to vote. I hope by-and-bye—I am sure that by-and-bye—when the population gets extended, when the different sections have a better organisation, municipal and otherwise, that by degrees a more complete system will be introduced. Now, these four gentlemen who are to be elected to Parliament will be able on the floor of this House to point out the defects of this law. They will ask for alterations in this law, and I have no doubt that Parliament will alter the law from time to time, according to the representations of these people, and that by degrees, as the country requires it and as they become ready to adopt it, perhaps the present system, the present qualification of electors and the present mode of holding elections in the older Provinces will be adopted.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman's observations are strangely at variance with the observations he addressed to this House twelve months ago, when the Franchise Bill was under discussion. He was then a great stickler for the sacred principles of uniformity.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not of pedantic uniformity, I said.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman denied altogether that the people, through their representatives in the different

Provinces, were better qualified to judge of the qualification of voters in those Provinces than the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were in this House, and he insisted during last Session that the representatives in this House were better judges as to the qualification of voters in the distant Province of British Colombia, than were those who represented that Province of the Local Legislature. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman lays down a wholly different principle, and he declares that while he could not trust the conclusions reached by the people's representatives in the different Provinces he is quite prepared to trust the conclusion reached by the members of the North-West Council. It must be remembered that a considerable number of the members of that Council are not representative. The hon. gentleman alluded to the steps he had taken at an earlier stage of the Session to give these people representation in this Parliament. He has admitted that this House is not competent to pass such an Act as this unless it is sanctioned and made valid by an Act of the Imperial Parliament. that being so, and the attention of the hon. gentleman having been called to this matter last Session, how is it that he has waited until this Session before inviting the Imperial Parliament to legislate on the subject? The course taken by the hon. gentleman seems to me somewhat extraordinary. We do not trust to the Administration of the day the ordinary matters of legislation; and yet the hon. gentleman without inviting the House to express its opinion as to the character of the legislation required, asks us to ask the Imperial Parliament to legislate on this subject? The hon. gentleman takes a course like that which he took in 1871. It was objected to; and the Government at that time found it necessary to bring down to Parliament specific resolutions, setting forth in exact terms the kind of legislation which was sought at the hands of the Imperial Parliament. The position then taken was that we would not consent to an alteration of our constitution by the Imperial Parliament simply at the instance of the Executive; yet the hon. gentleman now proposes to ask for Imperial legislation, as to the character of which we have very imperfect information. The hon. gentleman spoke two or three years ago about the sacred principle of representation by population; but in the representation of the North-West Territories, he proposes to depart from that radical principle of our constitution. I am not objecting to this, because it was done in the case of Manitoba; but while Parliament might safely give to the people of the Territories a larger representation than they would by population be entitled to in the first instance, it seems to me that Parliament ought not to have the power to increase or vary that representation at any subsequent period. If I understand the clauses which the hon. gentleman has read, the principle of representation by population will not apply to those Territories under this Bill until they become Provinces, and it would be in the power of the Government, after such legislation has been adopted, to double the representation in any one district—in fact, to increase it to an unlimited extent; and if the Government were a weak Government, or expected a small following from the other Provinces, there might be a strong temptation to give to those Territories undue representation, knowing to what an extent they would be dependent on the Administration for the time being. I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fourth clause of the Bill, which I apprehend does not create the qualification he intends. I do not agree with the observations made by my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) as to the effect of this clause. It says:

"The persons qualified to vote at the election of such members shall be the *bonâ fide* male residents and householders."

Here are two distinct classes of electors. If the hon. gentleman intents to give the franchise both to residents and householders, the word householders is surplusage, because a man could not be a householder without being a resident. Do I understand the intention of the hon. gentleman is to create two qualifications—that of simple residence, and that of householders?

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. My intention is to carry out the words of the Statute, which the hon. gentleman has just defined and explained; and I quite agree with him that the hon. gentleman who spoke before him on that side was in error in his construction of this clause.

Mr. MILLS. Then I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the schedule, which exactly conforms to the construction of my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman must alter either his schedule or the clause. Form No. 1 reads:

"You do swear that you are a *bonâ fide* male resident and householder within this polling division of this electoral district?"

According to the oath, the elector must be not only a resident, but a householder. But according to this section, it is sufficient if he is one or the other. It is clear that a person who might be a resident, without being a householder, would be entitled to vote under this clause. The hon. gentleman referred to the Statute as mine; he is mistaken. It was carried through in 1875, when my predecessor, Mr. Laird, was in the Government; but I know very well the principles that were before the mind of the party who drew up that Statute. The difficulty was that there were a large number of Americans engaged in trading in the country, and the object was to create a qualification which would exclude a class of persons to whom it was not desirable to extend the franchise. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the difficulties of framing a voters' list; and the very difficulties he has mentioned, and the loose provisions he has made, show that the qualification adopted is not a desirable one, unless the hon. gentleman were to declare that the qualification prescribed and the voters' list prepared for the election of members of the North-West Council shall be the qualification and the voters' list for the election of members to the House of Commons. If the hon. gentleman were to adopt that provision, then all these clauses relating to the preparation of voters' lists by a Government officer would disappear; but if the hon. gentleman is disposed to create a distinct list, I think the only proper qualification is that a man shall be a subject of Her Majesty, shall be twenty one years of age, and shall be a resident of the Territory. We should then have a simple declaration and qualification which would prevent fraud and would enable the young men of the country, the class of men most desirable to secure in that country, to exercise the elective franchise. Certainly, there is no necessary connection between men's interests in the conduct of public affairs and the qualifications which the hon. gentleman proposes; and the very provision which the hon. gentleman has suggested in this Bill, with regard to the preparation of the voters' lists, shows conclusively that it is impossible to form such a list upon this basis, to serve the ordinary purposes of a list. Why, if the hon. gentleman provides that a man may suggest to the officer who prepares the list or the enumerator, that such a party has left the country and his name should be struck out, or that another party is in the country and his name should be put on, up to the last moment, practically you have no list at all. There would be no object served by the list, no restraint upon the admission of parties to the polls who are not qualified, nothing that the enumerator requires which can be a test of a man's qualification when he puts in his appearance at the poll to vote. There is no more restraint on the admission of persons not properly qualified, by any provision the hon. gentleman has made, than there would be did no list exist. The third clause is objectionable and wholly inapplicable to that Territory. I would call the hon.

gentleman's attention to section 18 with regard to the deposit of $200 before a man can become a candidate. Now, whatever may be thought of the use of such a qualification in preventing parties coming forward who have no chance of being elected, in preventing bogus candidates being put into the field in counties in the older Provinces, no such use is likely to exist in the North-West Territories. The hon. gentleman admits the sparsity of the population and the difficulties of the case, and he does this by providing in the 17th section that it is only necessary to obtain the signature of four qualified voters to the nomination paper, while at least twenty-five are required in any one of the older Provinces. He next provides that a deposit of $200 shall be made. It may often occur that persons in tolerably good circumstances in the North-West, living far away from any banking institution, will have difficulty in finding $200 to deposit in an election contest, and the hon. gentleman ought not to insert such a provision. That glorious principle of uniformity for which the hon. gentleman proved such an extraordinary stickler last Session, that he kept the House sitting six months, is abandoned. He admits he cannot adhere to it; he admits that the qualification he has adopted for almost every Province he cannot apply in the North-West Territories, and he has admitted with regard to the nomination paper, that he cannot require the same number of signatures to it as is demanded in the Provinces; he admits the circumstances of the population are different by providing differently for them in the nomination paper; he admits it in the qualification of voters and in the preparation of voters' lists; and I think his proposal to require a deposit of $200 would simply be to declare that nineteen-twentieths—yes, more than that, 99 per cent.—of the population found in any one of these districts shall not be eligible for election, no matter what the other electors may think of their fitness. It is not a desirable condition of things. He feels it is necessary to leave the people, in a large degree, to themselves, to decide who is and who is not qualified to be a candidate; and that being the case, he ought not to insert a disqualifying provision of this sort. Now, the hon. gentleman has justified this appointment of enumerators, and I think it is a most serious objection. He has referred to the fact that a similar provision is made with regard to the elections to the North-West Council, and the preparation of the voters' lists for the North-West Council. But the hon. gentleman must see that the conditions are altogether different. The Government here are 2,000 miles away, and can exercise no power of supervision over their enumerators. They do not know how well or how badly these enumerators discharge their duties; they will not know whether the enumerators have or have not abused the authority with which they are vested. However desirous the Government might be to secure a full and fair representation of the people of those Territories, it will be beyond their power to do so under these circumstances; and I dare say there may be many members in the House who believe that matters would not be much improved if it were in the power of the Government to exercise supervision over the conduct of their officers. I think that the qualification of the voter is not such a one as is required in the North-West Territories; I think that the preparations of the voters' lists are exceedingly defective, and, in many respects, highly objectionable, and I believe that when this Bill comes into committee, radical changes will have to be made in it in all these particulars.

Mr. MULOCK. It is somewhat difficult to discuss section 4, as there appears to be different opinions as to its true meaning. It appears to me, if we read the section as it is drawn and interpreted by the schedule, it is necessary that an elector should be a householder. As the hon. member for Bothwell has stated, that qualification is quite inapplicable to the case of the North-West, and, I think the language of this section has been taken from an old law without reference to altered circumstances and the change in public opinion since the law on which it was based was framed. I do not know how far back we can trace this provision, but by the foot note to the section it appears it is based on Statute 43 Victoria, passed five years ago. It is possible that the language of that Statute was taken from some earlier Statute, before we adopted the principles of manhood suffrage which now prevail—I refer particularly to the farmers' sons vote and the votes of owners of real estate—and had that point been considered when the draftsman had the Bill in hand, it is possible the word "householder" would have been left out. If we look to the condition of the people, we will find in the North-West a great many who are not householders, but who ought to be entitled to vote. A great many young men have gone to the North-West and clubbed together; one owns the house and the others are living with him. Which of that group is to be entitled to vote? They ought all to be equally entitled to vote. The right of the franchise should not be limited to one who happens to be owner of a house. There are great many men who are simply lodgers, but are practically the heads of families, because they individually are the sole members of their respective families, so that I trust the limitation will be removed, and, in discussing this question, I would submit also whether the provision of this section, extending it in the way I indicate, might not, to the advantage of the people, be extended to the older Provinces. When we look at the Franchise Act we passed last Session, we find a most complicated system of qualification, complicated and expensive——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the North-West Territories.

Mr. MULOCK. I intend to confine myself to the North-West Territories Bill, but I suggest whether, when this Bill is in committee, or at a later stage when we are discussing some other measure, we could not extend this provision, and practically adopt it throughout the whole of the Dominion. I agree with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in regard to the deposits. It would be almost impossible to comply with that provision in the North-West, for the Act requires that the deposit should be made in legal tender or in gold. Now, while the candidates may be well worth the necessary amount, it will be practically impossible for them to comply literally with that law. No doubt that matter can be well dealt with in committee, but in regard to the qualification, I think that a great many persons who ought to have a vote will be deprived of a vote unless this clause is amended. In fact, it will limit the franchise so much that giving representation to the North-West will be almost illusory.

Mr. WATSON. I call the attention of the Minister who has charge of this Bill to the qualifications that were extended to the voters in the added territory of the Province of Manitoba in the election of 1882. The qualification was ownership of real property and three months' residence. It appears to me, when that qualification was given to persons who were entitled to vote at the last Dominion election in the western portion of the Province of Manitoba, it would be acceptable to the residents in the Territories. In that part of Manitoba they had no voters' list, and none was asked for.

Mr. ROYAL. In preparing this measure, the Government had either to devise a system of their own to carry out the object of the Bill, without having the facility to consult the opinion of the people in the North-West, or the Government had to take legislation already existing on the Statute-book, and so far not having been opposed in any

way by the people interested. I think the Government have done a wise thing in taking the second course, and it will be time enough, when the representatives of the North-West Territories have a seat in this House, for them to place before the House the requirements of their own people in the matter. The Government have taken from the Statute already existing, provisions with regard to the mode of holding the elections. The Government have taken from the old Statute that has been in existence for many years the qualification of the voters. There were elections in the Territories last year in the fall, and in no instance in that country or in their papers was any objection made to this portion of the law regulating the representation and the mode of representation of the north-western people in their own Council, and I believe quite properly so. On the one hand, some hon. members complain that this law is too perfect. In fact, the clause that requires the deposit of $200 is considered, I suppose, the very perfection of our legislation in this matter. The Government have retained that clause, and it is too perfect in the eyes of hon. members opposite. On the other hand, they say the law is too crude, too imperfect. Well, we have had some experience in that matter in the Province of Manitoba, and I suppose it is within the knowledge of every hon. member of this House that the Legislature of Manitoba has been perfecting its legislation in that respect for the last fifteen years. In fact, the mode of election was voluntary with the elector, whether to vote with the ballot or to give an open vote, and it is only this year, I believe, that the one mode of open voting was dropped. It shows that, in a new Province, or a new country, and especially in the North-West Territories, where the extent of the Territory is enormous, where the population is very sparse, how important it is, if you want to do justice to that people, not to give them a too perfect mode of registering voters or making the electoral lists. As was stated by the right hon. the leader of the Government, the present mode is, I believe, the most feasible and the most simple one. It is not very easy for these people, who may be otherwise occupied, to travel a distance of twenty-five or fifty or 100 miles, perhaps, with their own vehicles, their own modes of transport, because there is only one line of railway, to see that their names are properly registered on the list of voters, while the opportunity is given them, when they come to register their votes, to have either their names added or their qualifications properly stated on the electoral lists. Last year and the year before, the papers were filled with grievances from the North-West Territory. One of the demands made by the people in that part of Canada has been that it should be represented in the House of Commons, but in no instance was there a voice raised, or an article written in a paper, complaining of this very mode for the registration of voters. On the other hand, if municipalities were existing, generally speaking, in a new Province or a new Territory, where the population commenced to flow in, the municipal list would be generally the basis of the electoral lists, either for the Legislature or for this Parliament. You know that it is only very recently that a general Municipal Act was adopted for the North-West Territories, and that, so far, very few localities have availed themselves of the law. It shows that, however rudimentary this legislation is in the North-West, on account of the condition of the population there, they have not been able to avail themselves of that opportunity. Therefore I believe that this measure has been very wisely devised to meet the chief want, the chief requirement, the chief demand of the people in the North-West Territories—that is, to give them representation in this House. After their members have been returned, it will be time enough for them to place before this House their peculiar requirements and to perfect legislation in the matter of registration of voters and the mode of conducting the elections in those Territories. I believe the measure, as it is, is perfectly suitable for the present requirements of the people.

Mr. MITCHELL. It strikes me there might be very great improvement upon that Bill in one, to my mind, very important principle. It is a principle which I pointed out when the Franchise Bill was passed last year, and, instead of limiting the franchise more than we have done in our own country here, we should give to these people in that country, a great many of whom are not householders but intend to become householders, who have gone there for the purpose of taking up lands and making it their home, a large majority of whom are young men who have not houses, but who live in tents or in a variety of ways, still further advantages. I think we ought to extend the franchise to manhood suffrage, or something equivalent to it. That would simply simplify the thing very much, and, if the Bill were amended in that particular, it would be much more acceptable to the people. It will bring up a much larger constituency, and it will give to the class of people who intend to make it their home a right to take part in the government of the country. They will become taxpayers, and as such will necessarily have a right to the distribution of the taxes, and I think it will give greater satisfaction to the country than the particular limitation of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee.

Mr. MILLS I do not think we ought to go into committee now. There are important matters that require careful consideration, and I do not think the measure will be delayed if the hon. gentleman gives us a little time to consider it. Most of us have been pretty busy—too busy, to have considered the Bill with the attention that it deserves. I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to a matter intimately connected with this Bill, which he discussed the other day, that is, an address to Her Majesty asking for certain changes in the British North America Act, based upon an address. I could not find, at the moment, the action of this House in 1871 with reference to that matter, but I have turned it up, and I now refer to it. At that time, it was proposed to confirm the Manitoba Act, and to make provision for enlarging or altering the boundaries of certain Provinces. It was proposed at that time, that we should proceed just as the hon. gentleman now proposes to do. Objection was taken; it was then stated in the House, that no change ought to be made by the Imperial Parliament in the constitution of the country, so far as it relates to this Parliament, except on the advice of this Parliament, and this position was accepted by the Government. But before the matter came up for discussion I think the hon. gentleman left for Washington as High Commissioner, and Sir George E. Cartier was at the time leading the House. He admitted the soundness of the principle, he admitted there ought to be no change made in our constitution upon mere motion of the Ministers, that Parliament itself should control any alteration or amendment in the constitution, and so, instead of proceeding by an address simply there was an Act framed. I have the Act before me, which will be found to be word for word the same as the Imperial Statute. A resolution was adopted embracing this Act, the terms and provisions of which are set out, and then another resolution is added:

"That this House is of opinion that a measure embodying the provisions contained in the said proposed Bill should be submitted to the Imperial Parliament, and that a humble address be presented to Her Majesty in conformity with the foregoing resolution."

Now, that is precisely what I think ought to be done in this case. The hon. gentleman admits that we have not the power to give representation to the Territories in this Parliament, and he proposes to ask for Imperial legislation,

Now, I think it right and proper that he should propose to do that by Bill. He brings down his Bill here; we settle here, not in the Imperial Legislature, where they have no interest or concern in the matter, the terms and provisions of that Bill, just as we did in 1871, and then we embrace that Bill in an address to Her Majesty, asking that legislation should be had. Now, I do not know whether the hon. gentleman remembers what was then done, but I will send him over the Votes and Proceedings. I think exactly the same course ought to be taken here before we carry this Bill, we ought to settle on the terms and provisions of that Bill. The hon. gentleman proposes to give four representatives to the people of the Territories. Now, I am not objecting to that, although it may be, for the time being, at variance with the principle of representation by population, but it is absolutely necessary that the Imperial Act should provide that we should not have power to increase that number, and that these people should not receive additional representation until they are entitled to it by an increase in population—we should do precisely what we did in the case of British Columbia and Manitoba. I think it is clear that the rule we laid down in 1871 is a sound one; I think the House ought not, under any circumstances, to invite or to permit the Ministers to invite, the alteration of the constitution without the House itself determining the character of that alteration, and the provisions that are to be embraced in that Act, which are to become part and parcel of our constitution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it necessary to enter into a discussion upon that. There has been a joint address to Her Majesty praying that she will be pleased to submit a measure to the Imperial Parliament. Well, that has gone.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think that prevents the House from dealing with the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is upon the motion to go into committee.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not think we ought to go into committee to-night. This matter requires a great deal of consideration.

Mr. CASEY. I hope the hon. gentleman will pay attention to one point that, I think, has the greatest weight with him. Many hon. gentlemen have not studied the matter thoroughly, are not thoroughly familar with the Bill, and they will probably take a great deal more time to thresh it out in committee, and ask a great many more questions about it and delay the House much longer, if we are obliged to consider it in committee to-night than if we are given more time to study it. I think the hon. gentleman has found that to be his experience on former occasions, and I think he will find it so now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If there are any clauses likely to cause a good deal of discussion, we can let them stand over and make some progress in the Bill. At this period of the Session, perhaps, it would be as well to dispose of the clauses on which there will be no discussion.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. MILLS. How will the population be divided as to members? We have not before us any statement showing what will be the population of each of the two districts into which Assiniboia will be divided.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Saskatchewan and Alberta districts each have one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the present population of each of these?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Judging by the average population in the older Provinces of the Dominion, we give them a very large representation. Assiniboia has 16,794; Saskatchewan has, of whites, 4,486; Alberta, of whites, 4,871.

Mr. CASEY. How do the population of the two ridings in Assiniboia compare?

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. The population is 16,794, but there is not an equal division.

Mr. CASEY. A question might arise as to whether it would not be wiser to divide the Territory so as to give an equal population in each electoral division, without regard to the lines of the provisional district.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am under the impression that the hon. gentleman will find that the white population of Saskatchewan is only 1,792, in place of 4,800 as he has just stated. The population of Alberta, as I have it, is about 4,800, Assiniboia 16,408 and Saskatchewan 1,792

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. No. The white population of Saskatchewan is as follows:—Carrot River 197, Prince Albert, 3,628, Battleford 661, making about 4,400.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that the white population?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not observe a foot note which says that in the Saskatchewan district half-breeds were included with the whites.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then my calculation is correct, that Saskatchewan contains only 1,792 whites?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That must be so. There are 4,486 whites and half breeds and 6,200 Indians in the Saskatchewan.

Mr. MILLS. The difficulty I see in the way of the representation proposed is that the people will be scattered over an immense area where there is no municipal organisation of any kind and where the district itself may be unsurveyed. Does the hon. gentleman propose that all those people should be included in the electoral district, or does he intend to confine the right to vote to districts where organisation is practicable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. I propose that every man in any part of the three districts shall be qualified to vote, whether organised or not.

Mr. MILLS. Suppose half a dozen persons should be settled hundreds of miles away, how would they vote; is it proposed to appoint a returning officer? What is the provision with regard to the polling of votes? The hon. gentleman will see there may be practical difficulties in the way. That matter I know was considered at the time the North-West Territories' Act was framed, and I do not know how far the hon. gentleman has considered it in preparing his Bill. Inconvenience may arise, from the attempt to allow everyone who may be entitled to vote far greater than will arise from his exclusion, and the confining of voters to particular districts where there may be a certain population.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole of the machinery is adopted with a view to give everyone a vote. If settlers are too far away and cannot enter their names, we cannot help it; if they cannot get their names before the enumerator or deputy revising officer it is their misfortune. I hope the hon. gentleman will not try and restrict settlers in the outskirts from coming to vote if they choose to undertake the labor of coming down and polling their votes.

Mr. MILLS. In the representation of the North-West Territories there must be a certain number of settlers within a prescribed area. The Act states what the area is to be. If there are any persons scattered outside that prescribed area they are not voters in the North-West Territories at the present moment, unless there are provisions in the Act of which I am not aware. I think there must be a certain population in so many square miles, otherwise the same population scattered over four or five times that extent of territory would not be embraced. There would be a very great convenience if the hon. gentleman would provide that the area of a district should be limited by the area of the district embraced in the representation of the North-West Council. Take, for instance, the case he has mentioned. Suppose persons live a very considerable distance away. It cannot be maintained that polling divisions can be placed in those outlying portions to suit their particular requirements. If you say those persons can travel 200 or 300 miles and record their votes, how are you going to determine that they are British residents or that they do not reside in Montana? And it must be remembered that the enumerator can insert their names on the voters' list on polling day. You would have no means of knowing that the votes of a large number of persons were not recorded who were living altogether outside the Territory.

On section 3,

Mr. MILLS. Are the districts very nearly equal in population?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a very considerable difference in the population; District No. 1, which is the western district, containing 5,700, and District No. 2, the eastern district, 11,900. The eastern portion is the thickly settled portion of Assiniboia, but it is much smaller in territorial area. The western portion is very large, extending from the 104th meridian to the boundary of Alberta, and, for the future, there is no doubt that the western district will fill up rapidly, and will soon come up to the population of the eastern district. The reason why the line was taken there is, that there are different interests, or supposed interests, between the Qu'Appelle Valley and the Regina and Moose Jaw country, and the people desired that each section should have an opportunity of pressing its views upon this Parliament, and, as we are endeavoring to please them, we have provided that the whole of the Qu'Appelle district shall have one member, and that the whole of the rest of Assiniboia shall have another.

On section 5,

Mr. CASEY. So far as I can see, this does not provide that the elections shall be held simultaneously with those of the rest of the Dominion, or within a specified time after them, as in the case of other outlying districts. I think the relation, in point of time, of these elections to the elections in other parts of the Domiaion, should be stated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps not in this clause, but we will see about it afterwards.

On section 6,

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman were to provide that elections should be held on the same day as in the other electoral districts of the Dominion, I think he would meet the case in this clause. Now that there is telegraph communication with those districts, there is no reason why the election should not be held on the same day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and I have taken a memorandum. Perhaps we had better allow that section to stand.

On section 18,

Mr. CASEY. Why is it required if he is in the Territories and not when he is outside? I think inconvenience will be experienced when an outside candidate does not run. It would be better to require it in all cases.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is simply the present election law.

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman would better serve the interests of the people by not requiring a deposit. There is really no applicability of that principle to that section of the country. There may be, for example, a man in these sparsely settled districts whom the people in his own particular settlement would like to make a candidate. He may be put in the field, and he has not the support of the people in any other district. The result would be that he would be defeated and would be mulcted if he were required to make the deposit, which would be extremely inconvenient apart from that altogether. It might be, and probably would be the case, that a man could not be found in the district who could make the deposit required by the Statute, because legal tender notes would be objected to, and it might not be possible to obtain gold.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fear the hon. gentleman does not read the newspapers up there, or he would find that there is going to be as great an interest taken in electing members there as there is down here. There will be a great many more candidates than there are seats. As to the difficulty of getting money, that is all over now; they can get plenty of money, and they have plenty of money. I fancy they have more money there than we have down here.

Mr. MILLS. If beaver skins were made a legal tender in the district of Alberta, perhaps the deposit might be made. I do not think the hon. gentleman has taken the trouble to inform himself of the condition of things in that country when he tells us that money is so abundant. I do not know where he has got his information. My information is wholly different. I think there have been representations sent to the hon. gentleman within a very short time, telling him that the people find it impossible to get bank branches established in many of the settlements of that Territory.

Mr. CASEY. People may very well pay without having $200 in legal tender notes. If the hon. gentleman had been in that country, he would know that it is not always easy to get cash, and in a particular form. It has been easy to get cash this year, but it is to be hoped we are not going to have a rebellion every year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the candidate knows that he has to put up $200, he will take care to have the money ready, just as the candidates do down here.

On section 51,

Mr. MILLS. Why suggest open voting when the ballot is adopted everywhere else. Why depart from the settled rule?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I endeavored to explain on the second reading that the Local Legislature of the North-West Territories had decided that it was practically impossible to adopt all the intricacies of the ballot, and of their own free will they chose open voting. I therefore desire at present, with the assent of the House, to meet the well understood wishes of the people so far as expressed. I do not suppose hon. gentlemen are much frightened at the great influence of the Government in the Territories.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman refused to listen to the views expressed by the representatives of 2,000,000 in Ontario, yet he would have the 206 representatives of 5,000,-

000 people listen to the representation of the North-West Council. He appoints a certain number of representatives to sit in that Council, because he thinks the representatives of the people are not to be trusted with the management of their affairs, but now he tells us he has so much respect and defers so largely to the views of the representatives of the people in that Council that he is prepared to depart from the settled rule of this Legislature, and interfere with the great rule of uniformity by providing that in the North-West there should be open voting; not because the representatives of the people in this Parliament say so, but because the representatives of the people in the North-West Council say they find open voting very convenient.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These people have no voice here, and the only way we can get at their opinion is by talking it from their Legislature. Ontario is otherwise situated, it is represented in this House; and on looking at the Votes and Proceedings, it will be found that the majority of the representatives of Ontario voted for the Franchise Bill.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman put forward the sacred principle of uniformity as the principle upon which he pins his colors, yet now he hauls down his colors because the North-West Council say we do not want your principle.

Mr. CASEY. The Council of the North-West do not represent the North-West, only half the members are elected.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Sixteen.

Mr. CASEY. And the remainder represent the Government here and not the people at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But the sixteen do not.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman had not an opportunity of seeing all those members, but takes his impressions from those he met, and he does not tell us whether they were nominated members or elected members. In every case we have to consider in regard to the propriety of the ballot something more than the opinion they entertain at the time. I am willing to go as far as anybody in giving them anything they want in the way of rights and privileges, but, if it is merely a question of convenience, I think we should not abrogate the principle of the ballot for such a reason. In any case, most of the inconvenience would fall upon the Dominion officers, and not upon the people. It is just as easy, and easier, for the voter to vote by ballot as by word of mouth. The hon. gentleman said he supposed we would not be afraid of the influence of the Government upon the electors there. I think, if there is any place in Canada where the influence of the Government and Government officials, and the influence of the railway and railway officials, is likely to be felt, it is there. The people are likely to be as independent in the North-West Territories as elsewhere, but I think more influence can be exercised upon them than elsewhere. I think the clause should stand for the present, as well as the one in regard to open voting.

Mr. ROYAL. I do not think it would be wise to alter the legislation of the North-West Territories which they have passed themselves. With reference to open voting, we have the experience of Manitoba. Open voting as well as the ballot has been kept in existence until this year, and, when the ballot was first introduced in 1876 or 1877, it remained in existence only for one year. We had two or three elections under the ballot system, and I believe the population of Manitoba then was as intelligent as that of any older Province, but, after the experience of those two bye elections, the Legislature decided to abrogate the legislation and reinstate open voting. It is very likely that the same reasons which led the Legislature of Manitoba in that instance have led the people of the North-West Territories to so legislate in their own matters, and I believe it is very wise, having no other way to consult the wishes of that population, to copy their own laws which have been passed by themselves.

Mr. MILLS. The views expressed by the hon. gentleman, if logically carried out, and the views of the First Minister, would lead to this: that every electoral division ought to decide for itself what mode shall be adopted of holding the election, open voting or the ballot. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman proposes to adopt that or not, but that is the practical effect of his proposition. He says certain parties whom he has consulted are in favor of open voting. I do not know whether Mr. Jackson is one of them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I sometimes have heard from Mr. Jackson.

Mr. MILLS. It may be that some members of this House have expressed a preference for open voting, and I do not know whether he is going to allow them to have their way, or to see that the minority should abide the decision of a majority of this House. If that is the case, I do not see why the people of that Territory should not follow that rule as well as others. If the hon. gentleman could show that there would be great inconvenience from the adoption of the ballot system, that it would not be applicable to that country, that would be a reason, but, when he says that certain people there prefer open voting, he says what is true of every portion of this Dominion. There are some people in every part of this Dominion who would prefer open voting. I do not know how the hon. gentleman is going to please everyone. He may be in the position of the old man who tried to carry the donkey.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say I had seen any members, either nominated or elected, on this matter. My hon. friend opposite misunderstood me. I said that, if he would look at the proceedings of the Council in the North-West, he would find that the elected members as well as the nominated members were in favor of this, that is what I intended to convey. The elected members and the nominated members concurred in making a practical working ordinance for that Territory. The hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that logically every section up there ought to act for itself if my Bill is adopted.

Mr. MILLS. All over the Dominion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is intensely logical, and I am intensely practical. That is the difference, but somehow my legislation generally gets through.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, it does, but sometimes it takes a very long time. I hope this will not take quite so long. Perhaps, if the hon. gentleman had been a little more logical in his explanations on a former occasion, that might have gone through a little sooner. That legislation has turned out to be intensely practical, I must confess. I refer to the Franchise Bill of last year. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) proposes that there should be open voting because they have that system in Manitoba for local purposes. Did the hon. gentleman last year urge, when the Franchise Bill was under discussion, that the elections in that Province should take place by open voting?

Mr. ROYAL. I believe the hon. gentleman forgets that we are dealing with Territories, not Provinces, and, until the members are returned here to express the wishes of the people, we should copy their own legislation.

Mr. CASEY. I am perfectly aware that we are dealing with Territories, but I say the hon. gentleman's position is extremely inconsistent.

Mr. ROYAL. Not at all.

Mr. CASEY. He should have asked for open voting for Manitoba. If it should be adopted in Dominion legislation, it should be adopted in Manitoba as well as in the North-West Territories. There are parts of Manitoba which are quite as thinly peopled as the greater part of the North-West Territories. If the ballot has not worked badly in Manitoba, and no complaints have been made yet, why should it not be adopted in the North-West Territories? I had understood the hon. the First Minister to say that this Bill was settled with the North-West Council or some of its members, that he had advised with them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. CASEY. Then I misunderstood him. He was basing his view, then, upon the Bill which was framed by the North-West Council for their own elections. In that case, his remark loses all the weight it had, because it does not follow, in the North West any more than in Manitoba, that we should adopt a different principle of voting from that which is in force in the rest of the Dominion.

Mr. WATSON. I think this clause ought to stand. There seems to be considerable difference of opinion. As to the elections in Manitoba, they elect the Dominion members by ballot; but for the Local House the Premier of that Province and the Local Government have only seen fit to adopt the ballot after two-thirds of the residents of the Province have signed petitions in favor of it. It is not at all the representatives of the people who desire it, as they would rather have open voting and all the influence they could bring to bear, but they are forced into adopting the ballot by the numerous petitions from the people.

On section 52,

Mr. CASEY. Stand.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, not this clause.

Mr. CASEY. Is the hon. gentleman going to depart from the understanding that clauses which would provoke discussion should stand over?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I certainly never agreed to that, whenever an hon. member said "stand," the clause should stand. There is no reason in the world why section 52 should stand over.

Mr. CASEY. By this section the poll clerk is ordered to make erasures in the voters' list when directed by the deputy returning officer, which he can only do by section 44, which was allowed to stand.

Mr. DAVIES. It is a question whether we should not alter the phraseology of that clause. It gives an arbitrary power to the deputy returning officer to strike off such names as he pleases.

On section 62,

Mr. CASEY. Is it necessary to allow the posting of written proclamations? One would judge from the number of newspapers that come to us from the North-West Territories, that such things as proclamations, which could be prepared sometime beforehand, all but the exact date, might be easily had printed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They know very well up there. That is their provision.

Mr. CASEY. We are discussing the provision for ourselves There is no reason why we should adopt, in all the details, the rude methods adopted by the rudimentary North-West Council. A written proclamation might be so insignificant as to escape the notice of every body in the neighborhood, and might perhaps, in some cases, be intentionally so. There is certainly no difficulty in getting proclamation printed in the North-West Territories.

Mr. MILLS. They may be all printed, or partly printed and partly written. We might leave out the words, "or written," because a written proclamation would hardly attract attention, and if the hon. gentleman's statement is at all accurate—and I have no doubt that he has information that the newspapers circulate there very widely, that they have great printing facilities—if that is the condition of things, there is no reason for making this provision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will give an instance that occurs to me. Suppose the person sent out to put up these notices travels 350 or 400 miles, and runs out of printed notices, is he to go back and leave the rest of the country without notices? All he has to do is to write them.

Mr. CASEY. Supposing a messenger is sent out that cannot write, he would have no authority to write the proclamation and put it up. These proclamations might just as well be all printed here and sent up there for the dates to be filled in.

On section 63,

Mr. MILLS. This is a most extraordinary section. It provides that a returning officer shall not delay proceeding with an election under this Act, notwithstanding that he discovers a mistake in the steps prescribed by this Act, or that there has been a want of qualification in any person signing that nomination paper. The hon. gentleman proposes by this clause that the returning officer shall decide whether there has been an election or not. That is such an extraordinary provision that I am surprised the hon. gentleman should have proposed it. It seems to me that the returning officer should state clearly what are the necessary regulations, and if there has been such a departure from what is right and proper as would void an election in any other portion of the Dominion, it should void an election there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He reports the whole thing, and Parliament deals with it.

Mr. CASEY. That is what we object to. That is not a case with which Parliament should deal, but it should be left for the electors to deal with. We object to these questions being brought here for Parliament to decide by a partisan majority. This section would undoubtedly place the power of remitting any election in the hands of the returning officer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will not discuss it to-night.

On section 67,

Mr. CASEY. We should have an opportunity of comparing these details.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been very carefully done. We have taken the Dominion Election Act; no doubt it is all right.

On section 70.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman makes provision that nothing contained in his Act shall repeal or modify section 11 of the Electoral Franchise Act. The hon. gentleman has not incorporated it here, and we have not had an opportunity of looking at it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have had the fear of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), before my eyes. I will explain. It provides that no Indian in the North-West or British Columbia shall have a right to vote.

Mr. PATERSON. That is want of uniformity again.

Bill reported.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (page 1143) respecting the fees and expenses in connection with the electoral franchise in the North-West Territories.

Motion agreed to, resolution considered in Committee and ordered to be reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 11:05, p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 12th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRINTING AND STATIONERY BUREAU.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 132) respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery. He said: I suppose that, at this stage of the measure, I need not give any lengthy explanation about the Bill than this: The object of the Government, by this Bill, is to give power to the Government to establish a Printing Bureau and Stationery Office, that is to say, to adopt here the system which has been adopted and practised so successfully in the United States, so far as the printing of the Government and Parliament is concerned, and to adopt, as far as possible, the English system in relation to the stationery supplies of the different public Departments and both Houses of Parliament. As to the latter part of the proposition, I may say that we have accomplished a good deal of progress in the Stationery Office, and when the time comes, when I am called upon to give detailed explanations, I shall be in a position to give statistics showing the savings that have been effected and the progress we have made in the direction of economy, by the establishment of a stationery branch attached to the Department of the Secretary of State. As to the other part of the proposition, the object, as I said, so far as the Government and public printing is concerned, is to adopt, as far as possible, the American system, which also pravails in almost all other countries, except in England, where, however, there is a movement in the same direction. I shall give some statistics on the subject when the Bill is up for the second reading.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not quite certain whether I gathered the hon. gentleman's expression correctly, but it seemed to me rather that he was proposing to ask Parliament to empower the Government to establish this system. I trust, however, it will not be proposed to ask Parliament to empower the Government to establish this system, but rather that the system itself will be propo ed to Parliament for its consideration. The question is one of very great consequence both in its principles and in its details; it is one upon which we should have very full information, in order to put ourselves in a position to form a judgment whether the proposed change is a desirable one. I regret, Sir, that, as to a measure so important as this practically is, the hon. gentleman should have found himself unable to take the first step until so late a day as the 12th of May. I trust we shall have at an early day those full details which the hon. gentleman promised us, and without which it is impossible to appreciate the benefits of this proposal.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think the subject of the measure is not a novel one, or one which will take Parliament by surprise. Reports have been presented to this House emanating from the Department of the Secretary of State, mentioning the detail of the two different systems, the printing by the Government, or the contract system, the latter of which has been followed heretofore, and pointing to the advantages which might arise from the adoption of the system which we will ask the permission of Parliament to adopt. As I said before, the system is not a novelty, nor is it, I think, one which will take Parliament by surprise. The statistics in detail, when they are presented, can be easily considered by Parliament in support of or against the measure to be introduced

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IMMIGRATION FROM DAKOTA AND TEXAS.

Mr. ROYAL asked, Whether the Government is aware that a considerable number of settlers from Dakota and Texas are just now commencing to move to Manitoba from across the line?

Mr. CARLING. Yes; the Government is aware that a considerable influx of settlers from the States named has commenced to move into Manitoba. The Department has not, at this moment, the figures of numbers, but they will be ascertained as far as possible.

DEEP-WATER NAVIGATION OF MANITOBA WATERS.

Mr. ROYAL asked, Whether the Dominion Cabinet have received from the Provincial Government of Manitoba a copy of the following resolution and prayer, passed by the Legislature of the said Province on the 6th May instant, viz:—That whereas the council of the city of Winnipeg and the Board of Trade of the said city have appointed a joint delegation to proceed to Ottawa to lay before the Government of Canada the question of deep-water navigation from Lake Winnipeg and to the interior of this Province; whereas it is of the greatest importance to this Province that the navigation of the Red River at the place known as the St. Andrew's Rapids be so improved as to render such deep-water navigation possible; and whereas, if a greater depth of water was obtained at said locality, it would enable vessels of lake draught to proceed without interruption long distances into the Province and across the border into the United States as far as Fargo and Moorhead; therefore be it resolved that this House cordially endorses the action of the Winnipeg City Council and the Board of Trade in sending a delegation to Ottawa for the purpose of urging on the Government of Canada the importance of the improvement herein suggested, and the desirability of having a sum placed in the Estimates of the present year for the purpose of carrying out the same; and this House would add to its prayer that the request of this delegation be acceded to by the Government of Canada? What is the intention of the Government in regard to this matter?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have received a copy of the resolution and prayer passed by the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba as mentioned in this question. This was delivered to me by the deputation that came from Winnipeg the other day with reference to the improvement of the navigation of Red River. The intention of the

Government is to cause an examination to be made, in order to have the data necessary to examine the question, and then decide.

SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS.

Mr. JACKSON asked, Has the $19,154,598.50 deposits in the Government Savings Bank on March 31st, 1886, and also the $16,954,243.21 deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank at the same date, been invested in paying securities; and, if not all, how much has been invested, and what are the securities?

Mr. McLELAN. There has been no special investment made of these sums. They form part of the general debt of the Dominion.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. THOMPSON moved:

That the order for second reading of Bill (No. 22) An Act respecting Interest in the Province of British Columbia (Mr. Baker, Victoria), be placed on Government Orders.

He said: I may explain that the hon. introducer of this Bill stated to me, on the day I gave the notice, that he expected to be obliged to leave for home in consequence of important engagements, and was afraid that the Bill would not be reached before his departure, if left on the list of public Bills and Orders. The other evening that Bill was called, but in consequence of my having given the notice, the hon. gentleman did not move it.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no objection at all to the motion, but I move to add these words:

And that the order for second reading of Bill (No. 92) entitled: "An Act further to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878" (Mr. Jamieson), be placed on the Government Orders.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman will have to give notice of this.

Mr. BLAKE. It is a very pertinent amendment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It may be pertinent, but I think it is contrary to the rules of the House to move it without notice. I ask, Mr. Speaker, if that is so.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is an amendment.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Blake.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Geoffrion,	McIntyre,
Armstrong,	Gillmor,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Girouard,	Mills,
Béchard,	Glen,	Mitchell,
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Mulock,
Blake,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Hackett,	Platt,
Burpee,	Harley,	Ray,
Cameron (Huron),	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Inverness),	Hurteau,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Shakespeare,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd)	Jackson,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Jamieson,	Springer,
Casgrain,	King,	Townshend,
Colby,	Kirk,	Trow,
Cook,	Landerkin,	Vail,
Davies,	Langelier,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	Laurier,	Weldon,
Dundas,	Lister,	Wilson,
Edgar,	Macdonald (King's),	Wright,
Fisher,	Mackenzie,	Yeo.—68.
Forbes,	McCraney,	

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Foster,	McNeill,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gagné,	Massue,
Barnard,	Gault,	Moffat,
Benoit,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Blondeau,	Gordon,	Ouimet,
Bossé,	Guillet,	Paint,
Bourbeau,	Hall,	Pinsonneault,
Bowell,	Hay,	Pruyn,
Burns,	Hesson,	Reid,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hickey,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Carling,	Homer,	Royal,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jenkins,	Rykert,
Chapleau,	Kaulbach,	Scott,
Costigan,	Kilvert,	Shanly,
Coughlin,	Kranz,	Small,
Coursol,	Labrosse,	Sproule,
Curran,	Landry (Kent),	Taylor,
Cuthbert,	Landry (Montmagny),	Temple,
Daly,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Thompson,
Daoust,	Lesage,	Tupper,
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	Tyrwhitt,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Macmaster,	Vanasse,
Desaulniers (St.M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wallace (York),
Dickinson,	McCallum,	White (Cardwell),
Dodd,	McCarthy,	White (Hastings),
Dugas,	McDougald (Pictou),	White (Renfrew),
Dupont,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wigle,
Everett,	McGreevy,	Wood (Brockville),
Ferguson (Leeds&Gren)	McLelan,	Wood (Westm'l'd).—88.
Ferguson (Welland),		

Amendment negatived.

Mr. KRANZ. I move in amendment to add the following words:—

And that the order for second reading of Bill (No. 104), entitled: "An Act to amend the Canada Temperance Act of 1878" (Mr. Orton), be also placed on the Government Orders.

Mr. BLAKE. If the House had agreed to place on the Government Orders the other Bill, I should very gladly have voted for this as an additional amendment, so that both of these propositions might have received the consideration of the House this Session. But I think it would be scarcely reasonable that this proposition should be the only one submitted to the House this Session, and as the House has declined the other amendment I propose to vote against this one.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the hon. gentleman's position is one which will stand the scrutiny of the public, however much his own followers may approve of his conduct. If it were right in the abstract that the proposition which has been moved as an amendment by my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Kranz) should have the consideration of the House, it is just as right that it should have it, even though something else which my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has moved did not get that consideration. Right is right, whether on the banks of the Saskatchewan, the Red River, or anywhere else, and if it is right that this proposition should be considered, it is right that it should be considered now as well as before.

Mr. BLAKE. But right is not always right when one gets on the right side of the Speaker.

Mr. MITCHELL. As I intend to pursue a different, or rather the same course on this amendment as I did on the last, that is to vote for it, I wish to give my reasons. I voted for the other because it was upon a question which has been before the country a long time, and which has occupied a large amount of the time and attention of this Parliament, and deservedly so, in order that it might have the fullest and freest discussion. We have heard that the question was to be brought up this Session, and we have been looking forward—the friends of temperance on the

one hand, the friends of wine and beer on the other, and the opponents of both—in expectation of one or the other of these Bills coming up, when we should have the opportunity of discussing the question. But it is evident that the Government, in taking away all the days of private members, have destroyed the possibility of reaching these measures, if they are left among the Bills in the hands of private members. There are few questions of greater interest than the question of temperance, and as I voted for the other amendment in order that the question might come up for discussion, I intend to vote for this one for the same reason.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend has given a logical reason for the course he has chosen to take; I do not intend to criticise his remarks. But my hon. friend the Minister of Marine thinks my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will not be able to defend his position before the public; he thinks he stands in a very peculiar position before the public of Canada. I think, if anybody stands in a peculiar position before the public of Canada in regard to the late vote, it is the hon. Minister himself. That hon. gentleman has been one of the foremost, one of the ablest advocates of temperance——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CASEY. Well, one of the most prominent advocates of temperance. I am not discussing the question of how much it was worth or how much he got for it; but he owed his prominence in this House to the position he took on that question.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not the hon. Minister's character we are discussing, it is the question of the amendment.

Mr. CASEY. We are discussing the hon. Minister's speech. He said the position of the hon. leader of the Opposition was indefensible before the country, and I am showing that his position is indefensible. If you rule that in that I am out of order, the hon. Minister was out of order in attacking the position of the hon. leader of the Opposition; but if I am not allowed to show how inconsistent that hon. gentleman is, I am sure the country will be able to draw their conclusion without any assistance from me. As to the merits of this particular motion before the House, I agree with my hon. friend from Northumberland that there is room for argument that both motions should be supported; but, speaking for myself, I must say the motion which the House has voted down was a motion to put on the Order paper a Bill proposing to make the Scott Act workable. It has been maintained for a long time that the Scott Act, in its present form, is not workable, but that it requires amendment to enable it to be enforced at all. I maintain that having such an Act, we should put it in a workable shape, so that the question of prohibition may be fairly tested and the opinion of the people arrived at. The Scott Act being a Government measure, the Government themselves should have taken it up and done their best to make it workable, or repeal it altogether. Now, seeing we have been refused the opportunity of providing machinery to make the Act workable, it is proper we should refuse to consider any other Bill proposing to make a change in the principle of the Act itself or to weaken its effect. Had the Government been willing to allow us to discuss amendments to the Scott Act, we would have been willing to discuss any changes in the Act itself which might be proposed; but when they refuse to allow us to improve the machinery of the Act, it is perfectly logical and fair on our part to say we will refuse to consider any Bill proposing to make changes in the principle and essence of the Act itself. That is the reason I will vote against the resolution now before the House. I do not think such favoritism could be shown as to put a wine and beer measure on the Government Orders when the House has refused to put the other measure on the Orders. Therefore, without pronouncing any opinion on the wine and beer measure, I am prepared to vote against the resolution before the House.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I must assume that the hon. member for West Durham, in making his motion, was moved by a *bond fide* desire to bring before the House the subject of temperance, but if he had wished to carry the votes in his favor upon that motion, he should, at least, have proposed it in a manner to make it fair to both sides. He ought to have embodied in his motion the two other Bills which appear on the Order paper in the hands of private members, one from the Senate, which has already received the sanction of that distinguished body, the Bill in charge of my hon. friend on my right with reference to druggists, and the other, the Bill in the hands of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Orton). If the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Blake) had moved that all these Bills should be placed on the Government Orders, so as to ensure their being passed upon during the present Session, I should have had pleasure in voting in favor of his motion; but when he made a motion to give precedence to a Bill in favor of what may be called the Temperance side of the question, and excluded from that precedence the other Bills before the House, the one, neither temperance nor anti-temperance, and the other in favor of wine and beer, proposed by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Orton), I think he brought his motion before the House in a manner which made its defeat certain; and he must have known that would have been the result, and his action certainly affords ground for suspicion, as it did, on a recent occasion, when he tried to make himself agreeable——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Well, I will confine myself to saying it was evident on this occasion he tried to make himself agreeable to a particular class of voters, namely, the Temperance party, and with that view brought forward his one-sided, unfair motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the question, which is, whether this order shall be placed on the Government Orders.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). On that my opinion has always been so plainly expressed that, as a matter of course, I shall vote in favor of the motion of the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Kranz), if that motion stands alone; but I do think that the course I have suggested should be adopted, and, with the permission of the House, I would beg to move, in amendment to the motion of the hon. member for Waterloo:

That Bill 92, to further amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878; Bill 99, relating to Druggists; and Bill 118, amending the Acts respecting the sale of Intoxicating Liquors, be also put on Government Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER. With regard to Bill No. 92, the motion to put it on Government Orders has already been negatived.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Bill No. 92 by itself was voted down, but I submit whether it is inconsistent with that vote, that Bill No. 92, in conjunction with the two others, be placed on the Government Orders. A great many members of this House might be, as I am, unwilling that Bill No. 92 alone be put on Government Orders, while we might be willing that that Bill, in conjunction with the other Bills, should be put on the Government Orders. The proper and legitimate way to bring the matter before the House is that all the Bills affecting, directly or indirectly, the Temperance question, be placed on the Government Orders, so as to ensure during the present Session a disposal of the subject.

Mr. MILLS. There was a way in which the hon. gentleman might have accomplished the object the hon.

gentleman has in view, and that was by voting for the proposition of my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake). If the hon. gentleman had voted for that proposition, he might, with some show of reason, ask to have the other Bills put in precisely the same position. Not having done that, he is not now in a position to propose to reverse his vote, and ask the majority of this House to stultify themselves. The hon. gentleman has taken a course which makes it impossible for the majority of the House to support his proposition.

Mr SPEAKER. I do not think that the hon. member can add Bill No 92. The House has already passed upon that. If that amendment had been carried, the House could have adopted a motion to add the other Bills, but the House has already passed upon that Bill, and refused to add it to the Government Orders.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would draw your attention to the fact that the other evening, after voting down a motion that the resolution should be sent to Mr. Parnell, it was moved that it should be sent to Mr. Parnell and Mr. Gladstone, and no one deemed that to be out of order.

Mr. BLAKE. That is not the same at all.

Mr. MITCHELL. We were in a difficulty then.

Mr. McCARTHY. Now we have voted to refuse to advance one of the Bills, but we might be willing, as my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) was willing, to advance the both. I am unwilling to advance one, but I am quite willing to advance both. It seems to me that the motion is clearly in order.

Mr. BLAKE. The cases are by no means parallel. The proposition voted down the other night was to substitute the name of Parnell for the name of Gladstone. We said we declined to strike out Mr. Gladstone's name to insert Mr. Parnell's name. If the motion had been to add Mr. Parnell's name, and that had been voted down, and then it had been proposed to add that name and another, the case would have been more analagous. The view of the Chair is that, though these three Bills are coupled together, there is practically in the one proposition a proposal that Bill A, and Bill B and Bill C shall each be added. If my proposition had been carried, the majority of the House would have been in order afterwards to add other Bills, but it was voted down. I think your ruling is quite correct against that part of the motion adding the Bill which I proposed to add.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). While I respectfully dissent from your decision, as a matter of principle, and while I desired that the whole question, including the Bill of my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), as well as the other Bills, should be given prominence on the Orders, still, in view of your ruling, I beg leave to strike out that Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. With regard to the motion the other night, the proposal was to strike out all the words which provided that the resolution should be sent to Mr. Gladstone, and to state that it should be sent to Mr. Parnell. Therefore, the hon. gentleman will see that it is not at all the same case. This is in the nature of a complex question, and any hon. member can ask that each one of these Bills be put in a separate motion, because some members might wish to vote for one Bill and against another. Any member can ask that it should be put separately, and, if it were put separately, the hon. member will see at once that Bill No. 92 has been already passed upon by the House.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) stated that he would withdraw that.

Mr. BOWELL. I ask for information; I understand your ruling to be that, if the motion of the hon member for West Durham had been to have these two Bills added, any member could have demanded that they should be put separately?

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, to divide the motion.

Mr. BOWELL. I am asking the ruling of the Speaker, not the opinion of the member for West Durham. I will put my question again. If the hon. member for West Durham had placed a motion in your hands asking that two separate Bills should be placed on the Government Orders instead of one, would it have been within the province of any ndependent member of this House to have them separated?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. Or to ask your ruling to have it ruled out of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is what is called a complex question, and any member could ask that each Bill should be put separately.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then, I suppose, this can be done now?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly, take them one by one, which is the way I did. One thing at a time is a very good rule.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways, though.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). In deference to your ruling, I must amend my motion by striking out that portion of it relating to Bill No. 92, but, if my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) had not so strenuously supported your ruling, I think it not impossible that the motion he made in favor of having Bill No. 92 added might practically have been carried, and the whole subject might have been brought before the House; but I am afraid that, in the one-sided shape, as some may suppose, in which it is now placed, he and my hon. friends who supported his motion may now vote against it. I move that Bill No. 99, relating to druggists, and Bill No. 118, amending the Acts respecting the traffic in intoxicating liquors, be also placed on the Government Orders.

Mr. JAMIESON. I am glad to see that the House is waking up to the importance of temperance legislation. There are indications to-day of quite a revival of temperance sentiment in the House. Perhaps it is all for the best that the Bill of which I have the honor to have charge was not introduced so early in the Session, because, if it had been, we would not have had this manifestation we have had to-day. Whilst very anxious to press my Bill on, because I believe it is a necessary and proper piece of legislation, still I am not disposed to sail in the boat with wine and beer, neither am I disposed to sail in the boat with those who are in favor of an amendment permitting druggists to sell liquor in Scott Act counties in a way which I believe will have the effect of largely destroying the effectiveness of the Canada Temperance Act. Therefore, seeing that the amendment to give precedence or a place on the Government Orders to Bill No. 92, of which I have charge, has not received the approbation of the House, I do trust that the amendment and the amendment to the amendment will receive the same fate, that they will not receive the sanction of this House. I have not yet lost hope that, in the ordinary course of the procedure of the House, we will reach the Bill of which I have charge. I do not think the Government intend to take Monday, and I hope on Monday evening next I shall be able to reach that Bill in the usual course. It was reached within one or two Orders on Monday evening last, and I trust that on Monday evening next we shall be able to reach it and to dispose of it, and that it will receive the sanction of the House. I think it is highly important that all necessary legislation should be

given for the purpose of perfecting the Canada Temperance Act. However, I am not disposed, on a motion of this kind, to enter into the merits of the question. I may say, whilst disposed personally to thank the leader of the Opposition for the interest he has taken in my Bill, I really think it would have been better, perhaps, and more advisable if I had been spoken to in the matter. It may be said that I, a supporter of the Government, was placed in an awkward position by having to vote against the Government on this question. However, I deemed it advisable to do so because I thought that the Bill I had in charge was a necessary one, and I was very anxious it should receive the attention of the House. I am, however, very determinedly opposed, and I use that strong expression, to the legislation proposed by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Orton), and which has been taken in charge by the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Kranz). I am also opposed to the amendment of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), though I am glad to see he is improving, since he shows a kindly regard for the Bill I have in charge. However, I am more than suspicious of his motives.

Mr. BLAKE. I may say, in reply to the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), that it was not until the House met that I noticed the motion on the paper of the hon. Minister of Justice, which gave an opportunity for this step, and upon noticing it I searched for the hon. member for Lanark, and was unable to find him, as I desired that the step which I deemed it necessary to take should be taken effectively. I may further point out to the hon. member that even if his pleasing anticipations should be realised, of its getting a second reading on Monday next, it could not get a third reading until the following Monday, and what is going to happen on the following Monday?

Mr. HACKETT. Although I am not aware that the Bills referred to in the motion of the hon. member for Victoria will impair the working of the Scott Act to a great extent, I still feel it my duty to oppose his motion that these Bills be placed on the Government Orders. The county which I have the honor to represent was one of the first counties in Canada to adopt the Scott Act; it was in force there for three years, when a second election was held, and it was again carried by a large majority, and the Act is in force in that county now for a second time. It is also in force over the whole Province from which I come, and the people of that Province feel that some amendments are necessary to make it more effective, as it is very defective in some regards. I was willing to support the Bill of the hon. member for Lanark, and in consequence I support the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I may say that I supported the amendments of a similar character last year; and I support these amendments for the reason I now give, viz.: That I believe they are very necessary to the working of the law; and as the people of the county I represent have twice voted in favor of that law, I feel it my duty to carry out their wishes and make the Act as workable as possible. While doing that I was very much surprised to find that one of the temperance organisations of Prince Edward Island thought it necessary, at a meeting held by them, to censure me in a very severe manner. In the month of August the Grand Division of the Sons of Temperance, of Prince Edward Island, held their meeting at Eldon in that Province, and passed the following resolutions:—

"Mr. Rogers moved, and Mr. James Wall of 'Rising-sun Division' seconded, a resolution condemning the action of our representatives, Yeo and Hackett, for having shirked the vote on the Scott Act amendment"——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the question.

Mr. HACKETT. That is the question. I am on the subject of the Scott Act amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER. No; the question is whether we will put certain Bills on the Government Orders.

Mr. HACKETT. Yes, I understand that is it. The question is as to whether a certain Bill amending the Scott Act should be placed on the Government Orders, and that is what I am speaking to precisely. I am speaking with regard to Scott Act amendments, and I am showing you that while I supported these Scott Act amendments last Session, I was censured by a representative body of people in my county. I just want to say that that resolution was not correct, that I had voted and did not shirk anything.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. HACKETT. I will take the responsibility.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. BLAKE. Chair, chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will confine himself simply to the question of whether these Bills shall be placed on the Government Orders.

Mr. HACKETT. That is what I intend to do, Mr. Speaker. I think it would be very unwise that these should be transferred to the Government Orders, as we have just voted down a motion having reference to a Bill of much greater importance; and I was referring to the fact that I supported these amendments last year.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand your ruling is that each of these Bills are now to be put separately, or can be put separately, upon the demand of any member. Now, there are three Bills, as I understand.

Mr. SPEAKER. They are all on one side of the question.

Mr. McCARTHY. There are no sides to the question. There are three Bills, and it has been moved to place them upon the Government Orders. One is "Bill (No. 99) An Act respecting Druggists;" another is "Bill (No. 104) An Act to amend the Canada Temperance Act of 1878;" and the other is No. 118. Now I ask, has a member, in accordance with your ruling that these Bills be put separately, a right to move that the question be put separately as to each of these others? For my part, while I was quite willing to put upon the Government Orders the Bill in charge of my hon. friend to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, I am not willing to put on that measure alone. I am anxious to see this Bill regarding druggists put on also, as it has come from the Senate, and should have a chance of receiving the consideration of this House. It has been passed by the Senate and is very important in the interests of the druggists, and is not at all calculated to destroy the Scott Act in those counties where it may be enforced, and I think it ought to have an opportunity, at all events, of being brought to a second reading here.

Mr. COOK. My hon. friend from North Simcoe states that the Bill regarding druggists is very important to the druggists. Well, it is not in the interests of the druggists that we are legislating here, we are legislating for the interests of the people, and I regret exceedingly the conduct of my hon. friend in connection with this whole transaction. Of coure, when I look back and remember that the Mc Carthy Act was once in force in this country——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. COOK. I will say that on a former occasion I voted in favor of the Bill being put upon the Government Orders so as to receive the attention of this House at an early date.

I oppose the motion of my hon. friend from North Victoria because it tends in an opposite direction from temperance, and I shall therefore give it my opposition.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Having voted that the Bill of my hon. friend from Lanark be placed upon the Government Orders, so that it may be discussed and a decision arrived at this Session, I feel disposed, at the same time, to extend the same courtesy to the other Bill on the same subject introduced by my hon. friend from Wellington. I think that is a proper course to take, so that the question may come before the House, and a decision be arrived at before the close of the Session. I shall, therefore, vote for the motion of the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Kranz).

Mr. SPEAKER. In reference to the question which the hon. member for North Simcoe has just put, about dividing the question, I am afraid I may have been misunderstood when I stated that this was a complex question, and that when a complex question is put any member has a right to ask that it be divided. A member has a right to ask that it be divided, and it is for the House to order that by motion. The rule is laid down in May, 9th edition, p. 309, as follows :—

"If a question is complicated, the House may, if it think fit, order it to be divided, so that each part may be determined separately. A right has been claimed in both Houses, for an individual member to insist upon the division of a complicated question ; but it has not been recognised, nor can it be reasonable to allow it."

A member has a right to ask that it be divided, but it is for the House to order it. In the present case the hon. member will see that if the House votes against this amendment where three Bills are combined, then he can move that one of these be put separately afterwards. The House may refuse to put it on in conjunction with other Bills, and that it will be in order for him to move that it be put on by itself.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then, if I understand your ruling, Mr. Speaker, the reason you gave for ruling the motion out of order falls to the ground.

Mr. SPEAKER. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may be wrong, but saying "no" will not make me right. As I understood, it was on this ground: That because this was a complex question, because a member of the House could insist on this question being separated and the matters in question put separately, therefore the motion made by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) was out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. No; I said that the House had refused to place Bill No. 92 on the Government Orders, and therefore I did not think that question could be submitted again to the House. That was my ruling.

Mr. McCARTHY. The ground taken on this side was, that both those Bills being put as a substitute was not the same, but a different question from putting one Bill alone. I may have misunderstood your ruling, but I understood the ground was that this was a complex question. That was the ground we here all understood to be taken. It is very important that the ruling should be definite, and that we should understand the grounds of it, because it will form a precedent in other matters.

Mr. BLAKE. So far from that being the case, you, Mr. Speaker, had ruled before mention was made as to its being a complex question. That was additional proof adduced. You referred to the fact that this was a complex motion, and that the placing of each of the Bills would be an independent motion in point of fact. Although I do not say which way I will vote, as the subjects are different, if the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) will move that the questions be put separately, I am disposed to assent to the motion for my part, although your observation, Mr. Speaker, is perfectly correct that the motion put in its present form cannot by any means debar an hon. member from subsequently moving that any one of the Bills be placed on the Government Orders, because it is a different thing placing three or two or one of them on those Orders.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will move, seconded by the hon. member for West Durham, that the questions be put separately.

Mr. BLAKE. I will not second that proposition.

Mr. McCARTHY. I move that they be put separately.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman can attain the object he desires by moving, if the amendment is lost, that the druggists Bill be placed on the Government Orders.

House divided on amendment to the amendment of Mr. Cameron (Victoria.)

YEAS:

Messieurs

Béchard,	Haggart,	McMullen,
Bergeron,	Hickey,	Mitchell,
Bourassa,	Kilvert,	Orton,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kranz,	Ouimet,
Casgrain,	Labrosse,	Small,
Geoffrion,	Landerkin,	Taschereau,
Girouard,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Weldon.—22.
Guilbault,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Forbes,	Massus,
Allison,	Fortin,	Mills,
Amyot,	Foster,	Moffat,
Armstrong,	Gagné,	Montplaisir,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gaudet,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gault,	O'Brien,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gigault,	Paint,
Barnard,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Benoit,	Glen,	Pinsonneault,
Bernier,	Gordon,	Platt,
Blake,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Blondeau,	Gunn,	Ray,
Bossé,	Hackett,	Reid,
Bourbeau,	Hall,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Harley,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Burns,	Hay,	Robertson (Hastings),
Burpee,	Hesson,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Huron),	Holton,	Royal,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Rykert,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Hurteau,	Scott,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Scriver,
Campbell (Victoria),	Irvine,	Shakespeare,
Carling,	Jackson,	Shanly,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jamieson,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd)	Jenkins,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Kaulbach,	Springer,
Chapleau,	King,	Sproule,
Colby,	Kinney,	Tassé,
Cook,	Kirk,	Taylor,
Costigan,	Landry (Kent),	Temple,
Coughlin,	Landry (Montmagny),	Thompson,
Coursol,	Langelier,	Townshend,
Curran,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Trow,
Daly,	Laurier,	Tupper,
Davies,	Lesage,	Tyrwhitt,
Dawson,	Lister,	Vail,
De St. Georges,	Macdonald (King's),	Vanasse,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackenzie,	Wallace (Albert),
Desaulniers (St.M'rice),	Mackintosh,	Wallace (York),
Dickinson,	Macmaster,	Watson,
Dodd,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Cardwell),
Dugas,	McCallum,	White (Hastings),
Dundas,	McCarthy,	White (Renfrew),
Dupont,	McCraney,	Wigle,
Edgar,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wilson,
Everett,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Brockville),
Farrow,	McGreevy,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Ferguson (Leeds&Gren)	McIntyre,	Wright,
Ferguson (Welland),	McLelan,	Yeo.—149.
Fisher,	McNeill,	

Amendment negatived.

House divided on the amendment of Mr. Kranz.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Béchard,	Guilbault,	Orton,
Benoit,	Haggart,	Ouimet,
Bergeron,	Hurteau,	Pinsonneault,
Bourassa,	Kilvert,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Cameron (Victoria),	Kranz,	Royal,
Casgrain,	Labrosse,	Rykert,
Daoust,	Landerkin,	Small,
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Lesage,	Taschereau,
Dugas,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Tassé,
Gaudet,	Massue,	Vanasse,
Geoffrion,	Mitchell,	Weldon.—35.
Girouard,	Montplaisir,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	McLelan,
Allison,	Forbes,	McMullen,
Amyot,	Fortin,	McNeill,
Armstrong,	Foster,	Mills,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gagné,	Moffat,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gault,	Mulock,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gigault,	O'Brien,
Barnard,	Gillmor,	Paint,
Bernier,	Glen,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Gordon,	Platt,
Blondeau,	Guillett,	Pruyn,
Bossé,	Gunn,	Ray,
Bourbeau,	Hackett,	Reid,
Bowell,	Hall,	Riopel,
Burns,	Harley,	Robertson (Hastings),
Burpee,	Hay,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Huron),	Hesson,	Scott,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Holton,	Shakespeare,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Homer,	Shanly,
Carling,	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd)	Jackson,	Springer,
Casey,	Jamieson,	Sproule,
Chapleau,	Kaulbach,	Taylor,
Colby,	King,	Temple,
Cook,	Kinney,	Thompson,
Costigan,	Kirk,	Townshend,
Coughlin,	Landry (Montmagny),	Trow,
Coursol,	Langelier,	Tupper,
Curran,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Tyrwhitt,
Daly,	Laurier,	Vail,
Davies,	Lister,	Wallace (Albert),
Dawson,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
De St. Georges,	Mackenzie,	Watson,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Cardwell),
Dickinson,	Macmaster,	White (Hastings),
Dodd,	Macmillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dundas,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dupont,	McCarthy,	Wilson,
Edgar,	McCraney,	Wood (Brockville),
Everett,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Farrow,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wright,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McGreevy,	Yeo.—134.
Ferguson (Welland),	McIntyre,	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. HICKEY moved in amendment that Bill (No. 99) relating to druggists (from the Senate) be also added to the Government Orders. He said: This Bill affects the entire college of pharmacy and deals with an important interest in this country. Besides, I do not think there is a single provision in the Bill to which the most zealous friend of temperance could seriously object.

Amendment negatived, and main motion agreed to.

PUBLIC LANDS OF CANADA IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved third reading of Bill (No. 120) to make further provision respecting the administration of the public lands of Canada in British Columbia.

Mr. MILLS. Will the hon. Minister state whether the Government are carrying out the rectangular system of survey in British Columbia. I judge, from information that has come before us that such is the case. There was a good deal of discussion over this subject of the application of the rectangular system to mountainous districts at the time the State of California was being surveyed, and the Government of the United States came to the conclusion that the system could not well be carried out; that, in fact, it would seriously affect the public interest to adopt that system in districts that are so rough and mountainous as are some portions of California. That being the case, the same rule would apply in British Columbia. In fact, in the larger portion of the country, if it is to be adapted to settlement at all, the physical features will have to be followed and not mathematical lines drawn on the earth's surface. Large portions will be rendered unfit for settlement if the lines are drawn due north and south and east and west. No doubt the subject has received the attention of the Minister of the Interior, and I think it desirable before the third reading of the Bill is taken that the hon. gentleman should inform the House as to what has been done in that respect in regard to those lands.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The information I have from the Surveyor General is, that there are no serious difficulties in carrying out the method of survey adopted in the North-West, and as far as possible he is carrying out that method.

Bill read the third time and passed.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 125) to amend the law relating to the salaries of certain Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature for Ontario.—(Mr. Thompson.)

Bill (No. 126) to amend the law respecting Crown cases reserved.—(Mr. Thompson.)

Bill (No. 101) in amendment of "The Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883;" and the Act amending the same.—(Mr. Costigan.)

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES IN NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that the report of Committee of the Whole on resolution respecting the appointment of judges in the North-West Territories, be read the second time and concurred in.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. THOMPSON introduced Bill (No. 133) further to amend the law in respect to the North-West Territories.

Bill read the first time.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the report of Committee of the Whole respecting fees and expenses in connection with the electoral franchise in the North-West Territories, be read the second time and concurred in.

Resolution concurred in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Bill (No. 115) respecting the representation of the North-West Territories in the Parliament of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

REVISED STATUTES OF CANADA.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 9) respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to say, with reference to this Bill, that I have been told that the Statutes which it is proposed to make into law are, in several material respects, and with reference to some recent Statutes, changed. Now, for example, with reference to the Franchise provisions, I am told that the provision as to the electoral oath, to be administered, is altered. It seems to me that this is a very improper method of disposing of questions of this description. I think, if it is proposed to make changes in material parts of the law, it would have been proper to introduce fresh Bills into Parliament which might receive the judgment of Parliament as Bills, and which being passed into Acts could have been then consolidated, as the Acts of this Session, with the revision of the Statutes. But to make changes in the law, under the theory of a revision and consolidation, is to make those changes without giving Parliament and the country an opportunity of pronouncing upon the expediency or fitness of those changes; and for my part, I said before and I repeat that we have got to take very largely upon trust—even the select committee had to take very largely upon trust—the work of the consolidators. But if such changes of the law as I have referred to are introduced into the revision, we really do not know what changes we are making. Now, with reference to this question of the oath, if my memory serves me aright, during the discussions on the Franchise Bill last Session, it was pointed out that the oaths would no longer be suitable, having regard to the new franchise, and a pledge was made that this Session a Bill would be introduced to amend the law in this particular, and to make provision for that defect. I do not consider it a fulfilment of that pledge that the revision of the Statutes should contain such an oath; I think that pledge could be fulfilled only by our having in the ordinary way a Bill for consideration touching that question. I do not know whether there are other particulars in which the same process has been adopted, but if there be I can only say that I regret it very much.

Mr. WELDON. It strikes me, with regard to the Bill which was passed last Session, that in part of the consolidation relating to the franchise, the sections are totally transposed, and the alterations are such that it will be very difficult to know what their effect will be. Sometimes a section of the law is controlled a good deal by the context, and it also happens in this case that certain portions of the Act are transferred into other Acts. Now, that is a matter as to which we should proceed with a great deal of caution. Last Session, when the revised Statutes were introduced into the House, a joint committee of both Houses was appointed to go through the Acts, and compare them as far as possible. That, of course, was a task which would be utterly impossible for the whole committee to undertake, so the committee was sub-divided and certain portions were given to each sub-committee. So far as the sub-committees were concerned, they went through the portions allotted to them, and it was found in some cases that several mistakes were made which might have been very serious. At the same time, I felt that that was the only course which was open to us, as otherwise it would be impossible ever to have revised Statutes. A commissioner attended the sub-committees and explained the various changes, and, of course, a great deal had to be taken on the responsibility of that commissioner. But with regard to the amendments made in the Act of 1885, there has not been that care taken of them, although those Acts have been changed to a large extent. For instance, the sections are entirely transposed and new language is used which sometimes makes the construing of them very difficult; because every person who is familiar with the construction of the Statutes, knows that a change of a few words will sometimes make a considerable alteration, and cause a different construction to be put on the Act. In the Franchise Act there are many verbal changes made, some of them immaterial, but others, which I am not prepared to say without consideration, may not be a variation of the sense. We find sections taken out of the Franchise Act and transferred to other Acts, for instance, to the Dominion Elections Act. It appears to me that a distinct Bill should be brought in to make these changes, which could be incorporated in the consolidation when the final volumes are published. Any person who has had experience in regard to the consolidation of Statutes, knows that it is a matter which should be proceeded with with a great deal of caution. In the consolidation of the Statutes of New Brunswick, very serious changes were made, which were constantly turning up. In one instance the whole principle of the descent of real property was reversed, and a clause was inserted which had an *ex post facto* operation of fifteen years, and which seriously disturbed titles.

Mr. THOMPSON. It was not intended that the revisers should make any material changes in the language of the Statutes, or indeed any changes except such as were necessary to harmonise the Statutes, and I understand that is all that has been done in connection with the Franchise Act. Of course, as it is an Act in which a great deal of interest was taken last Session, and in regard to which there was considerable feeling, I am not surprised that any change whatever in it, even a verbal change, should excite comment; but I would ask hon. gentlemen who have made comments to point out any instance in which the revisers have taken an unwarrantable liberty with the text. If they have simply made the Franchise Act harmonise with the Election Act in respect of the oath of qualification, or in the phraseology of any of the sections, it seems to me that they were strictly within the line of duty, and within the line which they followed with regard to other Acts, in respect of which their conduct has not been criticised. If they have done more than that—if they have made a change against the policy of the Act or the wish of the House, now is the time to mention the particular instance.

Mr. BLAKE. That is just what we complain of. I maintain that changes in the law ought to be made by Parliament, and not by the revisers. For example, it may be a very serious question what sort of oath we should have. The oath proposed by the revisers is practically a new oath, and it is not, to my mind, a satisfactory one; it is too general; but I have no opportunity of moving an amendment. The hon. gentleman says now is the time to point any change out. How is the House going to remedy them? The House cannot remedy them.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have attached to the Bill a schedule of alterations to be made, and one value of that is that if a mistake was made, and the attention of the House called to it, we could correct it there.

Mr. BLAKE. But the proper way to make a statute is not to alter in Committee of the Whole something the revisers have set before us, but to have the proposition brought before us in the regular way.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is another question. I thought the hon. gentleman was under the impression that we could not amend anything here.

Mr. BLAKE. As the Bill came before the House we could not. What opportunity is given in this mass of Statutes, filling two volumes, to make amendments? I do not think it is a satisfactory or proper method of making them. It was pointed out last Session that the alterations we were making in the law would involve further alteration in the election law, and we were told that a Bill

would be brought before us this Session with that view. It is no redemption of that pledge to adopt such an oath as the revisers may think a fit oath, which they have presented to us in several thousands of pages of different Statutes, and to say to us, point out anything in the Committee of the Whole, and the necessary changes may be made. We have not that Act before us; what we have before us is a Bill to make that Act law. A measure of that kind is one in regard to which it is very important that we should have the practical experience of those engaged in the conduct of elections, active politicians throughout the country, who have had to do with the various devices which have to be guarded against for the introduction of spurious oaths. We have not that advantage. We adopt the view that the public have some interest in our legislation, and have some right and duty to make suggestions in regard to it, and in that view we establish certain intervals between the stages of Bills, print them and distribute them. We have none of these advantages now, but we are asked to swallow this holus bolus.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). As a member of the committee to which was referred this consolidation, I gave considerable attention to it, but, I must admit, not such attention as to make me feel thoroughly certain as to the changes proposed and the consolidation made. That was utterly impossible without giving the matter a great deal more time than we had at our disposal. But, still, those matters to which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has referred came up before the sub-committee of which I had the honor of being chairman, and they were satisfactorily explained to us as not interfering in any way with the Act. For instance, if hon. gentlemen will look at the Franchise Act, page 47 of the draft, they will find the parts that are to be consolidated. For instance, it mentions all except section 2, section 10, and sections 15 to 32, both inclusive. Those were left out because, as understood by us, and I have no doubt by those who consolidated the Statutes, they were of no effect, being virtually repealed. I think all the sections from 15 to 32 refer to the preliminary preparation of the list. That work having been done, it cannot come up again.

Mr. WELDON. That is just the question—has it been all done?

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). The preliminary part has been done.

Mr. WELDON. But you eliminate the final revision, which has to come.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). The reason we omitted that is that this consolidation will not come into force until after a proclamation is made, and that proclamation will not be made until after the time has elapsed for the final revision of these lists, and therefore all these sections are unnecessary. I give this example to show that there was no intention of changing the Act in any material respect, because being convinced that it was not changed in any material respect, the change consisting only in the striking out of things which were unnecessary, we made our recommendation that it should be adopted.

Mr. EDGAR. It is not so much what has been left out of it as what has been put in. In the first volume of the Revised Statutes, at page 119, we find, as a schedule of the Election Act, an entirely new form of qualification. It is necessary, in view of uniformity, that there should be one oath for the whole of the electorate, instead of, as formerly, using the oaths provided by the different Provinces; but I protest against the form of oath adopted, because it is an absolutely new form; it is absolutely new legislation on a vital point. The oath which we have been using in the Province of Ontario and at the Dominion elections, up to this time, is to be found in the Ontario Revised Statutes, vol. i, page 152. When a voter comes up to be sworn, surely, if the oath is meant to be of any utility as a prevention of fraud, he ought to be made to swear that he has got the necessary qualification. Now, the Ontario Act makes an elector swear:

"That on such a day you were actually, truly and in good faith possessed for your own use and benefit, as owner, tenant or occupant, as the case may be, of the real estate in respect of which your name is entered on the list of voters, and as such are entitled to vote at this election."

This provision of the oath is entirely left out in the new form; and I think the House should not be asked to pass such an oath without some explanation. Further, in the form of the Ontario oath, the voter is obliged to swear that he is of the full age of 21 years. Under the new franchise, which has set the qualification as to age at 21, as it was before in Ontario, the form of oath given does not contain this declaration. This is either a gross piece of negligence on the part of whoever prepared this form, or it is the result of design. I have heard that all through the country, boys are being put on the voters' list of sixteen years of age, and when they come to vote they will not be called upon to swear that they are of the proper age; consequently their votes will be taken. We should not be asked to pass measures in this loose way.

Mr. WELDON. This point is very important, because the first qualification, under the Franchise Act, is that the voter should be of the age of twenty-one, and be a British subject, by birth or naturalisation. The form of oath given does not contain the important statement that the voter is of the age of twenty-one; therefore, if persons under that age should get on the list, they will escape penalties, though they have not the proper qualification. The hon. member for Kent says the changes which have been made are changes which do not affect the Statutes, but he must know that we cannot in a moment decide whether the changes are such as he describes them to be or not, particularly when the sections of the different Statutes are transposed and numbered differently to what they are in the Statutes at present. For instance, section 55 of last year turns out to be section 15 in the consolidated edition. When the commission was first issued during the Session of 1884, the Revised Statutes were laid on the Table, and hon. members had a whole year to examine them. In the Session of 1885, they were referred to a committee, which took the whole of the Session to go through them carefully, and then they stood over another year. There should be no difficulty this year; because there has not been ample time to examine them, yet mistakes have been found. I pointed out a serious mistake in regard to navigation in Canadian waters. Here we find that the Statutes passed last Session are published in the Revised Statutes, as they were in 1885, but so transposed that it is utterly impossible, in a cursory examination, to find them.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). The object of a revision of the consolidation of the Statutes is to do what has been done here. All the Acts on a particular subject are consolidated, carefully eliminating the portions repealed and harmonising those remaining, so as to give a perfect Act. The consolidation of the Acts passed last year has been done in the same way as the consolidation of the Acts of previous years. That was done in the way I have mentioned, by consolidating into one Act everything that belonged to one subject, it did not matter in how many different Statutes it might have been found. No one found fault with that last winter, but the fault now found is, that the Acts passed last winter have not been put into this new consolidation—to use a common phrase—holus bolus, without any regard to what applied or not, but exactly as they passed last winter. As I understand, hon. gentlemen say that should have been done. For instance,

the Franchise Act should have been put in as it passed, without consolidating it, without eliminating any of those sections which have virtually become effete and no avail, but put in exactly as it was. It appears to me that the object and aim of the consolidation would have been lost sight of if that had been done. The question is, is that fairly and honestly done, has the meaning and intention of the Act been changed? If so, it would be a wrong thing, which ought not to have been done, but I do not think it has been. I do not say positively that it has not, but my conviction, from the cursory observation I was able to give to it, is that the law has not been changed materially. I admit frankly that we had not the time at our disposal to enable me to speak positively on it, but I believe firmly that it is a consolidation that we could properly recommend, and that this committee could easily adopt, without any fear of the laws having been changed in any way. As to the oath, it may have been better that that oath should be brought in by a special and particular Act, but it is a mere technical objection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Hon. gentlemen may say not, but if this is adopted now, will not this be the law?

Mr. EDGAR. It is new law and it is bad law.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). If they say it is bad law, the simple way is to move to amend that law and make it good, according to their views. My opinion is, that it is a reasonable and fair oath to take under the Franchise Act, and that it meets the different sections of the Act as it exists. I do not profess to judge for others, or to be infallible in my opinion. I may be entirely wrong, but I think, upon a fair reading, we shall find it to be so. Take the oath itself. The comments made on the fact that the elector is not asked to say positively that he is twenty-one years of age have no effect, for this reason. The elector swears that he is the person named, or purporting to be named on the list of voters shown to him. The law is certainly very strict, that no one shall get on but those who are twenty-one years of age, and the voter swears that he is the person who is on the list. We must take it *primâ facie* that he is properly there, and has been put there before a proper court.

Mr. WELDON. Why is it necessary that he should swear that he is a British subject?

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). It may not be necessary that he should swear to that.

Mr. BLAKE. Why should he swear to anything except to his identity, according to your theory?

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Because it goes further, and he swears that he is entitled to vote at this election. He must be a naturalised subject, he must have the qualifications under the Franchise Act. If he swears to this, he is covering the whole ground.

Mr. MILLS. Then why is he required to swear anything more?

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). It is necessary for him to swear he has not voted before and that he has received nothing and paid nothing to anyone to vote or refrain from voting. That is necessary because, if he had, it would not take his name off the list, but would disqualify him. That is absolutely necessary under the sections which prohibit the bribing of individuals for the purpose of getting their votes. So all this oath is necessary, except perhaps the declaration that he is a British subject.

Mr. WELDON. Read sub-section 6.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). That declares that he is a resident with his father, or, if his father be dead, with his mother, upon the farm in respect of which he is to vote. That may possibly be also necessary; I do not know. It is suggested by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. White, Renfrew) that he may have become disqualified by having left his father since he was put on the list. I do not know if that would disqualify him, but it might. So, if he was a British subject, he might have become the subject of another power in the meantime. But, at any rate, these are the only two things. It is my conviction that in other respects the oath is a proper one, but, if hon. gentlemen object to it, they have their remedy now. It may be difficult to see through the draft, it is so voluminous, but every change is noted at the foot of the section in which it is made. It is either set down as "re-drafted," if it has been re-drafted, or as "new," if it is new. I am not sure whether the changes as to numbers of sections are noted, but wherever the wording is different it is noted at the bottom of the section. Hon. gentlemen may say they have not the time or the leisure or the disposition to go over these two large volumes to see whether they are right or not, but hon. gentlemen will find that the sections in which the wording is noted to be "new" or "re-drafted," are not very numerous after all; and I think, whenever hon. gentlemen think it is not right or proper law to be enacted, they should move that it be amended in some way. In regard to the reference made by my hon. friend from the city and county of St. John (Mr. Weldon), to the important matter of which he has spoken, I think he will find a recommendation on the part of the committee that that shall be amended, and that in the schedule it is amended according to the views he put forward, which are very proper indeed, and which it was a very proper thing to point out.

Mr. MULOCK. The discussion, so far, has been principally confined to the alleged defect in regard to the oath for the qualification of voters. If an oath was necessary under the old law, I submit that it is doubly necessary under the new. Under the old law, the officials charged with the business of comparing the lists were able to have some personal knowledge of what they were engaged in doing. Speaking of the practice prevailing in the Province of Ontario, we know that the first step in the way of the preparation of the list was assessment. That assessment was made, not for the purpose of giving a vote to the person assessed, but for the purpose of taxation, and was made by persons having an actual knowledge of what they were engaged in doing. It is all changed now. The revising officer prepares the list, but he does not prepare it on any knowledge of his own whatever; and each revising officer having the power to receive just such information as he desires, to accept such evidence as he chooses, is in a position to make a list on absolutely unreliable testimony. I know that, in some ridings in the Province of Ontario, revising officers placed names upon the list on information and belief, on the affidavits or statutory declarations of third persons on information and belief. I would be glad if the Minister of Justice would understand the point I am making, because I am sure he has a desire to have this made right, and I want to point out this very serious matter to him. A vast number of names have been placed on the list in Ontario simply on evidence on information and belief. Now, the deponent may have sworn correctly, but his information may have been inaccurate, so that there was really no legal testimony before the revising officer when he accepted the name and placed it on the list.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It can be struck off afterwards.

Mr. MULOCK. It may be struck off, if it is found out, but, if it is not struck off, should the man have a vote if he is not entitled to a vote? Should we not perfect this system so that no person should have a voice in elections

without the statutory qualification? I presume that is what we are calling for. It is not intended that Parliament should represent persons who are not electors, or that the results of the elections shall depend upon persons who have not the necessary statutory qualifications. Now if it is admitted for a moment, as it must be, that the list to-day contains the names of persons who really have not the qualifications, surely we ought to provide a further test in order that our whole system of election shall not tend to be a mere farce.

Mr. THOMPSON. By changing the nature of the oath?

Mr. MULOCK. Yes. I think if we had the oath presented to the electors at the polls that he is possessed of the qualifications which he claims, it gives him a vote. I fully understood, speaking for myself last Session, that such was to be made law this year—I fully understood so from the Premier, and I fancy it is only by an oversight that matters are in their present condition. If it is the intention of the Government or the will of the House, that there shall be this final test submitted to every person claiming to be entitled to vote, I have no doubt that the committee who had revision of the list, could, in a very short time, bring in the necessary forms to be attached to this Act, or the Act it is intended to bring in.

Mr. MILLS. It appears from the consolidation of the Franchise Act that there are some twenty clauses left out, and the hon. gentleman from Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry), says that it is unnecessary that they should be embraced in the current list, and that the list shall be completed before this consolidated body of law goes into operation. Now, it seems to me that it is an elementary principle that where you repeal a law, everything that rests upon it, that has a legal origin in the law repealed, falls with it. I would like to know by what authority the list is upheld, unless there is a special provision—unless there is some new legal basis given to the list—upon what principle the current list could be upheld? Now, these lists will be the lists for the election for twelve months, possible for two years to come; they will be the lists in operation, that is, they will have legal effect and validity until the new list is prepared, until they are superseded by another list; but if you repeal those sections of the law, by the authority of which those lists are formed, and are made the election lists, then they disappear as effectually as the provisions of the law upon which they rest. I would like to know by what authority the lists that are now being prepared, are to remain the voters' lists, if you repeal the sections of the Act which makes them voters' lists, and substitute nothing else in their place. These Consolidated Statutes provide that at some period a proclamation shall issue bringing them into operation. Supposing that is issued twelve months hence, what will be the effect upon the existing lists? You repeal every section upon which these lists rest, and you repeal every provision of the law which authorises these lists to be framed, and having done that the lists disappear along with the provisions of the law upon which they repose. I say there is nothing clearer than that when the sections from 11 to 31 or 32, are repealed, when they disappear from the Statute-book, the voters' lists throughout Canada, which have been created by the authority of these sections, disappear with those sections. By what authority? Why, by the authority of the law which you have repealed, and which is law no longer. That being the case, I think it is clear as noon-day that not one voters' list in ten would exist if that consolidated body of law were brought into operation within the next twelve months, as it stands, without any provision being made for the perpetuation of these lists; there would be no voters' lists in existence, and no elections could be had until new lists could be prepared. I think that would be the legal effect. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. I would like to know by what authority these lists would remain the voters' lists. The hon. gentleman knows that there are certain sections of the Act which provide that revising officers shall be appointed who shall prepare certain lists, that they are prepared in a particular way, and it describes every step which shall be taken, and the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce a Bill by which all these provisions of the law shall be repealed. I say that being the case, unless there is some positive legislation for the purpose of perpetuating those lists, they disappear with the law.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent.) It seems to me the hon. gentleman's argument is very specious, because, if it is correct, we may go on a little further and say that everything that has been done even on those lists, would also become illegal. For instance, this House of Commons would have no authority to sit here; we would no longer be a House of Commons, because the franchise upon which we are elected was repealed last winter, and that everything that has been done under that law is wiped away by the fact of its being repealed. It appears to me that the amendment carried out to its logical conclusion leads to that result. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. If certain things have been done under an existing law, those things are legal; they are accomplished and fixed by law; but if the hon. gentleman is correct, all those things become illegal if we repeal the law under which they were done. Have we not been elected under a certain law? Will the hon. gentleman say that everything we have done is illegal because we have wiped away that law by the Franchise Act? This shows how ridiculous is the argument of the hon. gentleman.

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

After Recess.

Mr. THOMPSON. One of the principal objections made by the hon. member for West Durham was that a promise was made last Session that matters would be dealt with by substantive legislation, and as of course an opportunity will present itself for that I will, therefore, for the present drop the form of oath altogether.

Mr. DAVIES. Suggestion was made that the form of oath should contain a substantive declaration of the age of the elector claiming to vote. In regard to farmers' sons it is also desirable that such should be done and that a person claiming to vote has been residing with his father twelve months previous to the date of the election.

On section 2,

Mr. THOMPSON. Section 2 provides that "the Governor in Council may cause such Acts of the present Session as he thinks proper to be inserted in this consolidation," and at the end of that clause I add a few words in accordance with the report of the committee providing that alterations made in the schedules to this Bill shall be made before publication. An error is mentioned by the sub-committee, and it consists of the unnecessary repetition of a clause. It is due to the revisers to say that it was not originally their mistake. They incorporated it with the law as it is, and the law contains that error.

Mr. MILLS. There are voters' list now being prepared, and I understand by the revision of the Revised Statutes it is proposed to repeal the sections under which those lists are being prepared.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not exactly. That has simply reference to some preliminary work, but the provisions under which the lists are prepared are continued.

Mr. EDGAR. In the Franchise Act proper, which is consolidated here, in almost every paragragh there is some change, some adaptation we are told. It is objectionable

that we should be called upon to rush through with this Bill, while I see on the notice paper a Bill to amend the Franchise Act standing in the name of the Minister of Justice. If that Bill is before the House and any amendments are made which may be considered necessary to facilitate the working of the Act or to recall what we may pass over to-night in a lump, can those amendments be introduced into the law ?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is fully intended that the Acts of this Session shall be embodied in the consolidation in the same way as were the Acts of last Session. I hope to be able to introduce the Franchise Bill to-morrow or the next day.

Mr. WELDON. I am afraid this Act tends to take power to legislate out of the hands of Parliament and place it in the hands of the Government. The revised volume will be a large one without embodying the Acts of this Session,and it will be the better course to bring the Revised Statutes down to a certain period than to embrace the Statutes of this year.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it is very desirable to bring the consolidation down to as late a period as possible. It is only intended to cover cases of that kind.

Mr. WELDON. I know that a similar Act is in the consolidation of the New Brunswick Statutes, but I have heard complaints that alterations were made. It seems to me that you should bring the revision down to where you get the Statutes and then start again with the Acts passed this Session. When we give power to a body outside of ourselves to say that it is to be the effect of language as to which lawyers and judges differ, it would be far better to bring the Revised Statutes down to this Session, and let the Acts of this Session remain as they are.

Mr. THOMPSON. That would be losing a year, and, as I said before, this course has been pursued in all other consolidations and without any question, I think, having been raised or any charge made that the Acts had been changed by the revisers. Besides that, hon. gentlemen will remember that we are passing this Session some Acts for the purpose of taking their places in the consolidation; for instance, that in relation to summary convictions, where we have the case of clauses in phrases altogether different from that which they would occupy if they were substantive Acts.

Mr. MILLS. I think it is very clear, if that was the intention of the Government, that instead of proposing simply an amendment to the Act, the whole Act relating to the particular subject ought to have been consolidated, and all other laws on the subject repealed, and afterwards it might have been incorporated in the Revised Statutes. But that has not been done. For instance, we had an amendment to the land law, and it was open to the Government to supersede the existing law altogether and consolidate the law, propose a measure to the House and carry it through. It might then have been incorporated in the Revised Statutes. But the hon. gentleman proposes, after the work of revision has been completed, in so far as it may be said to have been completed at all, that the Government shall have the liberty of consolidating the law after Parliament rises. That is practically the proposition. Now, I do not think that ought to be the case. I think it would be infinitely better that the Government should propose to reintroduce those measures and to re-enact them this Session than to do what the hon. gentleman proposes. Certainly the work of consolidation, when it is done, will be in part undone from the first Session after the work is completed, and that first Session might just as well be this Session as next Session. There is no advantage in postponing it. The ten years which usually run before revision takes place, would expire one year sooner. It seems that this course is an unusual proceeding, because, although the work of consolidation is usually carried down to the close of the Session in which the Acts are carried, it is not carried down in the way the hon. gentleman proposes. Take for instance the land Bill amendments which were introduced. If the Government intended to do what the Minister of Justice now says was their intention, why was not the whole law brought before us, so that it could take its place in this volume? What the hon. gentleman proposes is that Parliament shall in part abdicate its function and hand them over to the Executive.

Mr. MACMASTER. In the consolidation of the Statutes of the Province of Quebec certain amendments were made while the Code was before the House, and the committee which was entrusted with the consolidation of the laws was also entrusted with the incorporation of the amendments made by the House with the original Statutes. It seems to me that the course the Minister is now pursuing is perfectly analogous.

On section 5,

Mr. WELDON. The time mentioned in the third subsection seems to be very indefinite, and the matter would depend entirely on the action of the Local Legislature.

Mr. THOMPSON. In some cases legislation has been carried forward which would require the action of one of the Local Legislatures. A few cases of that kind are provided for. It is proposed, when the proper Legislature makes provision for the punishment of an offence by fine or imprisonment, that the former provision should stand repealed. These are matters in respect of which the repeal could not be made by the Local Legislature now, but the repeal must be made here, because the offences are now criminal offences.

Mr. WELDON. If the Local Legislature had no power to repeal an Act passed before Confederation, how could they deal with it ?

Mr. THOMPSON. The subject matter of the legislation is with them, but as the offences are now felonies or misdemeanors, the provisions making them so are within our jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLS. I think the rule laid down by the Judicial Committee is that where the subject-matter is under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature, and there is no fine or punishment attached to it, then the offence is under provincial jurisdiction, and I do not think there is any limitation as to how the Local Legislature may characterise that offence. If the principal subject matter of which the crime is an incident, or the regulation for the enforcement of the law on that subject, is clearly within local jurisdiction, then it seems to me that the offence is under local legislation even though the law were passed before Confederation. There was a division of Statute-Law made by the Act of Confederation, and the Local Legislatures are just as competent to repeal what they would have the power to enact, even though it was passed before Confederation, as they would be if it had been enacted by themselves.

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot fully agree with my hon. friend, that because the Local Legislature has power to legislate with regard to coroners' inquests, it would have a right to say that a person committing a breach of the peace, while an inquest was proceeding, would be guilty of a felony. We are not interfering with the legislation here; we are providing an effective rule for repealing Acts which it is not competent for the Local Legislatures themselves to repeal.

On section 11,

Mr. DAVIES. I do not know whether the Minister of Justice has given full consideration to the question, how far we have the right to declare that this or that shall be

evidence in all courts. I think the preponderating opinion of the lawyers of this House is, that we have not that right,

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think that arises. We are only professing to speak of what is within our own jurisdiction. When we say that copies of these Acts shall be evidence in all courts, we mean, of course, so far as we have power to make them so.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved the second reading of Bill (No. 106) to amend an Act to restrict and regulate Chinese Immigration into Canada. He said: As I stated when introducing the Bill, it is the same, substantially, as that of last year, with the exception that a better and more practical mode of registration is adopted, and that the working of the Bill is put entirely under the control of the officers and the Minister of Customs. Another feature of the Bill is that merchants who were exempted from paying the entrance fee of $50 on arriving are no longer exempted. Another clause of the Bill, which is only a matter of detail, assimilates the bringing in of Chinese immigrants by rail with those coming in by steamer, at the same time providing that Chinese immigrants, passing through the territory by rail, if their intended destination is outside the Dominion, may be so transported without payment of the fee mentioned in the Act. There are no other special provisions differing from those of the Bill of last year.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose to amend sub-section *c* to read as follows:—

The expression "Chinese" means any person born of a Chinese father.

Mr. WELDON. No matter what nationality the mother is?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If born of a Chinese father he will be excluded.

Mr. GORDON. Will not this lead to litigation?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is intended to prevent litigation.

Mr. GORDON. He may say he has an English father in order to save the $50.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It will be for him to prove that. He might say the same if the expression were "of Chinese origin."

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has altered the first part of sub section *c*, but not the second part which says:

"The expression 'Chinese immigrant' means any person of Chinese origin, &c."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, I think the same change should be made.

Mr. WELDON. Make it "any Chinese entering Canada," as we have already explained what a Chinese is.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, that will do.

On section 3,

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I must express my disapproval of that. So far as I have seen the working under the charge of the Customs Department, it has not been at all satisfactory, and, when this Bill was before Parliament a year ago, it was distinctly understood that a person was to have that position as controller, and that the Customs Department would not have charge of this particular Bill or the working out of it. I referred to that part of the Bill at that time, and said that, so far as the port of Victoria was concerned, the Customs Department had sufficient to attend to without having charge of the working out of the provisions of this Bill, and the Minister of Customs endorsed what I said. I am satisfied that, if in the future it is to be worked out as in the past, it will be a very unsatisfactory piece of business. So far as the port of Victoria is concerned—and that is the only place I refer to—the Customs Department have not carried out the provisions of the law. They are not in sympathy with the Bill in any shape or form. Mr. Hamley was controller last year, but he took no interest whatever in seeing that the provisions of this law were enforced. It was left to his deputies to attend to that, and I can state for a fact that he knew of provisions of the Bill being violated and refused to have the guilty parties brought to justice and have them punished. I am satisfied, unless some person is appointed who is in sympathy with this Bill, and desires to see its provisions carried out, it will be a farce so far as enforcing its provisions are concerned.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know whether an officer of the Customs Department has been guilty of negligence of his duty. All I know is that the Bill as it was, and especially as it is, provides sufficient means to have the execution of this Act performed to the satisfaction of all. I might tell my hon. friend, who knows it, I suppose, that the Bill is restrictive enough, and has worked so well that, for the last two months, during which generally a large influx of Chinese immigration used to come to the Pacific coast, not a single entry of a new Chinese immigrant has been made. The law as it is proposed, with respect to registration, is so very stringent upon the officer that, unless there is gross negligence—and in that case he should be reported to headquarters—the Bill can be worked very satisfactorily.

Mr. GORDON. I quite agree with the remarks of the Secretary of State. Last year I was of opinion that such an Act would require a special department, but after seeing its operations for one year, so far as our port is concerned, I think it has worked well, and has almost amounted to an absolute prohibition of Chinese immigration. I am satisfied that there is no mode of enforcing that Act so economical as to have it carried into effect through the Customs Department. Every officer of Customs has access to every steamer, steamship and vessel of every description entering our port, and if the controller appointed was not in connection with the Customs, he would have to go to the Customs officers at the different ports in order to get information to enable him to prevent the Chinese entering the port. That is the conclusion I had arrived at, and I quite justify the Government in giving the administration of that Act to the Customs Department.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the objection taken against this is very extraordinary. I am against this whole Chinese Bill, myself, but of course we are not discussing that just now, but I do think the proposition to appoint a party outside the Customs Department to superintend this thing is simply ridiculous. I cannot at all sympathise with the vague charges made against the Customs officers of not doing their duty. I notice, in a subsequent part of this Bill, that an officer is to be appointed with a salary of $3,000 a year. To that I certainly would object. If I understood the hon. gentleman who last spoke, he said the practical effect of the Act last year was almost to exclude Chinese immigration altogether. Well, if that is so I do not see what we want with a $3,000 appointment. But leaving that point for the present, I think that if the hon. gentleman in my eye who made the objection to the

Customs officers, has any charge to make against them, he should make it to the head of the Department.

Mr. SHAKESPERAE. I know whereof I speak, and the charge was made to the Customs Department against the officer for not doing his duty, and I know that the Customs officer failed positively to do his duty.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then why do you support a Government who retains a Customs officer that fails to do his duty?

On section 6, sub-section 2,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This is a consolidation of the Act. We might leave that in suspense. I move to strike out the next paragraph after the paragraph concerning the $3,000.

Mr. MITCHELL. I object to the $3,000 paragraph. I do not see what we want of that officer. If the statement of the hon. gentleman in my eye is correct, that this almost excludes Chinese immigration, I do not see why we want to pay a man $3,000 a year for the purpose of interpreting for half a dozen immigrants who come in. If Chinese immigration is almost excluded, I do not see why we should require to appoint an officer at $3,000 a year and incur the other expenses, when there is nothing for him to do. Besides, there will be a lot of clerks to provide for, and I do not think the Government ought to press a policy of that kind upon the House.

Mr. GORDON. The cessation of Chinese immigration may be only of a temporary character. Before the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed, a great many Chinese were thrown out of employment, and that would naturally deter their countrymen from coming over. But the dulness incident to the completion of that road, I hope, will not continue very long, and as soon as times get brisk, as soon as our mines become developed, the Chinese will return in as great numbers as heretofore.

Mr. MILLS. What do you want them to come for?

Mr. GORDON. We do not want them to come, but if they do come we intend that Canada shall derive a proportionate revenue from them, and that is the only mode of getting the revenue which they should contribute to the Treasury of Canada.

Mr. DAVIES. The whole ground on which the Act has been justified was that it would be virtually prohibitory of the entry into this country of a class of people that those hon. gentlemen say it is not desirable to have here. Now if the Act is already effective you appoint a sinecure office with a salary of $3,000 a year, and if the Act is not effective then its object ceases altogether and it should be repealed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We want to make the Bill provide for an officer whose salary has been already voted by Parliament. But if there is no need of that officer he will not be employed this year, any more than last year. I think the Government has given, this year, the measure of its discretion in using the credit given last year; if they do not make the appointment, the money will not be expended. But we ought to provide for a possible influx of Chinese immigration, and if we want to prevent frauds we must have an officer who is qualified, so that we may not be obliged to choose from those places where prejudice may exist; but we want to choose a man who will be trained in the language, so that we may avoid difficulties and litigation.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman declared the object of the Government when this law was first proposed. It originated with the people of British Columbia; they were opposed to Chinese immigration. They desired that the Mongolians should be kept out of the country. They said they prevented the settlement of British Columbia by Europeans, that they interfered with the labor, and that it was impossible to secure the settlement of that Province with a desirable class of population, if effective measures were not taken for the exclusion of Chinese. The hon. gentleman appointed a commission. The hon. gentleman proposed a law for the purpose of accomplishing that object and complying with the wishes, with the prejudices if you please, of the people of British Columbia. Now, a representative of British Columbia assures us that it is quite possible there may be, at some future period, when the country is in a more prosperous position, a large influx of Chinese immigrants. That is an extraordinary declaration by the hon. gentleman. Why, I thought British Columbia was to be made a paradise by the exclusion of the Chinese, and now that hon. gentleman tells us it is not so prosperous as it might be, that possibly, in the future, British Columbia's prosperity will revive, and there will be a large influx of Chinese population, and that that class may then become necessary. If the Government intend the measure to be effective, and, I suppose, unless they did intend it to be so, they would not propose these amendments, then this officer and this salary are altogether unnecessary; and if they are necessary, then the hon. gentleman ought to repeal this law and remove the obstacles in the way of Chinese immigration.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman is mistaken on two points, and they are the only two points in his remarks. The Government did not introduce the law to prohibit Chinese immigration. The hon. gentleman must remember the remarks with which I introduced the Bill last year, when I said it was not to prohibit but to regulate it and to prevent too large an influx of Chinese immigrants, and especially that kind of immigration which should not be encouraged. We know very well that a large portion of the immigration coming to California is of an absolutely pauper class. Some were very good and were profitable to California as they might be to British Columbia, but a large class were paupers, and they had been prevented from coming to British Columbia by the large duty imposed and the restrictions imposed, and the large percentage of tonnage for each Chinese immigrant brought into the country. This is only the repetition of a clause of last year which did not evoke discussion.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think the reasons given by the Secretary of State are sufficient to warrant us in passing this clause. We have a pretty expensive staff of officers in British Columbia, considering the population.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. We contribute more in proportion than any other Province.

Mr. MITCHELL. You are a pretty expensive item to the Dominion, and we do not want to appoint and pay any more officials. You have an expensive luxury in Mr. Trutch, who is a pet of the Administration and has been foisted on the country, and who is kept there because he has certain friends. I suspect he has been studying the Chinese language, and perhaps the Government make this proposal in the Bill to provide this salary for Mr. Trutch as an interpreter to the Chinese. I do not say it is so; but perhaps the hon. Minister will state whether it is so or not.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is not so.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think we have already a sufficient staff to attend to this matter. One of the representatives of British Columbia has told us that Chinese immigration has almost stopped there. The Secretary of State has informed us that the immigration has pretty well stopped, and that the object of the Bill is to prevent an excessive immigration coming in. I do not think there is any very great danger of a large immigration of Chinese into the country, and if trade and commerce progress so that the immigration of Chinese labor is necessary, I do not think it will be any very great curse to Canada and to British

Columbia if it does come. Our country is suffering from depression of trade, and there are very great complaints of improvements required not being carried out, and yet it is proposed that we should pay a tax of $3,000 a year for an interpreter, as an addition to the expenses of the country.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I object entirely to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has last spoken, with respect to the tax on this country. There is no tax whatever, for the Dominion is drawing a revenue by the enforcement of this law. At the port of Victoria alone the Government have received over $9,000, and the cost to the Dominion has not been more than $1,000. So I would ask where does the taxation come in.

Mr. DAVIES. The commission cost more than that.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is charged to capital.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. We have nothing to do with that now. The people of British Columbia consider they know whether they want the Chinese or not as well as does the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I want to tell this House, and especially the hon. gentleman, that the people of British Columbia and the people of Canada do not want the Chinese. The hon. gentleman himself may want them, so that they may supersede white labor. There is no tax to the Dominion for the enforcement of this law. It is essentially necessary that officers of our own should be appointed who understand the Chinese language so as to interpret and explain it. It is very difficult to deal with those people. Everyone knows, who has had anything to do with them, that it is difficult to understand what they say, and if you have to depend on one of their own people they will deceive you before your own eyes. Hence you must have a man who understands their language to explain it to you.

Mr. DAVIES. Who is the interpreter now?

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Trutch.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. There has been a person employed temporary who came from China and who was born there.

An hon. MEMBER. Did he pay duty?

Mr. SHAKESPEARE No, he is a white man, and he understands the language thoroughly, and the judges of British Columbia have given him a good character in that respect. It is absolutely necessary that an interpreter should be appointed for the proper enforcement of this clause.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The young man employed now is one who is attached to the Department of Customs. It is not intended to spend the whole sum of $3,000 if the work can be done for a less amount.

Mr. VAIL. Is it proposed to continue the same person?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is, if we can secure his services.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move that $3,000 be struck out and $1,000 inserted. The Secretary of State has informed us that the gentleman at present performing the work is attached to the Department of Customs, I presume at a very small salary, and an addition of $1,000 will be quite sufficient. It seems an outrage that an interpreter attached to the Customs Department should receive as much almost as a deputy head of a Department at Ottawa, and nearly half the salary of a Minister of the Crown. It looks to me very much as if it was a salary provided for a place for some gentleman in British Columbia.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is not provided for that. I do not think the hon. gentleman is serious in his objections. In the limited confidence which that hon. gentleman gives to this Government, he might allow to pass this year what he was willing to allow to pass last year without a word.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman speaks of the limited confidence; I give them all they deserve. I have given them a great deal more than they deserve; I have given them a generous support, and on many occasions I have failed to express my opinion on questions coming before this House, out of sympathy with the Government. I talk in this House, as a rule, according to my convictions, and when I do not it is out of the generosity of my feelings towards the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite clear that the hon. gentleman has little confidence in the Government——

Mr. MITCHELL. Not much.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is equally clear that the hon. gentleman has a good deal of confidence in himself.

Mr. MITCHELL. You bet I have—more than I have in you.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says he always votes according to his convictions, and therefore his errors are not sins of commission, but sins of omission. He says he has often, out of generosity, refrained from voting against the Government when he ought to do so, if it were not for the generous support he was anxious to give them. He says Mr. Trutch is a pet of mine.

Mr. MITCHELL. Of course he is; everybody knows that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is in a pet; he has lost his temper lately, I do not know for what reason.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We would like to hear. I have only one thing to say about Mr. Trutch. I will not discuss his services——

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish you would.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the proper time comes I will.

Mr. MITCHELL. All right. I will have something to say about that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman talks about his large salary. He knows, or he ought to know, or else there is a failure in his memory, that Mr. Trutch was a gentleman holding an office before the Union of British Columbia with Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL. He got well paid for it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He was paid a salary, and the British Government insisted as one of the terms of the union between British Columbia and Canada, that certain pensions should be paid. Mr. Trutch was the Minister managing the public lands of the Province of British Columbia—holding an Imperial commission, like other gentlemen in British Columbia in those days. He and several others received pensions, but it was provided that if their services could be used that they should be at the service of the Canadian Government, and the only salary he got from the Government is the difference between his pension and the full salary he had before.

Mr. MITCHELL. I happen to know a little about Mr. Trutch as well as my right hon. friend. I happened to be a member of the Cabinet, of which the right hon. gentleman was leader, when Mr. Trutch was one of the delegates from British Columbia who came here when we proposed to bring in British Columbia into the Confederation. I happen to know that one of the conditions upon which he consented to come into the Confederation was that his salary should be provided for, his pension provided for——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not so.

Mr. MITCHELL. I tell you it is so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not so.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have as good a memory as the right hon. gentleman. Mr. Trutch took very good care before he came ——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the whole discussion is irregular.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have a right to explain. I have a right to follow the right hon. gentleman in the statement he made. It is not right for him to make those statements without reply——

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It was not right for the hon. gentleman to speak as he did at first.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not speak improperly. I say that Mr. Trutch has taken good care of himself. I repeat what I said before, that he is a pet of this Government. When he came here he was made a senator, and after that he received the governorship of British Columbia.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Trutch never was a senator.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, he was made Governor of British Columbia; perhaps you will deny that. He got a pension anyway; then he was appointed an agent of the Government—general agent of Canada, controlling the affairs, controlling the expenditure. There are queer stories told about Mr. Trutch.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am speaking within my right. I am discussing the question of salary, and if Mr. Trutch is a candidate for this office, all I can say is that he is pretty well taken care of. The right hon. gentleman has said that he would be prepared to discuss the question of the remuneration of Mr. Trutch and some other pets of his. Well, he will find me prepared to take up and deal with him.

Mr. DAVIES. I cannot see that the House will be justified in paying this enormous sum for an interpreter, in face of the assurance given us by the Secretary of State that the amount paid the interpreter during the past year did not exceed one third of this sum. An employee in the Customs Department last year discharged the duties for a sum a good deal below $1,000, and what justification is there for voting $3,000 to this officer—a larger sum than is paid to some judges? There is no justification for it whatever. I think the sum is extravagant; it is beyond what is required to be paid for the proper discharge of the duties of an interpreter.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friends are really unreasonable. What I stated was that we asked that a salary not exceeding that amount should be allowed. I have told my hon. friends that the Government have been careful not to expend any sums uselessly, and I said that the time might come when we could not have the services of an employee as an interpreter, such as we had last year. We say that it may be necessary, and we ask that provision should be made in case we have not a chance of obtaining the services of an employee, who is a skilled scholar in the Chinese language. I think my hon. friends should be satisfied with the explanation of the Government that, if the salary is not needed, or is needed only in a small measure, only the amount actually required will be paid. It may be found necessary to pay $3,000, and I think Parliament should give that amount of confidence to the Government.

Mr. DAVIES. That would be simply asking Parliament to delegate to the Government the power of fixing any salary. We have certain information before the House and I do not think anybody objects to an amount being appropriated for the salary of this officer. The question is to what extent shall this be done, and, so far as the information we have obtained is concerned, I do not think the House is satisfied that $3,000 will justly be required.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If we require to take a gentleman from China we might not be able to get his services for less.

Mr. DAVIES. Still the hon. gentleman says that an employee discharged the duties last year for $600.

An hon. MEMBER. Quite accidentally.

Mr. DAVIES. He was appointed to a position in the Customs office, and he discharged the duties of interpreter besides his other duties.

Mr. GORDON. He discharged them very indifferently, and the necessity arises that a competent person should be placed in the position of interpreter, not only in connection with the Chinese Bill, but in connection with the Customs Department. I have no doubt the Customs Department feel the necessity for an interpreter in many cases. They felt such a necessity in San Francisco, that they have a Chinese interpreter there in connection with the Customs Department, and it is only reasonable to expect that if you are to get a qualified man you will require to pay for him. There have been a number of cases in which it was found that a native interpreter could not be depended on, and the interpretation has been regarded as very indifferent until the present interpreter came in.

Mr. DAVIES, I leave the hon. gentleman who has just sat down to reconcile the discrepancies between the remarks he has just made and those which were made by another hon. gentleman from British Columbia, who, if I heard him correctly, said that the judge had certified to the efficiency with which this young man performed his duties.

Mr. MITCHELL. To test the question I propose that in sub-section *d* of section 5, the sum of $1,000 be substituted for $3,000.

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. Lost.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, we will have it put on record anyway.

Mr. WELDON. I see that the collector gets $3,800 and the chief clerk only $1,600, while it is now proposed to give the interpreter $3,000.

Mr. MILLS. I think it is rather an unusual mode of proceeding for the Government to ask us to give them a very much larger sum than experience shows they require. It would be time enough to vote the very large sum asked for by the Secretary of State when the necessity should arise. That necessity does not exist at the present time. If there is any matter in which Parliament has the right to exercise control over the conduct of the Administration it is with regard to the expenditure of public moneys. If Parliament gives to the Government three or four times the amount they require Parliament is actually abdicating its functions. The hon. gentleman, in asking us to do this, is asking us to depart from the well recognised principle of parliamentary government of control by the representatives of the people over the public expenditure. Suppose every other public office was dealt with as the hon. gentleman proposes we should deal with this one; we should to-day be called on to vote $90,000,000 and to place it at the disposal of the Government,

instead of the $30,000,000 odd which they actually require. The hon. First Minister made a statement with regard to our obligations to certain officers in British Columbia, which is an erroneous statement, and I would like to correct it. The amount to which we are placed under obligation to Mr. Trutch and others was the amount that was to be paid to them by the Government of British Columbia in consequence of the abolition of the offices which they held. Mr. Trutch held two offices. I think he held the office of stipendiary magistrate, which was practically abolished, and he held the office of Land Commissioner, which was a provincial office and which was continued, and the hon. gentleman proposed to pension him in regard to both, which he was not called upon to do. I make this statement because otherwise the erroneous statement made by the hon. First Minister would go uncorrected.

Mr. ORTON. I think it very important that there should be a proper Chinese interpreter at the present juncture. We all know that at present there is a reason why we may expect a very large influx of Chinese into British Columbia. It is well known to persons living in British Columbia that Chinese have for some years been washing out gold in some of the gold diggings of that Province. It was only last fall that it was found that Chinese had for two or three years been washing out gold in some very rich deposits, and had been disposing of it in the country and keeping the matter a secret. Owing to the large expected immigration of Chinese, it is highly important that there should be an interpreter, and that the Government should have sufficient authority to pay a man to efficiently discharge his duties.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is useless, with the servile following the Government have——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The CHAIRMAN. Order; I cannot hear a word the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is useless, with the following the Government have, to attempt to defeat them on this question; but I give notice to hon. gentlemen that I will get their names on record when we come to the motion for the third reading of this Bill.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MULOCK. I am unable to see on what principle the Government are proceeding in assigning so large a salary to this office. When we look at the salary bill of this country, I think it ought to suggest to the Government that they should pause before adding so large a sum as this to the permanent cost of management. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) pointed out the other evening the rate at which the cost of conducting the public service has been increasing in various ways; and with that warning before them, it appears to me unaccountable that the Government should on this occasion ask for authority to pay an interpreter who has to discharge comparatively minor duties, a higher salary than that of the deputy heads at Ottawa. We are told that the deputy heads practically govern the country, and we have deputy heads getting less than $3,000 a year. If we compare the duties discharged by other officials with the salaries paid to them, can you point to a single instance of a public servant getting the salary proposed to be given to this officer who discharges such minor duties? You are going to offer to this officer a higher salary than is given to the professors of the learned institutions of the country. For what reason is this amount put in? There is something behind it, and I think it must be a great secret, or we would have heard it. It cannot be in the public interest that the salary is fixed at the figure proposed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. With respect to the mystery, what the hon. gentleman has said has already been said by other hon. members in this House.

Mr. MULOCK. I have the right to say it, too.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, and he has the right to get up and say it half a dozen times if he likes.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the secret?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I might tell the secret perhaps, but the hon. gentleman would prefer that I should not say it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At any rate, it does not appear to me that any sort of reason has been assigned why $3,000 a year should be paid to an interpreter of this kind. I venture to say that this is one of the most extravagant salaries ever proposed to be voted in Parliament, and no sort of excuse has been given for it. I have no doubt an interpreter could be got for one-third of that amount, $1,000.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Last year the salary was voted without hon. gentlemen saying a word about it. What I have said is that if we were obliged to have a man brought from a foreign country as an interpreter, we could not get him for less than $3,000; and I have said that from information I have derived on the spot from people who could advise me. I have stated that up to the present moment we have not been obliged to spend that amount of money, and we might not be obliged to do so; but for the collection of this large duty, which might be considerably increased in another year, we ask from Parliament the sum of $3,000. That is the only reason, and I think it is a good reason, for asking it. The clause of last year was this:

"The Governor in Council may engage and pay an expert skilled in the English and Chinese languages, at a salary of not more than $3,000, to reside in the Province of British Columbia, and also to assign to him such duties as he deems fit."

Mr. MITCHELL. What amount of revenue is there from Chinese this year?

Mr. BOWELL. The revenue collected from the immigration of Chinese in Victoria, was $9,534; in Nanaimo, $54; in Winnipeg, $15.50; in Montreal, $55.50, less refund made to an Englishman who brought his Chinese wife and children to Victoria, and who paid $50 a head for them, of $400, the amount paid on the children, making the total revenue $9,158.50.

Mr. MITCHELL. And for that duty performed by the Customs Department, and for which a subaltern got $600 a year, you are going to tax the people $3,000 a year.

Mr. MULOCK. The Secretary of State intimated he had good reasons to offer, but for certain reasons he did not choose to inform the House of them. I submit that the House is entitled to know the reasons. They may be very good reasons, but I have not that confidence in the Secretary of State, in his official capacity, which would justify me in becoming an endorser for him, without knowing the size of the paper beforehand.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend was joking, and I joked a little at his expense, in connection with that secret reason for the payment to the interpreter.

Mr. DAVIES. The fact that the House voted the amount without question last year is no reason why we should do so this year. I do not know what an interpreter can be procured for, but I think he can be procured for less than $3,000.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. How can you know?

Mr. DAVIES. We have that on the statement of the hon. gentleman himself, that the duties were discharged by

a young man in the Customs Department who received about $600.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said that the salary paid was not $3,000, but I do not know whether it was $1,000 or more. My hon. friend has not the right to misquote me, but of course he does not do so intentionally. I say it was only by accident that we paid less last year. We wanted an interpreter, and were fortunate in finding one at the moment in the Customs Department, but we might not have one on hand at all times. To provide for the cases in which we are obliged to engage a skilled man in the Chinese and other languages, we may have to pay this amount.

Mr. MULOCK. What steps has the hon. gentleman taken to procure officials with these qualifications? Has he advertised?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman might advertise if he were on this side, and had charge of the administration of the Bill, but I was in San Francisco and made enquiries, and was told we could not procure the services of a skilled interpreter for less than $3,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be true as regards San Francisco, but I am sure that in the British treaty ports of China, men thoroughly acquainted with the English and Chinese languages can be got for a considerably smaller sum. Some years ago, qualifications of that kind were at a scarcity price, but if the hon. gentleman had made enquiries in Hong Kong and other Chinese ports, thrown open to British merchants, he would find competent interpreters for a smaller sum.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The information I had from people coming from those ports was that to get a competent interpreter we would have to pay the sum I mentioned.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understood the objection to the Chinese was Chinese cheap labor, but at the rate of $3,000 a year the labor is no longer cheap.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We do not want to take a Chinaman for that.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not aware that there is any great difficulty in getting a Chinese interpreter. There are lots of people willing to take the position.

Mr. BARNARD. Many of the gentlemen who have spoken on this question have spoken without a knowledge of the circumstances. If they had resided in Victoria, they would never have raised the objection as to the salary. I do not believe that in the city of Victoria at present, more than one or two men could be found to take that position at all. It would never do to take a Chinaman, because you could not rely on his giving a correct version of the evidence. No one Chinaman has respect or has confidence in another. They have a rule by which they can protect themselves, but they cannot go beyond that. If an interpreter were advertised for, there would not be more than two or three applicants for the place.

On section 8,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose, in sub-section *d*, to strike out the word "merchant," and in the third line the word "occupation." The clause will read:

Tourists, men of science, students who are bearers of certificates of identity specifying their object in coming to Canada, or other similar documents issued by the Chinese Government.

Mr. DAVIES. Why strike out the word "merchants." It seems unreasonable that merchants who come for purposes of trade should be subject to the penalty of $50 a head.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The representatives of British Columbia have urged the necessity of this upon the Government. There is great difficulty in distinguishing who is a merchant and who is not, and it is deemed necessary that a man who comes here to speculate should pay $50.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I am very glad that the Minister has decided to strike the word "merchants" out of that clause. It is essentially necessary that it should be struck out, because, in coming into the country, they pass themselves off as laborers while it is well known to the people of British Columbia that they are merchants. Here is a case in point. Ah-kim came over as a laborer from Puget Sound to Victoria with an American certificate. He then went to the American side and came back with a certificate representing him as a merchant, with the British Consul's stamp. That is the chief reason why the word "merchant" should be left out of this Bill. The laborers represent themselves as being merchants, and they have done that in several cases, and if you leave that word in they will be imposing upon the law continually.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman's reasoning does not convince me. The object of the Act was, first, to prevent the influx of Chinese laborers who might compete unfairly with our laborers; and, secondly, to prevent the influx of persons of a low order, who were addicted to vices which it was not desirable to introduce into this country. Those were the statements which justified the Minister in bringing in the Bill, because the Bill, on principle, can hardly be justified or defended at all. If the hon. gentleman says: You must take out the word "merchant," because we have had false certificates, does he not see that the same thing will continue, but these men will be certified as tourists, men of science, students, and in many other ways. It seems to me that, if there is a class of respectable Chinamen—and we know that they have merchants as respectable as the merchants of any other nation in the world—for this Parliament to subject a respectable merchant of China to a penalty of $50, because he enters this country, is not creditable. Whatever arguments may be used in favor of excluding a lower and vicious order of people, cannot be extended to the class known as merchants; and, as for false certificates being imposed upon the interpreter, they will continue to be imposed, upon the ground of the people being tourists or something else.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend is mistaken in one thing. We want to prevent hordes of paupers coming into the country and impose a tax upon them. We do not prevent men of means coming, and if they are men of intelligence as well as of means, they will understand having to pay the small duty, in comparison to their means, of $50, which is imposed by the Government, owing to the difficulty of ascertaining from other Chinese immigrants their real occupation. They will understand that it is the fault of their own fellow countrymen that the duty is imposed upon men upon whom the Government perhaps would not be disposed to impose it, because of the difficulty in distinguishing between merchants and those who are not merchants.

Mr. MULOCK. I think this section is rather loosely drawn. It is quite possible under this for the whole object of this Act to be defeated. The Chinese Government will be quite interested in unloading its pauper people on the Dominion of Canada, and will not be very particular when asked to certify. They may furnish certificates which will enable that class of people to come in under the term "tourists," and the Government cannot exclude them. Under this clause, if any immigrant presents a certificate stating why he has come into Canada, the tax cannot be collected. If the Chinese Government certify that Ah Sin is a tourist and has come into Canada for the purpose of visiting Canada, you cannot collect the tax. You do not reserve any power to yourselves to decide whether the certificate shows good reason or not why the man should be exempt.

Therefore I think the clause will simply enable the Chinese Government to be a little lax and to dump its pauper immigrants, its surplus population, on Canada.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am afraid my hon. friend has come into the House too late to read the Bill. He has read six lines of the clause, but, if he had read the continuation of the clause, he would have seen that his remarks are not *à propos*. He is wrong in two ways. He should know, knowing history as he does, that the policy of the Chinese Government is against immigration, and, if people are coming to British Columbia, they are coming there against the desire of the Chinese Government. Further, he will see by the continuation of the clause that that certificate to tourists, men of science and students, is not a thing that the man will put in his pocket according to the demand of the Chinese Government, but that certificate must be either in the French or English language, it must be examined and must have been endorsed, *visé*, by a British consul or *chargé d'affaires* or other accredited representative of Her Majesty at the place where the same is granted or the place of departure for Canada. I presume the hon. gentleman does not think these people will conspire to give bogus certificates.

Mr. DAVIES. It was just that which induced me to oppose striking out the word "merchant," because the argument of the gentleman from British Columbia was that certain people came with certificates as merchants who were really laborers. His argument implied a charge of fraud against the British consul. Now, the merchants, men of science and students are all classed together, and, if one requires a certificate in English or French endorsed by the British consul, the other requires it, and yet the hon. gentleman says there is no fear of any fraud being practised because of the high character of the officials. In that case, there is no reason for striking out the merchants. The word "merchant" as defined in this Act does not include everyone engaged in every species of trade, but only those engaged in the higher classes as the merchants. Is it creditable to this nation to say that a merchant engaged in the higher branches of trade shall not come into this country unless he pays $50 head money? I say it is discreditable in the extreme, and I cannot understand the policy of the Government. I can understand their policy in excluding laborers, because they say, whether rightly or wrongly, that Chinese labor is coming into competition with labor in this country, and I can also understand it in regard to those who are addicted to unnameable vices; but I cannot understand their policy in regard to the exclusion of, and the infliction of a penalty on those Chinese gentlemen who are engaged in the higher classes of trade.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Striking out the word "merchant" will tend to keep out the laboring class.

Mr. DAVIES. No, it will not.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Certainly, because those attempt to come in as merchants who are not merchants.

Mr. DAVIES. They must have a certificate from the British consul.

Mr SHAKESPEARE. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIES. Will he be a party to a fraud?

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. They must have a certificate, of course, from the British consul, and there is no doubt that that has been done. They have obtained certificates from the British consul representing themselves as merchants, when it is well known that they were laboring men.

Mr. WELDON. That is a charge against the consuls. If the consuls are guilty of fraud, they should be dismissed from their positions. That is not a charge against the Chinese but against the English consuls. It seems to me we should leave out these restrictions, if we are going to have the great Indian trade by the Canadian Pacific Railway, which debar merchants from coming in there. We know that no men are carrying on commercial operations to a larger extent than the Chinese themselves, and they stand as high as any other merchants. Those who have been in China know that some of the wealthiest merchants in the world are Chinamen, and to debar Chinese merchants from coming into the country by such restrictions, as are provided here, seems to me a relic of barbarism.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am sorry the statement made by the hon. gentleman, reflecting upon British consuls in Canada, was not made in the presence of the right hon. Premier, who has such an admiration of British officials everywhere.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I beg leave to correct the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am sure if he had been present the statement would have met with a prompt contradiction. I for one have no hesitation in saying that I do not believe that any British consul who represents Her Majesty in Chinese ports would give a certificate that he did not believe to be true.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I never said so.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman said that persons representing themselves as merchants got certificates from consuls, and arrived at Victoria as merchants, when, in fact, they were not merchants. Where did they get them, he asked? They must have got them from the place from which they sailed in China, I presume.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is where the Chinese come from, although some of them may have come from San Francisco and some other ports in the United States. Are these to be debarred? Let him distinguish, don't let him cast reflections upon a class of British servants that stand as high as any others of their class in the world. If he did not mean British consuls, he should have stated who he did mean.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the hon. gentlemen are so fond of encouraging Chinese immigration let them move an amendment, if they like, in favor of it.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the Secretary of State if there is anything in this Bill that would prevent any persons of this class that are alluded to from coming in on a certificate and changing their minds the moment they arrived in the country and had passed the Customs, and becoming residents. They come in free if they produce a certificate that they are tourists; the certificate may be given to them honestly, but once they have escaped the Customs they are within the Dominion and can become settlers. Is there any provisions whereby, if they change their minds and become residents, they are liable to be taxed?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is none.

Mr. MULOCK. There ought to be, I think.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. Secretary of State says we are anxious to encourage Chinese immigration. I, for one, have no hesitation in saying that so far as the mercantile class of Chinese are concerned, I am desirous of encouraging them, and I think that subjecting Chinese merchants to a

penalty of $50 per head on entering this Dominion is an unfortunate prelude to the opening up of the Canadian Pacific Railway, by which we expected to obtain such a large part of the Eastern trade as we are promised. I hope the hon. gentleman will withdraw his motion, for I am strongly opposed to it.

Mr. GORDON. So far as British Columbia is concerned, I am satisfied that no Bill ever passed this Parliament that has given such general satisfaction as this Bill to restrict Chinese immigration. As to Chinese merchants, the people of Prince Edward Island have never seen any. The Province of Prince Edward Island has never been invaded by Chinese immigrants, for if it had been the hon. gentleman would sing a different song to-night. I am very much mistaken if the people of that Province do not see the danger that is in store for them by hon gentlemen objecting to every measure pertaining to unlimited Chinese immigration.

Mr. DAVIES. I did not say so.

Mr. GORDON. This Bill has received the approbation of the Chinese merchants, in British Columbia, as well as of the white people, for the reason that a large number of the people had been deceived in coming to the Pacific coast, and on the termination of these large works, many of them were thrown out of employment, and became a burden upon Chinese merchants in British Columbia. A Chinese merchant assured me personally that he was not only opposed to Chinese immigration being continued, but he was opposed to any more Chinese merchants coming in. A Chinaman also informed me that there were over 500 Chinese out of employment, between Nanaimo and Victoria, and had been for months. Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite desire to see the Chinese come into the Dominion, let them proclaim it to their own Provinces, and make an effort to bring them to their Provinces.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman is entirely wandering from the question before the House. The question was not whether there should be an indiscriminate influx of Chinese into the country, and whether there should be a provision to prevent it; the question was, whether a particular class of Chinese, which had been admitted last year without paying head money, should now be excluded until they had paid that head money. The only argument the hon. gentleman gave for it was that a very respectable class of merchants there now held the monopoly of the Chinese trade, and they wished to exclude other Chinese merchants from coming there to trade. That may be a good argument for the hon. gentleman to use, who is a monopolist, but as I am not a monopolist, I am opposed to this provision.

The CHAIRMAN. It is moved to amend the clause by striking out the third sub-section.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. With respect to the first clause of section 7, I ask that $100 replace $50.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman has already had a concession made in regard to merchants.

Mr. DAVIES. This cannot be done except by resolution.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. It is in accordance with the wishes of the people of British Columbia that the amount be increased to $100, similar to the amount in the Australian Colonies. Not only do the people of British Columbia ask it, but many of the people of Ontario have expressed themselves in the same direction.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. members for British Columbia have stated that this Act amounted to almost total prohibition for the last year. If so, why increase the fee. If $50 is sufficient to make the Bill of a prohibitory character, why increase the amount?

Mr. DAVIES.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. This is not the season of the year when Chinese come into the Province. It is an erroneous idea to suppose that because few Chinese have come there within the last few weeks Chinese immigration has ceased. They come in larger numbers late in spring and during the summer months.

Mr. DAVIES. Is it in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The clause is carried.

On section 16,

Mr. DAVIES. This is a new clause.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is exactly the same thing as in the Bill, but it is to provide for certain cases not provided for last year.

Mr. BOWELL. It is for the purpose of allowing the railways and steamboats to carry Chinese from one port through the country to another. I will give the hon. gentleman an illustration. A number of Chinese were coming from New York or Boston to San Francisco, *via* Suspension Bridge, and thence by the Grand Trunk or Canada Southern through to Detroit, and there was no way of manifesting them, if I may use that term. This provision of the Bill is to enable them to be manifested through to the point of exit.

An hon. MEMBER. They go through in bond.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; literally they go through in bond, because the railway is responsible for the $50 on each Chinaman they do not land at Detroit or other outward points.

On section 19,

Mr. DAVIES. This seems rather an unreasonable clause.

Mr. BOWELL. Why?

Mr. DAVIES. There are two or three objections. In the first place the Chinese are here; we must put up with them. And yet you levy a special tax on them, and for what reason? Why are the poor fellows to be subject to a *per capita* tax of $1? Besides, this is imposing penalties, so the clause should initiate in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will understand, if he has paid any attentton to the laws providing for the registration of the inhabitants of a country, that you must impose some penalty for non-compliance with the law if you wish to fulfil the conditions of the law. I do not know how it is in the Province from which the hon. gentleman comes, but in the Province of Ontario, in the case of every child that is born, the parents, the nurse, or some one else, is obliged to report it to the registrar in order that a correct registration may be kept; and it was found necessary, if you desire to keep a record of the exact number of Chinese now in the country and of those who arrive in the country, to have as perfect a system of registration as it is possible to make. If you enact a law declaring that every child born of Chinese parents shall be registered, without imposing a penalty for non-compliance with the law, of course the committee will see that it would be impossible to carry it out.

Mr. DAVIES. That may be some reason for exacting a penalty at the time of registering, but it is no reason for imposing a *per capita* tax of $1. I do not see on what ground that tax is justified.

Mr. BOWELL. It may be a question as to whether it is too large or not, but I know in the Province of Ontario they have to pay a fee in connection with the registration.

Mr. WELDON. Persons coming in should pay, but I think it would be unjust to make those who are residents pay such fees.

Mr. BOWELL. That would meet the case. Of course a Chinese immigrant who comes into the country pays $50, but the object of this clause is to compel those now in the country to become registered, in order that we may be able to follow them.

Mr. WELDON. I have no objection to have a penalty for non-registration, but why impose a tax of $1 each?

Mr. BOWELL. You cannot expect books to be furnished and kept without cost. If the amount is considered too large, I have no doubt my hon. friend would reduce it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose to amend the clause by making it 50 cents, as it was last year.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 26,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The 26th clause provides that any Chinese person wishing to visit China and to return within a year might ask a certificate on leaving, and when on return he presented that certificate, he would obtain his entry free into Canada. Representations have been made to us that this system leads to great abuse. The Chinese who intend leaving the country for good, ask for a certificate, and on arriving in China sell it to somebody else; and as there is great difficulty in distinguishing one Chinese immigrant from another, a good many frauds are committed. To meet this difficulty, I have amended the clause so as to make it read:

Any Chinese person who wishes to leave Canada, with the declared intention of returning, shall give notice of such intention to the controller at the port whence he proposes to depart, and surrender to him his certificate of registration, receiving in lieu thereof, on payment of $1, a certificate of leave to depart and to return."

This obligation is in order to get correct statistics of the number of Chinese in the country. It may appear extraordinary that we should oblige them to register on leaving, but it is necessary in order to have accurate statistics—

And the person to whom such certificate is granted shall, on presentation of the same, on his return within one year from the date thereof, and on proving his identity to the satisfaction of the controller, be entitled to receive from the controller, the amount of the entrance fee paid by him on such return and have his certificate of registration returned to him. If he does not return within one year, the original certificate shall be cancelled.

The Chinese take certificates to leave and return. The master of the vessel is responsible for the entrance fee, and pays the full amount for the number of Chinese he brings in. Among them there may be one or more who have certificates to leave and return, and on proving identity to the satisfaction of the controller, the immigrant who returns with his certificate will be remitted the amount of his second entrance fee.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Throwing the responsibility on a Chinaman to prove anything is a small matter to him, for he will prove anything. That is our experience. The clause seems to me to be a little complicated, and I fear will not work satisfactorily. It would be far better to do away with the certificate entirely.

Mr. WELDON. And make them pay when they come back.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Why not, if they want to come back. As it is, they have been selling the certificates and making money out of them. I am desirous of having that certificate business done away with entirely. So far, it has proved very unsatisfactory; in fact it has proved a fraud. There is no difficulty in the world in those Chinese getting all the certificates they want and still remaining in the Province, while they send the certificates to China or the United States and sell them at $25 a piece. As they pay only a $1 they make their profit, and those who purchase them are saved $25 on their entrance fee. It is impossible to carry out that provision of the law. The only way we can meet the case is to strike out the clause with regard to the certificate entirely. It is the unanimous wish of the people of British Columbia, who have to come in contact with these people in the way of labor, that the certificates should be abolished, for the simple reason that the Chinese will defraud the Government and violate the law.

Mr. GILLMOR. I am sorry my hon. friend seems to have a sort of hydrophobia about Chinamen. He would not allow the poor Chinaman, who wants to return home, to come back again without paying $50 each time.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. My hon. friend says: I want him to pay $50 for coming back to his home. British Columbia is not his home. He does not bring his family there, but comes there with the intention of returning to China.

Mr. WELDON. Dead or alive.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Dead or alive.

Mr. GILLMOR. I think this fee should be struck out altogether. It must be degrading to the kind sentiments of the Secretary of State. The whole thing must be painful to him, because no man could have written and consented to the very humane and sympathetic report which he wrote, and yet bring in this legislation. My hon. friend does not believe at all in the report submitted to Parliament, but that investigation which was so thorough was, I believe, proved. My hon. friend does not believe a word about the character given to Chinamen in that report. He says there is no honesty or morality in them; but the report proves they are as moral as the hon. gentleman's white brethren and much more so. The trouble with my hon. friend is that they have no votes. Then again I believe the people are not so unanimous in Victoria with regard to this Chinese affair.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Yes.

Mr. GILLMOR. Not by any means so unanimous.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Prove that they are not.

Mr. GILLMOR. The report shows it. These merchants bear the very highest character for integrity, honesty, punctuality, and so do the Chinese as a class bear that character, and here is a man who would not allow his brother fellowmen—does my hon. friend consider them as his brothermen? Does he not have any feeling of that kind towards them? That shows how far politics will blind a man's morality and a man's feelings.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Ditto.

Mr. GILLMOR. I do not think you will find a Chinaman who will express sentiments more degrading than those. If so, they are worse than I think they are.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As my hon. friend has appealed to my personal feeling and opinion, I may say that, if it was a matter of personal feeling and opinion, I might not be altogether sympathetic with the legislation we passed, but the Government passes legislation for the country and in accordance with the expression of the feelings of the country.

Mr. GORDON. As one of the members from British Columbia, I should like to see the clause granting the Chinese certificates to return struck out of the Bill. The collector at Nanaimo is a New Brunswicker, and I do not know but that he is intimately acquainted with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillmor) or one of his nearest neighbors on that side of the House, and, in the only cases in which Chinese have applied to him for certificates to return, they have first asked if they could get them to send to their friends, in order to bring their friends into Canada and avoid the $50 penalty. The collector told them they could

get the certificates on the terms named in the Act, and, when he proposed to examine them, to examine the marks on their bodies, they became perfectly indifferent as to whether they had the certificate and paid the 50 cents or not. Now, if the hon. gentleman from New Brunswick had that class of people in his county, his humanity would change its form before the next election in the interest of his own people and of those people from his native Province who are scattered all over this Dominion, and are making this Dominion what we hope it is to be. It is that competition that is standing as a bar to the people of his own Province and of all these eastern Provinces, preventing them from approaching the Pacific coast to earn their livelihood at ordinary labor. For these reasons, and in order that the Act should be carried out, and should effect what it is intended to effect, I should prefer to see the 25th and 26th clauses, and the 24th clause from the word "Act," in the tenth line, struck out of the Bill. I do not wish to insist upon this if the clause the hon. the Secretary of State has provided will meet the case.

Mr. MILLS. The observation made by the hon. the Secretary of State, in reply to my hon. friend, is a frank confession that the sentiments expressed in the Bill before us and the legislation of last year do not express the personal sentiments of the Secretary of State. He declares he has a much more favorable opinion of the Chinese than is indicated by this legislation, and that, in promoting legislation of this sort, he is rather acting in consonance with the views of the supporters of the Government than with those which he himself entertains.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say that. I have made my confession, but I do not wish it to be distorted.

Mr. MILLS. I think I have fairly stated the effect of the hon. gentleman's remarks, which remind me of what was said by Mr. Pulteney, an English statesman, on one occasion, when he said that the heads of a party were sometimes like the heads of snakes, driven along by their tails.

Mr. HACKETT. I am sorry that the opposition to this Bill should come from the eastern Provinces. I notice that the opposition all comes from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIES. There never was any opposition to the Bill.

Mr. HACKETT. There has been a great deal of opposition. We have taken the greater part of the afternoon in discussing a Bill which has been for the greater part law for a year.

Mr. MILLS. It is to perfect it.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman does not appear to desire to perfect it, but his whole idea seems to be to obstruct it in every possible way. As I understand it, the object of this Bill is the protection of white labor in the Dominion of Canada. The people of British Columbia have suffered exceedingly from the influx of Chinese labor into that Province, and it is the duty of the representatives of the people from the eastern Provinces to support the representatives from British Columbia in the protection of the people of that Province. What do we find this evening? We find hon. gentlemen from the eastern Provinces, because they think they are out of the reach of Chinese immigration, obstructing the passage of this Bill. Are they out of the reach of Chinese immigration? We know that these people swarm over the whole country, that they are not confined to any locality, that, when once they get a footing, you find them spreading from one end of a country to the other, and now, with the opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we may find that the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island may be invaded by these people, and what may be the

effect? We have very large industries there in connection with fishing. We have people engaged in the canning of lobsters and mackerel and fish of that kind, and, if we get this cheap labor, our sons and daughters may be driven out of the country to a foreign country to make way for these Chinese; and yet we find hon. gentlemen opposing this Bill in order to allow the Chinese to come Scot free into the country to drive out our labor. But how silent are the hon. gentlemen from Ontario and Quebec. What are the knights of labor doing in this country now? They are fighting a hard battle against capital, and they have passed resolutions objecting to Chinese labor; but, where those knights of labor are strong, where you find labor strong, as in the cities of Toronto and Montreal, you find the representatives of those cities do not stand up advocating the Chinese, but the representatives of the Maritime Provinces, where they expect to be free for some years from the influx of Chinese immigration and Chinese labor, to advocate them and believe they are acting in the interests of their people. I am in the interest of the people of British Columbia in this matter, and I believe the interests of all our people will be served by keeping out Chinese labor. I think the member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) has insulted the white people of this country when he says the Chinese are as moral as the white population. To say that these people, who are shown by the strongest evidence brought out in the United States and in Canada as well, to be the most immoral of all people, are to be compared with the people of Canada, and to say that they are more moral than the people of British Columbia or of any other part of the country, is an insult to the people of this country. I hope this Bill will go through without any further opposition, although there may be an organised opposition and it may be agreed upon that gentlemen from Ontario and Quebec shall not oppose it, but that the opposition shall be confined to the members from the Maritime Provinces. I hope that the opposition will not succeed, and that the good sense of the House will stand by the people of British Columbia, and exclude from this country the people of China as much as possible, consistent with our duty to all the people of Canada.

Mr. DAVIES. I hope the Secretary of State will take to heart the lecture he has received, and inasmuch as the hon. gentleman from Prince (Mr. Hackett) is altogether in accord with the members from British Columbia, that the Secretary of State will endorse the suggestion made to him, and withdraw this section at once.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Between the two I will keep the Bill as it is.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I would like the clause to be amended by reducing the time from one year to six months. I hope the Minister will consent to that.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is so far from British Columbia to China. In China they are obliged to go on foot.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I move to strike out the words "one year," in the 23rd line of the 26th clause, and that the words "six months" be substituted in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. I declare the amendment lost. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the clause as amended be passed.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Yeas and nays.

The CHAIRMAN. It was declared lost. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the 26th clause do pass?

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I want that question settled, and I want the House divided upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. I declared that lost, and I gave plenty of time.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. You did not look up. A dozen members were on their feet, and you were looking at your paper at the same time.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This could not appear at all in the Votes and Proceedings. The hon. gentleman can move it when the Speaker is in the Chair. Of course, I understand the hon. gentleman's object, and I do not blame him for it.

On section 33,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose to put the word "fees" before the word "duty."

Mr. MILLS. This seems to me at variance with the terms of Union. You pay to British Columbia a certain subsidy, and if this is properly collectable by the Parliament of Canada, and forms part of the Consolidated Revenue, there is no more reason for paying it out to British Columbia, in addition to the subsidy to which she is entitled, than to pay it out of the Customs duties.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. The Provincial Government may be of considerable assistance at different times to the Dominion, in enforcing this Act, and it is not unfair, I think, to allow the portion mentioned in the Bill, to go to the Province. We want all the help we can get to enforce the provisions of the law.

Mr. GORDON. Seeing that British Columbia suffers the most from this scourge, she ought to be entitled to some remuneration.

Mr. HESSON. If Chinese are to be permitted to come in under a license, it is but right that the Province should obtain some compensation.

Mr. DAVIES. Compensation for what?

Mr. HESSON. It is provided that they shall come in under certain regulations, and it is only fair that the Province should have something to say as to the distribution of the fund arising out of their coming in. Certificates are to be issued to certain parties on certain payments, the Government receives the money, and if the effect to British Columbia is as damaging as the members represent it to be, it is but fair, if we insist that Chinese shall be allowed to come in, that the people of British Columbia should have some compensation. I think the proposition a reasonable one.

Mr. WELDON. On the same principle the people of the Maritime Provinces should be allowed compensation for the duty on flour.

Mr. HESSON. The people of the Lower Provinces can get good flour without paying any duty. We are able to furnish them with the best flour, and I hope the trade will develop.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This is a clause a little outside of the general run; still, in prosecutions, part of the fine is always given to the local authorities. In this case, we have necessarily the assistance of the local officers of the Government, and there is no provision to indemnify them for their assistance given in carrying out the Act. This Bill has had the assent of public opinion in British Columbia, as had the Bill of last year, and it is not desirable to make any change this year, at all events.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 13th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FOURTH REPORT OF PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. BERGIN. I move, seconded by Mr. Trow, that the fourth report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on Printing be adopted. In moving the adoption of this report, I think it well to state that the discussion in this House upon this report the other day was brought before the joint committee this morning, and the committee resolved, without division, to press the adoption of the report upon the House. The committee felt that they would not be true to their own dignity did they consent to the suggestion offered that this report should be revised by the Committee on Public Accounts. We did not feel that any committee in this House ought to place themselves in a position to have their work revised by another committee. The only authority to revise the report of a committee, to approve or condemn it, is the Parliament of this country, not any of its committees. The committee still adhere to their opinion, and they are the more strengthened in it, because they believe that although the Committee on Public Accounts were acting within their province when they recommended that the accounts of this House should be audited by the Auditor General, and although this House approved of the recommendation of the committee at that time, still, to give it the force of law, it was necessary that the Audit Act should be amended. For all these reasons, the committee felt that their report should be pressed upon the House, and they do not admit that the suggestion that this difficulty was due to a mere misunderstanding between two officers of this House moved them in any way, or at all entered into their consideration.

Mr. BLAKE. The adoption of this report cannot be moved to-day without notice. I had certainly some reason to hope that a different view would have been taken by the committee, and as they have determined to press the adoption of the report, I think the House should have some information as to the reasons for a decision of such serious consequence. I, therefore, object to the motion without notice.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, it is a motion requiring notice.

Mr. BERGIN. I do not think the objection taken by the hon. member for West Durham is well taken. It was perfectly understood at the time I withdrew the motion that it should be considered there was sufficient notice.

Mr. BLAKE. I must deny that statement. When in the world was the notice given? The question is, have the members of the House had any notice that this motion was to be made to-day?

Mr. BERGIN. The motion was withdrawn in order that the report might be submitted to the committee, and that the opinion of the committee might be given as to the propriety of the suggestion that was offered.

Mr. SPEAKER. A motion for the adoption of a report requires notice like any other motion, unless it is dispensed with by the unanimous consent of the House. If the objection is taken, of course it must go over.

Mr. BERGIN. It is very late in the Session, and I can quite understand that the hon. member for West Durham

is taking advantage of the rules of the House to throw this over. I do not think it is very courteous.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think it is in order to impute any such motive to me. All I can say is, that that observation is perfectly baseless.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman gives notice for to-morrow, I have no doubt both sides of the House will consent to the report being considered then.

Mr. BERGIN. If the House consents to take it up to-morrow, I am willing to withdraw the motion.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will withdraw the baseless observation before he asks us to consent.

Mr. BERGIN. I have no objection to accept the statement of the hon. member for West Durham that he had no such intention, but I think he will give me credit for the fact that the appearances justify——

Mr. BLAKE. I will give no credit for any such fact.

Motion withdrawn.

IMPROVEMENT OF RED RIVER.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew), (for Mr. SCOTT) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose of improving the Red River at St. Andrew's Rapids, so as to make the river navigable for lake vessels?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Though I partly answered this question a day or two ago, on a question that was put by another hon. member from Manitoba, I may say that during last season we had a survey made of that portion of the Red River known as the St. Andrew's Rapids, extending for a distance of about ten miles; that the assistant who made the examination gave the quantity of dredging that would have to be done; that it would cost a very large sum of money, over $500,000; then it is suggested that instead of that we might construct locks and dam on the plan adopted by the United States Government. To take that up, and have an examination and estimate, we would require an additional examination to be made of the river during next season. After that the matter will be laid before the Council, and, of course, I am not in a position to say what may be the result of their deliberations.

MANITOBA CENSUS.

Mr. SCOTT asked, Is it the intention of the Government to have a census of the Province of Manitoba taken this year?

Mr. CARLING. It is the intention of the Government.

TÊTE DU POINT BARRACKS AT KINGSTON.

Mr. GUNN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to sell the property known as the "Tête du Point" Barracks at Kingston? If so, whether it is to be sold by tender or by public auction, and whether full notice of the same will be given by advertisement?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not the intention of the Government to sell that property.

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the total value of all goods, being the produce of Canada, exported during the period from 1st July to 1st April in the fiscal years 1885 and 1886 respectively? Also, what the amounts of goods entered for consumption during the said periods of the said years?

Mr. BERGIN.

Mr. BOWELL. The total value of goods exported for the nine months ending 31st March, 1885, is $59,782,676; the total value of goods exported for the nine months ending 31st March, 1886, is $57,098,674. The total amount of goods entered for consumption, exclusive of British Columbia, for the nine months ending 31st March, 1885, is $73,665,255; the total amount of goods entered for consumption, exclusive of British Columbia, for the nine months ending 31st March, 1886, is $72,856,598.

WINDSOR BRANCH RAILWAY—NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. KINNEY asked, What was the arrangement with respect to the "Windsor Branch," finally settled by the Dominion Government with the Government of Nova Scotia, and referred to by the Premier of that Province in his address to the Legislature on 4th inst. as "not unsatisfactory to the Government of Nova Scotia?"

Mr. THOMPSON. In the absence of the Minister of Railways, I may state that no arrangement was finally settled by the Dominion Government with the Government of Nova Scotia with reference to the Windsor Branch. I have not seen the speech of the First Minister of Nova Scotia in which he refers to that subject, but I presume that his reference was to the Order in Council which was sent to the Government of Nova Scotia, after having been adopted here, and the substance of which is, that if satisfactory arrangements should be made by the Nova Scotia Government for the consolidation of the western railways, by which the Western Counties Railway shall be acquired and completed and the Windsor and Annapolis Railway acquired, the Windsor Branch might still be ceded to the proprietors of the consolidated road or the Government of Nova Scotia; and that, in lieu of the release required by the Statute to be given by the Western Counties Railway Company, the Government might be willing to accept the indemnity of the Nova Scotia Government.

SHORT LINE RAILWAY—MONTREAL TO SALISBURY.

Mr. KIRK asked, Has a contract been entered into by the Government with any person or company for the building of the Short Line Railway from Montreal *via* Fredericton to Salisbury? If so, with whom? Will the contract be laid before the House this Session?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, a contract has been entered into with the International Railway Company, of which Mr. Duncan McIntyre is president. I understand it will not be laid on the Table this Session, unless asked for.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved third reading of Bill (No. 106) to amend an Act to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL. I object to that Bill being read the third time, as it stands, and I gave notice to the House that when it came up for third reading I would propose an amendment. I beg to move in amendment:

That the Bill be not read the third time, but be referred back to the committee for the purpose of having sub-section "D" of section 5 amended, by leaving out the "$3,000" and substituting "$1,000."

As there may be some hon. gentlemen here who were not present during the discussion, I may briefly state that the objection I have to this sub-section is that it provides $3,000 per annum for a Chinese interpreter. As the object of the whole Chinese legislation is the exclusion of Chinese from the Dominion, I think the sum provided for the interpreter is entirely out of proportion to the work. It is nearly

the sum given to a deputy head of an official Department which controls hundreds of thousands of dollars expenditure; it is one-third what a Cabinet Minister gets; it is entirely out of proportion to the duties to be performed, and it was admitted by one of the Ministers that these duties had been performed by a clerk in the custom house who receives a salary of $600 per annum. Why the law should be amended so as to give the Government power to appoint a Chinese interpreter and pay him $3,000 per annum, is almost unaccountable. There may be the intention to provide a place for some Government attache whom they desire to locate safely and comfortably for the rest of his life; but, looking at the financial condition of the country and the enormous expenditure that is going on, we must conclude that such an officer is almost entirely unnecessary, especially in view of the fact that our intention is to exclude these people.

Mr. SPEAKER. Call in the members.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is surprised——

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a question of order. Have not the members been called in.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. Minister rose before I called in the members.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman is surprised, and asks why the Bill of last year should be so amended as to put in a clause providing for such a salary for this officer, the Chinese interpreter. I did not ask to amend the Bill in this manner. The measure before the House, which is a consolidation of the Bill of last year, does not amend anything in that respect, as the same amount was voted last year, so that it is not new legislation or new expenditure. I could understand this part of the hon. gentleman's argument, where he said that it has come out in the debate that during last year the services of an interpreter were performed by an employee in the Civil Service, an officer of the Customs Department, and that his services did not cost more than a few hundred dollars besides his salary. I am informed by the Minister of Customs that, accidentally, an officer of the Customs Department was appointed at a salary of $1,500 in the Customs, doing the duty of interpreter, because it happens that he can perform that duty at the present moment. Can he do it thoroughly? Can he do it completely? Can he continue to do it? We do not know. We say that, in case the Government should require—and the Government may require at any time—the services of an interpreter, the salary should not exceed the sum of $3,000; that is to say, that a salary of not more than $3,000 be put on the Statute-book, and the Government may appoint an officer at any lower salary, as the happy accident of last year gave us the power to do. If the Government are obliged to secure the services of an interpreter coming from China, according to the information we have, we do not think that the sum of $3,000 is excessive to pay for those services. It is very easy to say that an interpreter could be got for less, without taking the trouble of ascertaining the facts. The figure was put at $3,000 because, according to the information which I was able to gather myself, that it was not excessive, and we could not get a good officer for a less salary. If we can get one for $1,500, the Minister of Customs is not known to be extravagant in the expenditure of his Department, and he will get one for $1,500, or for less if he can. I have only to add, if my hon. friend was pleading against the Chinese influx into this country, and if his motion was made as a kind of reflection upon the Government allowing Chinese labor to come here, that empower the Government by this clause to secure a good interpreter, a good officer, to prevent frauds which have been discovered, I believe, in the dealings of the immigrants with the authorities in British Columbia; it is for the safety of the working man, it is for the safety of the public in British Columbia that we think it necessary to secure the services of a perfectly competent officer. I do not know whether we could get an officer for a less salary. I hope we will, and, if we do, according to the confidence which was given to the Government last year, we will do it for a less sum. I hope my hon. friend will not ask for a division of the House on a matter of this kind.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought last year that this was an extravagant sum. I am confirmed in that view by the events which have followed the vote of last year, and I shall, therefore, have to support the amendment.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think the Secretary of State is justified in more than insinuating that the gentleman who is now discharging the duties is not a competent official, because the House had the statement last night, made deliberately by the hon. member for Victoria, that the efficiency of that gentleman had been certified to by the Judges of the Supreme Court, and that he was a thoroughly competent man. Last year there might have been some justification for the House tacitly assenting to this enormous salary of $3,000 for an interpreter, because we acted upon the assurance of Ministers that a competent man could not be obtained for less. The events which have transpired since have shown that a competent man can be, and has been, obtained for a much less sum, and I do not think the House is justified now in voting a sum three times as large as the experience of the year has shown to be enough to pay a competent interpreter. The amount of the salary does not affect the policy of the Act. The policy of the Government and the effect of the Act were stated to be the absolute exclusion of these Chinese altogether, and the work to be done will be very slight indeed, and, as was very well remarked by the hon. member for Huron last night, if the present incumbent chooses to resign his position, and the Government cannot get a good man in British Columbia, there could be no difficulty in obtaining such a man from any of the treaty ports in China.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. Secretary of State——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Am I not allowed to reply?

Mr. SPEAKER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am sorry for it.

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that it is utterly impossible to obtain the services of a competent interpreter at the amount that is contained in the amendment just moved by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). When the work of putting into operation this Chinese Act was placed on the Customs Department, I was under the impression that it could be worked by the customs officials without any additional officers being appointed. Under the authority given by that law, I issued an order that all collectors of customs throughout the Dominion should be considered as controllers. I instructed the collector at Victoria to appoint a clerk to assist him in the work that fell upon him in connection with Chinese immigration, the granting of certificates, and to assist him as interpreter between the Chinese and customs officials. I found, however, that that would not work satisfactorily, and that it was necessary to appoint an interpreter, and I found that the cheapest man who could possibly be obtained, who had the necessary qualifications, was at the sum of $1,500 per annum. But fearing, at the same time, that there would not be sufficient work for him to do as Chinese interpreter solely, I made it a portion of his duty to act as customs

lerk, to deal altogether with invoices arriving from China and with all business transactions with Chinese merchants and others importing from that country. If the amendment is carried it would necessitate the dismissal of this man, and it would be impossible—I say impossible, because I made every enquiry in order to procure a competent person, and the cheapest man we could get, who was at all fitted for the work, a man of education and who understood the language, was for the sum of $1,500. When the House reflects that all the operations to be carried on under this Bill will not cost the country annually more than three or four thousand dollars at the outside, I think hon. gentlemen might allow the Government some discretion, might allow them the same discretion that they have given them in the past, and allow the motion to carry. I can assure hon. gentlemen that there is no desire to increase the expenditure, nor am I aware that there is any Government official, or any person connected with the Government, or any other person, in fact, who is applying for that position, or for whom the Government desire to provide a place.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is not Mr. Trutch applying for it?

Mr. BOWELL. No, he is not.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad of it.

Mr. BOWELL. Nor am I aware that Mr. Trutch is capable of acting as an interpreter. Mr. Trutch has never, to my knowledge, been an applicant for that position, and I repeat that I am not aware that he has the necessary education or qualifications to fill that office, if he were appointed, or if he were to apply for it, which it is not at all likely he will do.

Mr. VAIL. I think if this amendment should pass I could suggest a way of getting out of the difficulty.

Mr. BOWELL. By appointing you?

Mr. VAIL. Well, probably I understand as much of Chinese matters as my hon. friend.

Mr. BOWELL. If you do not know any more about them, you would not be fit for the position.

Mr. VAIL. If this gentleman who has been acting is to act in a dual capacity, I think the better way would be to give him $500 from the Customs Department, and the $1,000 that it is proposed to vote now as interpreter for the Chinese. Now, I do not suppose that there are a great many vessels arriving from China with immigrants during the year, and I should not suppose that this interpreter would have a great deal to do. Why, Sir, the sum of $3,000 that it is proposed to vote, is more than the county judges of the Provinces get, as a rule, and I think the sum is excessive, and may fairly be considered so. It is within $1,000 as much as the Judges of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia get at present, and is out of all reason in comparison with the duties this officer will be called upon to perform. I have no desire to reduce the amount below what is actually necessary for the Government to have in order to procure a competent man; but I say we are adopting an absurd custom in this House of voting twice or three times as much as is actually necessary for the payment of the service, and to place it in the hands of the Government and say: Oh, we have perfect confidence in you; we do not suppose you will spend any more than is actually necessary, and we will vote three times the amount you require. Now, I think that is a very wrong custom, and the sooner we abandon it the better. I shall certainly vote for the amendment upon the clear understanding that a competent man, in the first place, should be employed, and in the next place he should be paid a fair remuneration for his services. I think we may reasonably expect, if this Act is to be of any service at all, that the number of Chinese coming into the country in future will be very much reduced below the number entering last year, before this duty was placed upon them. Last night several hon. members, in speaking of this question, stated that the number of Chinese immigrants had been greatly reduced in consequence of the Bill we passed last year—in fact that for the last two or three months there has been no immigration at all. Under these circumstances, I think the Secretary of State ought not to press for this amount.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Customs has stated that an interpreter cannot be obtained for less than $3,000.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say so.

Mr. MULOCK. But the Secretary of State does not back up his statement with any evidence showing that this $3,000 is necessary. He does not say it is not enough, or that it is too much, but he simply asserts that he has made enquiry at a place where interpreters cannot be obtained—he has not made enquiry where interpreters can be obtained—and I think, without any evidence, he asks the House to declare that $3,000 are necessary. Now, the Secretary of State says: I do not know whether $3,000 are necessary or not, but trust us with the money, and we will be as economical as we can. Is his record such as to justify his claim to be economical? Last year he asked us to give him a little authority, when he was presenting to this House a Bill to give him power to appoint a lot of examiners and so on, in connection with the Civil Service Act, and what has he done? During the year he has spent all the money we voted him, and more too, and to-day he is asking for more. Now, he asks us to trust him. Well, I will not trust him in anything, if he has not been true in one thing. The Minister of Customs says, perhaps this will cost $1,000, perhaps $2,000, perhaps $3,000, perhaps $4,000, and Parliament, on such testimony as that—not testimony, but vague statements, is asked to hand over the public money to the Government. For my part, I think the proposition is wholly unjustifiable, and it proves beyond all question in what a crude way legislation is pitchforked into this House by the present Government.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mitchell.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	McIntyre,
Armstrong,	Forbes,	McMullen,
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Mitchell,
Béchard,	Glen,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Guay,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Gunn,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Ray,
Burpee,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Scriver,
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Somerville (Brant)
Cartwright (Sir Richard)	Kirk,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Landerkin,	Springer,
Charlton,	Langelier,	Trow,
Cook,	Laurier,	Vail,
Davies,	Lister,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	Livingston,	Weldon,
Edgar,	Mackenzie,	Wilson,
Fairbank,	McCraney,	Yeo.—60.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dundas,	McGreevy,
Allison,	Dupont,	McLelan,
Amyot,	Everett,	McNeill,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Farrow,	Massue,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Moffat,
Barker,	Ferguson (Welland),	Montplaisir,
Barnard,	Fortin,	O'Brien,
Bell,	Foster,	Orton,

Benoit,	Gagné,	Onimet,
Bergeron,	Gaudet,	Patterson (Essex),
Billy,	Gigault,	Pinsonneault,
Blondeau,	Gordon,	Pruyn,
Bossé,	Grandbois,	Reid,
Bourbeau,	Guillet,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bowell,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bryson,	Hall,	Rykert,
Burns,	Hay,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Small,
Carling,	Hickey,	Smyth,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Hilliard,	Sproule,
Chapleau,	Homer,	Taschereau,
Cimon,	Hurteau,	Tassé,
Cochrane,	Jamieson,	Temple,
Colby,	Kaulbach,	Thompson,
Costigan,	Kilvert,	Townshend,
Coughlin,	Kinney,	Tupper,
Coursol,	Kranz,	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Valin,
Cuthbert,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Vanasse,
Daly,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	Ward,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Macmaster,	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Hastings),
Desjardins,	McCallum,	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McCarthy,	Wigle,
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Westm'd).—114.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I beg to move that this Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending the same by striking out clauses 24, 25 and 26. These clauses refer to the granting of certificates to Chinese who signify their intention of leaving the country. It has been found that the common practice is to get those certificates, not for the purpose of leaving Canada, but for the purpose of trading with them. People have been in the habit of going to the customs officer and procuring a certificate for $1, and selling it for $20 or $25 to a friend in the United States or in China. So the person purchasing the certificate makes $24 or $25 also out of it. This practice has proved to be nothing less than a fraud, and it is useless to have such a clause in the Bill unless it can be made workable, and I am certain from past experience it is impossible to deal with the Chinese in the way proposed by those clauses. It is for that reason I move an amendment to strike out those clauses, so that no certificates shall be issued to Chinamen who signify their intention of leaving Canada, but that they shall all be placed on the same footing, by which arrangement all who come into Canada will have to pay $50 each.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman will see at once that his proposal will do injustice. There are a number of Chinese resident in Canada who are engaged in commerce. It might be necessary for one of those to visit China for his legitimate business; to another it might be necessary that he should go there to bring back some of his family; and those Chinese who have acquired the freedom of the country and require to go abroad for a few months on legitimate business would be placed under the necessity of paying a second tax although they are residents or citizens of Canada, if the amendment were adopted. Any Chinese resident who is entitled to remain here and who wishes to leave Canada is obliged to register himself before leaving; in default of registering, his certificate will be cancelled and he will be again considered an alien. But after having registered he cannot be absent more than twelve months, and when he comes back—and this shows how strict the measure proposed is—even within the twelve months, and he has his certificate to return, he is obliged to pay when he re-enters Canada. If, after his return and that second payment, he goes before the controller and proves his identity, he will be entitled to be returned the fifty dollars that he will have paid a second time. The hon. member says there is a great deal of personating in the exercise of the privilege of obtaining certificates to leave the country. But now the different restrictions, and the different modes of ascertaining the identity of immigrants are so very strict, that it would be almost impossible for frauds to take place, and the *onus probandi* of proof that the party is the same person who left the country within twelve months, will fall upon the immigrant; the officer will have to be satisfied that the person arriving is the same person as mentioned in the certificate before returning him the fifty dollars. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press his amendment; at all events, I do not think it can be granted.

Mr. GORDON. On the first reading of the Bill I was of opinion that it might be amended with advantage; but after hearing the amendments made by the hon. Minister last night, I am prepared to support it, believing that it will have the desired effect. If a Chinaman is able to recover his $50 from the custom house officer, he will do well, as commercial men find a great deal of trouble to get $50 or $10 returned by the Government. I will, therefore, support the Bill as proposed by the hon. Minister, and I ask my hon. friend to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment negatived on a division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 94) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1883.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

RATE OF INTEREST IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. THOMPSON moved the second reading Bill (No. 22) respecting interest in the Province of British Columbia.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Province of British Columbia is without any law regulating the subject of interest. This Bill, as I am sure the House is aware, from the circumstance which took place the other day, was introduced by one of the members from that Province, and it proposes that the rate of interest shall be established where no rate has been agreed upon. The proposal which has been made is somewhat exceptional. It is made in view of what is taken to be the exceptional position of the affairs of that country, because it proposes that the rate shall be 8 per cent. in the absence of any agreement; and that when judgment is recovered upon any contract in or by which interest at a higher rate than 8 per cent. per annum has been agreed in writing to be paid, the amount awarded by such judgment shall bear interest at the rate agreed upon, not, however, exceeding 12 per cent. per annum. These are the provisions of the Bill, and inasmuch as it seems reasonable that some provision should be made with regard to this subject, the motion was acquiesced in that the Bill should take its place on the Government Orders. As to the particular rate specified in the Bill, that is a matter of detail which can be explained in committee.

Mr. MILLS. I think there is here a departure from that sacred principle of uniformity, of which we heard so much last Session. It provides that where the rate of interest is not agreed upon, it shall be 8 per cent. per annum—2 per cent. more than it is elsewhere in the Dominion.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). In the Province of British Columbia, as I think everybody here knows, everything is much higher than in eastern Canada, and 8 per cent. in British Columbia is really equivalent to 6 per cent. in the eastern Provinces.

Mr. MILLS. How is that?

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). If the best commercial men in that Province go to a bank they cannot get an over-draft at less than 8 per cent. per annum. It frequently happens that one gentleman may accommodate another by overdrawing his account, and letting him have a certain sum of money which he may have to sue for afterwards, owing to adverse circumstances on the part of the borrower. I think it is only reasonable, in such a case, that he should get the same rate of interest on his judgment as he has to pay the banker from whom he got the money.

Mr. BLAKE. There is a horrible suggestion of 12 per cent. further on.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Clause 2 is to provide that when a judgment is obtained it shall not carry with it a higher rate than 12 per cent., although a higher rate may have been agreed upon—the rate agreed upon may be 16 or even 24 per cent., as they sometimes charge in British Columbia.

Mr. BLAKE. Do they?

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Yes. I should like to see some of you gentlemen out in British Columbia.

Mr. BLAKE. If we have to borrow money to pay our travelling expenses, at the rate of 24 per cent., how will we ever be able to get home again?

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). You will have to live on the interest of the amount you spend.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BLAKE. I may say that when we adopted somewhat similar regulations in the old Province of Canada, the condition of things was a good deal like that which the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Baker) has represented to be the case in British Columbia. The rate of interest which was usually charged was very much higher than 6 per cent., and there does not seem to be any very serious difficulty caused by adopting the same limitations in those cases in which there is no bargain as are adopted in other cases. All that will be necessary is that the people will have to bargain for the rate they want more than 6 per cent., and it is certainly inconvenient that there should be different laws regulating the interest in the different Provinces. It seems unreasonable, if there are to be mercantile transactions between two Provinces, that people should have to enquire what is the rate in one Province, as contra-distinguished from the other Province. Besides, the hon. gentleman must recollect that the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the influx of all good things which are going in and are to go in with it, including capital, will soon relieve that Province from the famine as to capital which has so much to do with the rate of interest. If the rate is to be higher, let the parties contract for that, but let the rate be the same as elsewhere.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I can give no better reason for this provision than I have already given. I think I know better, perhaps, than any hon. gentleman in this House what we require in British Columbia in this connection, having had a good deal to do with commercial transactions for the last fourteen years; and by my connection with the Board of Trade of that Province I think I know our requirements pretty well. If I had not a pretty good idea that 8 per cent. in British Columbia is about equivalent to 6 per cent. in Ontario, and if I had not thought that the explanations I have given would convince the House, I would not have introduced the Bill. At the same time I do not want to force the matter, and if hon. gentlemen are averse to putting British Columbia financially on the same footing as the rest of the Provinces, I must bow to their decision, though I do it with a bad grace.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that the word "eight" in the first clause be struck out and "six" inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that the words "in writing" in the ninth line be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 2,

Mr. BLAKE. What is the general law about this?

Mr. THOMPSON. The present provision which it is proposed to repeal is that the court may allow such a rate of interest as may appear to be just and reasonable, but the rate must not exceed 1 per cent. per month.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the provision in the other Provinces.

Mr. THOMPSON. Six per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. So that we have the same question here—why should the unfortunate judgment debtor pay more in British Columbia than he has to pay in the other Provinces? Is the hon. gentleman particularly anxious that he should pay up to 12 per cent.?

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). If the judgment debtor has agreed to pay more than 12 per cent., this provision is intended to let him off with 12 per cent. in any case.

Mr. THOMPSON. The object of the clause is to reduce the rate where a higher rate has been agreed upon.

Mr. BLAKE. In the other Provinces there is no such provision.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, I think not. I mistook the question.

Mr. BLAKE. In the other Provinces they stand by the contract, whatever it may be. What has the hon. gentleman to say as to this exceptional provision for cutting down the rate in British Columbia?

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand that the difficulty there is, that very high rates are agreed upon in some cases, and this is to prevent their being enforced.

Mr. BLAKE. This is raising the whole question of the interest law, because very high rates are agreed upon in parts of the Dominion and are enforced.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I venture with very great diffidence to offer an opinion on so purely legal a matter; but I was under the impression, which perhaps the legal gentlemen here can confirm or not, that in Ontario, at any rate, our courts would not enforce an excessive rate of interest on a judgment debt.

Mr. BLAKE. What is excessive interest?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think I have heard of cases in which very high rates, up to 15 or 20 per cent. were not enforced.

Mr. THOMPSON. It seems to me reasonable to make such a restriction as this. In the Province of Nova Scotia there is a restriction up to 10 per cent. Except in the one provision, that in the absence of a contract the rate shall be 6 per cent., there is very little uniformity in the interest law in the several Provinces.

Mr. BLAKE. The existing Statute in British Columbia provides for 1 per cent. a month, which is 12 per cent. a year, which is the provision proposed. What substantial change is there?

Mr. THOMPSON. The present provision is that in the absence of any contract the court may award damages at a rate not exceeding 12 per cent. This provision is to make it 8 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. But there is a provision for 12 per cent. also. What is the existing law in British Columbia as to judgment in a case in which more than 12 per cent. has actually been stipulated for?

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Whatever has been stipulated, if it is 24 per cent., it bears judgment.

Mr. ORTON. As I understand it, this is an attempt to make the law there somewhat similar to our law in Ontario, where, if there is no stipulation of interest, the rate shall not be more than 6 per cent. Why should it be 8 instead of 6 in British Columbia?

Mr. MILLS. In order to make this section conform to the one we have already amended, I suppose it would be necessary to change 8 in the second line to 6.

Mr. DAVIES. Then you will have the anomaly, that if a man gives a note for 20 per cent., that can be recovered up to the day of judgment, but after the judgment it will only bear 12 per cent.

Mr. THOMPSON. After judgment is recovered the rate will only be 6 per cent. I move that in the second line 8 be struck out and 6 substituted.

Mr. MILLS. After judgment the interest is collected on the judgment and not on the contract. This clause as it stands would give a party whatever rate of interest is agreed upon up to 12 per cent., making, I think, a wholly different rule from what exists in any other Province.

Mr. BLAKE. We have to consider this general question, whether we should, in this Parliament, adopt a rule for one Province for the adjustment of the rate of interest on judgments, which we do not propose to extend or apply to any of the other Provinces. Why should we do so? Why should we not decide on the same principle of action with reference to the rate of interest on judgments, for all the Provinces?

Mr. WELDON, In nearly all the Provinces the amount is recovered at the rate of interest agreed upon in the contract. The amount of damages includes that rate of interest, but after judgment the amount only bears 6 per cent. The effect of this will be that, supposing the rate agreed upon was 12 per cent., the party would recover by the judgment the amount of principal with interest at 12 per cent., and then receive 12 per cent., not only on the principal, but also upon the interest, or compound interest, which is contrary to all principle.

Mr. LANGELIER. There are two very serious objections to this. First, it will introduce a principle which is new to two of our most important Provinces. It is a principle entirely unknown in the Province of Quebec. There, when a rate is agreed upon, whether it be 20 or 25 per cent., if judgment is given, the interest on the whole amount must be calculated at that rate. Another grave objection is that it will encourage parties to go to law. If a debtor paid before being sued, he would have to pay the full amount of interest agreed upon, but if he waited to be sued and judgment was given against him, he would only pay 12 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask the Minister of Justice to consider how far it is reasonable we should lay down for one Province a rule as to the rate at which interest should be computed after judgment, without considering whether it be not a fitting rule to extend to all the Provinces. No doubt, the exercise of our power to deal with the question of interest was given us, because it was thought the commercial relations of the Dominion required one uniform rule. Now we are providing a rule for one Province which will not affect the others. It seems rather a retrograde step to take.

Mr. ORTON. I differ from hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the advisability of continuing the present law. A judgment was given by the late Judge McDougall, with reference to a gentleman in Ottawa, known to be a great usurer, who had lent money to a civil servant, and had received back three or four times the original loan. He sued the employee for a further sum of three or four times the amount of the loan. The case was brought before the late Judge McDougall, and he refused to give judgment in favor of this usurer, on the ground that he had not an equitable or just right to his claim. I think this is a step in the right direction, and the hon. gentleman will deserve great credit if he limits the rate to 12 per cent., which is high enough, in all conscience, for any usurer. If the law be so altered, judges will have a legal reason for giving judgment against usurers.

Mr. BLAKE. The effect of providing that in one Province not more than 12 per cent. may be recovered, will be to take away in other Provinces, where there is no such law, any ground for exercising equity, which is the principle the hon. gentleman desires should be exercised. While he would benefit Victoria, he would inflict injury on the rest of the Dominion.

Mr. ORTON. I think the law should apply to the whole Dominion.

Mr. BLAKE. That is what I say. Let us have one law, whatever it may be. Will the Minister of Justice say whether he thinks it reasonable we should have different laws?

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think it desirable at all, but, unfortunately, we have different laws in all the Provinces, except Ontario and Quebec, which have the one law. It is undesirable that should continue, and I was anxious, personally, to deal with the whole subject, but could not do so this Session. In the meantime I do not see why, when there exists no uniformity, we should not give to British Columbia the law she desires. We are only proposing to allow British Columbia to continue the system which exists there at present.

Mr. BLAKE. That is exactly the point. British Columbia has a system which the Minister proposes we should by legislation here continue. But the laws in the other Provinces are not Canadian laws; they were laws passed before Confederation.

Mr. THOMPSON. I beg pardon; the law in Nova Scotia was passed since.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the bulk of the laws which regulate interest were passed before Confederation, and we have not had a common Canadian law passed yet. Now, after eighteen or nineteen years, it is proposed that we should legislate partially on the subject of interest. Since British Columbia is satisfied with the existing law, why ask for legislation here; but, if the law in British Columbia is to be changed, I contend it should be changed for the whole of Canada. If we are to deal with interest at all, we should deal with it for the whole Dominion, and not for a particular Province. I do not say that the principle of uniformity is inexorable. The hon. gentleman may find grounds for the opposite principle, and I should be sorry if such could be found; but, as the hon. gentleman thinks the question ought to be dealt with as a whole, and that he had hoped to deal with it this Session, would it not be better not to take any action this Session, but to pass a general interest law next Session?

Mr. THOMPSON. We are not changing the law. In British Columbia they have no Statute, but it is the practice of their courts to allow the rate proposed. And it is proposed to continue by this clause what is now the practice of the courts in British Columbia.

Mr. BLAKE. According to that statement, the practice in British Columbia has at this moment no legal authority. There is no Statute under which interest can be recovered at this rate, and it is now proposed to make lawful what is not lawful.

Mr. THOMPSON. This will suit the circumstances of the country, and the courts have adopted it, and we should make it lawful; and as there is no uniformity, we cannot apply the law of another Province to British Columbia.

Mr. MILLS. We had a question similar in principle under discussion some days ago with regard to maritime jurisdiction, in which the hon. gentleman laid down principles strongly at variance wtth the doctrines he has just proclaimed.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not in the slightest degree different from the principles I lay down now. That was a subject in respect to which it was not supposed there would be any difficulty in making the whole law uniform.

Committee rose and reported.

WORKS OVER NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 130) respecting certain works constructed in or over navigable waters.

Mr. WELDON. This Bill makes a very serious alteration in the law, and interferes with the Local Legislatures, and it will also have a very serious effect as far as regards the Maritime Provinces. The hon. the Minister of Public Works proposes by this Act not only to include what was in the former Acts, but to include wharves, docks, piers and other structures, and to make all which are now constructed interfering with navigation not lawful works. The result will be that any wharves in any Province which are constructed in water which can be navigated would be illegal. Speaking of the wharves in the Province to which I belong, most of them are built where they certainly do interfere with navigation in the legal sense, though practically they do not, but this Bill would leave them entirely at the mercy of persons who might wish to interfere with them. The tenth section says that:

"Nothing hereinbefore contained shall apply to any work constructed under the authority of any Act of the Parliament of Canada or of the Legislatures."

But, in New Brunswick, the wharves, except in the harbor of St. John, are not, I think, built under any Act of the Legislature, but by individuals. The only way in which they have been recognised by Acts of the Legislature has been where grants have been given for the purpose of erecting these wharves or piers for the public benefit. This is a very serious matter, and would seriously affect us in the Lower Provinces. I also observe that there is the following section introduced:

"Any local authority, company or person, may proceed in like manner to obtain the approval of the Governor in Council of the site and plans of any work heretofore constructed."

I suppose that is, to a certain extent, to bring up the question which arose between the Local Government of New Brunswick and the Dominion in reference to the erection of the bridge across the St. John River. The 45th Vic., chap. 37, contained a provision that that Act should not authorise the construction of any bridge across the River St. Lawrence or the River St. John. After that Act was passed, the Government of New Brunswick undertook to build a bridge across the River St. John at Fredericton, which has been erected and is of great importance, and one of the most valuable works ever undertaken by any Government in that Province. Correspondence ensued between the two Governments, which was brought down last year under an Order of the House, under which very serious questions in regard to the Provincial rights and the rights of the Dominion were discussed in the Minute of the Executive Council of New Brunswick, in which they contested the right of the Dominion to interfere with them; and they went on to build the bridge. During the last Session of Parliament an Act was passed, at the instance of the Minister of Public Works, by which that portion of the Act 45th Vic., chap. 37, which prevented a bridge being built across the River St. John, was repealed, thus, to a certain extent, recognising the position taken by the Local Government of New Brunswick, with regard to the rights of the Province in relation to building the bridge in question; but the effect of this Act is to compel the Provincial Government, with regard to any bridges heretofore built, to obtain the authority of this Dominion. Then, there are very large bridges built over the rivers throughout the Province, particularly on the north shore, running from Westmoreland to Restigouche, and under a clause of this Act, if they are undertaken to be rebuilt or repaired, the approval of the Governor in Council must be obtained. I think that will hamper the Provincial Legislature very much with regard to the means of communication over the great rivers of our Province, and I submit that the effect of this will be, not only to interfere with the rights of private individuals, but to a great extent with the rights of the Province, and with the autonomy of the Governments of the Provinces with regard to their great works which are necessary, and which, by the British North America Act, are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Provinces. The booms, which were brought up some years ago when a question arose in regard to the navigation, stood in a very different position from what is intended to be included in this Act—wharves or docks. I think this matter ought to be considered before the Act is passed, an Act which apparently will tend to bring the Provincial Governments and the Dominion Government into conflict. As I have pointed out, in one case already a conflict arose between the two authorities, upon which a discussion ensued, which, I think, was to a certain extent avoided by the amendment last year.

Mr. VAIL. Perhaps the Minister will explain the object of this Bill?

Mr. THOMPSON. As regards the objection taken by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon), I do not understand that this Bill will make any change in the existing law.

Mr. WELDON. Oh, yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think not. I think it is simply declaratory of the law. It has already been decided repeatedly that any work, whether it be a bridge, boom, dam, aboiteau, or wharf, dock, pier or other structure, which has been erected and interferes with navigation, is not a lawful structure. That has been decided by the Supreme Court of Canada as well as by the courts of the Provinces, and the result was in one case that it was held lawful to pull down a wharf which was being built for the convenience of proprietors in the same way as every wharf in the harbor of Halifax has been built. As to bridges over streams, precisely the same thing has been held, that the Provincial authorities have no power by Statute or otherwise to cause a bridge to be erected over navigable

streams in such a way as to impede navigation. That being the settled law, we propose to provide means by which any structure which has been erected and which it is desirable to continue, or which it is desirable to re-erect, or in respect of new structures for legalising these structures.

Mr. VAIL. That would be right enough, perhaps, if the Minister would confine it to harbors and rivers. But we have a great many large bays, as the Minister knows, in Nova Scotia. Take the county, for instance, I represent. We have a great many breakwaters on the coast of St. Mary's Bay, a bay which is from three to ten miles wide. There are a great many breakwaters erected on the shores of that bay, and some people might say that these structures interfere, to some extent, with navigation, because they do certainly cover water over which vessels might sail if the wharves were not there. I do not think this Parliament should place it in the power of the Government to say that such wharves or structures are an interference with navigation, or that we should put them under the control of the Government in any way, where they have been built by private persons. Again, I object to the Bill because it requires everybody who is situated on the shores of this bay, if they raise money to build a structure of that kind, to send plans thereof to the Minister of Public Works and ask for the Government's approval before they can erect a wharf or breakwater. I can see no necessity for that whatever. Again, if the Bill is good for one place it is good for another, and if there is any part of the Dominion in which structures of that kind might be considered an interference with navigation, it is the River St. Lawrence, and that river is to be exempted from this Bill. I cannot see why that difference should be made. It seems to me that, as the matter stands now, it is all right enough, with the exception, as the Minister says, that it might be necessary for us to legislate in the direction of obliging persons when they propose to erect wharves and piers in the harbors and rivers, to submit their plans for the approval of the Minister of Public Works. I am aware that a difficulty arose in the port of Halifax with regard to a structure that was in course of erection, where a wharf was cut away, and a lawsuit occurred, and, according to the decision in that case, the party had no right to erect a wharf. It is quite proper that a person should be prevented from erecting a wharf where it is likely to impede navigation, but that is a very different thing from obliging a man to remove a wharf after it has been built. This is certainly a very arbitrary power to place in the hands of the Government.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not intend to oppose the second reading of the Bill. It is a very important one, and, so far as it relates to the future construction of wharves and bridges, I do not know that I have any opposition to offer. But the hon. gentleman knows that the Bill will have most important bearings, particularly in the Maritime Provinces. Last year the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) introduced a Bill which was referred to a select committee, and that committee reported a Bill which preserved all rights of wharf owners with respect of wharves built before the passage of the Act. The hon. gentleman knows that in the Province of Prince Edward Island it is absolutely essential that very long piers should be built in order to reach the navigable waters of the harbor. Sometimes they extend nearly half a mile out. Now there are riparian owners who have been compelled, *ex necessitate*, to build wharves for the last hundred years, and those wharves have always been recognised as legal, and although their existence might, perhaps, contravene the well established rule that any interference with navigation is a nuisance, still they have been legalised, so far as judges' law can do it, by the decisions of the Supreme Court, which have declared them to be necessary, and it would be a fatal thing to pass any legislation which would affect the legality of existing structures. My objection to this Bill is so far as it has retroactive effect, and affects bridges and wharves already built, and I think some provision should be made to protect existing rights. It would never do to compel a wharf owner who has had his wharf for fifty, sixty or seventy years, to remove that structure, to say to him: Your structure is no longer legal unless you come with plans and surveys and get them approved of by the Governor General in Council. It would not only entail an enormous loss and expense upon these people, but it would cast doubt upon the legality of their structures which would be very prejudicial to them. When an Act was passed relating to booms, bridges, dams, and aboiteaux, there was a section put in protecting the rights of existing wharf owners and bridge owners. The 96th section of the Act says:

"This Act shall not affect any bridge constructed before the 17th day of May, 1882, which hereafter requires to be rebuilt, or repaired, if such bridge, when so rebuilt or repaired, does not interfere to a greater extent with navigation than on the said day or theretofore."

Under the present Bill it will be impossible to rebuild any bridge at all, even if you built on the existing lines, and did not interfere any more with navigation than the old bridge did, without coming to the Governor General in Council and getting a permit. When we go into committee I shall be able to show the hon. gentleman the absolute necessity that exists, that, in so far as this clause of his Bill is retroactive, some provision should be put in which will protect the existing wharf owners and release them from the necessity of obtaining the authority of the Governor in Council in order to justify the existence of their wharves, which has never heretofore been disputed. The Bill last year, which was introduced by my hon. friend from Pictou, created quite a sensation down in our Province. A large memorial came up from the wharf owners and other proprietors against it. On their representation the Bill was amended in committee, and it was provided that proprietors of existing wharves might apply to the Governor General in Council to get their structures legalised, and that nothing in the Act should be construed in any way as declaring them to be illegal.

Mr. MITCHELL. I endorse every word that has been uttered by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Davies). The county I have the honor to represent has the second largest river running through it in the Province, and on that river, I suppose I am within the bounds in saying, that probably there are 100 to 150 wharves, many of which have been there forty, fifty, sixty or seventy years. Now it would be a great hardship if persons who are in occupation of those wharves, and who own them, or have purchased them, were to find that a law was passed by this House which renders illegal wharves that have stood for half a century or more, and have, while interfering more or less—because all wharves that have been built out into a navigable river do interfere more or less with navigation, but they do not interfere with it detrimentally—I say it would be a great hardship if these persons were obliged to go to the expense of getting plans and specifications of their structures made, and submit them to the Government for the purpose of getting them sanctioned. The Bill is quite open to an abuse of that kind, and I think it is a Bill which is not called for. I have heard no necessity stated for it, and as we have gone along ever since Confederation without it, I do not see why it is necessary now. The third clause is especially objectionable. It says:

"No work heretofore constructed shall, so far as the same interferes with navigation, be a lawful work, unless the site thereof has been or is approved, and such work is maintained in accordance with plans approved by the Governor in Council."

Any man who owns a wharf along any of those rivers, except the St. Lawrence, will have to come and apply to the Governor in Council to get his sanction for it. That is

a provision that the people ought not to be called upon to comply with. The people in my section will object to this Bill, and to that clause particularly, as being an interference with trade. I do not propose voting against the second reading of the Bill, if the Government thinks the Bill necessary; but, I hope when it goes into committee the third clause will be amended in such a way as not to have retroactive effect and not to interfere with existing structures.

Mr. BURPEE. This Bill may have some friends, for I suppose there is some good cause why it should be brought in; but it will certainly have a damaging effect on some rivers in the Province of New Brunswick. The River St. John is navigable for large steamers about eighty miles. In the course of that river there are perhaps forty wharves. These were built partly by private enterprise and partly by the Local Government; in some cases wholly by the Local Government, and in other cases wholly by private enterprise. Those wharves have been constructed and have been in operation for a long time, and the farmers depend entirely on them for the shipment of their produce in the summer season. To bring the whole of those wharves under the operation of this Act would be a gross injustice to the people living on that river. It would entail an amount of expense, trouble and confusion, which I do not think is anticipated by the Government bringing in this Bill. I think they have not fairly considered the situation, as regards the whole of the Provinces, or they would not have brought in a Bill so sweeping in its character as the present one. A reconsideration of the Bill is necessary. I hope the Government will not press the Bill without further modifying it, so as not to interfere with all those wharves, for those wharves that will come under its operation do not obstruct navigation, and do not require to be interfered with.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I desire to ask the Government whether the operation of this Bill can be made to apply to obstructions spoken of in a previous discussion. In my constituency there are several villages, not very large, it is true, but of considerable public importance, where the people are unable to get goods brought to them in consequence of obstructions to the rivers by the running of sawlogs. I do not speak in the interest of steamboat owners, but in the interest of the public, whose business is sorely interfered with. I see the Bill uses the term "booms." Could not the Minister of Justice extend the provisions so as to have power to make regulations for the running of sawlogs on navigable streams so that vessels can pass through and by them. It can be done, because I know in some cases it is done; but in some cases the selfishness of the lumbermen is so great that they will not make the necessary provision for the passing of vessels. The village of Nipissing, on Lake Nipissing, is so situated that for two months to come it will be impossible for a vessel to reach there with goods for the village and surrounding country. Consequently, the goods will have to be teamed for several miles, at the expense of the consumers. That would be avoided if the lumbermen knew there was a power existing somewhere to compel them to make provision for the passing of vessels. It can be done, because it has been done at the river at Bracebridge, where the public interests compel the lumbermen to make the necessary provision, and they did make it. Where they can do it once, they can do it again. I desire to ask whether the Government can alter one of the clauses so as to make it apply to the passage of logs down navigable streams; I only speak of streams properly navigable.

Mr. THOMPSON. What the hon. gentleman desires could be accomplished more effectually by an amendment to the Statute relating to the protection of navigable waters. However, there will be full opportunity to consider the hon. gentleman's suggestion and see what can be done in regard to it. The object of the present Bill is entirely misunderstood by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and by one of the hon. members from his Province on the other side of the House, because they seem to suppose that the object is to create an illegality in regard to existing structures, both as to bridges and wharves. The object of the Bill is simply this: The position of those structures having been brought before the highest court of the country, they are declared to be illegal, so that they may be removed by anyone, public or private, even by a private individual without any interest in the property. That being the case we propose to take power to remedy that grievance and enable existing structures to be legalised in so far as we can consistently legalise them in the public interest. It is not considered desirable at all to interfere with legality where it has been established. In Prince Edward Island there is a course of decisions which affirms the legality of those structures it is said. It is not desirable to disturb that line of decisions, if such there should be, and it would be desirable that it should not apply to any such structures as have been legalised by competent authority. But as regards existing structures we propose to take a power which does not exist now.

Mr. MITCHELL. The structures to which I refer include from 100 to 150 in my county, and the legality of those structures has never been questioned. I do not know a single instance where the legality was questioned, that is in regard to structures which people built out on their own foreshores, and the third clause of this Bill compels those persons to come to the Government and get them legalised.

Mr. THOMPSON. There are wharves at Halifax which had existed 100 years without anyone questioning their legality. But a year or two ago a gentleman considered it a fine amusement to pull down the wharf of a neighbor, and he did so. The Supreme Court of Canada gave a decision that he had a right to do so, because the wharf, however long it might have been there, and although erected upon a piece of property, granted to the person erecting it before the Union of the Provinces, was an illegal structure. Under the provisions of this Bill, we shall be enabled to legalise such structures. It is true that in regard to the vast majority of wharves this question has never been raised; but under this decision anyone is invited to question their legality, and this may cause very serious private injury, and in many respects public inconvenience. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) said it is giving very extreme power to the Governor in Council to declare wharves illegal. The decision to which I have referred declares that anybody, not the Governor in Council, but any person, has a perfect right to destroy them.

Mr. VAIL. That is, of course, in case of extending those wharves beyond where they were built. There is no right to destroy structures built twenty-five or forty years ago.

Mr. THOMPSON. It does not deal with rights acquired by user or prescription. It is not intended to countervail any principles of law by which time has cured the illegality, but in respect of all other works which the court has decided to be illegal, the Act simply declares the law and provides a remedy for future cases. I do not think it would be desirable, in the case of bridges, to allow them to be rebuilt without having the plans submitted. It might be if the proposition was to rebuild them exactly as before, but we know that even slight alterations may be made which may seriously affect the facilities for navigation, and I think in these cases the plans should be approved. With regard to the seventh section, the exception there is simply as to the site or plans of any bridge over the St. Lawrence, and that is the existing law at present; we only introduce it here because we are embracing the whole subject in one chapter. As regards the structures which the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail)

referred to, and the inconvenience of sending plans here in relation to bridges, that has to be done now in relation to breakwaters, &c. The party has no right to erect them at all according to the tenor of those decisions.

Mr. DAVIES. I wish the hon. gentleman simply to consider one point. I understand that his Bill does not deal with public harbors, the control of which the Supreme Court has already declared to be vested in the Dominion alone, as well as questions as to all navigable rivers, bays, &c. In the Province from which I come, if the riparian owner wants to build he applies to the Lieutenant Governor in Council. This is practically a repeal of that provision, and he would now have to come to Ottawa. I am not disposed at present to concede the point that the Dominion Government has a full control over the building of wharves along the inland rivers of the Dominion; I think it is very questionable. But, as the hon. gentleman does not propose to go into committee to-day, perhaps he will consider that point.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

REPRESENTATION OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES IN PARLIAMENT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 115) respecting the representation of the North-West Territory in the Parliament of Canada.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The fourth clause of this Act was one which stood over. It is the one which provides for the qualification of electors to vote under this Act. As I mentioned when this clause was before the House before, it is copied from the old Act which was passed years and years ago, and has been in force ever since as the law under which elections are held and the qualification provided in the North-West. It will be remembered that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), who is not now in his place, held that the grammatical and legal construction of the clause was that no resident could vote unless he was also a householder. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) took a different view of the clause, and I, looking at it grammatically and trying to give it a legal construction, agreed with the hon. gentleman. I, however, at once communicated with Judge Richardson, at Regina, to know what was the construction which always had been put on it in the elections there, and he says all the elections were held upon the idea that only those residents should vote who were householders as well. I have also had the advantage of seeing a member of the North-West Council, who is now in Ottawa, and he too says that such is the case. The schedule alluded to seems also to support that view. I thought, however, that if there was nothing else in the clause to support the view which I took, and which the hon. member for Bothwell took, the word "respectively" conclusively shows that a resident who is not a householder can vote. However, the principles upon which this Bill is submitted to the House is to have the same qualifications here as they have in the North-West. The member of the North-West Council who is here informs me that the whole subject will be up at the next Session of the North-West Council, and probably there will be a complete revision. I am, therefore, desirous of including this clause until they have declared their will to the representatives of the people there as to what they think ought to be the amendments, if any, in the qualification that should be adopted. So I propose to alter this clause, and put it beyond a doubt that the party must be a householder as well as a resident. A male must be a resident householder. He must be a resident for twelve months, but not a householder for twelve months. If he has been resident for twelve months and is a householder immediately preceding the issue of the writ, he has a vote. In order to render the clause plain, I propose to substitute the following for that now before the Chair:—

Every person qualified to vote at the election of a member under this Act shall be a *bonâ fide* male resident and householder of adult age, who is not an alien or an Indian, within the electoral district, and who has resided within said electoral district for at least twelve months immediately preceding the issue of the writ of election.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman's intention is to require both qualifications, of residence and householder, the matter would be expressed with more clearness if he declared that the party should be a householder and a resident for twelve months, qualifying the word householder by a statement of the time during which he is to be a resident. But I must say, I do not like the qualification. A considerable population is now going into that country, and the reasons that prevailed when that qualification was adopted no longer exist. It was adopted to prevent a migratory population who came in from the United States in considerable numbers for the purpose of carrying on trade in the country, from undertaking to control the election of members to the North-West Council. Many of the present population are young men, who are not householders, but who are residing in the families of others. For instance—and I believe there are many cases of the same sort—a man goes into the North-West and takes possession of a lot of land. His family are with him, as well as a considerable number of young men from the same locality, who take lands or are employed in the district. They do not build, but they are boarders in the house. Everyone of those young men would be disqualified under the hon. gentleman's franchise. Now, I think there is a simple qualification which would exactly meet the case of the North-West Territories, and would prevent any fraud in the preparation of the voters' lists; that is to declare that every male resident who has been in the country for twelve months, who is twenty-one years of age, and who is a natural-born or naturalised subject, shall be entitled to exercise the elective franchise. The hon. gentleman knows that the Canadian population who go there are not an ignorant or dissipated population; they have gone there for the purpose of bettering their condition by honest industry, and not to indulge in any wild speculation; and where is the danger to the public service of entrusting those persons with the elective franchise? If there is any class in the whole country who may safely be entrusted with it, it is the young men who have gone to the North-West for the purpose of establishing by their own industry homes for themselves; and I do not think it is well to declare that those parties who in some other part of the country would be entitled to the franchise as wage-earners are to be denied that privilege because they have gone into that country. The position the hon. gentleman takes to-day is an extraordinary one, considering the position he took thirteen months ago. He says this is the qualification that exists there now, and we intend, with the utmost—servility, shall I say?—fidelity, to adhere to that qualification; and just as soon as we learn that it is the intention of the North-West Council to adopt a different qualification we are ready to follow their example. Why does the hon. gentleman take that position? The hon. gentleman says that the people of the North-West Territories are without representation in this Parliament, and that the North-West Council must speak for them until they have representatives here; but if they were here, those four representatives could be voted down by the other 211 members in the House. The hon. gentleman has not adopted the principle that the House is to be divided into different political groups composed of the members from the different Provinces, and that those members are to decide what shall

be the electoral qualification in their own particular Provinces. That is not the principle he laid down last year. This House voted, notwithstanding protests from many hon gentlemen on this side of the House, for his principle of dealing with the elective franchise as if this country was a unit, as if there were no separating lines between one section and another, and adopted what he called the sacred principle of uniformity, to which, however, he made some exception, no doubt in order to prevent it being what he designated a pedantic uniformity; and now he proposes to follow a franchise which was adopted eleven years ago on account of the peculiar circumstances of the country at that particular time and regardless of its changed condition. Now that will be an extremely limited franchise, far more so than that which exists in the other Provinces of the Dominion; and if there is any section of the country that ought to have a more extended franchise than another, it is the North-West Territories. Why, Sir, we want people to go there; we want the young men of the country to settle there instead of in the United States; and what inducement does the hon. gentleman hold out to them? He tells them that if they go to the North-West they will be disfranchised—that they will not enjoy those political privileges which they enjoy in other portions of the Dominion. I say this much in order to bring before the committee the importance of adopting the principle of manhood suffrage in those Territories at the present moment. And if hon. gentlemen do not accept that position, I shall, on the third reading, move that that be the franchise for the election of members for the House of Commons, in the four districts the hon. gentleman proposes to create.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). This clause is, perhaps, the most important in the whole Bill. It is quite clear that the North-West Council are not satisfied with the franchise which now exists; for the hon. gentleman intimates that they propose dealing with the whole question at an early day. Yet the hon. gentleman proposes that we shall continue the law laid down for the North-West Council with regard to the franchise many years ago, and at a time when the circumstances of the country were different. It is manifest that if this clause passes as it stands, scores of men entitled to the franchise will be deprived of it. The class of men to whom my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) refers, men who have gone to the Territories with the *bonâ fide* intention of remaining, who have taken up and settled on lands, who have made improvements, who have cultivated their lands for a year or two, will be deprived of the franchise unless they have erected dwellings on their land. By law they are not bound to do so, for a time at all events; their claims to the land will be recognised, although they may not have erected houses, and there are scores of young men who have cultivated their lands, but have not erected houses, and have lived with their neighbors. Scores of men, who have come from the same locality in the older Provinces, have settled on lands in the one district, and the younger portion of them, instead of building houses for themselves upon their holdings, board with their neighbors in adjoining sections or a mile or two away; every one of these will be deprived of the franchise under this Bill. Why should the hon. gentleman deprive of the franchise a man who has gone there with the *bonâ fide* intention of living there, a man who has cultivated his farm but who may not have the means to build a house? Admitting it is advisable to follow the North-West Bill, as nearly as possible, we should not follow it when it inflicts an injustice on a large class of settlers, and we know that if this Bill passes, it will do an injustice to a large class. We ought to have judgment enough of our own to adopt a franchise that will reach every settler in the Territories, and that will not deprive scores of our best young men of the franchise altogether. Only the man who, in the technical meaning of the phrase, is a householder will be able by this measure to exercise the franchise. It is the simplest thing in the world to give the householder, although he may not be the owner of the house, the right to vote provided he has been in the locality twelve calendar months, and there is no reason why we should not go an additional step and give the owner of the land, although not a householder, also the right to vote. He is surely as much interested in the country as the householder, for the house may not be worth $5 and the former be the owner of real estate to the value of $50,000. This clause is unfair, unreasonable and unjust to the settlers of the North-West Territories, and I trust the hon. gentleman will see his way to give the franchise to those who are living in the Territories and own property there, but who are not householders in the technical meaning of the term.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The present Council is elected under this clause, and they will, I understand, deal with it at an early day, most probably this autumn. This is simply a temporary measure. I am desirous we should have the advantage of their experience as exhibited in their legislation in the next Council. It would, I think, be rather unfortunate that we, in our comparative ignorance of that country, should alter the franchise, and then find that when they meet in the fall it did not at all suit their views; but that we, in our ignorance, had adopted a franchise which was not, in their opinion, adapted to that country. It is much safer to keep the clause. I think there is no doubt this Parliament, on the authoritative expression from the Local Legislature of the North-West, as to what they deem most advantageous to the North-West, will adopt the law they may propose. I am desirous of not introducing any new franchise which may be rejected by the Local Legislature.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Why should we deal with the North-West Territories in a way different from that in which we deal with other portions of the Dominion. We have not in a single Province adopted the provincial franchise; we have a Dominion franchise and local franchises. Is there any reason why, with respect to the North-West Territories, we should deal with them as we deal with other Provinces? The real question is not what the North-West Council has done or what we have done for them, but what this Parliament should do with respect to its own franchise. If the Council had the power to do so, and thought fit to disfranchise thousands of people, that is no reason why we should do so. Our object should be to extend the franchise as far as possible. If we have a property qualification well and good, but let it be as generous and liberal as possible. Do not cut out of it men who have a stake in the country, who own land and pay taxes upon it. The hon. gentleman limits the franchise to the resident householders. As I have said, the householder may be worth practically nothing, but still he will be entitled to vote. One man has a house and half an acre of land; another may own a dozen sections, but unless he has a house he is deprived of the franchise, though he may have been in the country for years. That is not right, and I am perfectly satisfied that the owners of property in the North-West Territories will not be satisfied with the hon. gentleman's proposition. It is not a fair one, and ought not to prevail. Because the North-West Council have a franchise adapted to their wants, that is no reason why we should not have a different franchise here.

The committee rose, and it being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. WATSON. In my opinion, this fourth section will not be fair to a great majority of the settlers who may be in the North-West at the time of an election. I think the qualification of a householder will deprive a large number of people residing there of a vote, who ought to have a say in the election of a member to represent them in this House. The qualification, to my mind, ought to be simply residence, and I think all male residents, twenty-one years of age, should have a vote in the Territories. They have no system of voters' lists, and cannot possibly have it with any enumerator it may be proposed to provide in this Bill. I would not go so far as to require twelve months' residence. I believe that three or six months' residence is sufficient, because there may be a number of people with a stake in the country who have not resided there twelve months previous to the election, and I would be in favor of going further than my hon. from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) who has intimated his intention of moving an amendment. I think the qualification of residence and householder is absurd. There are a great many in the Territories who would be well qualified under the residence clause who might not be householders. I have been in communication with some members of the North-West Council as well as the First Minister, and I find that those gentlemen do not wish for such a stringent election law as this. It would be much better to adopt the franchise as provided under our own Dominion election law than to have a householder and twelve months' residence franchise. I think the ownership of real property and three or six months' residence should be the qualification.

Mr. WELDON. It seems to me that this is reversing entirely the conditions under which the Franchise Act was passed last year. If we look at the circumstances of the Territories as compared with 1875, when this description of suffrage was first introduced, we shall find that they are very much changed indeed. The difficulty with regard to householders will be that you will have a man who has been a resident of the Territory, living on land he does not own, and who has put up something to live in, having a vote, while the person who owns the land will not have a vote. It is difficult to define what a householder is. He may have put up a hut a week before the election, but, if he has lived in a tent or boarded anywhere in the Territories until a month or six weeks before the election, and then puts up a shanty, that gives him a vote, though it may be on some one else's land, while the person who owns the land will not have a right to exercise the franchise.

Mr. ROYAL. It struck me that the persons who are most interested in looking after their own laws, that is to say, the people in the North-West Territories, have not touched that law, which has been standing now in their book of ordinances for ten years; and I believe it should have been those people who should have shown the first example, while, as a matter of fact, they have never changed this part of their law. It remains as it was in 1875. It is true, no doubt, that within a short time, when they have a more dense population than they have now, very likely they will see that their laws are perfected, but I believe it is a danger to give to a sparse population, to a country which is just developing itself, too perfect a law. In fact the experience is there to confirm this assertion. On the other hand, the North-West Council, which is now composed of a majority of elected members, men of intelligence, men who have been in politics in other Provinces before they entered the Council at Regina, knows perfectly well that the electoral law is susceptible of improvement, but so far it has not touched it. I do not see why we should do it, why we should pretend to know the requirements of those people more than they do themselves. Therefore, I believe, in regard to this law, which, I suppose, will be changed next year after the first election, that it is quite logical to take their law as it is and wait until their representatives are on the floor of this House to change the law, to listen to their requirements, and to be guided in our legislation by their experience. Therefore, I believe in the wisdom of preserving the law as it is.

Mr. WELDON. Why did not the hon. gentleman do that last year?

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) thinks there is a danger in giving new countries too perfect a law. We wish to simplify the law, and he is in favor of not having the restrictions and qualifications too great. I for one, who have had some experience in elections in that new Territory, feel that the law is too perfect and that it ought to be made as simple as possible, that everyone who has resided in the North-West Territories ought to have a vote. He says he has no doubt the North-West Council will change this law as soon as it has an opportunity. If so, and he knows the imperfections of the law, he ought to give them the benefit of his experience and to change the law here, because we know it would be more simple to have not altogether manhood suffrage, but three or six months' residence with a property qualification.

On section 6,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was mentioned by some hon. gentlemen that, under the altered circumstances, we might have the general elections on the same day. I find that cannot well be done, but I shall move an addition to this clause which will provide that at any general election the nomination days shall be the same. Although, just directly along the line of railway, people can easily get to the poll, that is a very small portion of that enormous country, and between the nomination and the election there the lists are made up in fact, and the time will vary in different parts of the country. I am going to move that in addition to this clause there shall be the proviso:

Provided always, that, in the case of a general election, the day so fixed shall be the same as that fixed for the nomination of candidates in the other electoral districts of Canada.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 15,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the next clause, 15, eight days is the term fixed in the ordinance for the municipal elections, but the municipal elections are for districts of a smaller area than in this case, and therefore eight days will not be sufficient. I move that the blank be filled with fifteen.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 26,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The ordinance provides in the second week, but I think that is too short a period. It is almost impossible to compare the lists for the whole provisional districts, and I think we will fill up the blank by making it four weeks.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think four weeks is about the right time, but then the nomination is not to take place until fifteen days after.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the case of a general election the nomination will be fixed on the same day as it is all over the Dominion.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 28,

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. Some hon. gentlemen spoke against enumerators being appointed by the Government on account of the chance of political influences being at work in the selection of enumerators. I do not think that will apply. The doubt is whether there is any use for the enumerators at all, because men can go and enter their names at the time if they choose, whether there is an enumerator or not. That was mentioned to me to-day by a member of the Council, but I think we will keep the clause as it is now. The enumerators will be appointed and they will make the lists more or less perfectly, and in case of any imperfection, a party wishing to vote may go to the poll and can always correct the omission of his name by taking the oath of qualification and proving his right to vote. That is the system which has always existed, and I think it is well not to alter it. We declare that the polls are open to everybody who chooses to go and vote and can swear in his vote. I think it is well to have an enumerated list, though it must be imperfect from the enormous areas to be gone over, and the manner in which the sparse population is scattered over that country. If there is anything like political partisanship which has kept people off, men can always get on beyond a doubt by their claiming the right to vote and proving the right to vote, before the deputy returning officer.

Mr. WATSON. I agree with the remarks of the First Minister when he stated that the enumerators might be done away with altogether. I believe they would simply lead to confusion. Persons who had not their names put on the lists by the enumerators might be under the impression that they had no right to vote. If you cannot have all the names put on by some special provision, I think it is better to drop the enumerators altogether.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I agree with the remarks of the last speaker. If the franchise were to obtain in these Territories as is provided by sections 44 and 45, then it appears to me the appointment of the enumerators would be unnecessary and lead to useless expenditure. The enumerators' list is in no sense binding, anybody whose name is off the list, has a right to go to the polls and take the oath and have his name recorded as an elector, therefore there is no practical use for the enumerator. As I understand this clause, the Government have a right to appoint any number of enumerators in the electoral district, even one for each polling sub-division, so that there will be a large class of officials to be paid for work extending over four weeks. If an enumerator is to be appointed at all and the voters' list is to be made conclusive, I think there ought to be an appeal to a stipendiary magistrate. That is not provided for and therefore I do not see any practical purpose to be served.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Members of the North-West Council must have thought it of very considerable importance from the great attention given to the settling of this clause, because it provides as follows:—

> The Governor General may appoint enumerators to make lists of the electors in the electoral district; and if such appointments have not been made, the returning officer conjointly with any two justices of the peace, or with one justice of the peace and a notary public, or with any one of them resident in or near the electoral district and two electors of such district, neither of the number being a candidate, shall appoint under their hand a competent and reliable person to be enumerator for any one or more polling divisions of such district.

The Council were so anxious about the matter that if there was a failure on behalf of the Government to appoint an enumerator, then the revising officer and two justices, and if not two justices then a justice of the peace and a notary, and if those could not be found then two electors in the district not candidates, were to be appointed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does the hon. gentleman know if it has been utilised in the North-West to any extent? I am told it has not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not aware. I am afraid, from our imperfect knowledge, we cannot make any change now. There can be no doubt, from what has been said, that we will soon have a direct expression of opinion from the representatives of the North-West upon this and other matters.

On section 31,

Mr. WELDON. This clause gives great power to the enumerator. A man's name appears on the list, and, without any notice being given him, it may be subsequently erased by the enumerator.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the enumerator erased a man's name, all he would have to do would be to present himself and make affidavit.

Mr. WELDON. Where a man's name has once been placed on the list, some notice should be given before it is removed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You could not give notice.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). This is a very large power to give the enumerator. A man's name appears on the voters' list, and it may have been on the North-West Council list for years, for it is from that list that this new list will be largely made up; and without any notice or any investigation, the enumerator can simply draw an erasing line through it, and that is the end of it. If a man finds his name is not on the list, he may still go to the poll, tender his vote and, on taking the necessary oath, can vote. If the hon. gentleman could in any way lessen the arbitrary power given to the enumerator, it would be in the interest of the electors to do so. It would be better if the whole clause was struck out. As the hon. gentleman has well said, any person, whether his name is on the list or not, has the right to go to the poll and tender his vote, and if he takes the oath he has a right to vote and the deputy returning officer cannot prevent him. Under this clause a difficulty might arise. What purpose is served by enabling the enumerator to strike off and put on? The object is to enable the enumerator to make up a list as perfect as may be. It cannot possibly contain all the names, but there is the check that when they go to the poll an oath is administered. The clause is wholly unnecessary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Under this system there are no means of revising the voters' lists as prepared by the enumerators. If a name is put on, no matter how erroneous it may be, the man has a right to vote. There is no means of objecting to his name; there is no court of revision.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Yes, when he goes to the poll.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he is an unqualified person and his name is on the list returned by the enumerator he has got to vote. The enumerator is in fact a court of revision to try the matter himself. The hon. gentleman will see that the means which we have of correcting the list is sufficient for that purpose in the older Provinces; but here it is different; and if a name is put on by the enumerator how is it to be removed? The returning officer and the deputy returning officer cannot take it off, and there are no means by which an opposition candidate can dispute the qualification of those on the electoral list, and therefore the enumerator is made as it were an independent court to review his own decisions. If he is satisfied that a certain name was wrongly inserted he has power

to erase it; if he does so, the party displaced can go and make affidavit at the polls.

Mr. WELDON. If the enumerator places a name on the list, will that person be entitled to vote under any circumstances?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that if the enumerator places a name on the list, the name of a man who really has no right to vote and possesses no property qualification, that vote cannot be challenged at the polls, and he is not bound to take any oath. As I understand the law, it is not so; but from the hon. gentleman's interpretation of it, it is so. If it is not so, it ought to be provided in the law that the oath should be administered, otherwise the whole election will be in the hands of the enumerator.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS. He may put on as many names as he likes, but unless you can administer the oath the vote goes in good or bad. Now, it can hardly be the intention of the hon. gentleman to put this absolute power in the hands of the enumerator. That I do not understand to be the provision of the law, and if it is, it is a very bad one.

Mr. DAVIES. It is quite clear from the 45th section that even if a man's name is not on and he tenders his vote, he can be required to take the oath, if it is questioned at the polls. Now, there can be no reason for allowing the enumerator to strike it off, because a man can get up and tender his vote and if he takes the oath he can vote. I think giving the powers to the enumerators to erase a name confers a power which may be used in an arbitrary way, while it can do no possible good. It may mislead the electors into the belief that he has no vote, whereas, as a matter of fact, he had the right to go and tender his vote and, if required, take the oath.

Mr. WATSON. I think that some safeguard should be provided in this clause, and I would propose that the person making such representations to the enumerator be required to do so under oath. Certainly, if the enumerator looks over the explanations made by the First Minister as to his powers, and takes that view of them it may lead to great injustice.

Mr. MILLS. I would ask if it is the intention to give the enumerator power to strike off names on representation without notifying the party and giving him an opportunity of showing that he has a right to be on the voters' list. I would also ask the hon. gentleman whether, before adopting this franchise, he has ascertained, through the census takers, the probable number of persons who would be entitled to vote. I suppose they ascertained the number of householders.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it was merely a numerical census.

Mr. MILLS. I think it would be of very great importance to know how many parties would be qualified to vote, and how many disqualified.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If it had been a census in the ordinary acceptation of the word, as we understand it, instead of being a mere numbering of the people, we would not have had a chance of introducing this Bill this year, and perhaps for a long time. We wanted to find out what number of people were in a given district. Whether they are electors or not they have interests to be protected, and we wanted to know what the population was—whether aliens, or whites, or mixed breeds, or Indians. Well, we have got that, and we can only make the usual calculations as to the number of householders.

Mr. MILLS. The census takers must have gone to the dwellings of these people to ascertain their number, so it would not have been very difficult to have ascertained the number of householders.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events, it is only a numerical census we have got.

Mr. WATSON. The form for the census shows the householders in the Territories.

Mr. DAVIES. I have not heard the hon. gentleman express his assent or dissent from the suggestion made that the enumerator, while having full power to add to the list on the best evidence he can get, shall not have power to erase a man's name, because it can do no possible good except to place in his hands an arbitary power which he may misuse.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I am rather afraid to alter it as it is the law up there.

Mr. WELDON. Under this provision a man may go to the enumerator and say: I believe A.B. has not a house, and simply upon that the name is stricken off. That seems to me contrary to all principles of justice.

Mr. MILLS. I would also call attention to the other fact that, if these parties whose names are struck off can swear in their votes, why not depend upon an oath properly framed to protect the election.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If we were really considering a Franchise Bill for the North-West Territories, all these observations would receive full consideration. But, as I told the committee before, the scheme is to adopt, with as little alteration as possible, the law which has worked well up there, and I do not like to alter these clauses because I do not think there has been any abuse, or that there will be any abuse. Therefore, I desire to adhere to these clauses, without entering minutely into a discussion of them, as if we were introducing a Bill having no special object, like the object I have now, of assimilating the law here as the law there. With the permission of the committee I will go back to the 28th clause. My hon. friend for Montreal East called my attention to the fact that the enumerator was not sworn, although the other officers were. I wish, therefore, to move the following as paragraph 2:—

The enumerator shall, before acting as such, take the oath of office, in the form I 2 in the schedule to this Act.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 58,

Mr. WELDON. This clause gives the returning officer as an elector a right to vote, and also the casting vote in case of a tie.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not really been able to discover what alternative we have. I think we should give the returning officer the casting vote whether he is an elector or not.

Mr. MILLS. The returning officer might not be a resident of the district at all; he might be sent in from another district. In that case, it would be reasonable to give the clerk the casting vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sure the hon. gentleman, if he were a Minister, would not do such a thing, and I am sure we would not.

Mr. MILLS. I think the returning officer ought to be a resident of the district; and if the hon. gentleman would make that provision, the section will be all right. The hon. gentleman has carried the clause for open voting. I understand the North-West Council are a unit in favor of the ballot.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A member of the North-West Council has told me he hopes to introduce the system

of ballot. If that is done and I continue to have influence over the House, I shall ask the House to adopt the system.

Mr. MILLS. Would it not accomplish all the hon. gentleman has spoken of, if he were to provide, as we did in 1874, that the qualification of voters and the mode of voting in the North-West Territories for the election of members for the House of Commons shall be the same as for the election of members for the North-West Council. Without altering the law, the hon. gentleman would then accomplish his purpose, both with regard to the qualification of voters and the mode of voting. The hon. gentleman says, if he continues to lead the House, he will adopt the law passed by the North-West Council. It would be just as well to provide so now, and save the necessity of further legislation. We may have new elections here before another Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDNOALD. I do not suppose that is very likely, but although I have great confidence in the North-West Council, and believe it will adopt a system of voting by ballot that will be all right, still I see no necessity for agreeing in advance to whatever legislation they may adopt.

Committee rose and reported.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 134) to amend "An Act respecting a Reformatory for certain Juvenile Offenders in the County of Halifax, in the Province of Nova Scotia"—from the Senate.—(Mr. Thompson.)

Bill (No. 135) to amend "An Act respecting Offences against the person"—from the Senate.—(Mr. Thompson.)

SUPPLY—SEIZURE OF SCHOONER *DAVID J. ADAMS.*

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MITCHELL. As this is the only opportunity that a private member has of getting information from the Government, I beg to call the attention of the Government and the House to a very important event which has recently occurred—the seizure of the American schooner called the *David J. Adams*. The public have various accounts of the offence of which the parties on board that vessel have been guilty, and the press has also different statements about the charges for which the vessel has been seized. I notice that the seizure of the vessel has created very considerable commotion amongst our neighbors in the United States. That a member in the Senate of the United States has moved for a Bill of a retaliatory character, and that a member in the House of Representatives of the United States has done the same thing, and that the subject has been a matter of discussion in those two eminent bodies, and has been brought under the notice of the Cabinet of the United States and probably by them under the notice of the British Government. Now, I do not propose to evoke an extended discussion upon this matter. I think it would probably be indiscreet to do so at this time while matters of so great moment to the nation, to ourselves, and to our neighbors are pending between us; but it is evident, from the excitement that exists, that the public mind is a good deal agitated about it, and I think the Government might very fairly adopt a course which has been adopted by Mr. Gladstone and other Premiers of England when important international difficulties existed, such as the Eastern question, which has for some months agitated the mind of Europe, and in reference to which Mr. Gladstone has had occasion many times to make statements to Parliament. The same thing was done in reference to the Russo-India boundary difficulty, and our own Government did the same thing when the Riel difficulty was up last year. I do not ask the Government to make any statements or give any information that will at all impair our public interests. I know, as an old Minister, that Governments exercise great discretion in that matter, and I for one will not find fault with the Government if they do not go as extensively into it as, perhaps, many of us would like, because I know their responsibilities, and I think they should be the judges of what they think it right, at a crisis like this, to disclose, and of what they think it is not right to state. But there are some things they can state. They can set the public mind at rest as to the facts in connection with the seizure of the vessel, as to the offences charged against the vessel, as to the particular Statute or treaty under which she has been seized, and as to the particular offences for which she is libelled, and is now in the court. These are facts which they may fairly state and which will be looked for with interest, not only within our own territories, but on the other side of the line, and even in Europe. I have no doubt the matter has occupied the attention of the Government, for it is a very grave one, and I have no doubt it has been a matter of correspondence, perhaps remonstrance, and a good deal of negotiation with the Imperial authorities. I feel it would be unwise, unduly to press the Government for any extended information, but I would ask, and I think the country would expect, that any information which the Government feel they can give to this House, ought to be given, to set the public mind at rest as to the actual position of a matter of such vital importance, both to our own country and to our friendly neighbors.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite agree with my hon. friend that this is not a time for any extended discussion, and I shall content myself with a very brief and plain statement of the facts of the seizure, for which the hon. gentleman asked, and also of the charges which are to be made in connection with the seizure. My hon. friend has asked for no information which the Government may not give. He, himself, has been a Minister of the Crown and has, in a very responsible position, quite similar to that which I find myself in now, had to do with this vexed question of the enforcement of our rights under the Convention of 1818. A great many statements have been made in the newspaper press. Some of them have been fairly true; others of them have been far removed from truth. I am sorry that to-night I shall have to content myself with a briefer statement than I could otherwise give, from the fact that I have had nothing as yet but telegraphic despatches of the seizure, the full report not having yet come to hand. The schooner, *David J. Adams*, a fishing vessel owned in Gloucester, was in Digby Basin on Thursday and Friday of last week, according to the information which I have, with her port of register and name concealed, if not for the whole of the time at least for the greater part of the time that she was in. She was buying bait in contravention of the terms of the Treaty of 1818, and the Imperial Act of George III, which was founded upon that treaty; she was violating the Customs Law of the Dominion of Canada in that she came into port and remained there for twenty-four hours or more without reporting herself to the Collector of Customs; and Captain Scott, who had charge of the police vessel, the steamer *Lansdowne*, the only one which we have as yet fully equipped and in those waters, having been apprised of these facts by the Collector of Customs at Digby, went from St. John, where he happened to be at that time, and, after what seemed to him proper examination, determined to seize the vessel. This he did, and reported the fact of the seizure to the Department at Ottawa. I instructed him to retain the

vessel which he had seized at Digby, where the offence was committed, and where the vessel had been seized, but, before that telegram reached him, being late at night, he had made for St. John, to which place he towed the vessel. So soon as I could reach him the next day with a telegram, I asked him to take the vessel back again to Digby, and hold her there. This he did, delivering her over to the Collector of Customs. The offences, as I stated before, of the vessel were that she violated the Customs Law, that she violated the Dominion Fisheries Act of 1868 in buying bait, which was held by the Vice-Admiralty Court of Nova Scotia, in Halifax, to have been preparing to fish, and that she violated the terms of the Convention of 1818. Legal proceedings are now being undertaken; the vessel will be libelled or has been by this time libelled in the Vice-Admiralty Court, and the question will be fairly tried. I do not think I can make any fuller statement at the present time than this which I have made.

Mr. VAIL. I was in hopes that the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) would ask for a little fuller information. Parliament has been in Session now for a considerable time, and this question is of such magnitude and is so very important to the interests of the Dominion that I was in hopes the member for Northumberland would have asked for a little more information, and I was in hopes that, notwithstanding he had not done so, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or the Government, would have given the House fuller information on the subject. I am not disposed to press the Government one whit further than we have a right to press them in a matter of this kind. I know, to some extent, what their responsibilities are, but I think, now that Parliament is likely to prorogue very soon, Parliament ought to have had a fuller explanation of the position of this matter. The fisheries are a very important part of our commerce, and, coming as I do from one of the Maritime Provinces, and one that is more interested in the fisheries than any other Province, it is only natural to suppose that I and the people I represent would like to get all the information possible, with a due regard to the public interest. The exports of fish in Nova Scotia in 1870, amounted to $3,500,000. In 1883-84 they had reached nearly $9,000,000 — $8,600,000 or $8,700,000 — and we have at the present time about 30,000 people employed in the fisheries. The whole value of the fisheries the year before last was some $18,000,000, and after agriculture and the forest, the fisheries are about the most important of our exports. This matter has been presented to us in a very interesting light within the last few days. We find that the seizure that was made in the harbor of Digby was, of course, at once taken notice of by the United States, and certain resolutions have been introduced into the Senate, which shows plainly that this matter has attracted a good deal of attention. As the subject concerns so intimately the interests of the fishing community, I hoped that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would have said something about the instructions that have been issued to the commander of the fleet for the protection of the fisheries, that the people may know what his authority is. I hoped further that he would be able to tell us how many vessels had been chartered for the protection of the fisheries, also how many had been commissioned, and, if it was compatible with the public interest, what the understanding is between the British Government and the Dominion Government with reference to any assistance the former may be disposed to render us by furnishing vessels to assist in the protection of the fisheries. There is a good deal of information which, I think, the Government should have furnished to this House without in any way making public any portion of the correspondence that might at the present time be considered private. I think from the present state of affairs the House is entitled to have a copy of the instructions furnished to the commander of the fleet for the protection of the fisheries, laid upon the Table for our information. And besides that, I think the Government ought to take the House into its confidence so far as to inform us in what state the correspondence is, and if any steps have been taken by the Imperial Government and the Dominion Government in respect to this matter. Of course I do not expect the Government to give us any information which it might be injurious to the public interests to divulge. As I said before, I know the difficulties of the situation, but at the same time I would like the Government to take the House into their confidence so far as they can consistently with the public interest, on the several points I have named. I am not going to say much about the bait question, which is in controversy at the present time. I will say this, however, before sitting down, that if the American fishermen are to be permitted to come into our harbors and take bait without reporting at the Custom house, I am inclined to think that we will be in a very awkward position before long, because we shall then find that we are opening the door for vessels to trade from one port to another in the Dominion, and that is a matter which ought to be handled very carefully. There is another point which we might consider. If vessels are to be allowed to come in and purchase bait for fishing even outside the three-mile limit, they have great temptation, when they have the bait and are passing through our waters, to fish within the three-mile limit, and that may make trouble in the future. Of course all these things have to be considered. I do not see that there is much difficulty in deciding what is a fishing vessel and what is a trading vessel, and if trading vessels come into our ports for the purchase of bait, they must enter at our Custom housest he same as any other vessels, and clear in the same way. That would be a different thing altogether from fishermen coming in to purchase bait. But I do not wish to say more than is absolutely necessary in order to point out to the Government the position we occupy at the present time and the necessity of giving our people to understand that their interests will be protected.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not follow the course adopted by the hon. gentleman who very properly asked this question of the Government, because, unwittingly, at this moment he has unfortunately brought up incidentally a matter which ought not to be discussed or considered as doubtful in this case, and although his remarks were rather indistinct, unfortunately he has given away a portion of our case.

Mr. VAIL. Not at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will not argue it, because I would only be doing the same thing for which I am rather reprehending, so far as I venture to do so, the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), as an old Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and having had, I hope, a more difficult task than this to arrange, and greater responsibilities than this case involves—he was well aware, he knew the limits within which he could properly make enquiries; and I would ask this House on both sides whether my hon. friend, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not made a full and clear statement in answer to the question put by the hon. member for Northumberland. He told them the circumstances under which the vessel was seized, he has told them the grounds for the seizure, he has told them the Statute under which the seizure was made, and he has stated that proceedings are being taken in the courts for the purpose of procuring a conviction. That was a clear statement, and ought to be, I think, satisfactory to the House. I have no idea that we will have any trouble with the United States. I believe the Government of the United States

are animated by the most friendly feelings towards England and towards Canada. I believe the relations between England and the United States were never more agreeable than they are at the present moment. Of course when we look back, having memories, to the time when the hon. member for Northumberland was in the Government, and when seizures were made before, we saw the excitement under which the fishing interests labored along the American coast. They shared certain advantages, and they are annoyed because they believe they will be deprived of those advantages. They made a great noise before the last treaty, before 1871, and they are beginning to make a noise again, and politicians, of course, will make speeches in the line in which we have often seen done in this Legislature; a member will occasionally make a speech which he thinks will be agreeable to his constituents. But as regards the negotiations which may be going on between the Governments, in consequence of any real or alleged infractions of our laws, as regards any question arising out of them, I am quite satisfied that the United States Government and the United States Congress will give full freedom to the justice and impartiality of our tribunals in case of a conviction for any offence against our laws respecting the fisheries.

Mr. DAVIES. I regret the Government have not seen their way clear to accept the invitation which this debate offers them to make a plain and distinct statement to the House, such, I think, as the House is entitled to, of the view they take of the present grave crisis. The incident of the seizure of the *David J. Adams* is a very grave one, and hon. gentlemen will allow me to state why I think so. It may result, though I am sure we hope it will not, in a cessation of those friendly relations which have heretofore so happily existed between ourselves and our neighbors to the south. That seizure, we know, has been discussed at great length in the public press. The public are not ignorant of the alleged grounds of that seizure, and it does seem to me an anomaly that the press and people of the Dominion should be discussing that seizure and our right to make it, and the circumstances under which it was made, and this Parliament should sit quietly by and not say anything about it or give any expression of their views. We know that in regard to this matter we are face to face with the fact that the old treaty has expired. We are face to face with the fact that the United States Senators, and a very large section of their people, hold and have expressed very strong views with regard to their rights in this matter. We are face to face with the fact that they have taken the responsibility of declaring in their Parliament, that they intend to come into our waters to purchase bait, tranship their cargoes and ship their crews, and that they propose to do those acts as a matter of right. We know they have laid down the reasons why they think they have that right. They declare that owing to the repeal of the navigation laws, the passage of more favorable laws between the two nations than formerly existed, the restrictions of the old treaty have been more or less diminished. And they have sent that vessel in, and we have seized the vessel. What I contend is that we should have a statement as to the policy of the Government at this early stage of the proceedings. Certainly the Government have had plenty of time to make up, and they must have made up their minds as to a certain policy. It will not do to say that Parliament is not to discuss the question. Parliament has a right to demand, I think I am within my right in saying that Parliament has a right to insist that in the presence of grave complications that may follow from the seizure of that vessel, the Government should state to Parliament what views they hold upon the question, what its policy is to be, and whether it has given instructions to its officers to carry out that policy. I am perfectly aware that when the Government gave instructions to their officers to carry out any business of a delicate character, such as Captain Scott is entrusted with, they do so with great care and furnish secret instructions. We do not ask that those secret instructions should be submitted to the House; but we ask that the general instructions should be stated, that we should be informed what the policy of the Government is with respect to the presence in Canadian waters of American fishermen and the latitude to be allowed to them in obtaining bait and transhipping crews. The Government must have come to a policy; the Government must have instructed their officers who are going to act on those instructions, and this Parliament will be face to face with the result of that action; and are we to wait till the action has taken place without knowing what the policy is? Does the hon. gentleman deny or dispute that a vessel has been seized for breach of the Customs Law and also for violation of the Fishery Act? We have a right to know whether, in the opinion of the law officers of the Crown and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that American vessel has been guilty of a violation of the Fishery Convention; whether it is the intention of the Government to pursue the policy which apparently their officers have pursued or not; whether we are to hear of any other vessels being seized or not; whether the policy has received the approval of the Imperial Government. We know that in a matter of this kind any policy we may adopt, if the seizure can be taken to foreshadow a policy, we must have the approbation and approval of the Imperial Government; and I would like to know whether any correspondence has taken place between this Government and the Imperial Government on the subject, whether any correspondence has taken place between this Government and any official, indirectly, with the United States Government, and whether the hon. gentleman is in a position to inform us that the United States Government share or contend for the propositions which were laid down by Senator Frye in the Senate and by Mr. Dawes in the House of Representatives. The hon. gentleman says, and says correctly, that members of Parliament sometimes make use of expressions in their places for which the Government are not responsible, and I do not assume that because Senator Frye made a fire-eating speech in the Senate, the United States Government are responsible for all his utterances. But we cannot lose sight of the fact that leading gentlemen in both branches of Congress have given notice of their intention to introduce Bills which, if carried, will seriously interfere with our trade. The question has arrived at that stage when the Government should take Parliament into its confidence, and state whether they have decided on a policy, and, if so, announce its nature. Parliament will be prorogued, we all hope, in a very few days, and in my judgment it would be unfortunate if Parliament prorogues without the Government having taken us into its confidence, and asked for our support. I submit that an opportunity is afforded now for doing so. This is no time to enter into a lengthy discussion, to rake up the whole fishery business, or to weaken the Government's hands, and I would be the last one to do so on this occasion; but, as a representative of the people, I have a right to ask the Government to give a declaration to the House; a fuller declaration of the position of the matter; a general idea of the correspondence; a statement of the policy they have adopted, and the policy which they intend to carry out, and the general nature of the instructions given to the officers charged with carrying out that policy. It is not fair that Parliament should be left entirely in the dark on this question, and it is of no use to say that it is not in the public interest to give information. I say it is not in the public interest that the press should be discussing this matter and making positive statements from day to day, telegraphed from the scene of action on the responsibility of United States consuls and Dominion officials, and that

Parliament should be kept entirely in the dark. The hon. gentleman who opened the conversation did so very temperately, and I understood him not to press for the minutiæ of the policy or the details of the correspondence; but I understood him to desire that the general nature of that policy and of that correspondence, and of the action the Government intend to pursue, should be given to the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In other words, the hon. gentleman wishes us, when negotiations are going on, to show our hand while the United States are not doing so.

Mr. DAVIES. If I understood the statement made by the Minister of Fisheries, he showed his hand.

Mr. MILLS. I do not admit the proposition or the doctrine laid down by the First Minister. I think it is for Parliament to say what the policy of the Government shall be on this as on every other important transaction. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has not asked, the hon. gentleman who introduced this subject has not asked, the Government to give the particulars of the correspondence that has taken place; there is nothing of that sort desired; but we desire to know what policy the Government are pursuing in maintaining our rights with respect to the fisheries—whether the Government are intending to adopt the policy of restriction on this question of the fisheries, or whether they are seeking through that agency to protect our inshore fisheries, or what they are aiming at. It is a matter of very great consequence to this House to know the aim and policy of the Government, and they cannot contend that they are going to keep from the United States what it is they are aiming at in dealing with this important subject. The United States Government have from a very early period made propositions we have always refused and have put forward as legal rights those which we were right in resisting. We were simply assuming under the Convention of 1818 within certain waters the same rights that the United States Government made with regard to waters on their coast. But when the hon. gentleman proposes to adopt very stringent and special commercial regulations with respect to the fisheries, it is important for us to know precisely upon what lines the Government are acting. Surely that is not a matter which can in any way damage any negotiations, or in any way weaken the hands of the Government in dealing with the Government of the United States.

THE NORTH-WEST DISTURBANCE—GENERAL AMNESTY.

Mr. LAURIER. There is also another question of great practical interest, which, in my opinion, should receive the attention of the House. Early in the Session the Government were asked whether it was their intention to grant some general measure of amnesty to the parties connected with the late rebellion. The Government replied that the question was one of great delicacy, and that it was under consideration. So far as we know the consideration of the Government has not reached any conclusion; nothing so far has been done in the matter. Now we are fast approaching the end of the Session, and I submit that it would be fitting that the voice of the House should be heard in the matter. Whatever may have been the individual opinion of every one of us as to the causes which led to the rebellion, as to the circumstances which accompanied and followed it, now that the rebellion has been quelled for almost a full year, now that peace has been restored for almost a full year and harmony prevails everywhere, we can I think all unite in prayer to His Excellency to grant pardon and oblivion to all offenders, and for all offences connected with the late rebellion. This is not an occasion, Mr. Speaker, to recriminate, nor do I desire, in any way, to recriminate. I desire, on the contrary, to approach this subject in as moderate a spirit as possible; but I must express my surprise that the advisers of His Excellency have not yet recommended the course which I have just suggested. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have always taken the ground that Louis Riel was the sole author of the rebellion, that to his influence and to his influence alone the uprising was due. Well, if such was the opinion of gentlemen on the other side, the only conclusion of such an opinion must have been that Louis Riel alone should have been punished, and that the offences of everyone else connected with the rebellion should have been long ago forgiven and pardoned. Moreover, the fate of the country is to some extent already pledged in that direction. In the month of February last Mr. Dewdney, Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, conveyed a promise of amnesty to some classes of offenders in the late rebellion. On the 16th of February last Mr. Dewdney wrote as follows to the Indians under his jurisdiction:—

"As the spring is coming on the Government is doing all it can to provide seed grain, for all the land you can cultivate, in order that you may put in a good crop for the coming season. Large quantities of wheat, barley, oats and potatoes, as well as garden seeds will be sent to your agents, and it will therefore be necessary for you to make every preparation to begin work as soon as the weather will permit.

"The knowledge that soldiers are coming to the country has, I have no doubt, already reached you; and you have already been told by people who want to do you harm, that your arms are to be taken from you, and that arrests are to be made of those who took part in the troubles of last spring.

"This is to notify all Indians that such is not the case. No Indians will be disarmed who behave themselves and attend to what the agent tells them; neither will arrests be made of any who took part in last year's troubles. The soldiers who are coming are for the purpose of keeping the peace, and while here will endeavor to stop horse stealing both from whites and Indians, and arrest any found so engaged. They will also assist in putting a stop to whiskey smugglers coming across the line."

He concludes as follows:—

"I send you these words for your good, and hope you will take my advice and that of your agents and instructors, and not listen to men who, for selfish motives, wish to see you discontented and in trouble."

It is true that on a late occasion the Prime Minister, in answer to a question by my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, stated that this letter had not been authorised. Well, if not authorised before publication, it has not been disavowed since, and if it has not been disavowed it meant approval. If the Government did not intend to abide by this letter, I submit that their duty was then to have disavowed it. But they have allowed it to be circulated amongst the Indians and in the press, and in my judgment, if now the promise of that letter were not to be carried out, it would be a breach of faith on the part of the Government. On the same occasion the Prime Minister said:

"But with regard to certain half-breeds in the vicinity of Turtle Mountains, on the other side of the line, who, it has been represented strongly, were simply misguided, and have not been guilty in any way except in joining in the outbreak, he has been authorised to say that if they return and behave peaceably and loyally they will not be disturbed."

Well, the course which was then suggested by the Government and to be taken with their approval was certainly very proper. It was proper to induce those men who had been breakers of the law, who had fled from the country to avoid prosecution, and who had been simply misguided in their actions, to come back, and induce them to become subjects of Her Majesty. But it seems to me, and I think it will strike everybody, that if those who have broken the law and fled to avoid prosecution earned their pardon by simply coming back, then surely those who remain were more, or just as much, entitled to the same privileges and should have received pardon. I am aware that some individuals have been granted pardon, and that some prisoners have been released. But that is not sufficient. Mercy should be the rule and not the exception; severity only should be the exception. Apart from those who were arrested, tried and convicted, and who are now undergoing

sentence, apart from those who fled from the country, there are also large numbers of those who were engaged in the rebellion last year—in fact the bulk of them—who are at large, and whose liberty is in danger; they are living under constant apprehension that they can be instantly arrested. Now, I claim, and I think everybody will admit, that it is not humane that those people should ever remain in constant fear of arrest So far as my opinion goes, I can see no reason, taking the view which the Government took all along, why a free pardon should not be granted to everyone connected with the rebellion; Gabriel Dumont, now a fugitive; to Michel Dumas, also a fugitive; to Monkman, Lepine and the others confined in the penitentiary. I can see no reason, so far as I am concerned, why a free pardon should not be granted to every one of those men. But if the Government for reasons they consider adequate, and of which, I admit, they are the best judges, think that some exceptions should be made, let the exceptions be made, but at the same time let a general amnesty be granted to the whole population. Whatever may be the reasons for making exceptions in the case of some few individual persons, there certainly can be no reason whatever why the arm of the law should forever be suspended over the heads of the whole population. Such was not the course followed in the United States. Less than six weeks after the capture of Richmond the President of the United States issued a general proclamation of amnesty extending to the whole population, from which only a certain class of the principal offenders were excepted. Well, I suggest that the same course should be adopted here. The course adopted there was eminently wise and useful. It afforded at once security and confidence to the whole population of the south. I claim that some such course should be adopted here. The country is at peace; harmony prevails over the length and breadth of the land; those who were last year engaged in rebellion are now living quietly, and their only thought, so far as we know, appears to be to repair the injury the war inflicted on their country. But it is manifest that their energies must be dampened by the thought that they are never sure of a second moment of liberty. As I said before, I desire to approach the subject in as moderate a spirit as possible, and I only ask that a general proclamation of amnesty should be made for the whole population, leaving the Government, if they see fit, to make some exceptions. Such an amnesty would afford relief to the minds of the whole population, who are at present living under constant dread of arrest; and if this is done, those people will be given cause to bless and love the laws and institutions of their country. Without saying any more, I beg to move, seconded by Mr Blake:

That all the words after "that" be left out, and the following substituted:—That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying for the exercise of the royal prerogative, for granting a free pardon, indemnity, and oblivion for all crimes, offences, and misdemeanors connected with the late unhappy troubles in the North-West, to all of Her Majesty's subjects, in so far as the same may be compatible with the safety of the Crown and the security of the Dominion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fully appreciate the tone with which the hon. gentleman has made his motion. I quite agree that everything he has said has been worthy of the occasion. He has in no way attempted to make it a matter of political excitement; he has pleaded the cause of those who were unfortunately concerned in the outbreak; and I can assure the hon. gentleman freely that he cannot go substantially further in the direction of the resolution than the Government have already determined to go. We all know that the majority of those who were concerned in the outbreak, those who took arms under Riel and his immediate lieutenants, were misguided, were misled; and so far as the Indians are concerned, we must look upon them as having had their savage nature roused by the prospect of war and by the hope of getting that warlike dis-

tinction, the traditions of which rest among them, and which always excites the Indian tribes, and especially the younger warriors, when there is anything like warfare in their vicinity. So that I say the Government are quite prepared to deal with this subject in as large a sense as this resolution conveys; and I hope that the hon. gentleman, when he hears what I say, will be satisfied with it, and will not at this moment press this resolution. The resolution asks for an amnesty, in so far as it may be compatible with the safety of the Crown and the security of the Dominion. Well, the Crown is safe, and the Dominion is secure, I have no doubt; and that exception means a universal amnesty. I do not suppose any of us believe, or anyone in the North-West can feel for a moment, that either the safety of the Empire or the Crown, or the security of the Dominion, could be in any way affected, whether an amnesty were granted or not; but there are cases which I think, and which the House I am sure will think, ought to be made exceptions, and we cannot make individual exceptions by name, because the evidence is of all kinds, some *primâ facie*, and some amounting to moral certainty of guilt, and guilt, of what kind? of murder, atrocious murder. Well, a general amnesty would pardon all such persons. I had before me only yesterday a statement of a person who is now on the other side of the line, who boasted that he had shot a white man from a river bank while he was in his canoe going down the river. It was during the outbreak, and the murderer was an insurgent, but it was not in battle or in any way in hot blood. Now, I take it that the American Government ought to be asked to surrender that man. With respect to those parties, if there are any, and I know there are some, who have been guilty of other murders—murders in cold blood, though committed during the outbreak—they ought not to escape, because their offences are not in any true sense political offences merely. True, in all rebellions and outbreaks, there are atrocities; and in the case of this outbreak—it ought not to be dignified, really, by the name of rebellion—we pardon everyone whose only offence was to take up arms and assist in the outbreak, even if it was proved that in any contest that took place he had shot down some of our troops. It is a consequence of all warfare, whether civil or with foreign nations, that there is bloodshed and death; and the fact that one man more skilful, perhaps, as a marksman than another has killed his opponent, does not make him any more guilty than others who fired with the same intention, though not with the same success. Then, there is another point, which is of some considerable importance. We have very good evidence that there was at one time a very formidable conspiracy fomented on the south of the line by interested parties, whom I do not choose to designate more particularly, for the purpose of having an Indian, a savage invasion into our country. That evidence was so strong, and came from so many sources, that the Government felt it their duty to make some preparations; and hence, as we intimated in that statement of Mr. Dewdney, the Government were prepared to send a moveable column in case of any invasion from the south, especially in the vicinity of Calgary, in the Blackfoot country, so as to be prepared with a force to repel any such invasion. While I stated that that proclamation was not authorised and was not seen by us, we knew Mr. Dewdney had represented, as others had, that it was of great consequence, if new troops were sent in to the country, that they should be sent in in such a way as not to alarm the Indian tribes; so as not to make them believe, as interested parties would make them believe, that this additional force was sent for the purpose of renewing the war and of shooting and putting them down. It was with that view Mr. Dewdney made that announcement, which he did on his own responsibility. After the question put by the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Blake), I ascertained from Mr. Dewdney that, knowing the excitement which

existed among the Indians, especially among the Blackfeet, Bloods and Piegans, he thought it was well to come out with that proclamation. Since that time, I need not say, we have been in constant communication with the North-West; we have been watching the frontier, we have been watching the varying feelings of the Indian tribes, we have been watching the movements to the south of the line. Formidable the feeling was at first, but by degrees better counsels prevailed, and I hope and believe that the decidedly hostile feeling, which some few months ago existed south of the line, has to a great extent disappeared; and I may say this, as another reason why I should ask the hon. gentleman, after this statement, not to press the resolution, that I am aware, from credible evidence from a person, a refugee himself, whose respectability is vouched for, that those, the Metis especially, who are refugees from justice, are now signing a petition addressed to Her Majesty or the Governor General, praying for pardon and stating the reason why they desire to return. It is of very considerable importance we should get that petition, that we should get them to declare their submission to the laws and desire to return to the country. It is of the greatest importance to the future of the country that such a petition should be presented; and, if I am not mistaken, some very important refugees are at the head of the movement to petition the Governor General or the Queen to permit them to return to Canada. One thing more and I shall sit down. A general amnesty, not excepting those who have committed the atrocities to which I have alluded, would greatly irritate settlers in the North-West. I have had occasion, as it is my duty, to watch the public sentiments of the settlers in the North-West, so far as they can be ascertained from their newspapers, and there are some very respectable, well conducted journals in the North-West. The feeling that we can gather from those papers is that the Government have gone too far in the release of convicted prisoners. Some very respectable papers speak strongly on that point. They do not all say so, but the majority of the papers speak in that direction, that the sentences have been too short, and the imprisonments too short; and if an amnesty be given without exception, and the parties who committed these atrocities do take advantage of the amnesty and come into this country, the consequence would be, I fear, these men would be shot down by the friends or the relatives of those who suffered. Therefore, there must be exception. Those who have committed the kind of crimes I have mentioned, should, at all events, not be amnestied now. I hope and believe the petition to which I have alluded will be presented ere long, and I can only repeat that the Government are sincerely desirous to have the whole outbreak forgotten; they are sincerely desirous to have a wet sponge passed over the crimes, so far as they are political and not accompanied with atrocious murder, and that every man would feel secure against the possibility of being brought before a tribunal for any offence connected with the rebellion. I do not believe there is any apprehension or any serious apprehension among the Metis, who still remain in British America, or among the Indians, that any of them will be punished. I have not been able to discover that there is, because all the accounts go to show that white men, half-breeds and Indians are busily employed this season, to an extent that has never existed before in the North-West, in the cultivation of their grounds, and in a desire to support themselves and improve their lands. The Government will wait until they receive this petition which I have mentioned. They will be then prepared to grant a general amnesty, and they will only make exceptions of those against whom the evidence is strong, and with the reservation, the necessary reservation I think, that should any future evidence arise of actual complicity in any of the murders that occurred—murders as distinguished from bloodshed in honorable warfare or from combat in battle—the Government will be prepared to recommend to Her Majesty, to His Excellency the Governor General, the issuing of an amnesty.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad to hear the last statement of the hon. gentleman, to which I think no exception can be taken, from my point of view at any rate. As I understand the hon. gentleman, his statement is a declaration on the part of the Government that, upon the reception—which, I suppose, will be at comparatively early day—of some declaration or petition from certain half-breeds south of the line, they are willing to issue a general amnesty, affecting all the cases concerned in the outbreak, with the exception of those the hon. gentleman may believe—because, of course, it is impossible to say with a certainty what a trial would give—to be guilty of atrocities, and I suppose he refers to those in the Territories, who, as an expression of opinion, he thinks should be brought to trial, and to those out of the Territories, with respect to whom the hon. gentleman indicates he proposes to apply to the Government of the United States for extradition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the one case I have mentioned.

Mr. BLAKE. In that case. These cases, therefore, will be dealt with in course of law, and as to all the cases which will not be dealt with in courts of law—that is to all the cases except such as there are well grounded reasons for believing have been guilty of cold-blooded murder, as distinguished from death from battle-field or combat—we shall have a general amnesty. I have felt it was absolutely necessary we should have a discussion on this subject, so that the views held on this side, which I am glad to see approximate so closely to those on the other side, should be stated, because the condition of things as it stood appeared to me to be very unsatisfactory. The hon. gentleman will have observed that, so long ago as the 16th February, the Indian Commissioner made a proclamation to the Indians inside the Territories which was, so far as it could accomplish that result, a general amnesty to them without exception. Now, I find it difficult to concede that the Indian Commissioner should have taken that step—of course, he did take that step, after what the hon. gentleman has said, without any communication with the Department or the Government here—when the telegraph could have conveyed his views of the urgency of the occasion, and would have procured the authorisation of the Department for a step so important. I find it still more difficult to understand how, if some very sudden emergency necessitated the issue of that statement, it came to pass that the superintendent should have thought it consistent with his duty to leave the Government here in entire ignorance of his having taken that step, to such an extent that it was not until my calling attention to the subject on the 5th May—so long a time from the 16th February to the 5th May—that the hon. gentleman had to enquire of him what he had been doing up in the North-West in this matter. It seems to me a very extraordinary state of things that a course of this sort should have been pursued by that official. I think, unless he can show that there was some pressing emergency which disabled him, in his view of the public interest, from communicating what he was about to do before acting, he is blameable for not having communicated before acting. If there was such an emergency as justified him in acting before communicating, he is blameable for not communicating what he did do upon the doing of it, so that it might be understood here and the course of action consequent upon it might have been adopted. I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that, according to their well known views which I have heard him often enforce in reference to the Indians, with regard to promises and pledges, it would be only under the most extraordinary circumstances that the

Government would feel itself in a position to do otherwise than literally comply with that statement in the letter of the gentleman who was representing the Government and the Queen; and the fact that it was, although taken upon the official's own responsibility, practically irrevocable, that it could only be violated at the cost of a breach of faith, renders still more cogent the observations I have made. That being the state of things, it is the fact that on the 16th February there was practically, though unauthorised, a general amnesty to the Indians who were in the Territories. Then you come to another class of persons who have been in an informal manner amnestied also. The hon. gentleman informed us on the 5th May that Mr. Dewdney was not authorised to make the statement to which I have referred, but he added this:

"With regard to certain half-breeds in the vicinity of Turtle Mountains, on the other side of the line, who, it has been represented strongly, were simply misguided, and have not been guilty in any way except in joining in the outbreak, he has been authorised to say that, if they return and behave peacefully and loyally, they will not be disturbed."

I dare say these are the same persons to whom the hon. gentleman has referred this evening as the persons who had signed the petition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, these are other persons? Then we find that a certain number of the insurgents who fled to the United States and were on the other side of the line have been, by the authority of the Government, told that if they return they will not be troubled; so they have been, though we do not know who they are, yet a body of half-breeds who have left the lines have been, told that they will not be troubled. Then, it seems there is a third class of half-breeds who are outside the lines, who are not embraced within the limits of this message of peace, who are, the hon. gentleman says, now in process of signing some declaration to which the hon. gentleman attaches very considerable importance, and for the signature of which he proposes to wait some time before extending the royal clemency. Then you find the case of the half-breeds in the Territories. It hardly appears to me to be possible to contend, in fact it has not been contended, that they should be placed in any worse position than the Indians, and that it would be possible, after having amnestied, as it is admitted now we have practically amnestied, the Indians, that we should delay very long to amnesty the half-breeds. And then there is the great case, you know, of the whites of Prince Albert. We were told by the hon. gentleman that they were the persons who had really caused the rebellion. We were told by the Minister of the Interior that they were the persons who caused the rebellion. These alarming statements in regard to these public enemies were, to my mind, considerably mitigated by a statement I was glad to hear the new Minister of the Interior had made when in that neighborhood, whether it was made under some friendly pressure or whether it was that in an enemy's country like that, he thought he had better adopt a little policy; but I was glad to see that he declared to the inhabitants of Prince Albert, when he was amongst them, that he had never doubted their loyalty; so we may as well, in a friendly spirit, pass the sponge—to use the hon. gentleman's phrase—over these violent utterances with reference to the whites of Prince Albert, particularly as, after the very diligent search for public enemies which was made under the instructions of the Government, the result was, I am glad to know, and I am sure hon. gentlemen must be glad to know, attended with so little success that he was not able to find a very great many public enemies whom he might bring to trial, public justice and condemnation. There you have all the classes of the political offenders. Under those circumstances, I felt, as I showed by making an enquiry at a very early period of the Session, that it was absolutely necessary that one of two courses should be adopted; that the Government should make up their mind, if the public interest, in their view, the safety of the Dominion or the interests of public justice, required that any further prosecution should take place, to prosecute; and that if they felt, as I am glad to feel, that, with a very few exceptions, from the statement of the hon. gentleman to-night, the public interest did not require that, it was fitting that the sponge should be passed over all other events, and that an amnesty should take place. Now, as I understand it, that is practically the hon. gentleman's statement. For my own part, I shall not express an opinion contrary to the hon. gentleman's, with reference to the petition or declaration to which he refers. I do not myself attach a very great deal of importance to such petitions or declarations made under such circumstances. I do not think that they are extremely cogent bonds for good behavior in the future. I think we have to trust to the past and to the future rather than to any declarations which may be so made as of any practical importance, but, still, the hon. gentleman attached importance to them, and he says no long time will elapse before the result which he desires to attain will be attained, and that then, with the one or two unhappy exceptions to which he refers, and with respect to which I do not desire to say a single word dissenting from his conclusion upon them, ignorant as I am, of course, of the particulars, but taking his description of the offences, the sponge is to be passed over these transactions so far as it is possible for us to pass it. Under these circumstances, I should think the object of my hon. friend's motion has been attained, and, as far as my voice would have any effect, I would suggest to him to adopt the suggestion of the hon. gentleman and withdraw the motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad to hear that statement from the hon. gentleman, as I think it is the proper course to pursue, but I must ask the permission of the House to make one remark, as I am afraid, from the imperfection of my statement, I have rather made the hon. gentleman misunderstand what I desired to say. The hon. gentleman's question put the other day was specific. There was, I think, an announcement about the Indian arms being taken away.

Mr. BLAKE. That was another question. I put two questions. The question I put was this:

"Whether Mr. Dewdney had been authorised to inform the Indians of the North-West Territories that no arrests will be made of any who took part in last year's troubles."

Copied from Mr. Dewdney's letter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At that time I was not aware of that. I made this statement:

"Mr. Dewdney has not been so authorised; but with regard to certain half-breeds in the vicinity of Turtle Mountains on the other side of the lines, who it has been represented strongly, were simply misguided and have not been guilty in any way except in joining the outbreak; he has been authorised to say that if they return and behave peaceably and loyally, they will not be disturbed."

When, as I have already stated, we were informed by the evidence before us that there would be an invasion, we made an arrangement to send up an auxiliary force to the force then there. Representation was made, not only by Mr. Dewdney, the Lieutenant Governor, but by others, that the Indians would be alarmed, and he asked in his correspondence, which was very full, that great care should be taken when the troops went up there that the Indians should not be disturbed or alarmed, but that they should be informed that it was not for the purpose of affecting them or their security. Mr. Dewdney, in that portion of the notification that was read, certainly has learned from me that the force would not be sent directly among the reserves to frighten the Indians, and that he should take every step in his power to let the Indians know that the force was not sent with any

hostile intent, but to keep the peace along the frontier, and for the purposes mentioned in that statement. That was an open and general correspondence between Mr. Dewdney and myself, and that was carried out. Then with respect to the few half-breeds that were allowed to come in from Turtle Mountains, they were permitted to come in in consequence of strong representations made by Father Hugonard, who was in that vicinity, and who asked that these men, for whom he vouched as being respectable and peaceable men, who had been misled—he pressed very strongly, for particular reasons applicable to each case—that they should be allowed to come in. Well, the agent was sent to inform them that they might return, and if they behaved themselves well they would not be disturbed, but there was nothing like a formal amnesty. I will only say further that I am very glad that we agree upon this matter, and I can only repeat that I think we are for once in accord on both sides of the House with reference to the position of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LAURIER. I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment withdrawn, and motion agreed to.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Repairs, Furniture and Heating, &c., of Public Buildings $408,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first item for repairs, furniture, &c., $175,000, is the ordinary amount. The second item, grounds and public buildings at Ottawa, including Major's Hill Park, $9,500, shows a difference of $2,000 more. As I stated the other day, there was an arrangement made with the city about taking Major's Hill Park under the control of the Government, and that arrangement involves an additional expenditure of $2,000.

Mr. VAIL. Will it require $2,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It may not always require that, but it does this year. Removal of snow, public buildings, Ottawa—that is the usual amount. Heating the public buildings, Ottawa, $53,000, that is the amount of ordinary years. Gas, public buildings, Ottawa, $23,000; that is the same. Water, public buildings, Ottawa; we require $1,000 on account of having leased certain buildings in the city for Government purposes. Then the allowance for fuel and light, Rideau Hall, $8,000; that is the amount paid to the Governor General every year. Telephonic service, public buildings Ottawa, $3,000, instead of $6,000 last year. We have made a new arrangement with the telephone company by which we have the same service for half the price. The salaries of engineers, firemen, caretakers of Dominion public buildings, $37,000. There is an addition of $2,000 on account of new public buildings having been erected in different parts of the Dominion, which require additional engineers, firemen, &c. Next, heating Dominion public buildings, fuel, &c., $50,000. That is in accordance with the extension of public buildings throughout the Dominion, and the amount was not sufficient to meet the ordinary expenditure under that service. Lighting Dominion public buildings, hitherto paid by the various Departments occupying the offices, $25,000. This is a new item. The Government thought it was better that the lighting of the Dominion public buildings should be under the control of the Department of Public Works, instead of being scattered through all the Departments, and we believe from experience that the service will be better performed.

Mr. VAIL. This is the amount that it cost before?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. Guided by the experience of the different Departments, we added the sums together, and we thought it would be about $25,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where was that entry previously?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was paid under departmental contingencies. We have thought that the matter should be attended to by the Deparment of Public Works, and we therefore place it there instead of scattering it through the different Departments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this sum of $33,000 was charged in 1885-86 under the item for departmental contingencies, $186,000?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In that case it would follow that instead of a net increase in departmental contingencies of $5,670 the increase would be $40,000. My impression is that the hon. gentleman's memory is incorrect and that lighting and water were never paid under item 21: Under the head of departmental contingencies no such entries appear. Where were they charged?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman understands that the two items are for the outside service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are not charged to departmental contingencies.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount is not paid by my Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is practically a deduction from the usual charges for Customs, Excise, Post Office, and other Departments of the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that in addition to the amount of $53,000 for heating public buildings at Ottawa there is an amount of $50,000 for various public buildings we have obtained possession of in Ottawa for Government purposes or is it for buildings all over the Dominion?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are two items. The first is for public buildings at Ottawa, and the second is for public buildings all over the Dominion.

Harbors and Rivers, Nova Scotia..... $2,000 00

Mr. KIRK. Have the harbors for which amounts were voted last year all been completed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman must see that in these estimates they are without exception votes in connection with harbors already began. Any amount for new works must appear in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. KIRK. Is it estimated that the $2,000 now proposed for Mabou will complete the work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The engineer's estimate is that the total amount required for repairs is $2,000.

Mr. VAIL. Hon. members will notice that only $2,000 appears under this heading for Nova Scotia, as compared with $11,500 for Prince Edward Island, $63,750 for Quebec, $43,500 for Ontario. I hope the Minister of Public Works will take note of this fact and remember Nova Scotia in the Supplementary Estimates. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what is the position of the Digby pier at present.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are making some temporary repairs in order to allow the steamers to land their passengers and goods. But as to the extent of the larger work I cannot say now; I must reserve my remarks on that head until we come to the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. VAIL. The reason I have referred to this matter is that I have received a number of letters from people in

Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as to the disadvantages the people are laboring under in being obliged to land from vessels in scows. Steamers run from Boston and also daily from St. John, New Brunswick, and the people are subjected to great inconvenience. I hope the Minister will take a note of the matter, and will see that the work is pushed as rapidly as possible.

Harbors and Rivers, Prince Edward Island..... $11,500 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For repairs to breakwaters, piers, &c, acquired from the Local Government we require $2,000; for the New London breakwater $2,500; for Cascumpec, removal of rock, $5,000, and for repairs to the Souris breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I hope the hon. gentleman will remember that $2,000 is not a sufficient sum for repairs to the Souris breakwater, and that, as a good deal of damage has been done last season, he will bring down in the Supplementary Estimates a sufficient sum to repair it.

Mr. McINTYRE. I regret that the sum appropriated for repairs to Souris breakwater this year is only $2,000. As far as I am able to judge, it will require at least $8,000 or $10,000 to repair the damage which was done there last fall. Last year the sum of $3,000 was granted, and the work was farmed out to three or four individuals, and the expectant candidate for that portion of the county gave orders to his friends, who were of course favorable to the Government, and those were the only ones who could receive any work during the time the work was in progress. There were no tenders asked as there should have been. The proper way, I think, in the construction of works of this kind, is that they should be let by public competition, and then let the contractor get his material at the usual rates. Whilst this work was in progress a storm came up and a large amount of damage was done to the breakwater; a large portion of the eastern wall was driven in, and it has remained so all the past winter. In fact, it is a matter of surprise to the people how the work stood it at all. It was in that condition when I left home, and I do not know how it has been since. They did not commence work on the breakwater until late in the fall, which is not the proper time to do work in such an exposed position. The work should begin in the summer when the weather is calm, because in the fall it is not possible to continue the work steadily; they may work one day and be off for the next three or four days. Whilst I am on the subject I would draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to another work in King's county, to which I directed his attention some three years ago. I refer to the breakwater at the mouth of St. Peter's harbor. The hon. gentleman will remember that the contract was given out in 1882 or 1883, that the contractor did a certain part of the work and then withdrew, taking a portion of the money coming to him for that year. The hon. gentleman will remember that in the Session of 1883 I drew his attention to the condition of that work, to the fact that it was in a state of disrepair, and that the harbor was likely to be destroyed unless the work was prosecuted. The hon. gentleman promised on that occasion that in the succeeding spring the work would be prosecuted to the satisfaction of the people, but that promise has not been carried out. The balance was carried over for a couple of years, but now I see that it has disappeared altogether. Now it would be satisfactory to the people there to know if that work is to be completed, for if the harbor is to be left in its present condition it will be completely ruined.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was not in the Estimates last year; for, if so, it would have appeared in italics in the adjoining column of this years' Estimates.

Mr. McINTYRE. Well, it was in the year before.

Mr. VAIL.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That statement of the hon. gentleman, therefore, is not correct. The hon. gentleman says that the work on Souris breakwater was begun too late in the year. Whose fault is that? I could not begin until the money was at my disposal.

Mr. McINTYRE. You had the money in July.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman does not suppose that after having been six months in Session we could begin immediately. We had a great many works to proceed with, and we had to prepare plans and specifications. This work may be very important, but I could not abandon all the other works, some of which were quite as important as this, in order to carry it through immediately. Instructions were given to take them as fast as we could go on with the works. This year I hope the Session will finish this month, and then we will have nearly two months more than we had last year, and we will be able to begin our work earlier, and thus meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman who says that these works should begin earlier. I am perfectly with him in that, but I cannot begin to work unless the money is voted, and as the Session finishes generally about May or June, we cannot begin at the very beginning of summer. When the money is voted and is put at my disposal, instructions are given to the engineers or architects to prepare their plans and specifications. In this case the hon. gentleman says no tenders were called for. It is not usual to call for tenders for small works. We generally do these things otherwise, by having a clerk of works or engineer on the spot, because these specifications could not possibly cover the whole ground. Sometimes we cannot know exactly the quantity of work to be done, and therefore we could not call on a contractor to give us a tender for it, as it sometimes turns out to be double or treble what it was thought to be. That is the reason why small works of this kind are performed by days' labor under the supervision of an engineer or a clerk of works. With regard to the other pier the hon. gentleman spoke of, if he will be kind enough to put a question on the notice paper, I shall be able to answer it in forty-eight hours.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman says that small works he adopts the system of performing by days' labor instead of by tender; but I think nearly all the building of piers and breakwaters in Prince Edward Island is done by days' labor, which is not thrown open, as it ought to be, to the general public, but the money is sent down to a little clique who simply employ men who are known and recognised as wearing the ribbon of the party: "No other person need apply." These breakwaters are built in exposed places, and there ought to be a survey to ascertain minutely the quantity of work to be done, and then it ought to be done by contract. I have warned the hon. gentleman of this before. He knows, if he has examined these works, that the plan of spending $1,000 in one year and perhaps $1,500 in another, and placing that money in the hands of such people as he dignifies by the name of clerks of works, is really and truly throwing money away. Last year we voted $1,500 for the New London breakwater; this year the hon. gentleman is asking for $2,000 more. What is that but mere patch-work? The money is sent to a little clique who spend it among their friends; and I warn the hon. gentleman that the public interest is not being served by a system of that kind. There is no class of work that should be so efficiently built as breakwaters, and if, after careful examination and after specifications prepared by a competent engineer, they are built under contract by the lowest tenderer, they will be useful to the public and will reflect credit on the hon. gentleman's Department. I suppose we may expect in the Supplementary Estimates large sums for other breakwaters, because we are instructed that the elections are not far off, and the

surest evidence of that is in the votes in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman's remarks would frighten a Minister of Public Works if I were more disposed to be frightened than I am. If we were to bring down large sums for these works, he would say, you are bringing them down for the elections. Therefore, I take the hon. gentleman's warning that we should not bring down large estimates for Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIES. I do wish you to bring large sums for the Island.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Fortunately for me, I am not in the habit of consulting the hon. gentleman about the estimates to be brought down. The hon. gentleman says that in voting $2,000 or $3,000 this year, and as much next year, we are squandering the money. But unless these works are built at a cost of five or six times as much as they now cost, we cannot do otherwise than repair them as the damage occurs. The great difficulty in the Maritime Provinces is that sea worms destroy the wood in these works in three or four years, and all at once a work that seems to be solid crumbles, or is carried away by a storm. The only way to remedy that effectually would be to build the works in a more substantial way, with stone slopes to protect them, which would cost a very large sum of money. We have done that in the case of works of great magnitude; but I have instructed my chief engineer, that whenever practicable, it is better to wait for three or four years, if the work can stand it, instead of repairing it from year to year and spending small sums upon it, so as to accumulate larger sums to protect the work in the way I state. But these small works cannot be done otherwise than by days' work; and in that case the work is best done under the supervision of an officer. It is quite possible, in so many extensive works from one end of the Dominion to the other, that some negligence will occur on the part of local officers. The hon. gentleman complains that the men employed are friends of the Government. That is one of those accidents that occur under every Government; the hon. gentleman knows they occurred under the Government who preceded us, and I have no doubt they will occur under Governments who will follow us.

Mr. HACKETT. I desire to say that the allegations of the hon. member for Queen's are quite incorrect. I do not know much about the breakwater to which he refers especially, but with regard to the gentlemen appointed to superintend these works, they are honest, conscientious men, and the money entrusted to their charge is as faithfully expended as it can be. I am not aware that any man having control of this work is in any way open to the imputation of jobbing. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that because a small sum of money, amounting to less than $1,000, is placed in the hands of men in Prince Edward Island, it would be thrown away? He is quite incorrect. The people of Prince Edward Island are as careful of public money as the people of any other Province, and the hon. gentleman, when he speaks in that sense, is reflecting on the people of his own Province. The people of Prince county, at least, are quite cognisant of the fact that public money for the building of breakwaters is of great advantage to them, and any amount, be it ever so small or so large, is ever gratefully accepted by them, and is expended in the most careful and economic manner, under the management of the Minister of Public Works, and the able engineers and gentlemen he controls. It is a reflection on our people to say that you cannot send down to Prince Edward Island $1,000 to expend in an emergency—the end of a breakwater may be carried away or the approach to it—but you must take another man from another Province to control that expenditure. I am glad to state the hon. gentleman is quite incorrect, and that the money that is expended is expended in the very best direction. The hon. gentleman, when he says the money at New London was wasted, is passing a reflection on a very important section of his own county.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not expect my criticism to meet the approval of the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Hackett). With reference to the item:

Balance of re-imbursement to the Government of Prince Edward Island, in settlement of their claims for the construction and maintenance of harbor and river works of Federal importance, 1st July, 1873, to January, 1883, $24,240 00.

Is that in full settlement of claim, or is the claim still open?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is in settlement of the claim.

Mr. DAVIES. There is no claim preferred by the Government of Prince Edward Island for another sum?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the claim was made in the first instance by the Government of Prince Edward Island, they claimed a much larger sum. Then we granted after examination $53,000 or $54,000 for a number of wharves or piers, and afterwards, on their asking us to reconsider the matter, saying there were certain piers that were of the same Federal importance as those we had accepted, the matter was reconsidered, and finally this sum of $24,000 was voted with the sanction of Parliament in settlement of the claim.

Mr. DAVIES. When the $53,000 was voted, it was made a condition in the Order in Council that the Government of Prince Edward Island should give a receipt in full. They would not however give the receipt, but pressed their claims for a further and larger amount. The hon. gentleman yielded to their pressure to the extent of $24,000 and paid it. Was that money accepted by the Prince Edward Island Government as a settlement in full?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As far as I can recollect, it was a final settlement.

Mr. DAVIES. There is no application pending for a further sum?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot recollect.

Mr. HACKETT. I do not know why the hon. gentleman should be so persistent in wanting to know whether it is a matter open between the Government of Prince Edward Island and the Dominion. I think it is our interest that the matter should be left in such a state that the Prince Edward Island Government can advance their claim at any time.

Mr. DAVIES. When the hon. gentleman becomes a minister, I will address my questions to him. In the mean time, I will address them to the Minister of Public Works.

Public Works, New Brunswick..... ..... $41,500 00

Mr. WELDON. Is the Negro Point breakwater, St. John harbor, under contract now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; the contractors are Rhodes, Curry & Co.

Mr. WELDON. Have they not failed? And it is not a man named Harrison who has the contract.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The statement that I have here shows that they are the contractors. The date of contract is August, 1885, so they must be new contractors. The work will be completed 30th September, 1886.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How comes it to be that there is so large a revote?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose it is on account of the work having been stopped. We had to call for new tenders.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is estimated to be the total cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The works were re-let to Rhodes, Curry & Co., on the 12th August, 1885. Their contract is for $60,000, and $25,000 to $30,000 will be required to finish.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Previous to 1878, $145,000 had been expended. Each year from that, there was expended $30,000, $16,000, $5,000, $2,000, $5,000, $30,000, $41,000, $19,000, $6,500, $35,500, respectively.

Mr. VAIL. It is about time the work was completed. It has been a drag on the Treasury for years, and I hope it will be rebuilt in such a way that there will be no danger of its being carried off again.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman knows how it was damaged by the storm.

Mr. BURPEE. Perhaps the Minister will give us some idea of the expenditure on the St. John River. The amount is small, it is true, but it is said that it is frittered away and does very little good. I should like to know what the money is for, how it is used, and whether there is any contract. It is said it is given to some two or three parties, and they expend it as they think proper with very little advantage to the river. We have the same amounts year after year. The amount appears to be divided into three parts, although two of them run connectedly from Fredericton to River des Chutes. The other part is above Grand Falls.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first amount of $1,000, Bear Island to Fredericton, the chief engineer states is required to continue the improvement of the navigable channel of this river by removing boulders, snags, and other obstructions. This amount was expended last year, and I think a similar sum was expended the previous years.

Mr. BURPEE. Is it by contract or days' work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think it was under the supervision of some officer of my Department. Then the vote of $3,000 for the River St. John above Grand Falls, and the River Tobique, is put in for the continuation of the improvements of the navigable channel of the River St. John above Grand Falls. I have not been there myself, but I have understood from different parties for the last three years that these sums were well employed and did good service to the navigation.

Mr. WELDON. What was done with it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Last year, the sum of $2,743.55 was applied to the repairs to a breakwater on the east side of Grand Falls, and towards the construction of a wharf on west side, $900; improvements between Woodstock and Grand Falls, blasting rock and removing sand bars at various places. Then the other sum is from the River des Chutes to Bear Island. That is to be expended in continuing the improvement of this river by removing the boulders and other obstructions.

Mr. GILLMOR. Will the hon. Minister explain about this expenditure on the Madawaska River?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no item this year for the Madawaska River.

Mr. IRVINE. Of course, it is not well for any person to find fault with money expended in his own constituency. It seems to be something out of the usual course, and I do not wish it to be understood that the observations I make are in the shape of fault-finding with the expenditure of the money, but numerous complaints have been made to me since I have been a member of Parliament, that the money expended on the River St. John, above Woodstock, is practically thrown away, that it is done by days' work and in a very improper way, so much so that I have been solicited by several in my own county and in the county of Victoria, which the Minister of Inland Revenue represents, to ask for a detailed statement showing how the money has been expended for three years past. I have not done so, but if I have the fortune to be here another year, I may be obliged to do so. No steamboat runs on the River St. John above Woodstock since the construction of the railway and since the river has been bridged. There are four bridges above Woodstock, and there is no steamboat navigation. There are some tow boats running there, I think, but the public who live on both sides of the river think a large portion of this money is very uselessly expended. So far as the Tobique river is concerned, it may be a necessity to expend it, because they have no means of communication except by the river or by road, and there is a great deal of lumbering done there. I have been asked to direct the attention of the Minister to one point where some benefit might be done. That is at Hartland. There is a station of the New Brunswick Railway there and a very large amount of business is done, and they have to cross from one side of the river to the other, but the only means of communication is a wire ferry. At Florenceville, above, and at Woodstock, below, they have bridges, but there they have nothing but a wire ferry, and I am told there are impediments, in the shape of boulders, which it would be of service to the people at that point to have removed.

Mr. WELDON. Is no contract let for any of this work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is done by days' work.

Mr. WELDON. Who had charge of that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Those works are under the charge of the clerks of works and superintendents that were appointed for that purpose.

General repairs and improvements of harbors and rivers of the Maritime Provinces $12,000 00

Mr. VAIL. I have before called the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this vote, which is largely expended for travelling expenses of the engineers in charge of all the works in the Maritime Provinces. I think it would be better to charge that sum to salaries instead of public works. Probably not one-third of the amount goes to general repairs and works.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This sum covers the travelling expenses and salaries of those engineers who are sent to make examinations and surveys, and they must be paid in some way. This is the ordinary vote for that purpose.

Mr. VAIL. I would ask if there was an engineer employed last year to survey the works in Nova Scotia with a view of deciding what portion of the works would be considered Dominion and what Local. I know an engineer went through the Province, but whether he was employed by the Dominion or Local Government I could not say.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think we had an engineer employed there, the Provincial Government made a claim in that direction, and we could not take it up until we had procured some information, and we had an engineer who went round. I do not know how far his work has been done.

Harbors and Rivers, Quebec. $63,750 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Etang du Nord, $7,000. That is at one of the Magdalen Islands, and is a harbor of refuge; $5,000 will be required to complete it. I am sorry

the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) is not here, for he could explain this item. It is for fishing boats, because there is no shelter on that coast.

Mr. LANGELIER. Is this work done by contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think there is a contract. The difficulty was that it is far out of the way.

Mr. LANGELIER. I would ask also if the work at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière is done by contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. Only $750 are required to complete.

Mr. LANGELIER. There is nothing provided for the wharf and pier. Is it not to be lengthened?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; there will be something in the supplementaries.

Mr. LANGELIER. Is the work at Château Richer also being executed by contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman knows that there are boulders at Château Richer. We have been clearing away the boulders, because boats go there to trade and to the quarries, and they are very often wrecked or damaged. We have been clearing a channel, and I think this amount will complete the work.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the sum of $9,000 complete the works near Nicolet?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think there is something else in the Supplementary Estimates. At the entrance to the mouth of the river where the harbor has been made, we require to complete one side by putting brushwood and stone. We have a portion of the material on hand, and this is for the purpose of using it and completing the work.

Mr. LAURIER. Does that mean completion during the year?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. From July to July. That is done by contract; R. P. Cook is the contractor.

Mr. LANGELIER. This $3,000 for Lanoraie, is that for the same pier built many years ago by the Richelieu Company?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, it is another one.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) I see there is nothing for the St. Louis River. I presume the hon. Minister has forgotten these works.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) That is so; I see there is nothing.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Can the hon. Minister tell us whether there will be anything in the Supplementary Estimates?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) I am unable to tell that now; the Supplementary Estimates are not yet passed in Council.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Just a moment ago, I heard the hon. gentleman tell the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) that there would be in the Supplementary Estimates an amount for Trois Pistoles. It is so near the St. Louis River in the present Estimates that, if the Supplementary Estimates are already prepared for Trois Pistoles, the Minister ought to know whether there will be an amount for the St. Louis River.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Unfortunately, Trois Pistoles is not quite so near as that to the St. Louis River. With regard to Trois Pistoles I knew that the Supplementary Estimates had been passed in Council, and that is the reason why I have been able to give an answer to the hon. member for Megantic.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman will allow me to remind him that a delegation from Beauharnois waited upon him and asked the Government through him, whether these works were to be continued. The Minister knows perfectly well the importance of these works which were begun about three years ago. The owners of the river frontage on both sides have greatly suffered from the construction of these works, still they felt satisfied when they thought of the benefits which would result from their completion. If they are abandoned now the money expended up to this time will not be of much use, while a very small sum would complete them. This would be exceedingly important, not only for the town of Beauharnois but for the whole district.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) With regard to this item of the St. Louis River, if I understand the nature of the works, it was intended to deepen the river-bed, and these works are not yet completed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Some of the works were not completed but they are completed now.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) With regard to the taking up of anchors and chains from the bottom of the St. Lawrence, the hon. Minister stated a moment ago that these works were not intended to take place in the Quebec harbor. The Quebec Harbor Commissioners have an apparatus made for the special purpose of taking up anchors and chains, by which an immense quantity has been taken up from the Quebec harbor. Is it intended to use this apparatus for the purpose of taking up these anchors and chains or to have them taken up by day's work? In the latter case the work would be very costly.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) That apparatus does not belong to the Harbor Commissioners; it belongs to the Department of Public Works. It is by means of this apparatus that the chains and boulders have been taken up. It is quite possible that, after this year, when the work referred to will be completed, that this machine will be transferred to the Quebec Harbor Commissioners to whom it will be more useful than to the Department.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Is this work of the same nature as that which has been performed last year with regard to the taking up of chains and anchors? I understand that a man by the name of Fradette has been employed in taking up chains and anchors at various places near St. Jean d'Echaillons.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) It is not the same thing. At St. Jean d'Echaillons, the work was done under a contract with the Department of Marine to take up the wreck of the steamer *Ottawa*. Mr. Fradette had a contract, but he was unable to carry it out, as he had not the necessary appliances and the price was not sufficient. The Department asked for tenders for the clearing off of the whole wreck, and Mr. Fradette happened to put in the lowest tender. I understand that since then the contract has been given to him, and that he will commence his work as soon as the water will be warm enough to allow him to dive. I believe a sum of $12,000 or $15,000 will be required for that object.

Mr. AMYOT. Besides the present amount?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Will this amount be expended by day's work or under contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) It will not be by contract but by means of the lifting barge which will take up the boulders and chains. A crew is put on board and the work is done by that crew.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works on the repairs of the St. Michel's wharf. I see there is nothing this year in the Estimates for these works. Last year, the Government has expended $1,000 to repair the wharf at St. Michel, and I believe the reports of the officers of the Department state that the work has been exceedingly well done. With the $1,000, work was done which is worth at least $3,000. If the Government do not wish to see these works carried off by the next storm, they must cause these repairs to be continued towards the shore. This is one of the most useful wharves to navigation. Very often vessels of a high tonnage, go there to seek a refuge against sudden storms. All those who are conversant with the subject, have remarked that if the parish of St. Michel had not built these works the Government would have been obliged to build them. Until now, all that has been done by the Government has been the taking up of a few stones opposite the wharf, and the repairing of the wharf last year. The country feels grateful towards the Government for that much, but that should not be the end of it. I am free to inform the hon. Minister that the continuation of these works will not diminish the chances of the Government at the next general election. It will be considered as an act of justice which will cause the electors to be favorably disposed. Moreover, public interests demands that the Government should see to it. There is another question with reference to the amount due on the wharf. Perhaps this is not the proper time to deal with the question. Still, as the Dominion Government is on very fair terms with several of the Local Governments, they might possibly agree with the Local Government to settle this question. It will be remembered that this wharf was built with money borrowed when the Government issued debentures. The parish had borrowed this money at the suggestion of the hon. Minister, and it had been stated that that money would never be refunded. The parish acted in good faith. Since then the parish sustained heavy losses. It is not a wealthy parish, and although the whole district uses this wharf, the parish is obliged to pay it in full. All we have to do is to cross the river to see that the principle which I desire to apply to St. Michel is applied on the other shore on the Island of Orleans. The fact that a river separates the two places is no reason why the same principle should not apply. The hon. Minister of Public Works knows the question perfectly well, and with his knowledge of business and his knowledge of the locality, I am sure that he will finally accede to my demand. For this year, I will ask the hon. Minister, in the name of public usefulness, to be pleased to put something in the Supplementary Estimates to maintain this wharf, because if it should be carried away by the waters, we would be face to face with a loss which would require an expenditure of $20,000 or $30,000 or, perhaps, $40,000 to rebuild it. We can maintain this wharf by repairing it, and I hope that the well-known spirit of justice which animates the hon. Minister will induce him to take into consideration the details which may facilitate the settlement of this question.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) With regard to the Yamaska River, is this sum intended to complete the works?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Yes.

Mr. AUGER. (Translation.) What is the nature of these works?

Mr. AMYOT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) It is a deepening at the head of the St. John's Island at the shoals below Cardin's Island, at the lower entrance of the lock and at the rapids of St. Aimé.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) Is the work done by contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Yes.

Harbors and rivers, Ontario $43,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what purpose will $4,000 for Cobourg harbor be expended?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. On works in connection with the extension of the eastern pier.

Mr. CHARLTON. How is it proposed to expend $2,000 at Little Current, Lake Huron?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a work that has been going on for several years; it is dredging and blasting rock to improve the steamboat channel. This will complete the work. I understand the work has been very well done, and is much appreciated by steamboat captains and mariners.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is proposed to do with the $1,000 for Port Hope harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is proposed to add a further length to the breakwater.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For what is $4,000 required at Kingston?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is for work on the shoal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then as to the $10,000 or Midland harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That amount has been revoted three times. A deputation from the municipal council and the railway companies waited on the Government, and it was understood they were to proceed with their part of the work. They are to construct the cribs, and the material from the dredging will be thrown into them, so that a double object will be served: the crib work will be filled in and there will be an increased depth of water obtained.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I observe that the vote for the improvement of the channel of the River Ottawa above Pembroke has been dropped this year. I desire to draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that a statement has been made to me by steamboat owners and others interested in the navigation at that particular point, that an expenditure of between $2,000 and $3,000 is necessary to complete the improvement of the channel at that point, and, unless such expenditure is made, the previous expenditure of $5,000 or $6,000 will be practically lost. I would ask the Minister to consider the question with a view to placing an amount of say $3,000 in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Is that at the same place?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Yes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was not so informed. I will make a note of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What about $4,000 which it is proposed to expend at Sault Ste. Marie.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a very important work. The steamers that go to Lake Superior, when they reach Sault Ste. Marie, do not stop on our side because there is not sufficient depth of water and they cross over to the American side. We think we should give our own people a chance to have the steamers stop there, and I am informed by the engineer that $4,000 will go a long way towards remedying the evil complained of.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I called the attention of the Minister of Public Works early this Session to the condition of Bayfield harbor, where the work which had been done had been completely torn up last autumn. He forwarded me a photograph of the work, and I understood him to say that orders were given to construct the crib work of sufficient solidity to resist the storms there. But I have a letter from the reeve of Bayfield in which he mentions that unless some dredging is done there the harbor will be perfectly useless. Is that being attended to?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. As the winter has only just closed we could not do it before, but the intention is to do it now?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there is a dredge in Goderich.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And probably two or three days' work would be sufficient to clean out the sand and make the harbor available both for a harbor of refuge and for general harbor purposes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is true there is a drêdge at Goderich, but she is in great demand. I have given orders that she shall go from there in order to clear the entrances of two or three or four other harbors.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the sum appropriated for Bayfield harbor has already been expended, and whether the work intended to be completed at the north pier has been completed? My recollection is that $4,000 was voted for the purpose, and I would like to know if the money has been expended and the work done to the satisfaction of the Department. The information I get from Bayfield is of a very unsatisfactory character. I was not in the House when the hon. gentleman answered the hon. member for South Huron. If I had been I could have satisfied him that the statements he received where wholly unreliable. I am prepared to say that the larger portion of that money was absolutely thrown away, that it was worse than wasted because it was improperly done. Some of the piling was done in such a way that when they struck a boulder they would cut it off, and when a storm came a large portion was carried away and was afterwards used for fence posts, when they were thrown upon the bank.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is quite possible that there may have been something of that kind, and that some of the piles were not put down far enough to be protected in case of a storm. But I understood from the chief engineer that it was not so, that the work was proceeding well, and was well done. The objection which the hon. member for South Huron made the other day, and to which he called my attention, was that we had not been dredging, and that the entrance was not open. He was perfectly right in that. The idea was not when they began to dredge to open the channel altogether. It was purely and simply, when the work was going on, to give facilities for the smaller boats to go in, leaving a good deal of the work to be done afterwards, when the pier where the gap had occurred would be completed, leaving the water to scour and work out a portion of the accumulation of sand and *débris* which was found there. The photograph which I showed the hon. gentleman was only to show that the work was progressing well. I was glad the hon. gentleman called my attention to it because, after all, there might be negligence somewhere, and I am always glad when hon. gentlemen call my attention to anything of that kind, and I investigate it at once. But I understood from the engineer that the work was progressing well, and that he was waiting for the spring to go on with it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Has the break in the north pier been repaired?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. So I understood from the chief engineer.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is beyond a doubt that a large portion of the piles driven in there were not over 6 or 8 feet in length.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Last year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is repaired.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). True, but that money is all wasted. Nothing but the grossest possible negligence could have caused it. What I complain of is that the money voted by Parliament was wasted, simply because there was not proper superintendence. It is unreasonable that a man should be employed as clerk of works who lives at a long distance from the place, when there were an abundance of the hon. gentleman's friends near the place. He came from Goderich, and there was no reason why that should be. There was the expense of bringing the men and supplies from there, and there is actually a charge for travelling expenses. He should have employed a man who lived near the place and took an interest in the work, and he could thus have got supplies cheaper and avoided the cost of transport. As I know the hon. gentleman takes an interest in the charming little harbor of Port Albert, and as I believe a delegation from that place waited upon him and that he received them, as he always receives everybody, courteously, and as there were hopes that something would be done, I should like to ask him about that work. I may say that, although I am opposed to doing this kind of work by day work, by employing some person as superintendent who goes and gets his own friends to do the work, yet, I must say that in Port Albert the work has been very well done. I visited the place and I think the work was fairly well done; I do not think there was any ground of complaint. It will require a little more—not very much—to make it a very convenient harbor. The sum of $1,000, $2,000 or $3,000 expended there would be money well expended, and would be of the greatest possible advantage to the locality. It is one of the most important harbors we have on the shore of Lake Huron. A large amount of lumber, wood, grain and other articles are shipped from that port, and if the hon. gentleman could only see his way to expending a couple of thousand dollars there, I am satisfied that when he next comes to the locality he will come to the conclusion that I have come to, that the money was well expended.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that in one case the money was well expended.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am always willing to give credit where credit is due.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman said that only my friends were employed.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No; I said the superintendent employed his friends.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was going to say that I had to employ my friends rather than my opponents.

Mr. WILSON. Early in the Session I presented a petition from Port Stanley, from a very influential deputation, who came accompanied by a resolution of the county council, asking that a certain appropriation should be made to Port Stanley harbor. I would like to ask if the Minister has given the matter his consideration or not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That has been looked into, but I have not yet come to a decision about it.

Mr. WILSON. I think I had an equally gratifying answer last year. I was led to hope until the Supplementary Estimates came down; and when they came down, I was told to wait until next year: but hope deferred makes the heart sick, and I am getting a little tired of waiting so long. I think the Minister is well aware that that harbor is not safe, and that owing to its defective condition many lives have been lost. Perhaps he may say that the Government have not the control of the harbor, but that it is controlled by the Grand Trunk Railway. Still, I think it is the duty of the Government to see that the tolls collected by the Grand Trunk Railway are expended in repairing the harbor. Perhaps they have been; but I moved for a return a short time ago, and I found that that company had even neglected to return to the Government for a number of years the amount they had received as tolls, and the amount they had expended on the harbor. Therefore I say, that when the Government have deliberately neglected to enforce their agreement with that company, it is their bounden duty to see that the harbor is put in such a condition as will prevent such wrecks and serious losses of life as have taken place there. I still hope the Minister may put a small item in the Supplementary Estimates for Port Stanley. I must say that I am afraid he is injuring the prospects of the Government candidate in the next election; it is a good Tory preserve, having a large majority of Conservatives, and it would be to the interest of the Government to improve that harbor.

Mr. McCRANEY. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to Oakville harbor. I believe there was a deputation from Oakville down here two or three weeks ago to see the Minister, and I understand from those gentlemen that he received them very kindly, and led them to hope that something would be done. I suppose it is in the recollection of some hon. members that on the 5th of April, the day of the great storm in Lake Ontario, Oakville harbor was nearly entirely destroyed. At any rate, the east pier and lighthouse was entirely swept away, and it was supposed the loss was from $20,000 to $25,000. I understand that since that time the Minister has sent up his engineer to survey the harbor, and I trust that he has already made a report. I may say that Oakville harbor is one of great importance; it is the principal harbor between Toronto and Hamilton, it has a good depth of water, and it is the only safe harbor between these two places for vessels in a storm. I was there shortly after the great storm, and again a few days ago, and in the interval damage has been done fully to the extent of $1,000; so that delay is dangerous, and whatever is done should be done at once. The town has done all it could do for the harbor. It has expended upon it during the last ten years about $10,000; and having involved itself in debt for public improvements, it is not in a position now to rebuild the harbor, although it is quite willing to do all it possibly can to assist in that work, but unless the Government do something towards it, I am afraid the harbor will not be rebuilt. Therefore I hope the Minister will see his way to put something in the Supplementary Estimates for that purpose.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter has already received my attention. I was waited upon by a deputation some time ago in reference to it; the hon. gentleman, I think, was not present; but I was told that if the Government found that they could recommend to Parliament a vote of a certain sum of money for this work, the town would contribute one-half of the expense. That is certainly an encouragement; but I am not in a position to inform the hon. gentleman what we can do.

Mr. McCRANEY. I am very much pleased to hear the hon. Minister say that, and I am satisfied the town will be willing to contribute one-half.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. LISTER. I am not going to ask the Minister for any assistance for the harbor I am about to refer to; but I have a grievance to lay before the House from the people of Sarnia. We have a harbor there on which not a dollar of public money has ever been spent; it is a natural harbor, and the moment vessels get into the river they are protected from storms. But during the past year the Government for some purpose, thought proper to appoint a harbor master for the town of Sarnia. He left this Province and went to the United States, and representations were made to the Government by their own friends and by the people of Sarnia generally, asking that no appointment should be made to the vacancy; but in spite of the protestations of the people, the Government have appointed a harbor master to fill his place. For many years past American vessels, on their way to Lake Huron and Lake Superior, have been in the habit of touching the town of Sarnia and buying their supplies there, and the harbor master, appointed a year or two ago, collected fees from those vessels. Port Huron is situated immediately opposite the town of Sarnia. The result of the collection of these fees by the harbor master is that the town has completely lost the trade it had from vessels which were in the habit of calling there. American papers in Detroit, Port Huron, and the ports along the lakes had articles pointing out to American shipowners the consequence of touching at Sarnia, and speaking in harsh terms of the Government for the appointment of the harbor master. It is the only town where public money has not been expended, in which a harbor master has been appointed. The people are unanimous, regardless of politics, that there should be no harbor master there, and they have sent representations to the Government to that effect. Every wharf in Sarnia is owned by private individuals, and there has been no difficulty heretofore which it required a harbor master to settle. Windsor is in the same position as Sarnia, the wharves there being owned by private individuals, and Windsor has no harbor master. This appointment is a drag on the shipping and trade of the town; and if the Government will only cancel it, they will meet with the hearty approval of the people, because this appointment means the loss of thousands of dollars every year. The American vessels which formerly stopped at Sarnia are now stopping at Port Huron. American shippers feel that they have no harbor officers in their ports, except in Detroit, and that consequently our vessels are not charged harbor dues in American ports, it is not right that American vessels should have to pay harbor dues in Sarnia. For instance, I might cite the instance of a barge tow which had come there for supplies, and had to pay $30 in fees. The Americans look upon it as a swindle, and will not come unless the Government abolish these fees, and if they should do so they will be complying with the wishes of the whole people.

Mr. McLELAN. Last season, representations were made for the appointment of a harbor master in the port of Sarnia, on the ground that the river was often obstructed by rafts of timber and logs, and thus made unapproachable to vessels. The only dispute was as to who should be appointed, but on all sides there was a demand for a harbor master who would regulate trade and traffic and prevent the river being obstructed. The hon. gentleman gives as a reason for the cancellation of the appointment that no money has been expended there; but in Halifax, where no money has been expended, a harbor master is necessary.

Mr. LISTER. They have vast shipping.

Mr. McLELAN. Sarnia has also a great deal of shipping; and whether it be a natural or artificial harbor, if there is a large amount of shipping a harbor master is necessary. The Minister of Marine is absent, but I believe a proposition was submitted to him that no fees should be charged.

Mr. LISTER. American traders feel very bitterly on this subject. True, there was a petition from the people asking for a harbor master, but it was owing to a difficulty about the ferry, and that petition was got up by one of the persons interested in the ferry matter. He had an idea that if a harbor master was appointed, he would get the ferry to start from his own wharf. People signed that petition without knowing the consequences, and since then a petition has been sent to the Government, asking for the cancellation of the appointment. So far as the obstructions were concerned, they were not obstructions in the harbor at all, for the north harbor is a bay which is not navigable and people having lands adjoining the bay, have loaned it for the purpose of booming logs; but it was mentioned as a ground for the petition. There is not more than five feet of water there at the most. The object of the petition was that the ferry should be forced to leave the dock of the principal mover of the petition.

Harbors and Rivers, Manitoba.....$1,000 00

Mr. WATSON. I am sorry to see there is not a larger amount voted for harbors and rivers in Manitoba. Is it the intention of the Government to spend any amount on the Water Hen River?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. WATSON. I regret there is not an amount placed in the Estimates for improving Water Hen or White Mud Rivers this year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Those rivers were not mentioned last year, and therefore, no matter what may be the decision of the Government, they could not appear in these Estimates. They could only appear in the Supplementary Estimates.

North Saskatchewan River, British Columbia.... $15,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to the vote for North Saskatchewan River, but I would like to know what the hon. gentleman proposes to do with it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman sees we had another sum of $10,000 last year. As promised, there was a survey made of the river, the result of which is that the Chief Engineer has suggested that $15,000 should be applied in improving the North Saskatchewan River at Cole's Falls, some nine miles above the forks, by removing boulders, &c., so as to secure a depth of four feet or more at low water. Cole's Falls is said to be the worst part of the river east of Prince Albert. There is $5,000 of a re-vote and $10,000 of a new vote, and the estimate of the engineer is that it will cost $15,000 to improve the river.

Harbors and Rivers, &c., British Columbia.....$10,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will this amount of $8,500 do the work of removing the Dredger Rock in Victoria harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; I think that will complete the work.

Dredging.....$139,000 00

Mr. KING. Will the hon. gentleman say where the steam dredge will be employed during the summer in New Brunswick?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say.

Mr. KING. Does the hon. gentleman mean to do anything on the Grand Lake?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say where the dredging will be done. The hon. gentleman knows probably that the $30,000 we have for these Maritime Provinces is to work the dredges and the tugs, and so on, and the dredges are sent where they are required.

Mr. KING. I would remind the hon. gentleman that a survey was made at one point some years ago and $5,000 was voted, but very little of that has been expended up to the present time, and the necessity of dredging there is much greater now than it was when the survey was made.

Mr. VAIL. The vote for the other Provinces for dredging is separated, but there is only one vote for all the Maritime Provinces. I should like to know what portion is going to be expended in Nova Scotia and where?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the wants of Nova Scotia are greater than those of New Brunswick or those of New Brunswick greater than those of Nova Scotia, a little more may be expended where it is needed than the exact proportion of, say, $10,000 in each of the three Provinces. If it were divided, we might not have enough to work a dredge in one Province where it was required, while we might have enough if the vote was taken for the three together. It is for the advantage of the service to take it in this way.

Mr. VAIL. But Nova Scotia has ten times as many harbors as any other Province.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think Nova Scotia is neglected in dredging.

Mr. BURPEE. I think I have to complain of the dredging on the River St. John. Before Confederation we had a dredge specially built and appropriated to clear the channel between Fredericton and St. John. When we went into Confederation that dredge was taken charge of by the Dominion, and another dredge, a superior one, no doubt, was put in her place, but this dredge, instead of being employed on the river St. John as the intention was, has been employed about the wharves of St. John and Fredericton and other wharves. Some points on that river which required attention have been neglected because of the pressure of parties representing the cities at each end of the navigation of this river to employ the dredge continually around those wharves. I do not see what object they can have in clearing the channel around the wharves, if the channel on the river, which gives them employment, is allowed to be filled up. I know that, in one case, the dredge was taken from the principal shoals on the river to dredge out a channel to a private cove. The shoal at Oromocto, as is well known, when a dry season occurs, like last year, there are numerous vessels, both from the United States and from St. John, carrying lumber that have to unload part of their cargo and tow it, in order to get over the shoal, and then reload. That causes great inconvenience. I hope the Minister will make a note of this. Mr. Perley, his chief engineer, knows what is needed very well, and knows that, in the time of the late Government, a work was commenced to put more water into the channel to keep it clear, but there has not been a sufficient dam made up to this time to keep it clear, and it requires dredging.

Mr. WATSON. Where will this $10,000 be expended in Manitoba?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the same way that we expended the vote of last year, that is, in working the dredge and the tug at the mouth of the White Mud River.

Mr. WATSON. I hope it will be used better than it was last year. Last year the tug on the White Mud River was not worked at all. Two years ago there was $10,000 voted for the improvement of the Water Hen River. The engineer made a survey and laid out the money. He built a couple of scows and a small dredge at Westbourne, on the

White Mud River. Now these dredges have lain there ever since on the banks of the river. Of the whole $10,000 voted not five cents worth of improvements have been made on the White Mud River, or on the Water Hen River, or on the lake. I would like to see some portion of this money, or another sum in the Supplementary Estimates, to operate this plant that is lying there idle.

Slides and Booms..... $16,800 00

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask the Minister whether any portion of this appropriation is to be used to improve the Quinze Rapids. I may say that a moderate sum of money would improve those rapids and make them passable. There has been some work done there, I believe, but the company has failed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is for the Ottawa works.

Roads and Bridges..... $19,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This $11,500 for bridges over the River Ottawa at Ottawa city, and over the Rideau Canal looks like a new work.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to put these bridges in order once for all, and then we will only have to keep them up.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 12:45 a.m., (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 14th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 22) respecting interest in the Province of British Columbia.—(Mr. Thompson.)

WORKS IN OR OVER NAVIGABLE WATERS.

The House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 130) respecting certain works constructed in or over navigable waters.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LANGELIER. This Bill provides that no work heretofore constructed shall, so far as the same interferes with navigation, be lawful work, unless the site has been approved by the Governor in Council. This interferes with the Quebec Harbor Commission.

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose to strike out clauses two, three and six, which will remove the objection of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES. That declaration, to a large extent, removes the objections taken against this Bill. The hon. gentleman sees that, in the Maritime Provinces, which are intersected with bays, creeks and rivers, there are many hundreds of bridges which have been built heretofore without any direct legislative authority, in the sense of an Act being passed. They have been built under the direction of the Governor in Council of the several Provinces, on votes of money given by the Legislatures, without pointing out a specific place where they should be built. In the old Act, there was nothing to affect these old bridges, and they were not obliged to come in to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council with plans and specifications in order to render those bridges legal. If I understand the hon. gentleman aright, this will go further and will compel the local authorities to obtain from the Governor in Council a legislation of their existing bridges, and that seems to me an evil.

Mr. THOMPSON. It does not compel the legislation of the existing bridges, but it enables the Governor in Council to legalise them. It will compel them to obtain legislation if they have to be rebuilt.

Mr. WELDON. Rebuilt or repaired.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, I do not think it goes so far as that.

Mr. WELDON. There might be a nice distinction drawn between rebuilding and repairing.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think, where the old bridge has gone down and there is a new one to be built, there ought to be some control to see that navigation is not interfered with by the new bridge to any greater extent than by the old. I know of some cases where there could not be any ground for disputing the lawfulness of the old bridge, but a new bridge is built, perhaps, with lower passageways or narrower passageways between the piers. I think there ought to be some control as to that. If not, wherever there has been a bridge built under supervision, not interfering with navigation, a new bridge substantially interfering with navigation may be lawful.

Mr. DAVIES. But the ninth section provides for that, because it says the Act shall not affect any bridge built before the 17th May, 1882, which hereafter requires to be rebuilt or repaired, if such bridge does not interfere with navigation to any greater extent than before. The law already provides that, if any such bridge is repaired in a manner to interfere with navigation, the authority of the Governor in Council must be obtained, and, if that is retained, any old bridges which are repaired in such a way as to interfere more than they formerly did with navigation, will require the authority of the Governor in Council. It does not appear to me to be judicious to go further. In the Province from which I come many of our bridges are built of timber which requires to be replaced every five or six years. We have not introduced stone bridges to the extent that other Provinces have, and it would be very hard if, every time a bridge is to be repaired, plans have to be submitted to the Governor in Council, although the repairing does not cause any greater interference with navigation than before.

Mr. MITCHELL. If I understood the Minister of Justice aright, he proposes to strike out the second, third and sixth sections of this Bill, and by that means to leave existing structures free from its operation.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, it will not declare those structures to be illegal, and, if they are illegal at common law, we have power by this Bill to declare them legal.

On section 4,

Mr. LANGELIER. It is in this clause that the amendment I suggested in the interest of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners should be introduced. At present, if any work of that kind is to be built within the limits of the harbor of Quebec, no application has to be made to the Governor in Council. The only authority which has to be resorted to is the harbor commissioners. The Governor in Council has nothing to do with the construction of any wharves or piers, or anything of that kind, within the limits of the harbor of Quebec.

Mr. THOMPSON. They do that under a special Statute, and I do not think this clause interferes with that.

Mr. WELDON. The harbor of St. John, under an old Statute, is the property of the corporation. It is not a public harbor in the sense that other harbors are which have been transferred to the Dominion, but it is entirely private property and belongs to the corporation by Royal charter, confirmed by an Act of 1784. The corporation have always taken the power to have a wharf built by a harbor line defined by the Legislature of New Brunswick. I think there ought to be some reservation of the rights of that corporation, because the question might be raised. My hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) says we could not touch private property, but a nice question might arise, and I think those rights might be reserved.

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose to add to this clause the words: "For which no sufficient sanction otherwise exists." If there is no sufficient legal sanction for the work otherwise, they may come to the Governor in Council. That will save the rights of everybody, and will only include in the scope of this jurisdiction those works in respect of which there is no means now of making them lawful.

Mr. TUPPER. Would not that follow from the striking out of those other clauses? I think that would meet the difficulty of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon).

Mr. BURPEE. The question raised by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is partly met by striking out those sections, but not the whole. As I explained yesterday, these wharves are for the accommodation of the farmers generally, in moving their agricultural products, and in some cases they are also for the purpose of securing the banks of the river from being washed away by freshets. Every year new constructions are being made for that purpose. They are generally inexpensive, ranging from $100 to $1000. I take it that if the construction is required, the party requiring it would still have to come to the Government for a permit, even though it might not cost more than $100.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think not, for the reason that the words I have introduced now save all rights, whether private rights or those conferred by the Statute; so that the application to the Governor in Council is only to be made *in respect to those structures for* which there is no legal sanction. If the private proprietor, in such a case as the hon. gentleman speaks of, has a right to erect a wharf, he need not come here to get it confirmed; but if there exists no law for it, and it is an unlawful structure at common law, then the Bill requires him to come to the Governor in Council for permission.

Mr. WELDON. In common law any erection built where the public right of navigation exists, is illegal. Now, these small wharves on the St. John are built in some cases for the purposes of protecting the banks from freshets, and may not extend more than twelve feet into the water, being simply an abutment, the water being deep, for the purpose of facilitating the landing of produce and cattle going up and down the river.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is very undesirable that we should interfere with these, or be troubled by them, but I think when we have inserted the words which exempt from the operation of the clause all those structures in respect to which there are legal rights, there would be no difficulty.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I see this clause sets forth that duplicate copies of plans and specifications have to be registered in the county or district of the different Provinces where they belong. Now, in my Province we have no registry offices for deeds in each county, and there might be a difficulty unless the word "district" would include the whole Province; otherwise it needs to be worded a little differently.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman is right, as we have but one registry office for the island—for the Province, not for the county.

Mr. THOMPSON. I move to amend the twenty-fourth line, by striking out the word "or" and inserting the words "county or Province."

Mr. TUPPER. I would suggest whether the word "duplicates," in fourth line, should not be "duplicate." The plural word might be construed to require parties to deposit duplicates of the plans and duplicates of the descriptions. In the Bill which the select committee prepared last Session, the words "duplicate thereof" were used, instead of the present expression, "duplicates thereof." I understand it is not the intention to require a duplicate of the plan, but only of the description.

Mr. THOMPSON. We might make it read, "and duplicate of each of them."

Mr. WELDON. With regard to the St. John River, there are large alluvial lands at its mouth. The river is deep, and the small wharves erected on each side are useful for protecting the banks as well as for affording conveniences for shipping. I think these wharves should be exempted from the operation of this Act. My hon. friend from Sunbury (Mr. Brupee) has five of them opposite his place on the river bank.

Mr. THOMPSON. Could such structures be said to *interfere with navigation at all?*

Mr. BURPEE. Not at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then they would not come under the Bill.

Mr. BURPEE. The Local Government, in such cases, go to half the expense of building those wharves, and the people or the locality interested pay the other half.

Mr. DAVIES. If the structures interfere with navigation they are illegal, and can be removed on a complaint made by any one. We do not propose to legalise them or to declare them illegal; they take their chance as before, except that after this Bill passes the Governor in Council can make them legal, and this is the only way it can be done, because the local authority cannot do it

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

REPRESENTATION OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES IN PARLIAMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of Bill (No. 115) respecting the representation of the North-West Territories in the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. MILLS moved in amendment:

That the Bill be not read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of so amending the same as to provide that every male person of twenty-one years of age, who is a natural-born or naturalised subject of Her Majesty, and who has been a resident for twelve months in the Territories, shall be entitled to vote for the election of a member of the House of Commons.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. MILLS moved in amendment:

That the Bill be not read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole to amend the same by striking out that part of clause 18 requiring a deposit of $200 on the part of any person becoming a candidate for an election to the House of Commons.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. WATSON moved in amendment:

That the Bill be not read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole to amend the same so as to protect voters against the undue influence of Government officials by providing for voting by ballot.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

HALIFAX REFORMATORY FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS.

Mr. THOMPSON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 134) to amend an Act respecting a reformatory for certain juvenile offenders in the county of Halifax, in the Province of Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to. Bill read the second time.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON.

Mr. THOMPSON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 135) to amend an Act respecting offences against the person. He said: This is a Bill which was passed in the Senate for the purpose of removing a doubt which has existed, principally, I believe, in the Province of Ontario. It has been held there that in the case of the desertion of a wife by a husband the wife is not competent to testify against the husband, and this Bill is to remove that doubt

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY—CONSTITUTION OF THE SENATE.

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

Mr. MILLS. I propose, Sir, to move an amendment as to the desirability of amending the British North America Act so far as it relates to the constitution of the Senate. I think that the experience we have had during the past ten years shows that in that particular, at all events, our constitution is seriously defective, and that the purpose which a second Chamber was intended to serve in our parliamentary system has not been secured by the Senate as it is now constituted. It is not my intention to detain the House at any length in the discussion of this question, because I have no doubt we shall, at no distant day, be called upon to consider the question at the hustings, and whatever conclusion we may reach here to-day will not be a final settlement of this very important question. My first objection to the Senate as at present constituted, is, that it is inconsistent with the federal principle of government with which we have set out. In the preamble of the British North America Act we declare that we organise our union on a federal basis, and we provide in our constitution for the appointment of a second Chamber, to protect in some degree the interest and the authority of the various Provinces and their powers against encroachment. At the same time we do not allow the Provinces in any way to exercise any control over the appointment of the second Chamber, but we provide that it shall be appointed by Her Majesty's representative upon the advice of the responsible Ministers of the day; and while we make that provision, we practically appoint the Senate without reference to the views that may be entertained, or the interests that may require to be guarded, on the part of any of the Provinces of the Dominion. Our Senate as constituted is not consistent with any recognised principle in any well-considered system of parliamentary government. A Senate, if it is to protect or guard Provincial rights or Provincial interests, should in some way be controlled by the Provinces. If it is to be simply an ordinary national institution, there ought not to be any Provincial control over the appointment of Senators, and there ought not to be any limitation as to the number of Senators; but when we declare that there shall be a fixed number of Senators from the respective Provinces, who shall be residents of the same, it is clear that we are recognising the Senate as in some way a protector of Provincial rights and Provincial interests; and yet it is quite possible that the Administration which enjoys the confidence of this House, as a whole, may not be possessed of the confidence of the majority of the representatives of all the Provinces. Now, Sir, we remember very well that in 1867, at the first meeting of Parliament held after the Union, the Province of Nova Scotia sent here but one member supporting the Administration; and the Senators who were to protect the interests of that Province were appointed by a Government which enjoyed the confidence of only one representative out of the nineteen from the Province. It is, I think, clear that in this particular the Senate is not in harmony with the federal principle of our constitution. There are, no doubt, other features of the constitution which are a departure from the general principle on which it is based. There is the provision with regard to property and civil rights. It is within the power of the Local Legislatures to give their assent to legislation on those subjects by this House, and thus practically to transfer their power to this Parliament; but so widely at variance with the federal principle of Government has that provision of our constitution been regarded, that it has never been acted upon, and, in fact, it is a dead letter. Then, there is the power of veto which is given to the Federal Government over Acts which lie wholly beyond its province, and within the exclusive province of the Local Legislatures. It never was intended that that power should be exercised by the Federal Government, except to disallow Acts which are *ultra vires* of the Local Legislatures. But there is no such limitation laid down in the British North America Act, and it is plain, from our experience, that in every instance in which the federal principle has been departed from, mischievous consequences have been the result. And our experience with reference to the constitution of the Senate shows that it is not an efficient second Chamber—that while it may offer no serious obstacle to the conduct of public affairs, so long as those who are in political sympathy with the majority of that body control their administration—yet, if there was a change of Government, and the administration of public affairs should pass into the hands of those not in political accord with the Senate, it is plain, I think, that we should have a deadlock in our legislation and our administration. In fact, in the Senate, as at present constituted, there are no means of adjusting it to the public opinion of the country. In England, if the House of Lords puts itself in opposition to the views of the majority of the House of Commons, it is in the power of the Executive to increase the number of Peers until the second Chamber is brought in harmony with the first. It is a common saying that under the English constitution you have a system of mutual checks and guarantees. The arbitrary power of the Crown is checked by the power of making or controlling money appropriations in the House of Commons; the arbitrary power in the House of Commons is controlled by the power of dissolution vested in the Crown; and the arbitrary power of obstruction, in the House of Lords, is controlled by the power of creating new Peers. In fact, the existence of that power renders its exercise almost altogether unnecessary. There is no such check in our constitutional system; there is no means of bringing the Senate into harmony with the House of Commons or with the settled opinion of the country. We know, looking at what has already transpired, that the ordinary life of the Senate is twenty years, while the ordinary life of the House of Commons is but three years; so that it would require half a generation to bring the second Chamber into harmony with the first. This is an age of very great change and very rapid progress, and it is clear that the Senate, as at present constituted, would provoke a revolution in this country if it were to exercise its power, as it undoubtedly could exercise it, in seriously opposing the wishes of the majority of the House of Commons and the views of the country. It seems to me that it is very important we should seek to make such changes in the constitution of the second Chamber as will bring it more under the immediate control of the public opinion of the country. There are many ways in which

this might be done. In fact, if we were to seek to frame a system which would embrace a second Chamber that would be, in the smallest degree possible, beneficial, I do not think a system better calculated to accomplish the object could be devised than the one which already exists. Why, there is no motive to action on the part of the second Chamber. There is no useful purpose that a second Chamber may serve which the second Chamber in this country has served. I believe it is a fact that the gentlemen who compose the Senate are infinitely more interested in occupying what is called the Senators' gallery in this Chamber, than in occupying the seats which belong to them, in the discharge of their duties, in the second Chamber. That is an unfortunate condition of things. There is a score of useful enquiries conducted almost every year by Committees of the House of Lords, not one of which is undertaken by the second Chamber here. There are many and important duties that the second Chamber might undertake. Valuable information that might be collected, important conclusions that might be reached, and which would greatly facilitate Parliament in the discharge of its legislative functions, and the Government in the discharge of its administrative duties, which are wholly unattended to, because this House is far too busy, in the discharge of the duties that already devolve upon it, to undertake them, and because the Senate has no intention or inclination to undertake them. The Senate is in no way amenable to public opinion; it is not controlled by the intelligent public opinion of the country, and the majority of the Senators are best pleased when they find they have little or nothing to do. In fact, they adjourn from time to time because they claim they have nothing to do, and yet there are many very important and highly useful enquiries which might be undertaken, but which are wholly neglected by that body. We know that there is a tendency in every legislative body to extend its authority beyond the constitutional boundary. There is a disposition in men in every sphere of life to arrogate to themselves a greater amount of authority than is actually necessary in the discharge of the duties assigned to them. This Parliament is, perhaps, no exception to this rule; and the very notion of giving to the Provinces representation in the Senate Chamber, as Provinces, in theory at least, was intended to make the Senators the special guardians of Provincial rights and interests. But on what occasion has the Senate ever come to the rescue of the Provinces? On what occasion has it upheld the authority of the Provinces against parliamentary or ministerial encroachment? We know what has been done in the way of disallowing Provincial railway charters and of interfering with measures which are specially under the control of the Local Legislatures, as, for instance, the Streams Bill; we know that the Government, in many cases, have arbitrarily gone beyond their proper constitutional sphere by interfering with the duties devolving on another Legislature, and for which another Government is responsible to the people of the Province, and yet, so far as I know, there has not been a single instance in which the Senate has remonstrated or undertaken to protect the interests of the Provinces of which, it was supposed, when our constitutional system was adopted the Senators would be the special guardians. It requires no examination in detail of the work done by the Senate to say that it has altogether failed in its duties in this particular; it requires no examination in detail of the work that has been done by the Senate to show that it has not performed any of the important duties which specially belong to it. The work which we supposed it would have done, it has left undone; and many of the things which it has done, are things which it would have been better, in the public interest, to have left undone. Then we supposed the Senate would represent he settled, progressive opinions of the country. It is not supposed to be subject to popular impulses to the same extent as the more popular Chamber. We know this is the experience of the United States. We know that, under the constitution of the United States, the Senate, while it has resisted those short-lived popular impulses which have sometimes moved the House to action, has, nevertheless, been under the control of public opinion. Where the public have had time to reflect, and where they adhere to their conclusions, upon an important question of public policy, the Senate of the United States represents the opinion of the country upon such questions quite as decidedly as do the members of the House of Representatives; but this cannot be said of our Senate. We supposed the Senate would stand up for popular interests, especially where moral considerations were wholly upon that side of the question. Yet have the Senate done so in any important public question? How did the Senate act upon the subject of the gerrymander? Why, the hon. gentleman himself, who was leading this House in 1872, laid down an important rule of public policy, and that rule was assented to by this side of the House; there was no difference of opinion with regard to it. The hon. gentleman said it would be wholly contrary to his opinion of what was right and expedient to undertake to form a constituency out of parts of different counties. The people were in the habit, he said, of acting together in their agricultural meetings, in their municipal meetings, in their political meetings, and in meetings for judicial and other purposes. That a man sometimes entered into the township or village council, he became a leading and influential man, he became known to his people and enjoyed their confidence, and rose from the township council to the county council, and from the county council to Parliament; and yet, if you take off the township in which he resided and put it into a county to which he was a stranger, you will destroy his opportunities of promotion and of public service, those opportunities of public service which those who knew and trusted him would permit him to exercise; and yet we find the hon. gentleman, for the purpose of securing a party advantage, ten years later, wholly abandoning that position and taking up a wholly different line. There was an opportunity for the Senate to stand by a well-settled principle and an accepted doctrine, a principle of right and justice, of fair play and political decency, and to maintain it against the views of a simple mechanical majority in this House, the views of a majority who were looking to their own interests and not to the general well-being of the country. We know that the hon. gentleman who leads the Government has always favored a legislative union. He declared himself in favor of that at the inception of our federal system. He declared himself as preferring a legislative union at the very time that the Quebec resolutions were under discussion in the old Canadian Parliament. The hon. gentleman has done so on more than one occasion since. Yet I apprehend that there are certain important reasons why our federal system should be fairly carried out, and, in order to fairly carry it out, it is important that the constitution of the Senate should be changed, and the Senate made amenable to public opinion, and subjected to popular control. The position of the Senate at the present time is one that is very far from satisfactory. Those hon. gentlemen are not under the control of public opinion; they are not called upon to pay any regard to popular wishes or popular prejudices. They are not in a position to acquire that knowledge of public questions which belongs to members of this House. I think it may be laid down as a sound political axiom that, in order that men may be in accord with the country, and in order that they may rightly apprehend the spirit and tendency of the day to which they belong, they must in some degree be dependent upon their fellow-men throughout the country. We know, if we look at the progress of the Mother Country since the begin-

ning of this century, the great progress that has been made politically, materially and socially, by the people of the United Kingdom, has been made in spite of the prejudices and the opposition of the more cultured, the better informed, and more wealthy classes. The movement of society has been from beneath and not from above. The intellectual light of the superior classes has not been that by which the progress of the nation has been guided. We know that, in order that men may fairly represent the community, it is necessary that they should be a portion of the community, they should not stand apart, they should not stand aloof, they should not be an isolated or separate class, having no points of contact with the public at large. The House of Lords, no doubt, is far better informed, far more enlightened, far more cultured in the aggregate, than the masses of the people of the United Kingdom; and yet the masses of the people of the United Kingdom, for the past seventy-five years—the majority of them, at least—have been right, and the majority of the House of Lords has been wrong. There can be no doubt of that. So that, in order that a body may be a useful body, in order that it may reflect public opinion, in order that it may be in sympathy with the age, in order that it may legislate in harmony with the requirements of the country, it is necessary that it should be an integral part of the country, and this you do not have in a Senate, a nominated body, the members of which receive their appointments from the Ministers of the Crown, and receive them for life. I dare say, even if we were to give the hon. gentleman the power of naming a House of Commons, he might find, perhaps, a larger number of highly cultured and intelligent men to compose the House than those who compose it at this moment, but he could not constitute a more influential body, he could not thus create a body which would have as much influence with the public, a body in whose deliberations and discussions the people would take the same interest; and precisely so it is with regard to the constitution of the Senate. In the constitution of a second Chamber, it is important that all classes of the community should be represented; in fact, it should be the community itself in miniature, and, if it is defective in this respect, I do not care how intelligent the members may be, I do not care how assiduous they might be in the discharge of their duties, and we know they have not been that in the Senate as now constituted, the public would take very little interest in what they do. Every man in public life looks at the public questions that come before him, in a great degree, from his own standpoint; he does not take an exhaustive view, he does not consider the question from every possible point of view; it is, in the nature of things, impossible for him to do so; human capacity is limited, and the result is that he succeeds in interesting in the views which he expresses and the opinions which he entertains, but a fraction of the community. Now, in order that we may have a second Chamber fairly representing the opinions of the country, capable of holding in check this House when it is wrong, capable of co-operating with it when it is right, capable of preventing mischief, and capable of defending that which is in the public interest, it is necessary that such a Chamber should enjoy the confidence of, and stand in sympathy with, the great mass of the population of the country. In order that this may be done, it is necessary that the Chamber should emanate from the people themselves, and feel its responsibility to them. I do not propose that a second Chamber should be created as a rival to this House, and if you limit its numbers there is no danger of its being so. I say that one important thing to give a legislative body a very considerable influence in the country, is, that it should be a pretty numerous body. A second Chamber, in order to become a rival to this House, would have to be a large body. I do not propose that we should create a second Chamber that is anything like as numerous as this House. I believe that half the numbers of those who now compose the Senate would be large enough. A Chamber in which you would return from Ontario half the present number of Senators, that is, twelve; twelve from the Province of Quebec, twelve from the Maritime Provinces, and a proportionate number from the other Provinces to the west, would be a second Chamber capable of discharging those duties which it is important that a second House should discharge. It has been well observed by Mr. Mill, in his work on Representative Government, that one House, where the powers it possesses are large and embrace a great number and variety of important subjects, can never well be entrusted with parliamentary authority. It has no second body to consult, it feels under no restraint, and the tendency is to use arbitrarily the power which belongs to the majority. Now, Sir, that is one of the evils we have experienced in this Parliament, and which has been exhibited during the past seven or eight years, and it is due to the fact that, so far as the present Administration is concerned, we are without a second Chamber. The Senate has taken a long holiday. It has done nothing. Why, the vast majority of those who occasionally, by fits and starts, sit elsewhere, when it suits their purpose, have been appointed by the hon. gentleman; they know that they owe their positions to him. As an eminent Irish statesman and jurist once said of the Irish peers, "they are the sheep of his pasture." It is he who has made them, and not they themselves. They feel that if they were not to-day precisely as he desires, they would be ungrateful, and they would be exhibiting the absence of some of those qualities of mind that do most to dignify human nature. So the hon. gentleman has the Senate in his keeping, and if the hon. gentleman were out of office and was sitting on this side of the House, the Senate, which at present is wholly useless, under those circumstances would become mischievous, and if it were not mischievous it would be owing to the hon. gentleman's forbearance. Practically, as the Senate is at present constituted, in case a Reform Administration were in power, we have a body which would place the power of veto in the hands of the minority of the House of Commons, that is to say, entirely in the hands of the hon. gentleman for the next ten years to come. Now I say that is an intolerable condition of things. I need only state that fact to show that the present system ought not to be perpetuated, that it ought to be changed at the earliest possible moment. Sir, I am not going to detain the House unnecessarily in the discussion of this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. I know those hon. gentlemen who have given their minds no trouble, who have never thought upon the subject of our constitutional system, who are quite content if the Government will give means for building a dock or a harbor in their county, and thus enable them to come back again—I know they will listen with impatience to any discussion of this sort. They think matters as they now stand are well enough, and they would like to let that well enough alone. But I believe the majority of us—the whole of this side, and I trust the majority in the country, are inclined to take a different view. They regard the second Chamber, as it is now constituted, as a nuisance which ought to be abated. They regard it as a wholly unnecessary element in our constitutional system; they regard it as a dead shoot that ought to be eliminated. Sir, I think that a second Chamber is necessary. I think the events that have transpired in this House for the past six and seven years show that a second Chamber is necessary. I think that arbitrary and uncontrolled power ought not to be in the hands of any party or any man, and it is because I think so, that I am in favor of changing the constitution of the Senate. I will therefore move:

To leave out all the words after the word "That" and add the following instead thereof:—The present method of constituting the Senate is inconsistent with the Federal principle in our system of Government, it makes that body independent of the people and the Crown, and is in other material respects defective, and that appropriate steps should be taken to secure such amendments of the British North America Act as to make the Senate directly responsible to the people in the several Provinces of the Dominion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to say but a very few words in answer to the speech of the hon. gentleman. It is quite evident, from the time it is proposed, and the manner of its proposition, that the hon. gentleman does not expect, could not expect, and knows, that there can be no satisfactory or full discussion of this question in this Chamber during the present Session. If the hon. gentleman really desired to have a full discussion, a full deliberation, and to get the opinion of this House as representatives of the people, as to the constitution of the Senate, he would have moved it after due notice, he would have moved it early in the Session, he would have moved it so that it could be discussed as a substantive proposition But everyone knows that not only the hon. gentleman, but other hon. gentlemen on the other side, are desirous of airing their opinions in order that they may go to the country. It is quite evident that the hon. gentlemen opposite have an uneasy suspicion that there is going to be an immediate dissolution, an immediate election, and they are exceedingly anxious, and they are very much afraid.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. EDGAR. Come on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am bound to believe that the hon. gentlemen are not afraid of it, still, they are preparing for it; and the hon. gentleman has aired this subject at the eleventh hour of this Session, not for the purpose of any man, woman or child being able to make up their mind on the proposition, but simply as a little kite or balloon thrown up for the public to look at. This is one of the great questions, among many other great questions, brought up during this Session for consideration at the polls. The hon. gentleman stated in his resolution, and in the beginning of his speech, that the constitution of the Senate was contrary to the federal principle of our constitution. Well, we have got the federal principle, certainly. Every Province has given contributions of its own, given power of its own, and, Mr. Speaker, *quoad* the Dominion Government, the principle on which this Parliament was formed, and the Executive is formed, and the powers of the Crown is administered, is not on the federal principle, but on the principle of the British constitution, and it is so declared in the preamble of the British North America Act, which says:

"Whereas the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united in one Dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar to that of the United Kingdom."

Not any other principle, not the principle stated by the hon. gentleman, but "with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom." Well, Mr. Speaker, we have the British constitution, so far as the Senate is concerned, and the Executive is concerned; and on the other side of the line there is another constitution, a very good constitution, a noble constitution, Mr. Speaker; but it is not our constitution, it is not the British constitution. They are both good, they are both excellent in their way, but we must have one, or we must have the other, it appears to me.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot have hermaphrodite.

Mr. MILLS. That is what we have got.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must have one or the other. The majority of the people of the Dominion draw their inspiration and their constitutional principles from the example of the Mother Country, from the constitution of the Mother Country, from the constitution of Great Britain and Ireland, and they do not draw them from the United States. The hon. gentleman objects very much to the Upper House, on the ground that they are useless. If they are useless it can do no harm. What complaint, then, can there be against the House of Lords if they do no harm? There is no principle of government in which civilised countries which desire to have a constitution, more fixed than that where a country has an established constitution; there must be a wrong shown before there should be any alteration made in that constitution. If every person chose to theorise as does the hon. gentleman, to say that this will be better in my opinion, and that will be better in my opinion, here a little and there a little, there would be no finality, there would be no fixity of the constitution. Our constitution is a good one as it is and it is satisfactory for all purposes; the country is going on well; the laws passed by this House are good laws and are not objected to by the other House; the country is developing very rapidly. And why this uneasiness to alter the constitution?

Mr. MILLS. Why did you alter it last year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says the Upper House is at my beck and under my control.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, how are they under my beck and under my control? I am here holding my present position as having the confidence of a majority of the House.

Mr. HESSON. And the confidence of the people.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says I have the confidence of the country too. I believe the majority in the House truly represent the feelings, wishes and opinions of the majority of the people in the Dominion. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) objects that the Upper House, during the time I have been here enjoying the confidence of a majority of this House, did not oppose the feeling, and wishes of a majority of this House, and therefore oppose the feelings, wishes and opinions of the majority of the people themselves. They are in harmony with this House; this House is in harmony with the people. And what objection can there be to that? Does the hon. gentleman want to have one House set against the other? The hon. gentleman, as a Liberal, as an extreme Reformer, objects because the Upper House agrees with the wishes and feelings of the majority of the people. The Reformers in England attack the House of Lords because the majority is opposed to the opinions of the majority of the people. I believe in the case of the House of Lords, no Liberal Government, except in very special cases, has found any difficulty in getting on with that body.

Mr. MILLS. The Government have power to increase the number.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This has been the experience of Mr. Gladstone. The hon. gentleman knows, and this House knows, that for very many years Mr. Gladstone has been at the head of the Liberal Administration; that the Conservative Administrations in England have been few and short-lived; that really England has, ever since the Reform Bill was passed, except during six or seven years, or perhaps a little more, been governed by a series of Liberal Administrations. And yet those Liberal Governments have hitherto found no difficulty in governing the country, and in those few cases in which the House of Lords has differed from the House of Commons, in which they have shown their independence of principle, whenever

a measure, after once passing the House of Commons, and after being rejected by the House of Lords, was again sent to the Upper House, the House of Lords have never, after ascertaining that the Bill was in accordance with the wishes of the people, I do not remember now an instance, rejected the measure on its second return in a subsequent Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How about marriage with a deceased wife's sister Bill? They have rejected that, I think, several times.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a question of morals. Under our constitution we have responsible government. Do we wish to surrender responsible government? Do we wish to adopt the American system so far as that is concerned? If the hon. gentleman wishes to adopt the American constitution then I can quite understand a second Chamber being constituted with powers equal to those of the Senate of the United States. Surely we represent the people, surely as representatives of the people we ought to have the initiatory power on most subjects of legislation; and so long as we have responsible government this House can at any moment, as representing the people, dismiss the Ministers, and consequently obtain other Ministers more fully representing the opinions and wishes of the people to take their places. But if the Upper House is to be altered according to the American system and be elected by the people, as members to this House are, they must have the same powers; and substantially the Senate of the United States at this moment has the same power as the House of Representatives, and is a portion of the executive, and is undoubtedly more powerful than the House of Lords. Indeed, the House of Representatives is a comparatively unimportant body in comparison with the Senate of the United States. Do we wish to diminish our position and authority, to alter the principle that Ministers must be responsible to this House and not to the other, and have a check in the shape of another branch of the Legislature claiming in the same way as we do have a right to claim to represent the wishes of the people. Although in imitation of the British constitution, all matters connected with the expenditure of money must initiate in the House of Commons, the Senate can amend our money Bills; they can destroy them in fact, and they do use that power without any hesitation. Do we want to adopt that principle and that system? You cannot avoid this dilemma: If you wish to adopt an elective Senate, no matter what may be the process of election, you must give them the same power as this House possesses, they will claim it, they will take it, and you cannot resist it. Therefore you cannot have responsible government and have any government that will last any time, if the Ministers must be responsible to this Chamber, and at the same time responsible to the other Chamber, You cannot have the two.

Mr. MILLS. How was it from 1854 to 1867 in Old Canada. There were two elective bodies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The experiment was so unsuccessful that the leader of the hon. gentleman's own party, the Hon. George Brown, voted for the abolition of the elective Senate and favored the nominative system. It has lasted ever since.

Mr. MILLS. The Hon. George Brown never favored an elective second Chamber. He opposed it at the time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know he was always opposed to it, and a majority of the representatives of the people found for once that the Hon. George Brown was right, and that Chamber, after having been tried for two Parliaments, was found to be so utterly unworkable that with his consent it was abolished. More than that, the Hon. George Brown was one of the founders of the present constitution—one of those who worked very diligently, very zealously and with great ability in the direction of this constitution of 1867; and it was a fixed principle with him, in the settlement of this constitution, that an elective Upper House should be done away with, and that we should return to the old system in which we should have a Chamber, not controlling this House, but acting as a court of supervision, acting very much as the House of Lords does in England—acting and protecting people from the chance of surprise. I must say, with all due deference to the opinion of the hon. gentleman that I think the Senate has performed its functions well, has performed them not in a partisan sense. The hon. gentleman says that the majority are of one way of thinking. Well, that is so, I believe. But when hon. gentlemen opposite were in the Government, although they found a difference of opinion in two or three cases, I think the main current of the administration of the laws, the current of the legislation under the guidance of my hon. friend for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was not impeded or obstructed in any way by the Senate. They acted, I think, with that prudence, that discretion and that absence of violent partisanship which should be maintained and should obtain in a second body of that kind. I shall not occupy the time of the House any longer. I can only say, however, that there is no cry in the country for an alteration of the constitution. We do not hear of any petitions; we do not see any petitions. We have a great many political meetings through the country. We have political speeches, and perhaps, now that the hon. gentleman has set the ball rolling, for the next few months we may have the Senate aired, and the speech of the hon. gentleman will be the text from which his friends will preach. But we have had no real feeling in any part of the country in favor of an alteration of the constitution. I do not know that it was mentioned at any one of the speeches during the contest of 1882. I do not think it was made a matter of party conflict in 1878. I do not think it was made a question of discussion in 1874. I do not think the question of the Senate was brought up as a matter upon which the parties fought, or upon which there was any difference of opinion, in any of those elections. To-day the hon. gentleman broaches it. He has always been a theoriser. He has studied constitutional questions; he has studied them well, as I have always said and admitted; but the whole tendency of his mind is to theorise and philosophise, but not, I think, in such a way as to lead to any practical legislation or any practical conclusion. An hon. friend has just handed me the exact words of Mr. Brown on the question to which I have just been alluding. He said:

"I have always held that two elective Chambers are inconsistent with the right working of the British constitution."

I, for one, am not content to alter our constitution, so far as it assimilates to the British constitution.

Mr. MILLS. You denied that, and resisted it in 1854.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I know. In 1854 an elective Upper House was carried; an elective Upper House was thrown on the country. But there was a strong feeling in both Canadas, and certainly in French Canada, at that time in favor of an elective Upper House. It is not so now. There is no feeling expressed there, there is no feeling known or heard of in favor of such a change in the constitution as the hon. gentleman desires by this resolution. And although there was a great feeling in favor of an elective Senate, and although it was made the programme of the party in Lower Canada headed by Mr. Morin, the same representatives of the people from Quebec and from Upper Canada that voted originally in favor of an elective Upper House, almost unanimously—unanimously, I believe, so far as Lower Canada was concerned—voted for the abolition of an elective Chamber, and for the substitution of peers for life, which our senators really are. I would only say in conclusion that the hon. gentleman

while making this his political move will not, I think, gain anything by it. The object is so clear and unmistakeable that the country will see that the hon. gentleman did not hope, expect, or desire, that there should be a full consideration, a full discussion, of the great question, the enormous question, of asking the Imperial Parliament to alter our constitution on such an important point. The hon. gentleman has chosen by his motion and by the manner in which he dealt with the subject that he does not wish or desire to have the opinion of this House; he merely wishes to throw it in the baldest way before the people. The people will understand that, and I am quite satisfied that at the polls they will express the opinion that they would rather have a constitution according to the constitution of our forefathers than to have an American constitution foisted upon us, and have an alteration in the constitution without any wrong, or injury, or grievance, or prejudice to the development of the future of this country by keeping it as it is.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat states that this is an inopportune time to introduce a resolution of this kind. Those who have been in Parliament during the last few days will have noticed that that is the exception he has taken to other motions made on this side. The fact is that we would almost despair of finding a proper time to introduce certain motions that we feel it our duty to introduce. Now, what argument has the hon. gentleman advanced to prove that this motion is not brought forward at the proper time? Is it because the Session is, as he supposes, so near at an end? If so, I might reply by the argument which he used last year. When the hon. gentleman introduced the Franchise Bill at a late period of the Session, and when we pointed out that it was a measure which would require a whole Session to discuss it, he replied: Well, what is the necessity for the House coming to a close? Why not discuss it; we can remain here and discuss it? Well, certainly, we are in the same position here to-day. The hon. gentleman cannot shelter himself behind a pretence of that kind. Parliament has not to be prorogued on a particular day, and we are here ready for a full, free, and exhaustive discussion upon the subject, if hon. gentlemen opposite are likewise prepared. Then the objection is raised that it is introduced as an amendment to Supply. It is true, on certain questions, a motion introduced in amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply might not receive the favorable consideration of the House, because it cannot be amended; but that argument fails in the present case, for this reason: Suppose the motion was introduced as a substantive motion susceptible of amendment, the question would be before us in all its length and breadth. This is a plain question. The hon. member for Bothwell asks the House to vote that it is desirable to have a change in the constitution of the Senate. The hon. gentleman says: No; it is ideal prefection as it is; we have received it from our forefathers; it has done well, and has done no injury, while the system you propose is impracticable. I submit, if this question was introduced in a substantive motion, no amendment could be offered that could give a freer range of discussion than we have under the present motion. There are the two opinions on the subject; the sides have been taken; the hon. member for Bothwell expresses himself in favor of a change in the constitution of the Upper House, and the hon. First Minister says we want no change, because the Upper House, as at present constituted, is properly constituted. What is to prevent us, under these circumstances, having a free and full discussion of the question? Now, I desire to deal with a few of the arguments the hon. gentleman used in answer to the very logical and temperate speech made by the hon. member for Bothwell. He said, in the first place, that the hon. member for Bothwell had argued that the Senate was doing no good, and therefore he said it was incapable of doing harm; and if it does no harm, why not let it remain as it is? Well, that is rather a poor argument, I think; and a very obvious answer to it —one which, I grant, would point in the direction of the abolition of the Senate altogether—would be that on the ground of expenditure alone, it is a serious matter to keep a body for which all that can be said is that it is doing no harm. The hon. gentleman said further, that the Senate was modelled after the English House of Lords, which has existed in England for a very great length of time, without producing any evil results; Liberal Administrations, he said, had conducted the affairs of Great Britain for many years, and had experienced no difficulty with the Lords. But the hon. gentleman knows very well, what he did not choose to state to the House, that there are powers of check which can be exercised over the House of Lords that cannot be exercised over the Senate of Canada; and it has been the knowledge of that power which has led the House of Lords, on many occasions, to recognise the popular will, and to move, however reluctantly, in the direction of that will. But what power is there to control the actions of our nominated Senate? Why, Sir, the very authority which created the members of that body is powerless over them. True, out of a feeling of gratitude, they have too often been found ready to be at his service, and to forward his wishes; but, if they saw fit not to do so, but to resist the legislation of this House, what power have we over them? Suppose they set themselves as a block against the legislation of this House, and refuse to allow the popular will to be carried out, could you create a number of new Senators holding views in accord with those of the majority of the people who would bring them to terms? No, Sir. They are a power greater than the hon. gentleman, who has brought most of them into existence as legislators. That institution is an anomaly. I am glad to know, however, that in that House, constituted as it is, there are men of sufficient public spirit, sufficient grasp of mind, and sufficient knowledge of what an Upper Chamber ought to be, to have recognised the fact that, as at present constituted, it is not in harmony with the spirit of our institutions. This question has been introduced and debated in that Chamber, and one of the most eminent men in it has openly declared that it is idle for anyone to suppose that the people of this country recognise them as at all in harmony with the popular sentiment, and has pointed out, what is the fact, that the great Province of Ontario, in which the two political parties number about half and half of the electorate—or did at the last election, though no doubt there is to-day a majority in harmony with the Liberal party—that great Province has at present in the Upper Chamber only four representatives who are in accord with the Liberal party; and if the hon. First Minister retains power much longer, as time is doing its work with us all, he may have to fill vacancies caused in the Senate by death, and the discrepancy will become still greater. To talk of the Senate as at present constituted being a guardian of the rights and interest of the different Provinces, is absurd, for we see that it has utterly failed. The hon. gentleman says, and says truly, that the Senate is intended to guard provincial interests; and that is the strongest argument for its maintenance—that the different Provinces have representation in it in greater proportion than they have in this Chamber. In that respect we have in a measure adopted the principles of the American constitution, which gives the small State of Rhode Island as great a voice in the Senate as the large and popular State of New York. But our Senate, constituted in such a way that it necessarily takes a partisan feeling, constituted in such a way that it seems impossible for many of its members to exercise their functions in a judicial spirit, has time and again

lost sight of its duty with reference to provincial rights. Many members have failed to recognise the rights of their own Province and all the Provinces, and every onslaught made by the hon. First Minister on the rights of the different Provinces of this Dominion has been aided and abetted by the majority of the members of the Upper Chamber. When he sought to take from the Provinces the licensing power—a power which the highest court of this country and the Privy Council of England have pronounced to be within their right—when he laid his hand on that power and sought to wrest it from them, was any objection raised to his act by the Upper Chamber? Were the members of that body, whose peculiar duty, according to the hon. gentleman, ought to be to guard the rights of the different Provinces, found maintaining those rights on that occasion? No, Sir; they were found to be just as docile and tractable as the gentlemen who sit behind him in this House; and as his supporters in this House must have been overwhelmed by the humiliation that came upon them in that matter, so must the members of the Senate have been overwhelmed because they cast in their lot with them. I do not know that I could point to any act of that House that could commend itself to our approval. I do not deny that there are good men in that House; there are no doubt good men in it; but constituted as it is at present it tends to dwarf the energies of the very best men you could put into it. The hon. gentleman stated further that the present constitution of the Senate is in accordance with the principles of responsible government, because, he said, I nominated most of the members of that Senate, and I am here because I am supported by a majority of the representatives of the people in this House; and, therefore, he takes for granted that he is supported by a majority of the people of the country, which is rather doubtful, seeing that that majority was secured by peculiar means, But, he says, he is supported by the majority of the country, and therefore in nominating the Senate, it was really the people who nominated them. If we are to admit the correctness of his position in reference to that matter, I would say if they had been nominated by the hon. gentleman, with the provision that when he lost the confidence of the people, the Senate would be assumed to have lost it also, there would be some argument in his pretension. It is not sure that the hon. gentleman will hold the confidence of the people for all time to come; he has held it, by one means and another, quite too long, and the time will certainly come when the confidence of the country will not be accorded to the ruling party in this House. When that time comes, how will the Senate stand then? Why, these gentlemen whom he named, and claims he was carrying out the principles of responsible government in nominating them, will still remain. They are nominated for life, and there they will remain for life in the preponderance in that House, ready, with the feelings they have too often exhibited, to stand in the way and thwart the desires of public men. Therefore, the argument of the hon. gentleman does not hold good. He cannot claim that the ideas of responsible government are being acted upon, while we maintain the constitution of the Senate as it is. I remarked a short time ago, that while there are many capable and clever men in the Senate, the very constitution of that body dwarfs the energies of these men, so that we do not get the benefit we should of their intellectual powers. When the hon. gentleman stated it would be impossible to have two elective Houses to carry on legislation in this country, he was reminded by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that we had already tried that experiment, and it was more than an experiment, for several years. I tell the hon. gentleman that in my opinion, and I believe that opinion is shared by the people, the ablest men in the Senate to-day, men who have sat there since Confederation, are those who were marked out by the people as men fit to be representatives. Those men are the ablest there to-day, and have ever been so. What has been, in many cases, the principle upon which the First Minister has acted with reference to filling vacancies in the Senate? Did he take those who received the approval of the people? No, Sir. Too often, the principle he has acted upon has been that when a gentleman has appealed to a constituency and been rejected by the people and his opponent elected, the hon. gentleman has, immediately after his rejection, appointed the defeated candidate to a seat in the Senate, where he can use his power in vetoing Acts passed by the men elected by the people. That is the way in which the hon. gentleman has succeeded in bringing the Senate into disrepute. No better test of the value of the House, that I know of, can be made than to examine into the work they do. What have they done? We know that in this House, when there is legislation to be done, and you, Sir, know it very well, for you have had practical experience of it, we have sat from day to day, from week to week, every day until two or three o'clock in the morning, in order that each subject might be properly discussed before becoming law, and if such prolonged sittings are necessary here, why should not the same attention be necessary in the other Chamber whose duty it is to supervise our legislation? Let me give you a record of the time spent by these hon. gentlemen in the Senate, and let the country judge whether it is possible for them, in the space of time they give to their duties, to efficiently discharge them. I have a record of the last three Sessions which I have summarised. I could give each day's sitting, but that would take too long, so I will simply give a *résumé* of the sittings. Take the Session of 1884. In the first 16 days the Senate sat 14 hours; then they were very tired, and, as a matter of expediency, they took a holiday for 2 weeks, adjourning till 13th February. At the end of February, when this House had been in Session 44 days, including Sundays, they had sat altogether 31 hours and 5 minutes. Then they sat during March, except during the holidays, from the 21st to the 26th; and at the end of March, their record shows, for the 75 days from the opening of the Session to the 1st of April, sittings covering in all 70 hours and 50 minutes. They had to work a little harder in April, because it is an actual fact that on the 2nd April they sat 7 hours. Their debate was on the second reading of the Vancouver Island Railway. Then they sat for 2 nights subsequently, one sitting lasting 7 hours and the other 6 hours and a quarter. On both sittings they had a great discussion over the Scott Act; whether they helped it or impaired it, I will not say. That brought up the average. We find at the close of the Session, that the Session had lasted 94 days, including Sundays, during which the Senate had sat altogether, supervising the hasty legislation passed in this House, 115 hours and 40 minutes; and the cost of this to the country was $133,576 or over a $1,000 an hour. Then we have the Session of 1885, which opened 29th January. The Senate sat the 2 days in January, and 13 days in February, in which time they had sat altogether, 13 hours and 40 minutes. They then adjourned until the 20th February, and at the end of February, had sat altogether, since the opening of the Session, 26 hours and 15 minutes. Then, in March, they sat 54 hours and 55 minutes. Now you will see that is pretty hard work, averaging 2 hours a day. Therefore you will not wonder that they took a rest from 29th March to 8th April, and sat in all, in April, 49 hours and 20 minutes. The first 8 days of May they sat 17 hours, 35 minutes, and then rested from the 8th to the 20th, and in the whole of May their sittings amounted to 32 hours 55 minutes. From 29th May they rested until the 2nd of June. On that day they sat for 2½ hours, then took 8 days' rest. Who will begrudge it

to them? On the 11th they felt tired again and rested until the 15th; then they worked from the 15th to the 19th. That completely overpowered them, for they rested from the 19th June to the 2nd of July, having sat, in all June, 10 hours and 30 minutes, in revising the hasty legislation of this House. In the twenty days of July, they sat 48 hours and 10 minutes, and their total record, for the long Session of 1885, in which this House sat from hour to hour, from day to day, from week to week, discussing the great questions of the country, the Session lasted 173 days, including Sundays, and the hours they sat numbered 222 hours and 5 minutes. Look at the present Session. The House opened on the 25th February. On the 25th and 26th they sat 5 hours; down to the 9th March, they sat 16 hours and 25 minutes, then they took 2 weeks' holidays to the 23rd March. Who will begrudge them their holidays? Who will say they were not entitled to 2 weeks' rest? Their record, to the end of March, was 23 hours, 55 minutes for that month, and their record for the month of April, was 25 hours to the 15th. Then they took 2 weeks' holidays, and by the end of April, they had sat 30 hours and 35 minutes in that month, and down to the 7th May, which is the latest my figures go to, we find the Session had lasted 72 days, including Sundays, from the 25th February to the 7th May, and they have sat 74 hours and 20 minutes. Will any gentleman tell me that, with a record like that before us, that Chamber has demonstrated that, constituted as it is at the present time, it is fulfilling the purposes for which it was created, that it is acting as a judicial body in any way, that it is revising hasty legislation passed in this House? Can they rise in the face of this authentic record of the time they have taken and pretend to say that is so? Why have they adjourned? Because there was nothing for them to do? Not so. Their powers are not so circumscribed, but, as I stated before, the way in which they are constituted dwarfs their energies. They are not responsible to the people. One of the ablest Senators in that House, in discussing the question, used these remarks, and I give them as pertinent, and as the key to the explanation of the reason why we have work of so little avail in that Chamber. One of the ablest members of that Chamber said:

"We can do as we please. Not a word can be breathed against us. We care not for the people. We can order those doors to be closed. We can exclude the reporters, and the people need know nothing of our work. We can pass orders and make decrees; perhaps a madcap king of Bavaria may do freaks, but even he is called to account now and then; but this Chamber has no check on its powers; we are absolute, we do just as we please."

And the inevitable result of that is that you will have work performed, with your Chamber constituted in that way, you will have such work in the future as you have had in the past, and the people themselves will be the judges whether that work is satisfactory to the people of this country or not. I have told you that, in 1884, it has cost us for the work they had done $133,576. The work in 1885, the record of which I gave you, cost $175,508. The people of this country will say whether that is money properly expended or whether it is not. But it is the very fact that they are not responsible to the people and that they do not feel that responsibility that dwarfs the energies even of the able men who are in there. There is an atmosphere that seems impossible for those who would desire to do otherwise to rise beyond—a Government soothing influence that seems to pervade the body and makes them incapable of fairly and properly criticising measures that come from the hand of the man who called them into existence as a political power. But there are men there who recognise the importance of their duties, and one of those, one of the most active members of that body, in protesting against the two weeks' adjournment, asked whether they should adjourn when there was so much of public importance demanding investigation and enquiry at the hands of the representatives of the people in this House. He said: You propose to adjourn for two weeks, and you have been sitting for an hour or two a day, and there is the great cause of the late rebellion in the North-West, that caused the loss of life and the sacrifice of millions of treasure; why cannot we sit? Why should we adjourn? Why cannot we sit and investigate into the causes of that late rebellion?

An hon. MEMBER. Who is that?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). One of the most active members of that body, a Conservative who has become disgusted with the manner in which the business is done, and who desires now, as the Liberal members desire, that there shall be a reconstitution of that House, that there shall be some movement, some response, to the wishes of the people. He said, secondly, that they might profitably employ their time in ascertaining how the millions expended in suppressing that rebellion had been expended, and who will say there is not a field for enquiry worthy for that body to take hold of? I remember when they had a committee investigating the expenditure of a few thousand dollars on the Kaministiquia River, when they sought to find fault with my hon. friend from East York, who was then in power, and to make out that a job had been perpetrated, and to-day we find that that has been adopted by the railway authorities. At that time, acting in a partisan spirit, they could find time to sit on a committee, but it is different now when there have been millions upon millions of the people's money expended, and it has been charged in the public prints, with what truth I will not say, that there has been extravagant expenditures in connection with that. Has there been a committee appointed by the Senate to look into that matter? No, but they coolly propose to adjourn for two weeks then, and subsequently for another two weeks, in face of the protest of this able member, who pointed out that they might discharge that duty in the interests of the people. Thirdly, he said they might have an enquiry as to how the $1,000,000 annually expended upon the Indians is expended. Who will say, in the light of the revelations given to us by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), from the departmental blue books and other sources, that there is no room and no necessity for an enquiry there. That was pointed out by this honorable Senator, but it had no avail with them. Another subject he suggested was the investigation by a committee of the timber limits improperly given away in what he called the disputed territory. Is that not a thing in reference to which some care should be exercised by those who are elected to look after provincial rights? Here the rights of one of the Provinces were being sacrificed, but the representatives in that Chamber who are supposed to represent that Province were averse to remaining, and they are almost wholly of one political party, they were unwilling to remain to give any investigation to this subject. They preferred their ease, and why not? because, if fault is found with them, who shall say anything to them? They are, as properly stated in the remarks which I have read, above and beyond the people, and they may do as they please. He also suggested that it would be proper and profitable to enquire into the question of timber limits and coal land leases. Would not that be desirable, in the face of charges which have been made and denials of charges which we hear and see made in the newspapers and which we hear on the floor of Parliament? What better time would there be for that body to take that into consideration and examine into it fully? And, sixthly, he says: We ought to remain here, it is imperative that we should remain here, and should have an ample, full, free discussion as to how we can build up in the Maritime Provinces that great

interest, the sea coast fisheries. But their holidays are of more value to them than the interests of the Maritime Provinces. What to them is it whether our fishing industries languish or not? They are off on their two weeks jaunt, only on their return to sit for a few hours, and then to adjourn for two weeks more.

Mr. HESSON. Louder.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) is unable to hear me, apparently. I venture to say he will not find it so difficult to hear me as to answer me, when he may have an opportunity to do so perhaps on the public platform, if he does not choose to do so on the floor of the House. In the seventh place, that member of the Senate suggested an investigation into the many wasteful expenditures of this prodigal Government, and who will say there is no room for that House to have given its attention in that direction? But that seemed not to have any effect on them either. Then another subject suggested was that it was desirable in the interests of this country, and who will say it is not, that the Senate should take up and enquire into the important question of widening the provisions of the extradition treaty. Is that not an important subject? Might they not have given their attention to it? But was that attended to by them? No, their minds were bent upon a holiday, and upon a holiday they went. Ninthly, he suggested that they should have a discussion upon the experience of the working of the tariff, and some of its ill-effects. Was not there a field upon which to have their view? They could have investigated all the depressed industries in the country at the present time, and ascertained what the cost was and how the tariff was working injuriously in one direction and beneficially in another. These, Sir, are the nine reasons that that member of that honorable body gave when he protested against the adjournment of two weeks they were making, and he pointed out to them that their duty was to look after the public interest. But, Sir, it was of no avail, and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot fail to see, the country, at any rate, Mr. Speaker, will not fail to see, that when you have a Chamber constituted as that is, nominated by the First Minister of the day, nominated for life, when they are placed in that position by the power that creates them, utterly beyond the control of the people in any sense, you cannot have more efficient legislation from that branch of the Legislature in the future than you have in the past. Sir, I am not extreme in my views, I am not desirous, as the First Minister said, of tinkering at the constitution all the time; that is not to be desired; but, Sir, we have had eighteen years' experience of the working of that body, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to rise and deny, if they can, that during the whole course of that eighteen years the tendency of legislation in that House has not been in the direction which I have indicated at the present time. If there was better legislation and more useful legislation in that House in the early days of Confederation I believe it was due to the fact that the House was then more largely composed of representatives who had secured the confidence of the people of this country, than it is at the present time. Holding the views that I do, I am in accord with the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell, because I believe that experience has demonstrated that it is desirable in the interests of this country that some change should be made in the constitution of the Senate, and that regard should be had to the elective principle.

Mr. FOSTER. I have listened with pleasure to the speech of my hon. friend for Brant (Mr. Paterson). I do not intend to speak long, I shall try to finish by six o'clock. I merely wish to take up two or three points in the remarks he made in the way of friendly criticism. In the first place, I wish to notice the great change that has come over the hon. gentleman's mind, and over those who so loudly applauded him in the opening part of his speech. Sir, if I do not misremember, I think that hon. gentleman took up a good many hours of last Session, and I think his brother members opposite took up a good many hours of last Session, in ponderous and wordy declamation, to prove that at that stage of the Session when the Franchise Bill was brought in, there was no proper time for its discussion. Yet, the hon. gentleman has so far turned round that although it has been stated on both sides of this House that the Session is probably within eight or ten days of its close, when hon. gentlemen on both sides are anxious to get away to their homes, the hon. gentleman gets up and states: We have any amount of time for full discussion; we have the proper range and the proper latitude, and the question can be thoroughly discussed. Thus we see how easy it is for that hon. gentleman to change his point of view, to change his position, where principle is not at stake, and where some party advantage only is looked for. Now he made another rather odd assertion. He found fault with the Senate because it was too much under the power of the Government. He says it is appointed by the Government, it is the creature of the Government, and the members of that body are placed there to do the work of the Government, yet he drew a contrast between our Senate and the House of Lords in Great Britain, to the detriment of ours, by saying that the House of Lords was much less under the influence of the Government of the day than our Senate is. Why this Senate is free, and it has its complement, is complete, as he stated. But if the House of Lords does not do what the Government wishes, the Government forces it by adding a certain number to the House to make it do its work. So in the House of Lords, if it does not do what the Government wishes, the Government has enginery by which it can bring the House of Lords to its will by the creation of more peers, and yet my hon. friend declares that the House of Lords is superior in this respect to our Senate. This is an anomaly, which my hon. friend may be able to reconcile, but which I cannot. He says that the Senate is partisan. Has he offered a single remedy to cure partisanship? Is there not partisanship in this House? Does not partisanship exist on that side of the House? Is not partisanship found in the speeches, in the reasoning, in the mind of my hon. friend who has just spoken? Does he propose any remedy by which there can be a Senate or House yonder, which will be bereft of all partisanship and will come up to that high ideal of a legislative body, which will discuss everything from the ground of right reason and practical result. I think the hon. member before he urges as an objection to the other body that it is partisan is bound to show to this House that he has some method for placing a legislative body there which will not be a partisan body and so to cure that evil. The hon. gentleman says that provincial rights are relinquished by gentlemen in the other House. I have seen him rise in this House and declare in language as loud as that of any other son of thunder that this House has deserted provincial rights, this House which comes from the people, and therefore if it is an objection to the other branch of the Legislature that it deserts provincial rights, on his own ground and from his own argument and from the assertions he has made here hundreds of times if he has made them at all, the very same objection lies against this House, because he himself has stated over and over again that this House, the creation of the people, has ignored provincial rights. He says: It may be all right now when the gentlemen in the other House are of the same political opinion as the gentlemen here, and all goes on well; but when a change takes place, how will it be then? How will it be under any method which the hon. gentleman may suggest? How is the hon. gentleman going to elect the

Upper House? Is he going to have the same length of term as here? If that is his proposition—I do not say that it is—what is the use of having two elective bodies co-terminus with each other, beginning from the same public sentiment and ending with a similar public sentiment and in the same phase of it. The hon. gentleman does not propose anything to cure the evil. If he is going to have the period of election for the Upper House longer than the period for this House, you will elect its members at a certain phase of public opinion that will be in accordance with public opinion as represented by the members of this House. This House dies before the other. Public opinion will have changed, and you will have a set of men in this House with different opinions and holding different political maxims from those in the other House. Will they not be opposed to each other? The hon. gentleman has not proposed any method by which to overcome that strong objection. The hon. gentleman said we had an elective Senate once. So we had. The test of experience is a very good test. The people of Canada are fairly wise people, and the politicians of 1867 were quite as wise as the politicians of to-day; and looking over that experiment, which they entered on as an experiment, and looking at the results of it, when they came into this wider and greater Union, they said: We have tried an elective Senate; we do not believe it worked well. When we enter upon the new career of a great and wide confederation, we will build upon the old rock-bed of the contitution of Great Britain, and have a Senate appointed for life rather than an elective Senate, which we have tried as an experiment, and which has failed. The hon. gentleman further said, and his assertion is one of those wild assertions which hon. gentlemen cannot always substantiate, that in almost every case the appointee to the Senate was a rejected candidate; that he went before the people, who rejected him, and the moment they did so he was placed in the Upper House. I challenge the hon. member to take the list of appointees to the Senate, and prove that bold assertion he has made. I do not think he can do it. And again, the hon. gentleman said that measures ought to be more fully discussed in the Senate; that if we discussed measures the Senate ought to spend an equal time in discussing them. That does not follow. Does not the Railway Committee discuss railway measures sometimes for days and days, and yet when they come down to this House they are passed almost without discussion. It is a case almost parallel: This House takes up measures, introduces them, discusses them, places them in proper shape and sends them to the other body. If they have been well considered here, and if we have sustained our own dignity and done our own work, we must say they have been properly considered here and there is no necessity for an equal length of time being spent in considering them in the other House, which revises them. Let me now touch upon the last point that I will mention with respect to the hon. member. His general objection, if there was any point to it, was, that the Senate was a costly body, a useless body, that it sits a little while and then goes on long holidays, and that therefore it was a body useless, expensive, and which did little good. And what is the obvious conclusion? Sir, if there was any conclusion at all to be drawn from the hon. gentleman's remarks it was that the Senate, which is so useless, which has so little discussion, which did nothing, which was so costly and which was a burdensome thing should be swept out of existence entirely. Yet neither the hon. gentlemen who had spoken nor the mover of the resolution had the courage to come before this Parliament and the country in a straightforward manly way and place before the people the plain issue of the abolition of the Senate. They first pile up the cost and seek to show its uselessness; and they end by, what? They say: Oh, let us keep it by all means, but we will make some general confusing statement to the people on which we can go to them and say we are against the Senate, while we will not pledge ourselves to anything. That is the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite. From I do not know how far back down to the present time they have never gone before the people with a definite plain issue; they always take strong grounds in their speeches, but when they come to concentrate their speeches into resolutions they have only some misty, airy, cloudy, nebulous thing which no person on earth can materialize.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) to incorporate the North American Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Northern and North-Western Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

SUPPLY—CONSTITUTION OF THE SENATE.

Mr. DAVIES. The resolution which my hon. friend from Bothwell has moved, involves, as the right hon. First Minister said, a radical change in our constitution, and should therefore be carefully considered. But it does not follow, because it involves that change, that we should be afraid to face it; and if the experience we have gained during the past 18 years of our political life convinces us that a change is required, we should have the manliness and the courage to say so, and to say so at the right time. In looking back over the history of this Dominion during that time, I can come to but one conclusion, that the constitution of the Senate, as it exists at present, is not in accordance with the spirit of the age, does not reflect the views of the people, and does not give effect to the measures the people desire to pass. I myself, if I had been in political life when our constitution was framed, would not have been averse to the adoption of even a more radical system than that proposed by my hon. friend. I am radical enough to believe that in this age and in this country, and with so intelligent a people, we should have got along well enough with one Chamber alone; but that was not the view of the fathers of our constitution; and the prevailing opinion seems to be that it is necessary to have some kind of a second Chamber. The question, therefore, before the House is, what character shall that Chamber take? Shall it be simply a nominative body, the members appointed for life, not changing as the desires and wishes of the people change, but remaining constituted as the Premier for the time being makes it? I do not think that is right. I remember, when our constitution, as embodied in the British North America Act, was under review in the English House of Commons, that great orator and tribune of the people, John Bright, gave his views on this particular feature of it. He then warned those who were promoting the British North America Act, that there was a radical defect in the constitution they were framing which consisted in creating a body composed of what he called stereotyped life peers; and he predicted that the time would not be long before the people of Canada would come to agree with him and be ready to make the change which he then desired should be made. I will, with your permission, read a few words which that right hon. gentleman uttered at the time upon this question, and I think he has a right to-day to say that his fears and his predictions have been fully verified. He says, referring to the promoters of the British North America Act and the people of Canada:

"They have established their House of Representatives directly upon the basis of representation. They have adopted the system which prevails in the United States, which, upon every ten years summing up of the census in that country, the number of members may be changed, and is by law changed in the different States and districts, as the rate of population may have changed. Therefore, in that respect, his friends in Canada have not adopted the principle which prevails in this country, but that which prevails in the United States. I believe they have done that which is right, and which they have a right to do, and which is inevitable there. I regret very much that they have not adopted another system with regard to their Council or Senate, because I am satisfied—I have not a particle of doubt with regard to it—that we run a great danger of making this Act work ill almost from the beginning. They have the example of thirty-six States in the United States, in which the Senate is elected, and no man, however sanguine, can hope that seventy-two stereotyped provincial peers in Canada, will work harmoniously with a body elected upon a system so wide and so general as that which prevails in the States of the American Union."

Sir, I venture to say that the prediction of that great orator and statesman has been verified. I venture to say that the vast majority of the people of this country believe that we have incurred the danger he predicted of making that Act work ill almost from the beginning. Our eighteen years' experience shows that, so far as the Senate have been able, they have contributed to the ill-working of the machine. I believe, Sir, in the people ruling. There was a time in the history of the world when kings ruled alone, when their will was law; there was a time when the Commons had no voice in the making or the execution of the laws which they were bound to obey. But the world progressed, and the nobles took a share in the work of government with the king. For a time they ruled, but not in the interest of the common people. The great mass of the people were little above slaves. But intelligence and education have been diffused so rapidly that in the Mother Country, the mother of Parliaments, a new era has dawned, and during the last forty or fifty years the common people have had their share in the government of that country. Sir, it is inevitable that the reign of the common people shall come, and shall come soon. I believe it is coming in this country of ours. I believe it is right that the common people, those who have been excluded from having a reasonable voice in the making of the laws, should have that reasonable voice given to them, and I believe that anything that obstructs the fair, honest views of the people from being expressed should be removed. I believe the Senate is an obstruction in that regard. The hon. gentleman who replied to the mover of the resolution recognised its gravity; he recognised that it was a great step in the direction of popular government, and he met it with a flat refusal. He is satisfied with the existing state of affairs, and well he may be; and why? Because the Senate reflects the opinion of the people? No; because the Senate reflects his individual whim—nay, his caprice; and that is inevitable, because he has had the appointment of the members of that body. While the theory at the beginning seemed to be very pretty and very good, that the best men from the different Provinces should be selected and should form a kind of high judicial court, removed to some extent from the whims and the caprice of the popular branch, which would maintain an equilibrium between political parties, what has been the practical working of that theory? What is that body to-day? We find that the Liberal party of Canada, who, I am bold to say, are in a majority in this country, although not in this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIES. I have not hesitated in expressing that as my individual belief, and that belief will be shown to be well founded when the people next go to the polls. How is that opinion reflected in our little House of Lords by those stereotype provincial peers, as the hon. Mr. Bright called them? We have been given very little more than a corporal's guard? Do hon. gentleman think that is right or proper? Suppose that the people in the coming elections should vote want of confidence, as I believe they will, in the right hon. gentleman opposite, what position will the country then be in? We will be in this position, that we will have an obstructive body, a partisan body, a body which has shown itself in time past to be bitterly partisan, to do what? To facilitate the carrying out of the wishes of the people? To advance liberal legislation? No, Sir; but to obstruct and do whatever they can to paralyse the power of the Government. The right hon. gentleman said that he was surprised and annoyed that my hon. friend should have moved this resolution in the way he did. I would be surprised if my hon. friend could move a resolution in any way, which would meet the approval of the right hon. gentleman. But if my hon. friend has taken the opportunity of proposing this constitutional resolution on the motion to go into Supply, he is only following the precedent established by the right hon. gentleman when he was in Opposition. When he wanted to move a resolution on a great constitutional question what course did he take? He moved his resolution when the House was going into Supply, just as my hon. friend has done. The proposition advanced in the resolution of my hon. friend is no new proposition; it is not the first time the hon. gentleman has moved a resolution in this House enunciating the same proposition. Hon. gentlemen know that the honored and respected leader of this party, the Gladstone of Canada, the future Premier of Canada—they know and the country knows that he has laid down, as a plank in his platform, the principles which my hon. friend has formulated in his resolution to-night. He has discussed them in his London speech and in other great speeches, and therefore we are not here moving a new principle with which to catch public opinion at the coming elections. We are, on the contrary, seeking to formulate and, if possible, to carry a resolution embodying the views of our party, views which will be endorsed by the people when they have the opportunity of expressing their opinion. It is a curious fact that hon. gentlemen opposite, in their minor organs, and when they are not face to face with the leaders of the Liberal party, are very fond of accusing that party of being without a policy. But those who have sat opposite to us for the last few years and have listened to the policy we have enunciated, from day to day, in the resolutions we have moved, know that we have a policy, a grand and noble policy, which will meet the approval of the people. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries who spoke—for what purpose I do not know, for after he had spoken I was unable to understand what idea he wished the House to gather from his remarks—characterised the resolution in a number of adjectives, as airy, nebulous, cloudy, misty, and incomprehensible. His remarks were excusable on one ground only, namely, that he never read the resolution at all. The resolution affirms two propositions: One, that the existing constitution of the Senate, by making that body independent of the people, is inconsistent with the Federal principle of our system of government. There is in that proposition nothing nebulous and airy, but, on the contrary, it is plain, practical and liberal. It affirms the principle that we do not believe in the existence of governing bodies independent of the people. The resolution goes on to affirm how that constitution will be changed:

"That appropriate steps be taken to secure such amendments as will make the Senate directly responsible to the people."

These are the two propositions affirmed in my hon. friend's resolution, which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries characterised as airy and nebulous. The hon. gentleman came out as the champion of the Senate, and I listened with great attention to ascertain why he championed this body so ardently. He is, or, I should say, he was—I must qualify my remarks—known as the great champion of total abstinence in this country, and perhaps it may be from the notable evidence which the Senate has given of their

sympathy with his past views, that the hon. gentleman expresses his admiration for them to-day. The hon. gentleman justified the existence of partisanship in the Senate. On what ground? Because, he said, it exists in the Commons as well. But the reason for the existence of a second House, the justification of its existence, is that, as far as possible, partisanship should be banished from it, and that it should be a high judicial body, free of any such taint. If the House of Commons is partisan, the people have the remedy in their own hands. When the proper time comes, they can remove those whose partisanship has been inimical to the public interest, but if partisanship shows itself in the Senate, what remedy have the people? The people are powerless, the Senators are there for life, and, as my hon. friend, in quoting from the remarks of a distinguished Senator, said: "The Senate can remain and laugh at the people." This anomaly should not be allowed to exist in this free country where we profess to enjoy responsible government, and where we hope and believe the people govern. It is not proper that a body should continue to exist which is not responsible to the people, it is not proper that such a body should control the legislation and policy of this House, while is responsible to the people. I was amused at the apology which the Minister of Marine offered for the want of action and the want of work on the part of the Senate. My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) quoted at length the record of their proceedings, showing what a hard-worked body they are; and I wonder how some of the venerable old gentlemen who compose the Senate manage to survive the number of hours they put in during the three months. What did the Minister of Marine say? He said he was surprised that any complaint should be made that the Senate did not work harder. What need, he asked, was there for them to work, since the House of Commons did all the work. If that argument is worth anything at all, it is an argument for the abolition of the Senate. If we do all the work, if our measures are so carefully prepared in committee that there is no need for the Senate to work, why maintain the Senate at a cost of a quarter of a million to the country. But, I say, if the Senate would discharge the duties they are bound to discharge, they have a vast field in which to work. Why should they not initiate legislation? It is well known that a large majority of the members of this House are hard working men who find it very difficult indeed to give up time from their work at home and come here to discharge the necessary work of legislation. Are they assisted by the Senate? Have the Senate initiated legislation? No, Sir. What a grand field they had this Session. Here we were going to consolidate seventeen or eighteen years of Statute work; and what a grand opportunity this gave the Senate to give a reason for their existence, by appointing a committee to take that work in hand and thus relieve the Commons. We were working day and night, we were over worked, in fact, and unable to do this work as it should be done. Why should it not have been taken up by those gentlemen, who take their holidays and do not pretend to discharge any of the work they are supposed to discharge, and which, according to the constitutional theory, they should discharge. The right hon. the First Minister said very correctly, that we are enjoying a constitution which has existed for eighteen years, and should not seek hastily to change it; that no radical change should be made unless we could prove the existence of a wrong. That brings us to the question of fact whether wrong has been shown to exist or not. I do not wish to give my expression of opinion, but will give the House that of a gentleman who has sat in the Senate since its inception, who has taken an active and prominent part in its labors, and who has been the leader there of one of our political parties. Let us see what his opinion is after twelve years' experience of the working of the Senate, and let us see whether he believes or does not believe, after that experience, that a wrong exists.

Mr. McNEILL. Name.

Mr. DAVIES. The Hon. Mr. Scott. I find him saying:

"According to the history of the Senate, it is used simply for the political exigencies of the Government of the day. I quite appreciate the sentiment of the hon. gentleman who has spoken before me, but, if he had sat in the last Parliament, as I did, he would know that members of the Senate were not then quite so fair and reasonable; that this House, with its great Conservative majority, was used——"

I want to appeal to that gentleman with all his experience as to the use which is made of the Senate.——

"was used as an inquisitorial commission for the purpose of sending forth through this country damaging reports against the late Government—reports that to-day they would not endorse. They spent month after month procuring evidence to show how preposterous it was to make improvements on the Kaministiquia River, yet last year and this year there are votes for the improvement of that river. They said that a breakwater should be constructed at Prince Arthur's Landing, and to carry out the scheme they spent money there to no purpose. When we introduced a Bill for the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway, it was thrown out of this House, when the present Government introduced a Bill for the same purpose, it was carried here. When we introduced a Bill to right a wrong in the county of Huron, to reconstruct the ridings of that county as they should be, it was scorned and thrown out; when a Bill is introduced by the present Government to manipulate every municipality in Ontario, to 'hive the Grits,' as they say, to alter every constituency at the beck and instance of their friends in the other House, no attempt is made to stop it, or to see whether it is fair or in accord with provincial rights or not. When the present Government took the absurd position of fighting the Provinces——"

This quotation I am making is *à propos* to the defence of the Senate on the ground that they represent the smaller Provinces.——

"when the present Government took the absurd position of fighting the Provinces and attempting to deprive them of their rights, when they attempted to take the licensing power from the Provincial Governments which they had enjoyed for eighteen years, and when I raised my voice here against the Bill when it came up to the Senate, who listened to me? Not a soul."

Of the eighty independent high judicial functionaries, as they were supposed to be, who were appealed to at a critical moment to raise their voices on behalf of provincial rights, threatened by the Government of the day, how many listened to the hon. gentleman's appeal? Not one.——

"Sir John A. Macdonald has stated that the licensing power belonged to the Dominion, and so this House, at the beck of the Government of the day, at once accepted the proposition and would not listen to an argument against it for one moment. What is the position of this House on that question to-day? Does it occupy a good one on a question where it should stand up for provincial rights? On every measure affecting provincial rights it supported the Government. It was in the interests of the strong party in the House of Common that that view should prevail, and it did prevail. That was the way this Chamber manifested its independence."

Sir, there is the record, the matured opinion of a gentleman who has been in that Chamber, a very leading member of it, for the last twelve years, and I say, in the face of that record, there can be but one opinion as to the use of that body in protecting provincial rights at least. Now, if there are statements made by the Hon. Mr. Scott from his place in the Senate, which I have read, any of which are untrue, let us hear them challenged to-night. If they are true, they prove conclusively that the resolution of my hon. friend has not been moved a day or an hour too soon. The right hon. gentleman seemed to pooh pooh the idea that the Senators are at all under his control. I would not venture an opinion of my own, but I will refer him to the opinion of a gentleman who has long supported him in that Chamber, and not a week ago, when the question of the constitution of the Senate came up, what do we find him saying?:

"There is not a member here who has received his appointment from either Government that does not feel under more or less restraint and obligation to the party or the leader of the party that appointed him, and members are to that extent shackled and bound. In many instances, I am quite satisfied that hon. gentlemen here would take a different stand from what they do were it not that they feel they owe their

appointment to the present Government, and consequently must support all measures introduced by them."

There is a splendid character to give to the body appointed by the right hon. gentleman, a body whose actions show they are here to register the decrees of the right hon. gentleman himself, and not to protect the rights of the Provinces, or to advance or promote the interests of the people. Now, the right hon. gentleman also did not scruple to say, that in his opinion, the Senate to-day truly reflects the voice of the people. He has had his answer from the mouth of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson), who proved to him, that from the premier Province of this Dominion, a Province which I congratulate on having had twelve long years of Liberal rule, and which promises to maintain that rule for a long time to come, there are only four Liberal representatives in that Senate. It is a farce to say, that when Ontario has only four Liberal representatives in the Senate, that Senate truly represents the voice of the people. It is ridiculous; it is a travesty on the facts as we know them to exist. The hon. gentleman compared our Senate to the House of Lords in England, and led us to believe that it was modelled upon that body, and that it discharged the same functions and duties in this Dominion as the House of Lords discharge in Great Britain; but there is no comparison possibly between the two bodies. We know that the House of Lords is a venerable institution which has come down from antiquity, which preserves, and is maintained by those who are in favor of it in order that it may preserve and maintain the special interests of a particular class. Here in this broad Dominion, I am proud to say we have not and we ought not to have any special class or special interests which require a special body to preserve. We have no aristocracy, we have no landed interests, in the sense in which they have landed interests at home. We are a people to that extent, homogeneous that the interest of one class ought to be, and I believe is, the interest of all; and therefore the reasons for the continuance of the House of Lords—whether they are tenable or not is a matter which the English people will decide—do not exist here. But there is no parallel at all. The members of the House of Lords do not owe their position to the appointment of a Premier. The members of the House of Lords are such because they are sons of their fathers, because their fathers before have been members of that House. It runs in the family, as my hon. friend says, and while that may or may not be defensible, while they are there to defend the interests of their class, there is no parallel between such a body and this, appointed by the Premier and reflecting his will alone, nor is there any comparison between our Senate and the Senate of the United States. The hon. gentleman says we seek to introduce a body similar to the Senate of the United States. No, we do not. The Senate of the United States possesses powers by the constitution of that country with which it is not desirable that we should invest the Senate of this country, and I have never heard anyone on this side of the House propose to invest them with such powers. The Senate of the United States are so appointed that the smallest State has as great a representation as the largest. They are not only a legislative body but they are to some extent an executive body. Their constitution is entirely different from ours at present or from our proposed one, and no analogy can be drawn. I will not take up the time of the House further on this subject. I believe that it is proper and right that we should have placed before this House now, when we are, so far as we can gather, upon the eve of a general election, that we should formulate in a distinct way and in a distinct form the principles we hold in regard to the second Chamber; and, believing that the principles formulated in the resolution of my hon. friend will give to the people of this country a second Chamber far in advance of the one under which we now suffer, I will gladly support his motion.

Mr. McNEILL. I shall take up the time of the House only a few moments, but I do not feel inclined to vote on this subject without expressing my views. I think it is unfortunate that none of the hon. gentlemen opposite who followed the Premier ventured to grapple with the main argument which he advanced to the House which was, as I understand it, that the second elective Chamber we formerly had proved a failure, and that in point of fact the two elective bodies would be found to conflict with each other. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) seemed to be pressed with the force of that objection, too, before it was urged from this side of the House by the right hon. Premier, because he endeavored to guard himself. I see he shakes his head. I did him the credit to suppose that he had been aware of that objection and had been pressed by it, but I see that he denies that he was. The hon. gentleman said that it would be necessary to have a Chamber that would keep this House in check, and a little while afterwards he said that we would require to have that Chamber so constituted that it would not be a rival to this House. Now, that is just where the difficulty comes in. If you have two elective Chambers, either the second will be a rival to this House, or you will not have a second Chamber that is of any benefit at all. If you make that second Chamber weak, if you reduce its independence, as the hon. gentleman proposed, it will vitually amount to nothing and be no check. If, again, you have a Chamber elected by the people, the question is, upon what franchise is it to be elected? Is it to be elected on the same franchise as this House, or upon some other franchise? Is the property qualification to be higher than the property qualification for this House? If it is higher that will make a difference in the first instance but the result will be that we shall soon have an agitation to reduce the qualification. We shall therefore simply have what the hon. gentleman himself regards as a danger, we shall have a rival House, in short, to this representative Chamber. But, Sir, it is a most important fact that we find hon. gentlemen rising up in their places in this House and proposing, in the calmest way, without any warning whatever, such a radical proposition as has been presented to us to-night; we found hon. gentlemen getting up without a moment's warning the other night, and supporting a proposition in support of a policy which just a round dozen members of Mr. Gladstone's late Cabinet had declared to be most dangerous to the integrity of the Empire; we find the leader of the Opposition rising without a moment's notice to ask this House to support that proposition. We find to-day another hon. member getting up without a moment's notice, and in a calm kind of way, on a summer afternoon, suggesting that we should alter the British constitution; and we find the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), saying that that is perfectly right, and just the sort of thing we ought to do. I think that is not the sort of thing we ought to have in this House of Commons. I think we ought to conduct our debates with greater gravity than that, and we ought not to approach a question of this enormous importance with such a light heart. I venture to think that it would be a very great loss, and a very great injury to the people of this country, if we were to attempt to substitute an elective body for the nominated Chamber which now exists. As I understand it, the weakness of this House is just where the strength of the other House is to be found. This House is weak because it is dependent upon the people, and, as I understand it, it is just because this House is intended to represent the people that it is weak; and on the other hand, because it has its sanction directly from the people, it is

strong also. I say the weakness of this House consists in the fact that the members, because they know that their seats depend on the will of the electorate, are inclined often to do that which they think would be pleasing to their constituents, rather than that which they believe, in their hearts, would be in the interest of the country. But that is what we require, and what the British constitution requires—this British constitution which hon. gentlemen think is to be altered, as I said, in a summer's afternoon, this British constitution, of course, as we all know, has been produced without much thought by a parcel of men who do not know very much about what they were doing. Sir, this very characteristic of the British constitution is of all others, to my mind, one of those we ought to guard with the greatest jealousy. In the second Chamber are men who are not dependent for their seats upon the electorate, and therein I see one of the greatest safeguards to the interest of the country. When you find a sudden wave of excitement passing over the country, which may influence hon. members of this House to do this or that which they think may be pleasing to their constituents, we have no kind of guarantee that they will not give way to the pressure of this popular excitement. But you have in the second Chamber gentlemen who hold their seats for life, who are independent of the people, and who are able to approach a question calmly and to consider it upon its merits, without regard to the opinion of those outside upon whose votes they would otherwise be dependent. In that way they are able to stem the tide of public excitement until the people have time to reflect and recover their sober second thought. That is where we have the benefit of a Chamber which is not elective. But the hon gentlemen opposite desire to do away with that safeguard. altogether, and to have an elective Chamber which will be just as liable to be forced by popular excitement of any kind as is the House of Commons, and in that way they do away with one of the very safeguards which the men who framed the British constitution foresaw and provided against. But these hon. gentlemen treat the British constitution as if it was a child's toy, or a house built of cards, which they are to deal with just as they please. It seems to me that the House of Commons is strong just where the second Chamber is weak, and the second Chamber is strong just where the House of Commons is weak, and so you find that the one supplements or complements the other, and in these two together you have a most admirable combination. Suppose this House pass some crude and hasty measure, you have a second Chamber to counteract it. Suppose the House of Commons will not give way to the second Chamber, the Sovereign holds in her hand the key to the dead lock, viz., a dissolution and appeal to the people, then, if the elective Chamber is sustained the second Chamber will, of course, give way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McNEILL. It has always been found so. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, of course; it is well to laugh and to be theoretical. We have always found that to be so in practice. We have not found in England any difficulty of that kind. We have found that the House of Lords in England have frequently refused to sanction the legislation proposed in the House of Commons; but we have never found, with the exception of the one unimportant case mentioned by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), that the House of Lords has persisted in its refusal to pass any measure of great importance when there has been an appeal to the people.

An hon. MEMBER. How about the Reform Bill?

Mr. MILLS. How about Jewish disabilities?

Mr. McNEILL. On the last occasion when there was a difference between the Lords and Commons, no doubt the House of Lords came out triumphantly. That was not because they went against the people, but because the House of Commons, represented by the Premier and the Government of the day, were afraid to appeal to the people on the question. The House of Lords begged that there should be an appeal to the people. Lord Salisbury and other leading statesmen requested such an appeal, but Mr. Gladstone feared to appeal to the people on the question, and he gave way, and the House of Lords prevented the House of Commons doing, what hon. gentlemen here would have objected to being done, making a re-distribution of seats without anyone knowing what the distribution was to be. But I venture to think that the people of this country have some respect for the constitution which has been provided for them through the wisdom of ages, and by the blood of their ancestors, and that they will guard that constitution jealously. I do not believe that hon. gentlemen opposite are going to make a great deal of political capital out of this attempt to substitute an elective Chamber for the present Senate. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) seemed to see the difficulty of that position. He does not believe in a body of that kind, and he goes a step forward and says: Abolish the whole thing; do away altogether with the British constitution. It will, however, be some time before that comes to pass.

Mr. JAMIESON. Before I record my vote on this question, I think it advisable to offer a few remarks. On several occasions, both in my own constituency and elsewhere, I have expressed the opinion that in my judgment there was room for a change in the constitution of the Senate. I regret, however, very much that this matter has come before the House in the shape in which it has been submitted. Whilst I am in favor of the principle of the amendment, I at the same time have confidence in the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. JAMIESON. It may seem strange to some hon. gentleman that I take that position. Had the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) moved it as a substantive motion, I for one would have been only too glad to have supported it to the best of my ability. But the hon. gentleman has moved it in such a way that, in my judgment, he will not obtain a fair expression of the sentiment of the House on this question, and I regret very much it should be placed before the House in that way. I have confidence in the Government, and I am not going to vote want of confidence in the Government on this question. I only regret I cannot say the same in regard to the Senate, that is, that I have confidence in them. This conviction in regard to a change in the constitution of the Senate has forced itself upon me in consequence of the events which have transpired since I have had a seat in this House. I think the action of the Senate during the last Session of Parliament was not only ill-advised, but very arbitrary; and if on no other ground than their action on the Bill to amend the Canada Temperance Act which passed through this House last year, I would be disposed to support any reasonable proposition for an amendment in the constitution of the Senate to bring it into harmony with what I believe to be the public sentiment of this country. I have no hesitation in saying that, in my judgment, the venerable gentlemen who occupy seats in the Upper House are entirely out of harmony and sympathy with the people of this Dominion. I trust if hon. gentlemen at my right, the friends of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), come into power—and I hope they will not, and I do not intend to help them to power even on this question—but if they do attain to power, I trust their record on this question will be better than it was during the time they were in power several years ago. I understand from the public records that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) carried through this House a resolution affirming the advisability and desirability of a change

in the constitution of the Senate. However, no practical results flowed from that motion.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, and the reasons were given.

Mr. JAMIESON. I trust if those hon. gentlemen come into power this question will be treated by them in a practical way. I hope their policy on this question will not be one of masterly inactivity. Should I have the fortune or misfortune to be in this House when the hon. gentlemen at my right change over to the Treasury benches, and should they not take up this question, I will take an opportunity of reminding them——

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of voting for it then.

Mr. JAMIESON,—of proving their honesty in dealing with this question in a practical way. It is not my desire to discuss this question at any great length. I may again express my great regret that it has not come up in such a way as to enable me to give it my support. It is a dangerous state of things to have in any country, a second Chamber not amenable to public sentiment. I have strong convictions on this question. I take no stock, to use a common expression, in the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill). It seems to me that the arguments made use of by that hon. gentleman, such as that the Senate, being appointed for life, is more independent than we who have seats in this House as representatives of the public sentiment of the country, are erroneous. If we carry out that argument to its logical conclusion it will tell diametrically against the principles of responsible government. I agree with the sentiment that we are representatives of the people and that the people in this country govern. The people are the sovereign Parliament of the country, and when we, the direct representatives of the people, pass on any question, while I concede the right of the Senate to discuss and modify such a measure, I do not concede its right, as it did last year in the instance I have referred to, to act in a manner directly opposed to the wishes of the people. Not only that, but after we had refused to concur in the action of the Senate on that question and sent the Bill back to them, they re-affirmed their position. What position are we going to occupy? The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) says that in the event of a dead lock the Queen's representative has the matter in his own hands. I should like to know whether the Queen or the Queen's representative can change the constitution of this country, the British North America Act. I understand that the number of Senators who constitute the Upper House is fixed by that Act and no power short of the Imperial Parliament can make any change in the Act. Nor could the representative of the Queen or even Her Majesty herself, without the concurrence of the Lords and Commons of England, make any change in the Act. Now, Sir, I do trust that in some way or other, from some party or other in this country—and so far as I am concerned, no matter with what party I may be allied, I shall give such a measure my hearty support—I do trust that some change in the constitution of that body will take place which will render it more in harmony with popular opinion and the sympathies of the people. It is said that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has had a wonderful effect already. I am told—whether it is a strange coincidence or not—that, just about the time the amendment was moved in the House, the venerable gentlemen in the Senate woke up to a wonderful extent. Perhaps if we move an amendment every Session, or once or twice a Session, it might have a very beneficial effect upon these gentlemen. I have expressed my views on this question in this cursory fashion. It was not my intention to speak, and in fact I was surprised when the question came up; but I regret very much that it has come up in the way it has. I desire to say that because I vote against this amendment in the shape in which it is moved, in the abstract form in which it has come before the House, that is not to be taken as an index of my opinion on the subject. I simply vote against it because it is a vote of want of confidence, and as I am a supporter of the Government, and have confidence in its judgment and ability in the Administration of the affairs of this country, I shall vote against the amendment on that ground. I trust, however, to see the day when a different state of things will prevail in this country, in reference to the constitution of the body known as the Senate.

Mr. MILLS. Perhaps the House will allow me to say a word by way of explanation. The hon. gentleman says I carried a resolution on this subject in the House in 1875, and that I took no further action. I stated at the time that I did not propose to go further than to get the House to express an opinion on the subject, with a view of making it an issue in the election. My opinion was then, and is now, that a change in our constitution, whether it is a change within our power to make, or a change which we may seek at the hands of another body, should not be made without popular sanction. That was the reason I did not then proceed further, and my desire now is to obtain from the House such an expression of opinion as that the country will understand precisely how hon. gentleman stand on this question.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has given us a very frank and interesting account of the state of his feelings, and the tendency of his vote upon this question. He has told us that he agrees thoroughly with the principle of this resolution, but that he will not vote for it now, for fear he should seem to express want of confidence in the Government; but that if our friends come into power and do not reform the Senate, and the question should come up again, then he would be happy to vote for it. I fancy that is about the state of feeling of a great many gentlemen on that side, who are really with us in regard to that question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CASEY. I do not mean those gentlemen who are crying "no." I do not suspect them; but there are gentlemen on that side who entertain similar views.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CASEY. Then, as we seem to have a pretty unanimous denial from that side that they entertain the same views as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, those who have been calling "no" will certainly not shelter themselves behind the plea that they are voting against this resolution, because it is a vote of want of confidence. As we have a nearly unanimous expression of opinion that they are against this motion on principle, then we should be justified in taking the vote which will take place on this motion as the real expression of the opinions of those gentlemen, and they will not be able to hide behind the question of confidence. Now, this habit of taking refuge behind the pretext of confidence or want of confidence, the habit of expressing blind loyalty to the Government as an excuse for voting against all sorts of resolutions, brought up in this particular form, has gone too far in this House. Such doctrines were ridiculed by the present leader of the House, when they were proposed in a former Parliament, when he was leader of the Opposition. Not long since, I had occasion to read one of his speeches on that point, in which he ridiculed the idea that an abstract resolution not expressing want of confidence in the Government, an abstract question of policy brought forward as an amendment to Supply, could or should be construed as a motion of want of confidence in the Government. And he ridiculed it properly, because it is a well known parliamentary prac-

tice, known to no one better than himself, that a motion of this kind is not necessarily one of want of confidence in the Government. It is not a motion of want of confidence unless the Government choose to make it so. It would not have been so on this occasion if the right hon. gentleman had not made it so; and if he has made it so, if he has laid it down as a policy so to regard it, it is for the reason that he wishes to have the motion defeated, that he does not want an open expression of opinion upon it by his friends, as well as those on this side. He has called upon the loyalty of his friends and backers to vote down this motion, although some of them, as we have already had proof, will give that vote, feeling at the same time full sympathy with the opinions expressed in the resolution. So, Sir, I say that pretext is worn out. Now, my hon. friend who preceded me certainly made one very important admission, and one which I think he honestly made. He told us the Senate were not in harmony with the opinions of the people of Canada. That is what we have been contending all this afternoon and for years back. That is what we believe to be the fact—that the Senate are not in harmony with the views of the people, and that, when an election comes round and the views of the people are expressed in the shape of an election of members to this House, it will turn out that the Senate is not in political harmony with this House either. Both the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me have referred to the motion carried in this House in 1875, affirming this principle, and almost in the identical words of the motion now before us. But attention has not been called to the fact that in 1873 a similar motion, almost in the same words, was proposed and defeated; that almost immediately after that Session there was a dissolution of the House, and that, although that question of the Senate was not a leading issue at that election, because it was overshadowed by the great issue of the Pacific scandal, yet the new House that was elected affirmed by a non-partisan vote the very principle which the members who sat here in 1873 had rejected. So we see that after this matter had been discussed in Parliament, after there had been an election, in which no doubt, this issue went for something, after a new House came back, the principle was affirmed. Yet I think my hon. friend for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and his colleagues were quite right in not pressing that principle into action until there was an opportunity to make it an issue at the elections. That opportunity did not occur. The issue was again overshadowed by one of those waves of popular enthusiasm which my hon. friend from Bruce referred to, the infatuation about the National Policy, and we have had no election tried squarely upon this issue yet. But I approve of the conduct of the Liberal Government of that time in postponing action as they did. If the present Government had seen fit to follow their wholesome example, and postpone the making of an infinitely more radical and revolutionary change which they did make last year in the representative institutions of our country, they would have gone much further towards performing their duty as responsible Ministers and representatives of the people. Now, the hon. Minister of Marine did make use of some arguments in the course of his remarks, most of which I think have been disposed of by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies). That hon. Minister asks, how are we to get a non-partisan Senate? Would a Senate elected by the people be less partisan than the present? We never contended that it would be. What we have been contending is that the Senate should be in harmony with the people. If the people are partisan, if they are strong on one side, so should the Senate be, and so should be the House of Commons; if there are not strong party lines among the people, the Senate should reflect that state of things. What we claim is that the Senate should represent the people whether they are partisan or not; and I am afraid it will not be non-partisan until that millenium comes when party lines will disappear altogether. The hon. gentleman said that the House of Lords were more subject to the ruling party than the Senate. Of course it is in one sense, though it cannot be said that it is more docile—I have to thank my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) for the word—in support of any Government than the Senate is in support of this Government. But we all remember the case, which has been alluded to more than once, of the great Reform Bill, which the House of Lords would undoubtedly have continued to oppose had it not been for the fear that the Tory majority in that House would be swamped by the elevation of others to the peerage. That is one of the wholesome checks which exist in England upon the action of the House of Lords. It is because the Government of the day can bring this check to bear upon political opponents holding hereditary seats, that the House of Lords is less dangerous to constitutional liberty than the Senate of Canada; for if it undertook to show open and dogged defiance to the Government of the day, it would be swamped by the elevation of the friends of liberty to the peerage. The Senate of Canada is dangerous to liberty, because the Government of the day, which represents the people, cannot in any way prevent it obstructing, if it choses, any legislation that Government may carry through the popular House, and any such obstacle in the way of legislation is dangerous to popular liberty. The comparison in other respects between the Senate and the House of Lords is one for which I think the members of our Upper Chamber will not thank the leader of this House. If there is anything calculated to bring ridicule on our worthy friends in that Chamber, which I would be far from doing, it is the attempt to institute such a comparison. We have the greatest respect for the individuals composing our Upper Chamber, whom the leader of the House called, in his amusing and humorous way, life peers; we have great respect for them personally, respect for their abilities, and often respect for their action; but it is the most unkind thing possible to ask this House to institute any comparison between that body and the English House of Lords. We all know that the English House of Lords represent a distinct interest; that the constitution of England has been dual from the first, one body representing the great land interest, land holders and aristocrats, and the other body representing the people, and that the House of Lords was not instituted, as our House was, for the purpose of acting as a check on the other body. Both bodies naturally constituted the Parliament of the realm, representing the different classes of the community. No such reason existed for the creation of a Brummagem House of Lords in Canada. As a matter of fact, the Senate, as constituted from the first, has merely been a means of pensioning off those members of the party in power who have been unable or have not taken the trouble to find seats in the popular assembly, and a means of finding a seat for a Minister when it has not been convenient to open a constituency and send him back for election; it has been used for these purposes entirely, and I think it cannot be pretended that the appointments, as a rule, have been made with any reference to the calm, judicial character of the appointees. If we took the thoroughly Tory view of my friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), that it is necessary to check and hinder the will of the people as expressed in the Lower House, then these appointments might seem to be made with regard to the fitness of things; but looking on them as a body of men supposed to be so superior in political training and knowledge, and in impartiality, to the members of this House, that they have a right to revise our legislation, and throw it out if it does not seem good to them, I think it cannot be pretended that the appointments have been made with a view to the fitness of the parties appointed. My hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) asserted that nobody

on this side of the House had grappled with the hon. Premier's argument that an elective Senate had been tried before in Canada, and had been found to be a failure. We did not grapple with that argument because there was no such argument. There was an assertion made by the hon. Premier that the experiment had been such a failure as to disgust Mr. George Brown with the principle of an elective Senate, an assertion which was immediately shown to be glaringly incorrect, because Mr. George Brown had always been a consistent opponent of an elective Senate. But we never did have an elective Senate. The old Legislative Council was partly composed of elective members; but I think we are all old enough to remember that the nominative members were not turned out to make way for them, and that there was always a large leaven of nominative members along with those who had been elected. Then again, Sir, as to the actual failure or success of the experiment. If the Hon. George Brown was right for once, as the hon. First Minister has told us, the right hon. First Minister must have been wrong, because he was a supporter of the principle which he says Mr. Brown opposed; and, in practice, I think, Mr. Brown's contention was maintained by the facts, rather than the contention of the First Minister. No doubt in the earlier years during which elective members sat in the Senate, that body did make one or two attempts to deal with money Bills, but they very soon found out their mistake. The point was given up; and had we an elective Senate for fifty years, it is not probable that this demand would be over repeated. There were no signs of it for years before Confederation, and I do not remember the slightest expression of opinion of any considerable number of electors in favor of the return to the nominative system. The great bulk of Canadians were surprised, and more than surprised, to find that we had gone back to the middle ages for our plan to constitute a second Chamber. The Premier says that the plan of an elective Senate is incompatible with responsible government. I suppose the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill), would call that another argument. But the right hon. gentleman gave no reason, I presume because there is no reason, for the assertion. I cannot imagine any reason why an elective Senate should be incompatible with responsible government. If there is, I hope some hon. gentleman will give it to us before the debate is over, but at present we have only the bare assertion to deal with. It is a fact that responsible government did exist for a number of years in Canada with a Senate in part elective, and which it was intended to make wholly elective. I take the other side, and argue that the existence of a nominative Senate is utterly inconsistent with responsible and representative institutions, because it is a standing and irremovable obstacle in the way of carrying out the will of the people. Then the Premier said there was no popular agitation in favor of this motion, there were no petitions and so on. Well, the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) has told us what view the temperance people take of the action of the Senate; he has told us that they have no confidence in the Senate. We did not need to hear that from the hon. gentleman, because we remember that at all the meetings of temperance associations since the action of the Senate last year, and at many of the meetings of the clergymen of different churches, resolutions were passed declaring the people had no confidence in the Senate, and that the constitution of that body should be changed. Nay more, we had petitions from the temperance associations laid before the House, in which the same sentiments were enunciated, so that the House is well informed of the sentiment of the temperance people, and of the fact that there has been and is a strong agitation throughout the country in favor of a change. Thus the hon. gentleman's plea that there is no agitation falls to the ground, in face of the fact given by one of his own supporters that there exists an agitation, and a powerful one, in favor of a change. We are charged with not having a definite plan to propose. I think it was the Minister of Marine made that charge. Well, I think the principle is as clearly and definitely laid down in the resolution as it could be. It would have been absurd for us to propose a definite detailed plan, involving all the machinery for electing the Senate, as a motion in amendment to the motion to go into Supply, and that just for the sake of trying to satisfy the Minister of Marine. Had we done that, we would have earned the reprobation of the country and justified the allegations of those who say such a resolution should not be brought up on the present occasion. The proposition is clear and definite, as to principle, and if the House should adopt it it will be the duty of the Government to work out the details. There is room for difference with regard to detail. There is room to argue in favor of election of the Senate by the Local Parliaments or by direct appeal to the people. I do not pretend to discuss these details, but I say the vast majority of the people, Liberal and Conservative, believe that some change is needed in order to do away with this clique of irresponsible life peers as I may call them, who form the Senate of Canada—not to do away with them in a personal sense, but to do away with the present constitution of that body, and give us a second Chamber, if we are to have one at all, which will be responsible to the people. Some of the arguments would lead us to believe there is no use for the Chamber at all. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries used a strong argument in that direction when he said the Senate need not discuss matters of legislation because they are fully discussed here. If the government would leave this an open question, and give their supporters liberty to ascertain the feelings of their constituencies, I am certain this resolution would be carried by a considerable majority.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), is asking us to do something which needs a great deal of explanation before it can receive the sanction of this House. I am glad the Opposition have brought this matter forward, but I regret that they should have brought it forward as an amendment to the motion to go into Supply. I regret this, not because I approve of the principle of an elective Senate, for I do not, but because I would like to see scope given for a fuller and freer expression of the opinion of the House, which would be given were the resolution brought forward as a substantive motion. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), has evidently been making a mental caricature of the Senate, and some of his inferences are not only amusing but very misleading. He asked for a change on the principle that it was needed on the ground of economy. The hon. gentleman knows that in the country there is no stronger principle you can go to the people upon than any principle involving economy, but it was most remarkable that he should first give us the cost of the Senate during last Session and the preceding Sessions, but not tell us, what every hon. gentleman must know, that it the Senate were made elective it would add to the expenditure of the country. I do not think an election to the Senate could be carried on for much less than the expense involved in the election of members to this House; so that, upon the principle of economy, the motion is a failure. The people would have to pay more for an elective Senate than for the Senate as at present constituted. There is another principle enunciated, and that is that the Senate, as at present constituted, is not responsible to the people. We all know that it was designed the Senate as at present constituted should not be responsible to the people in the sense in which hon. gentlemen opposite endeavor to use the term. We know that with a Senate elected by the people, placed to some extent—to what extent we do not know, because the resolution only asks us to formulate the principle of an elective Senate—above this House, we would have one body elected, the outcome of the

popular will sitting in judgment over another body, which is also the outcome of the popular will. No such anomaly exists in any country in the world, or could exist consistent with the legislation of the country's affairs. Now, so far as the independence of the Senate is concerned, it seems to me that, whenever the Senate does act, it is blamed, and, if it does not act as often as hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think it should, it is blamed also. I do not think the Senate has interfered with any measure passed by this House this Session without its being abused by the Reform press of this country. But, a day or two ago, it saw fit not to give its sanction to a Bill which had received the sanction of the majority of the members of this House. I myself voted against the principle of the Bill introduced by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Robertson), though it received the votes of a majority of the members of this House; but, because the Senate did this, it is abused by the Reform press of this country. If we cannot agree with the Senate when it negatives the action of the majority of this House, it is not for the press to abuse it because it exercises one of the functions of its creation in doing so. Take the case of my hon. friend from North Lanark, the very ground upon which, if this were a substantive motion, he would support it to-night, that last Session the Senate added on the well-known amendment to the Bill which he introduced in this House. I understand it to be one of the functions of that body, that, if this House is compelled, owing to the strength of a popular wave passing over the country to pass legislation here which in our judgment we may not approve of, one of the duties of the Senate is to check that until the time that it becomes an assured fact that the popular will is right. It is just possible that the wave of temperance which is going over the country may not last. If so, do not blame the Senate for what it did, though you may disagree with it, though you may find it inconvenient in the mean time, but in that act the Senate was simply discharging one of its well known functions. So far as the Senate being independent is concerned, we have heard to-night that it cannot be independent of the man who creates it. It seems to me that hon. gentlemen give hon. members of the other House but very little credit for honesty and for intelligence. It seems tome that the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), and all who have preceded him might as well say, when the First Minister recommends the appointment of a judge to the bench, that he cannot be independent but must subvert his position, and remain the tool, if he ever was the tool, of the First Minister because he appointed him. I think the case is analogus, and there is one fact of which I wish to remind hon. gentlemen, and that is there is no doubt that a good deal of the opposition that they now manifest to the Senate is owing to the fact that the Senate is at the present time so largely composed of men whose politics are in unison with the majority of this House. I say there is no doubt of that; there is none in my mind. I may be wrong, but I give my reason why I make that statement. During the five years Mr. Mackenzie was in power, we saw not one honest effort made to alter the constitution of the Senate, if we except the effort which was made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), which proved abortive, and for which he got roundly abused by his own friends. During that time Mr. Mackenzie made many appointments to the Senate, and I wish to point out that, if the general elections of 1878 had resulted in the retention of Mr. Mackenzie and his party in office, the Senate to-day, with the number of vacancies that have since occurred, would be of a political complexion, different from what it is now. So that you see the lapse of time will undoubtedly cure the very evil of which these hon. gentlemen complain and will remove one of their chief obstacles to the present constitution of the Senate. It may be that the hope of altering the political complexion of the Senate in this regard is a forlorn one. It is not for me to speak as to that; that question will be decided by the people. But I do say that, if the Senate were made elective, as is proposed, I fail to see how, by any method that I have ever been able to hear or to conceive, it could be made practicable. If hon. gentlemen opposite would take up the question of the abolition of the Senate as contradistinguished from the election of the Senate, I can understand that there would be a great deal of force in what they say as to the results; but to come to this House with a simple principle, the principle of affirming the election of members to the Senate, is one that this House ought not to pass upon without the details, without the system, the plan by which it is proposed to make this important change in our constitution, being fully made known to this House. What would be thought of Mr. Gladstone submitting to the English House of Commons a simple resolution affirming the principle of Home Rule, without going on and presenting, as he did, in a statesmanlike way—however much we may disapprove of it—his scheme for the government of Ireland? For these reasons I shall oppose the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to see that the hon. member who has just sat down has really come out squarely and fairly in favor of an irresponsible Senate. He says that he does not desire to see a Senate in any sense or in any way responsible to the people. There is a little difference of position between that hon. gentleman and what I understood to be some of the remarks of the right hon. the leader of the Government. I understood the right hon. the leader of the Government to say that the Senate was in sympathy with the people of the country, that, because it was in sympathy with him and he was supported by the majority of the people of this country, it was therefore evident that the Senate itself was in sympathy with the majority of the people of the country. I do not care just now to point out the fair conclusion which a juxtaposition of the hon. gentleman's argument with that of his supporter and friend from North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) would lead to, because the hon. member for North Lanark said clearly and distinctly that the Senate was not to-day in sympathy with the majority of the people of the country. Perhaps I might be tempted to draw the conclusion that the right hon. the leader of the Government was not to-day in sympathy with the people of the country, but I leave that for these two hon. gentlemen to fight out between themselves. There are two main divisions of this question in regard to the Senate, and one which the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) brought forward, I think the one which seems to influence the majority of the gentlemen on the other side of the House, I mean in defending the Senate because of its being an imitation of the English House of Lords. I think that, in this argument, the hon. gentleman has entirely misconceived the original object of the Senate in this country and he has certainly entirely misconceived the present state of the Senate. As I understand, those who dealt with the British North America Act and formed our Confederation did not form our Senate upon the model of the English House of Lords. As I understand, the gentlemen who did that work, they created the Senate for the express purpose of being a balance between the greater and the lesser Provinces of this country and for the purpose of defending and protecting the rights of the minor Provinces. But, Sir, supposing the Senate had been intended for a model of the English House of Lords, I am sure nobody who knows anything about the two Chambers but must see what a perfect travesty the Senate is upon its original. The Senate is in no sense the representative of a class; I say so, not because there is a class in this country which the Senate might represent, if there were such a class

certainly the Senate could not be said to represent it, but I am happy to know that in this country there are no classes, in this country we are intensely and inevitably democratic, and there is no class of people who possesses an undue influence in the government of the country. The English House of Lords did demand and obtain a share in the government of the country at a time when a privileged class was able to impose itself upon the people and to assert its right to a large share in the Government; but in this country there is no such class, and no second Chamber is needed to represent it. The right hon. leader, in his reply to the hon. member for Bothwell, seemed to indicate that the latter was proposing, as a substitute for our present Senate, something in the form of the American Senate. I do not so understand the motion, and I do not think there is any hon. gentleman on this side of the House who desires to introduce into our country that portion of the American constitution. Here we have an executive government directly responsible to the Parliament of the country, while in the United States they have an executive which is not so responsible. The House of Representatives and the Senate have certain executive functions which are specially delegated to them, but which I do not think any Senate, whether appointed or elected, could possibly possess in this country. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has not fairly represented our position when he suggested that we on this side of the House are opposed to the Senate because the Senate is opposed to us. I do not think that is the feeling of anyone on this side, or that it influenced the hon. member for Bothwell in any way. We believe that the Senate is a menace to the rights and privileges of the people, and we believe that it does not matter one whit whether the Senate be in sympathy with one party or the other, because it is just as liable to oppose the behests of the people when one party is in power as the other. It is true that in consequence of the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite have held the reins of power for the greater part of the time since Confederation, their party is more largely represented in the Senate than ours. As a rule gentlemen who are appointed to the Senate, no matter from which side of politics, are intensely partisan before they are appointed. They are chiefly appointed in consequence of political services, and it is not in human nature when men have worked for years through campaign after campaign for one political party, that they should be able immediately to divest themselves of all political feeling and act in a judicial and independent spirit. The hon. gentleman has alluded to the judiciary of the country, and has asked why the senators should not be able to divest themselves of their political feelings like the judiciary. Sir, it is a very different thing. The judiciary have not to deal with political questions, they are not concerned in the political warfare of the country; but the senators are so concerned, and even though they may be independent of the people of the country, they will still have to pass upon the acts and legislation of the party which they opposed or which they favored before they became senators. The hon. gentlemen opposite have pointed to the difficulties which might occur in the case of an elective Senate. I am inclined to think the people of this country will be able to overcome those difficulties; I am inclined to think that our statesmen would be sufficiently wise and far-seeing to remove those difficulties, were they to arise. But there is still a more radical way of cutting that Gordian knot, and one which I myself would favor, and that is the complete abolition of the Senate. I am quite prepared to support the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell because I think it a step in the right direction, but I would be prepared myself, individually, to go much further than that, because I would like to see the expenditure incurred for the maintenance of the Senate removed from the Public Accounts of our country. In looking over the Public Accounts I find there is an average of something like $130,000 a year spent upon the Senate by itself, and I find there is also a portion of the general expenditure connected with the public buildings at Ottawa, which, added to that sum, I think I am safe in saying would amount to $200,000 a year. Now, I believe that the Senate is not necessary; I believe the amount of work which our Senate has accomplished, or which an elective Senate might accomplish, would not be a fair equivalent for this expenditure. When I think that, upon a moderate computation, this expense represents an interest upon $4,000,000; when I believe that by the removal of the Senate we could clear off so much of our public debt, and reduce our annual expenditure, I am convinced that the good the Senate is doing to-day, or that it is ever likely to do, is not equivalent to that expenditure. The First Minister said he did not think the Senate was of any great use, but he pointed out that it was doing no harm. I think the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution had pointed out that the Senate is likely to do a great deal of harm in certain circumstances. Instances have been brought forward where the Senate has opposed the will of the people. I was suprised to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries defending the existence of the Senate in its present form. I can quite understand that, as a Minister, he would not be prepared to accept that motion, but I was surprised to hear him say that the Senate did no harm, and that, as a matter of fact, it was not necessary for the Senate to discuss the Acts which come before it from this House. I think the most important instance which has occurred in the history of the Senate where that body has been an injury to the country and opposed the will of the people, is when it put an impediment in the way of temperance legislation, and I was surprised to hear the Minister of Marine overlooking that fact in his defence of the Senate. Sir, I think the hon. gentlemen who have opposed this motion to-night have not really undertaken to defend the present constitution of the Senate, they have only tried to point out what might be the possible weaknesses in an elective Senate. They have only tried to point out that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has not or could not remove the expense attendant on the Senate if an elective Senate were substituted for the present appointed Senate. In this way hon. gentlemen have given evidence of the necessity of something being done. I am glad to know that the hon. member for Bothwell has brought this question forward before the next elections, whenever they may come. I understand this motion to mean that the Liberal party of this country has resolved to try and bring about a change in the constitution of the Senate; and, if they do so, it is right to announce that policy on the floor of Parliament before going before the people. It is absurd to say that this question has not been before the people. It has, on several occasions, been discussed in Parliament and before the country by many of the leading members of the Liberal party; and I may tell the hon. leader of the Government, though he may not know it, there is a strong feeling in the country that the Senate has outlived its usefulness and does not accomplish the purpose which it was intended to accomplish, and that it can only accomplish evil and not good. And this feeling will be aroused and the attention of the people will be turned towards this matter by the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to-night. I think it is probable from what has dropped from the leader of the Government that the chances are that the elections will not come on immediately, but that perhaps a year may intervene, and during that time the people will have an opportunity of thinking over the subject before they are called upon to choose their representatives in the next Parliament. In considering the matter they will come to the conclusion that the proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell is a

sound and just one, and one that will meet with the approval of the people of the country. I have therefore great pleasure in supporting this motion, although were I myself to choose in the matter I would perhaps go a little further and abolish the whole thing.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I deem it my duty to explain the vote I am about to give on the important question now under discussion. It is proposed by this motion to change the mode of appointment of senators, and a blow is aimed at the basis of the present system. When Confederation was accepted by the various Provinces, it was agreed that the senators would be appointed for life by the Crown. This was accepted in order to balance the powers of the State. It was then understood that at certain periods of crisis, at certain times of popular excitement, the policy of the Lower House might be warped so as to seriously endanger the interests of the future, and it was understood that such a body as the Senate, who, so to speak, would only be responsible to their conscience and to their God, was necessary as a moderating power. To-day it is proposed that popular passions should be called upon to elect this second House, and to disturb the stability of the established order of things. By the establishment of a Senate appointed for life we were offered a guarantee against popular effervescence, against certain principles which might prevail at a given moment, and imperil social order, and at the same time this measure propounded the wise principles which preside over the laws of well governed communities. The guarantees which were given to us ought to be maintained. People are complaining to-day that the great majority of the Senate is recruited among members of one distinct political stripe. Well, this is the necessary consequence of the system which prevails in this country, but that does not prove that the system is bad. The Grit or Liberal party, whatever we may choose to call it, having been in opposition for a long time, the consequence is that they have been unable to appoint senators. Let them obtain power and hold it for a long period through a wise policy, and then the Senate will be composed of more Liberals than Conservatives. Such is the working of parties. What is most important is that the Senate should always be composed of men appointed by a Government who are responsible to the people. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the nature of the complaint? It is charged that the Senate has refused to pass a law on temperance. Well, if there is a reason which has, more than any others, convinced me of the usefulness of the Senate, it is this same reason. I have no hesitation in saying that if the majority of this House passed a law for the absolute prohibition of strong liquors, it would simply be an act of weakness, a concession to prejudices, and a concession unworthy of our enlightened and intelligent House. It is perfectly known, that, especially in northern countries, it is impossible to prohibit the use of alcoholic liquors; let the traffic be regulated, let it be endeavored, through wise legislation, to give good liquors to the trade; let light wines be introduced, and by degrees, two or three generations hence, this appetite of the people for strong liquors will disappear; but let it not be laid down as a principle, that it is wise to deceive people and to secure their confidence through false measures. Quite recently this House passed a law for which I have much respect—a respect, which however, would not involve the sacrifice of my convictions—to allow people who do not believe in God to obtain the confidence of judges, to influence the decision of cases without taking their oath. The Senate, very wisely refused to sanction that law. The Senate may do a great deal of good, and it cannot do any harm. It may do good by checking our laws or giving the finishing touch, and during periods of great popular effervescence, by putting back the car of the State on the right track. It cannot do any harm, because if it happened to pass laws which would not be just or beneficial to the country, the popular branch of the Legislature would be there to check it. From the standpoint of Conservative principles, from the standpoint of social order, in the name of the Government, of the family, so to speak, which the Conservative party tends to consolidate, both by the autonomy of the Provinces, and by due respect for the rights of each citizen, I object to the proposed innovation, and I very much fear that our friends opposite who desire to bring about this retrogressive measure, which is at the same time a sacrifice to popular prejudices, I very much fear I say that this measure will not bring the amount of support they expect from it. Let us make lasting laws. Let us have due regard to whatever compacts may exist between Provinces. We may, from time to time, differ on fiscal policy; we may have different ideas on certain legislation, on various policies of management, but there are great outlines which do not vary, and on which we can never hold different opinions. Let us construe the federal compact in such a way as to derive from it the greatest profit for the people, but let us not change the bases which have been adopted by the different Provinces at the time of Confederation.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) I do not desire to protract this debate, but I should like to point out to my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), that he has misappreciated the principle of the resolution before the House. The principle of that resolution is not to abolish the Senate, but simply to adopt another mode with regard to its constitution. I perfectly agree with all he has said on the necessity of a second House as a means of balancing the powers of the State. On that point I am as much a Conservative as my hon. friend from Bellechasse, but he must see the difference between having a Senate which is not responsible to anybody whatever and a Senate which is responsible to the people. All that my hon. friend from Bothwell asks is that the Senate should be constituted as to not be, as it now is, a perfectly irresponsible body which can defy the power of the House, set itself against all legislation, and which cannot be brought to change its opinion. Our constitution has been compared to the English constitution. There is an immense difference between the two. In England, the House of Lords is not irresponsible; if it sets itself against legislation, against the will of the country, there is a way of changing its opinion. After all, our constitution is a democratic constitution. The power which ought to rule is the choice of the majority. I do not wish to say that it is always supreme wisdom which prevails, but everybody will admit that it is the majority which rules, while as regards the Senate, under our constitution, it is quite different. The Senate is composed of a limited number which can never be increased nor diminished. If the majority in this House enacts a law, and if the Senate refuses to adopt it, what is the result? Under our constitution there is absolutely no means of changing this state of things. In England, there is a remedy which lies in the Sovereign's power. The Sovereign himself has the right to add to the number of the House of Lords. It is a dangerous remedy, which has never been applied to my knowledge, but it was very near being applied. I do not remember just now whether it was at the time of the emancipation of Catholics, or in the case of the Reform Bill of 1832, but I know it was on one of these two questions—the Sovereign was very near adding a certain number of persons to the House of Lords in order to restore harmony in that House. Well, Mr. Speaker, the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell, has no other object but to bring the Senate to be more in harmony with the popular branch. If it was a question of abolishing the Senate, I would agree with the hon. member for Bellechasse, and I would vote against the motion of the hon. member

for Bothwell; but on this point, I must make another remark, which, I am sure will meet the approbation of all the French members, and it is that an elective Senate is not at variance with Conservative principles, for it is a measure which has been urged for over fifty years by the French nationality.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I think the Senate does not occupy the position it should occupy. The First Minister has several times alluded to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as being exceedingly theoretical. In the matter of appointments to the Senate, the Premier has been politically eminently practical. Allusion has been made to the British House of Peers. While our constitution is generally framed on British principles, there are many things in which the comparison is not a fair one. Even the popular branch of that Legislature is to-day struggling with questions which we have settled. I allude more particularly to the question of Home Rule. The nation is exercised to a very great extent to-day, on this question, a question which we, as Canadians, have settled, and the right to which we would not for a moment submit to be deprived of. It has been stated here, and I believe correctly, that the Senate, in many instances, has been recruited from defeated candidates. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has particularly alluded to this. Let me refer to a single sample. It is about twelve years ago that, at the foot of Lake Huron, a gunboat arrived in port with the Premier on board. He landed amid the booming of cannon. There was a nomination going on. To his candidate he lent all the power of his personal prestige, and advocated his candidature. He spoke vigorously. He spoke for one hour. His candidate was defeated by 600 majority. Had he spoken for one hour longer I think he would have been defeated by twice that number. What was the first act following that? The representative of the people came to the House and was soon called to lead the Government. The defeated candidate was at once placed in the Senate. What was the chief act of the Senate soon after? Was it that of independence, that judicial position which is claimed for it in theory? By no means. If the theory was carried into practice in the selection of members of the Senate, and if the members of that body acted independently and justly, the Senate would possess very much more influence than it has to-day. It is stated that one of the objects of the Senate is to check hasty legislation. A Session or two ago we had an illustration of this checking of hasty legislation. In the last days of the Session, in almost its last hour, the celebrated McCarthy Act was introduced, and its 100 sections were considered and passed between Saturday evening and Tuesday morning. At 4 o'clock that morning there were not half a dozen members who were not asleep, and those who were passing the Bill moved about more like ghosts than representatives of the people. The Bill went to the Senate and they passed it through without reading it. The amendments were not printed at all—it was passed as a mere matter of form. And that is the way in which hasty legislation is checked by that body. Subsequently, the Senate found time to pass an amendment to defeat and kill a measure which had been introduced by the Senate known as the Scott Act, and which the people in many sections were, by vast majorities, using. Such are some of the actions of the Senate. The First Minister has asked, why should we object to the Senate when it is doing no harm? That is the best recommendation that can be given it; and we are asked further to understand that the meaning of doing no harm is, that it does not oppose any act of this Government. That is what is meant by doing no harm. When there was an Administration directing the affairs of this country adverse to the political feelings of the Senate, there was action then, strong, vigorous action too. There was the action of a "fishing" commission that sat for weeks to try and find something on which to trip the then Administration. One of the duties of the members of that committee was to examine the Kaministiquia River. Regardless of expense, one of them purchased a bed-cord, hired a canoe and took soundings of the river. One of the grave charges brought against the Mackenzie Administration was in regard to squandering money on that river, and wrongly locating the terminus of the railway. Events have revenged the ex-Premier. When I stood upon the same ground two years ago, I saw six pile-drivers working day and night preparing the foundations for an immense elevator for the Canadian Pacific Railway. A small elevator had been erected at the point where the opponents of the Mackenzie Administration claimed that the railway should terminate. Appropriations had been made to improve that harbor to the extent of a quarter of a million, but they found themselves under the necessity of adopting the view of those men whose views they condemned, and they are expending money to improve the navigation of the river, so that shipping may take advantage of the natural position of the waters. One-sixth of the amount expended in trying to place the harbor in the wrong place, is now found adequate to establish a harbor where nature intended it to be. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has tried to defend the Senate, as he does all Government views. He has stated that the resolution is "airy, nebulous and misty." He pronounced with great emphasis, to the injury I fear of his knuckles upon his desk, that the Reform party has never given to the people any direct, square issue. Well, I believe the hon. gentleman is free from such a charge. I believe he went to his constituency with a clear and distinct issue—independence. We have seen the way it has been carried out. One hon. gentleman opposite has expressed regret that the motion come in a forms which he cannot support, although he is in favor of its principle. He admits to us that when he obtains his freedom, when the chains are stricken from him and the party on this side occupy the Treasury benches, then he will be glad to support this measure. We are glad to know where he stands. Much weight has been attached by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) to the cost which would be caused if the form of the Senate is changed to an elective body, the cost of holding the elections. Since when have gentlemen opposite become so anxious about the cost of elections? This is a recent idea with them. Last Session they were reminded of the cost of certain changes relating to elections, a cost which has since been found to exceed all expectations. We hear nothing of all that. Supposing it did cost something we would get something for it. What are we getting now? We have had some discussion recently about superannuation. To the general principle of superannuation there may be offered many objections—at all events to the manner in which it is worked out. But as now constituted I believe the usefulness of the Senate is gone, and I think it would be a great economy in its present form if we were to superannuate that body.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before the matter goes to a vote I crave the indulgence of the House for about five minutes. I intend to vote for the resolution of the hon. member for Bothwell, not because I am satisfied with it, but simply because it is a change, and, being a change, it must be for the better, because it cannot be for the worse. I wish to go a step further than the hon. member for Bothwell. I agree with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) that the Senate is a useless body and ought to be abolished—that it is not only useless but expensive. If any evidence was required that we in this country are wise enough to govern ourselves by a single Chamber, I think it has been furnished by the example of the great Province of Ontario, which, for eighteen years, has been ruled by a single

Chamber, and has never felt the least bad effect from it, or the least need for a second Chamber. The right hon. leader of the Government pleaded for a further lease of existence for the Senate in its present form, and the only argument he adduced that had any force was simply that it did no harm, and therefore, that it ought to be allowed to live. Well, Sir, it would puzzle a Philadelphia lawyer to find any good it did, and doing neither good nor harm, I think the most reasonable and sensible thing to do is to abolish it altogether. I was suprised to hear the Premier say that our constitution was not founded or modelled on the federal principle but on the monarchical principles of England and its constitutional principles. Now, it may be that he meant that the framers of the constitution tried to model it in that way, but if they did, and if they thought the Senate as now constituted was a reproduction of the House of Lords, they were miserably mistaken. It does not represent the House of Lords in one single respect, except that it is not responsible to the people. If we want to find the constitution of the House of Lords and compare it with our Senate we have to go back to the time when the House of Lords first came into existence. I need not tell hon. gentlemen that the time was when there was no Parliament in Britain, when the king was supreme. But that sort of thing could not continue longer when there were men nearly as powerful in the country, and even more powerful, than the king himself. The result was that the Lords time and time again claimed a share of the government. They got what they wanted, and it was a good thing for the country in many respects, although in others not so good. Still they succeeded in establishing their claim. That was the foundation of the House of Lords. It has come down to us modified, it is true, in many respects, but still the successors of the first barons of England. And we are told that in this new country of ours it was the intention of the framers of our constitution to model our Senate on the House of Lords of England. Why, Sir, is it not an absurdity, is it not an impudent thing, to say nothing of its grotesqueness for a young, struggling country like ours, scarcely 100 years old, to dig into the graves of by-gone years and array ourselves in the worm-eaten vestments of a thousand years ago? But I deny that the Senate of Canada in anyway represents the House of Lords of Great Britain. The House of Lords has some excuse for its existence in the past, but what reason have we for the existence of a Senate now? We all know that, as founded at first, the House of Lords represented the landed interests of the country, and that it represents those interests still. Added to that, in some respects it represents the moneyed interests of the country. I would ask if our Senate is any parallel to it in either of these two respects. If you take it as the representative of the landed interest, I am afraid that some of them would be able to say of themselves, in the language of Shakespeare, that they were:

"Lords of their presence and no land beside."

If you take them as representing the moneyed interest, I am afraid some of them only represent the money they expended in helping to elect Government candidates. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as well as the leader of the Government, admitted that the Senate was partisan, and claimed that it was right and proper it should be so. The Premier said: I represent the people of the country; my party has been elected by an overwhelming vote of the people of the country, and here the representatives of the party in the Senate, in upholding me and in carrying out my views, are representing the views of the people of the country. That may be as long as the present Government remains in power. But how would it be supposing that in a year, or two, or three, or four, or five years, when every man in that House has been appointed for the sole and express purpose of supporting the policy of the present leader of the Government, how would it be supposing the other party came into power? Whom would they be bound to represent then? I am afraid they would just do as they have done in the past, endeavor to carry out the views of the hon. gentleman to whom they owe their existence. I need not point out to hon. gentlemen that this was the case when the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie was Premier of the Dominion. We all know that the Province of British Columbia had cause of complaint; that a solemn agreement with them had been violated; and when Mr. Mackenzie, with his usual honesty of purpose, attempted to give that Province compensation, he was baulked by the Senate, no doubt at the express wish of the hon. gentleman who leads the Government now. But, Sir, we have been told by the right hon. leader of the Government that the Senate is a necessity for the defence of the rights of the different Provinces. Will any hon. gentleman on the other side be kind enough to point out when the Senate ever took such a stand? I appeal to hon. gentlemen, without fear of contradiction, to say if I do not speak the literal truth when I declare that instead of protecting the rights of the Provinces, there has never been an attempt made during the last half dozen years, by the party now in power—and there have been very many—to deprive the Provinces of their rights, when that Senate came to the rescue of the Provinces. I defy hon. gentlemen to point out one single instance. What happened when the right hon. leader of the Government tried to grasp the licensing power from the Provinces? If ever there was a dishonest attempt made to seize that which did not belong to the Government, that was the one. For seventeen years, the right of the Provinces to issue licenses had gone unchallenged; it was distinctly understood at the time of Confederation, that that right should belong to them; and yet, in order to advance some party purpose, in order to gratify a private pique against the Government of Ontario, the right hon. gentleman tried to grasp that power, at a grievous expense to this country, in money, besides loss of time and expense of energy by the Provinces in frustrating him. Did the Senate, then, in any manner attempt to prevent the wrong that was being done to the Provinces? It was a matter of notoriety that the Bill was rushed through the Senate in a few minutes, without even being read; it was taken on trust. A friend suggests the Gerrymander Act, as another instance, one of the most infamous attempts on the liberties of the people that was ever made. In that case or in the case of the Franchise Bill, did the Senate make any attempt to right the wrongs that were being done? No, Sir. I believe the time is fast coming when a change will have to be made in the constitution of that body. It may have been modelled after the House of Lords; but one thing can be said of the House of Lords, that they are wise enough to comprehend the drift of public opinion. It is true, they sometimes show a disposition to resist popular will, but they have always sense enough to know when they have gone far enough, and to pause before coming into direct collision with the people; and if the time should ever come when the House of Lords shall try to obstruct the popular will, that day their doom is sealed and I for one would be ready to stand over the wreck, and say: "So perish all such relics of barbarism." It has been stated that the late Hon. George Brown was one of the most persistent advocates of an appointed Senate. I know that he was, and he was a consistent advocate of it; he was always opposed to an elective Senate, and Sir, it was one of the mistakes of his life. We standing here, now, responsible to the country, and to posterity for our acts, are we to be guided in our actions by the opinions of any man of the past? No, perish the thought. It is our duty to do what we believe to be right. It is our duty, whenever we find anything that we consider defective, to endeavor in a constitutional way to

get it corrected; and the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell, although not everything I could wish, is a step in that direction, and I feel bond to give it my support.

Mr. WELDON. I wish to say a few words on this question before the vote is taken. I do not think it necessary to discuss what system shall be adopted. The question is simply whether the present constitution of the Senate answers the purpose which it was intended to answer. Hon. members who made a comparison between it and the House of Lords, forgot that the principle on which the Senate is created is entirely different from that on which the House of Lords is based. The House of Lords is hereditary; its members take their seats in it by virtue either of their elevation to the peerage, which extends beyond life, or by succession. But the principle of life peerages, the principle on which Senators are appointed, is entirely opposed to that on which the House of Lords is based, and it has been so decided by them. When the late Baron Parke was appointed a peer for life, the House of Lords took the matter up, and decided that life peerages should not be created. One of the objections then taken to these peerages was that they would enable a Ministry to swamp the House of Lords with peers appointed for life. So that when we compare the constitution of the Upper Chamber of this Dominion with that part of the British constitution, we find that they are utterly opposed to each other. The principle of our second Chamber, I take it, is an entirely wrong principle. At the time of Confederation the attempt was made to adopt the system in vogue in the Provinces, that of the Legislative Councils. For 17 years that system has been tried, and I think the feeling of the country is that there should be a change. The right hon. Premier said no change should be made unless some wrong could be shown; but we know that great and serious changes have been made in our constitution already. By the Gerrymander Act of 1882, the constitution was changed, and 55 constituencies in the Province of Ontario were altered; and for that Act no reason was shown, nor was it claimed that any wrong was created by the division made in the British North America Act itself. The Franchise Act was another alteration in the constitution; and if the right hon. leader of the Government has felt it necessary to make changes with regard to the constituencies and the electorate, surely the fact that the Senators were appointed originally for life is no reason why, if we find that a change is necessary, that change should not be made. There is another distinction between the Senate and the House of Lords. I think, with the exception of the time my hon. friend for East York was in power, there has never been one measure proposed by the Premier thrown out of or amended by the Senate. We find that the House of Lords deal with Government measures, discuss them calmly and dispassionately, and make serious amendments which the Government are often compelled to accept. But in this House we find that, so far as the Government are concerned, they pay very little regard to the consideration of what action may be taken by the Senate, knowing well that they will take whatever action the Government may dictate. My hon. friend from Lambton has also spoken with regard to appointments. When we look at the appointments lately made, we cannot but help feeling convinced that the mode adopted is not beneficial to the country. The Senate is, in fact, made a refuge, a sort of cave of Adullam, in which many supporters of the Government find a comfortable retreat. With regard to the last appointment to the Senate made from the Province of New Brunswick, if the Senate, as has been pointed out, was established for the purpose of protecting provincial rights, we are entitled to claim that the men appointed should be residents of the Provinces they are supposed to represent. I make no objection to the hon. Senator who was last appointed from New Brunswick, either on account of his race or creed, but I protest against an officer of the House of Commons being pitchforked into the Senate as a representative of the Province of New Brunswick. If there were no other reason, that would be sufficient to make me favor the resolution of my hon. friend. There is another principle with regard to the Senate, which has been pointed out, and verified by the action of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). He has stated that he is in favor of the principle of the resolution, but because he puts party above principle he is going to vote against it. It is because the Senate put party above principle, that I support this resolution.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier) for having pronounced himself in favor of the Senate. In so doing he agrees, not only with the whole Conservative party but also with the immense majority of the population of his Province. I have noticed during this debate that several of the political friends of the hon. member for East Quebec do not hold the same views as he does with regard to the Senate. I have noticed that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) has positively declared that he would vote in favor of the resolutions moved by the hon. member for Bothwell, because these resolutions were only a step towards the abolition of the Senate. Another member of the Opposition has declared that he would vote for these resolutions because they would make the Senate elective, and so would render it useless, as he did not see the necessity of having two Houses elected by the people. In this the hon. member is perfectly consistent, and for my part I do not see the necessity of having two Houses elected by the people. And what guarantee would that afford to the hon. members who are now complaining against the policy of the Government and against certain measures which are pretended to be or really are centralising measures and which have been voted by the Senate during the two last years? Would not the Franchise Bill have been voted by a House elected by the people whose would necessarily have been composed of Tories or of Conservatives from the Province of Quebec, for the Senate having been elected by the people at the same time as the members of the House of Commons, or at about the same time, a number of Conservative senators proportionately as great as the number of Conservative members of the House of Commons would have been elected? And I now ask the hon. members who are now complaining against the Senate because they have not rejected the Franchise Bill whether a House whose great majority would have been composed of Conservative senators would not have adopted the same policy? Evidently it would, and that argument is valueless in my opinion. If we examine the present composition of the Senate we find within it men who have occupied in this House the position of Ministers, who have even filled still higher positions in their respective Provinces—the position of Lieutenant Governor. I notice that the ex-Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Quebec is now a member of the Senate; after having occupied the position of Minister in this House he went to the Upper House. Is it not to be supposed that the experience of such a man is very useful with regard to the legislation which will be adopted by this House, and which will have to be revised by the Upper House? Mr. Speaker, I have been quite surprised at the position taken by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), to whom I might give the very honorable title of apostle of temperance. That hon. gentleman has stated, in the first place, that he was quite favorable to the principle of the resolutions moved by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and then he made another statement none the less surprising when he declared that his confidence in the Government was greater than his distrust towards the Senate. It is a very good thing for the Senate that the hon. member should have so

much confidence in the Government as otherwise there would have been danger for the existence of the Senate. There are many other considerations in favor of the maintenance of a non-elective Senate, as several measures have been adopted both in the Dominion and Local Parliaments which have been defeated in the Upper Houses. To corroborate that statement I will mention the fact that, in the Province of Quebec, the Legislative Council has thought fit on a certain occasion to refuse to vote the supplies which had been submitted to the Council by the Legislative Assembly, and the position taken on that occasion by the Legislative Council of the Province of Quebec was fully sanctioned a few weeks later by the popular vote. A short time after the Cabinet was starved out and they resigned. Another Cabinet was formed and shortly after they appealed to the people; and the immense majority of the Province of Quebec supported this new Government and voted against the former Government to whom the supplies had been refused by the Legislative Council. This is a very strong proof in favor of non-elective Upper Houses. Besides, Mr. Speaker, the Senate is composed in great part of politicians who have been through the House of Commons and who have acquired in this House great experience as regards politics and the affairs of the country, and I do not see that men appointed by the Government should be less qualified to fill the position of senators, whether they are appointed by a Conservative Government or by a Liberal Government; for whatever party may be in power it is their interest to appoint to the Senate the men who have had the most experience and who are best qualified to fill this high position. Now, I believe that the party in power by choosing from among the most distinguished politicians, men who have made their mark in this House must necessarily make as good a choice as if senators were elected by the people, who would be sure to send to the Upper House men who would be more or less young and often less experienced than those appointed by the Government. Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be quite dangerous to alter the present constitution of the Senate, and to do away with that trinity which exists in our constitution. All nations who have not respected the ground works of their constitutions, have found it impossible to prosper, and to exist for a long time. I consider that we have elections enough under our constitution, that frequent elections are a cause of demoralisation for the people, and that after the elective Senate, it is likely that a measure, for the abolition of the Senate, will be proposed, if we are to believe certain hon. gentlemen opposite, who have stated that the proposed mode of transformation of the Senate is only a step towards the abolition of the Senate. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I deem it my duty to vote against the resolutions of the hon. member for Bothwell, and to agree with those who desire that the groundwork of our constitution should be respected, and that the guarantees afforded by the Act of Confederation to the minorities of the various Provinces, should be preserved.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mills.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Forbes,	McIntyre,
Armstrong,	Geoffrion,	McMullen,
Auger,	Gillmor,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Glen,	Mulock,
Béchard,	Guay,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gunn,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Ray,
Burpee,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Scriver,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jackson,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Kirk,	Springer,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Charlton,	Langelier,	Vail,
Cockburn,	Laurier,	Watson,
Davies,	Lister,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	Livingston,	Wilson,
Fisher,	McCraney,	Yeo.—57.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Farrow,	McDougald (Pictou),
Amyot,	Ferguson (Welland),	McDougall (C. Breton),
Bain (Soulanges),	Fortin,	McLelan,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Foster,	McNeill,
Baker (Victoria),	Gagné,	Massue,
Barnard,	Gaudet,	Moffat,
Bell,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Gordon,	O'Brien,
Billy,	Grandbois,	Pruyn,
Blondeau,	Guillet,	Reid,
Bowell,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bryson,	Haggart,	Rykert,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hall,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hesson,	Shanly,
Carling,	Hickey,	Small,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Homer,	Sproule,
Chapleau,	Jamieson,	Taschereau,
Cochrane,	Jenkins,	Taylor,
Colby,	Kaulbach,	Temple,
Costigan,	Kilvert,	Thompson,
Coughlin,	Kinney,	Tupper,
Curran,	Kranz,	Tyrwhitt,
Daly,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Lesage,	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Cardwell),
Dickinson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Hastings),
Dodd,	Mackintosh,	Wigle,
Dugas,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Brockville),
Dupont,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Westm'l'd).—89.
Everett,	McCallum,	

Amendment negatived.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Salaries, military branch and district staff..... $17,000 00

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The decrease is caused by the retirement of the Deputy Adjutant General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that a good many of the officers, whose salaries are voted under this head, have received notice, which is almost equivalent to the statement that their services will not be required after the expiration of a year or so. The Minister should inform the House what the policy of the Government is going to be with respect to these gentlemen who have been employed, some for longer and some for shorter periods. If it be the intention of the Government to dispense with the services of any of these officers, it is desirable the House should know the reason why.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Under one of my predecessors, Sir Alexander Campbell, a general order was issued, based upon an Order in Council, making all the staff appointments for a period of five years. This term of office expired about seven or eight months ago. During the critical period of the trouble of the North-West, I thought it would be not only inconvenient, but almost impossible for the Department to make any change and to dispense with the services of any of the officers composing the staff. However, this year I felt it my duty, as the policy of the Government had been already announced by that Order in Council, to inform the different officers on our staff that after next year they must consider that the Order in Council and the general order based upon it, must prevail. That does not at all mean that the services of these gentlemen will be dispensed with, but if it should be considered necessary, from the standpoint of the Department, or of economy, to dispense with the services of any gentleman, they cannot complain of what has been done.

Mr. O'BRIEN. There is something in the policy the Government are pursuing with regard to the staff which is open to very serious question. In the first place, the rule

that these staff officers are to vacate their positions at the end of five years is altogether erroneous, because in a large country district it takes a staff officer two years, at least, thoroughly to know the district, and by the time the five years have elapsed, and he is to be changed to another district, he knows his district thoroughly. The system of changing men every five years is open to serious question. It impairs the efficiency of the officers, because in a large district they cannot become acquainted with their duties, with their men, with the position of the various companies, until a considerable period has elapsed. Considering the small salaries these officers get, it is rather hard upon them to be compelled to make these changes. The period for which an officer in the position of a brigade major or deputy adjutant-general should remain in one place, should not be less than ten years, if it is necessary at all that he should vacate his position at the end of a definite period. This rule places officers in the uncomfortable position of being in a state of uncertainty as to their period of service. If they know that, as a matter of absolute necessity, they must leave their positions at the end of a certain period, and take them on that understanding, they cannot complain, but, I think, there is nothing worse than for a man to be in a state of uncertainty. I would strongly recommend to the hon. Minister that the present incumbents of office, especially those who have been in the service for a long period of years, the salaries of whom were not large enough to enable them to put aside sufficient provision, and who are beyond the possibility of finding other employment, should be dealt with liberally. I hope the Department will act generously towards them, more particularly as they have done so with regard to other officers who have held similar positions.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When the Supplementary Estimates are brought down, possibly my hon. friend will see that the long and valuable services to the force of the officers to whom he refers have been recognised as well as those of others who have been retired before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Let us understand what the policy of the Government is. As I understand the order to which the Minister of Militia referred, it was that, after the period of five years, the various officers should be shifted. There was nothing to my recollection in that order about dismissing them, practically, from the service. If he is going to lay down the policy that, after a period of five or ten years, the officers who have held important commands are to be dismissed, whether they are competent to serve or not, that is one thing; and if he is going, as has been done in the English and other services, to fix an age limit at which the officers will retire, that of course is also worthy of consideration; but it is due to the force and to the House to know what the policy of the Government is. Do I understand the Minister to say that, in the space of a year or thereabouts, any or all of these officers are liable to be dismissed? Is that the policy?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, they are liable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Without reference to age?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman, if he refers to the order which I have referred to, the one issued by Sir Alexander Campbell when he was administering the Department of Militia, will find that, as in the English service, there was a period of age beyond which an officer would be retired.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What age?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Sixty-three. Besides, by that order it was also declared that an officer belonging to the staff would not hold the appointment beyond five years. It did not make it imperative upon the Government to dispense with his services after five years, but it left it to the discretion of the Government to utilise his services beyond that period, and I think, in answer more particularly to my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that there is a good deal of reason in the policy which was adopted by my predecessor. These apppointments are really prizes, and, in a country like ours, not having a regular army, they are prizes which are sought after and which should be distributed, as much as possible, among the men who take an active interest in the militia force. I know that the salaries are not very large, but these prizes are really sought after much more than one would suppose, and I believe that, after five years, when a man in the position of deputy adjutant general or a brigade major, finds it is deemed necessary to dispense with his services under that order, he would have no reason to complain of the action of the Government in retiring him. Notwithstanding that order, we have availed ourselves of the services of gentlemen long after that period, and I would not wish it to be understood that in every case it is the intention of the Government, after five years, to make a complete sweep, a complete change as far as the militia staff is concerned; but if it is deemed advisable to do so, the officers who hold those positions cannot in any way complain of the action of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is fair, I think, as regards all the officers appointed after that order was passed, but there were a great many other officers who were appointed prior to the date of that order and whose appointment was expected to be permanent so long as they remained efficient. I recognise fully the propriety in military matters of fixing a time limit. No doubt, once or twice, we lose the services of a very good and valuable officer, but generally, I believe, in all services, French, English and continental generally, they have laid down the principle that, after a certain period, military men must expect to be retired; but the point which I urge and which I think the Minister will see the justice of is that, in deciding who is to retire, a distinction may very fairly be made between the officers appointed before and after the promulgation of that order, because they accepted the offices under different conditions.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I fully recognise the propriety of what the hon. gentleman has said. In the case of Colonel Denison, which I believe my hon. friend was referring to, and in that of Colonel Milsom, I made that distinction. I recognised the fact that they entered the force before the promulgation of that order and believed it was a permanent appointment, and from that standpoint I thought it was necessary and right and proper to treat them differently from the five-year-term men, who accepted the position knowing that after five years it was in the discretion of the Government to keep them or remove them.

Mr. VAIL. Who is the deputy adjutant general it is proposed to remove?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Colonel Denison who has been in charge of Military District No. 2, and Colonel Milsom, who is well known in the section of country which the hon. gentleman represents, and who has been acting as brigade major in the same district.

Mr. CASEY. There are one or two inconsistencies in the expenditure in this branch of which I would like to ask some explanation. I find that Colonel Irwin holds a sort of dual position, that he acts as commandant of a regiment of artillery which is supposed to exist, but, as C Battery which is required to make up the regiment has never been brought into existence, there is really no regiment of artillery. He received $456 last year for acting in that capacity, and he also received $2,300 as inspector of artillery, making a total of $2,756. When we compare that salary with the salaries of the deputy adjutants general, who are

only, I see, to get $1,200 this year, according to the Estimate, there is a very strange discrepancy. The deputy adjutants general have full control and command of all the militia in their districts during active service, their duties are very onerous in times of peace, and their whole time is occupied in the business. If $1,200 is sufficient salary for them, I fail to see why it required more than $2,700 to pay Colonel Irwin. I see this year the estimate for Colonel Irwin is $1,800 as inspector of artillery, and, if he continues to receive the same amount of $450 for commanding this non-existing regiment of artillery, he will receive $2,250 instead of $2,700, but even at that rate it is $1,000 more than the deputy adjutants general receive. His duties are only to inspect the artillery, only about 2,000 in all, while many adjutants general have to look after more, some over 3,000 troops. That is, the duties in regard to these artillery inspectors are only the same as those of the deputy adjutants general in time of peace. I would like to know the reason for this great discrepancy between the salaries.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not know how the hon. gentleman can arrive at the conclusion that there is no regiment of artillery because C Battery is not organised.

Mr. CASEY. Because it requires three batteries to make a regiment of artillery.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. But the number of men who compose the two batteries, A and B, are quite sufficient to form a regiment. The regiment may be more or less strong, but that does not prevent it from being the Canadian regiment of artillery as it has been constituted for two years. The hon. gentleman thinks that the pay given to Lieut. Colonel Irwin is larger than it ought to be, as compared with the pay granted to the deputy adjutants general. The hon. gentleman must remember that Colonel Irwin is inspector of warlike stores, as well as of artillery, for the Dominion of Canada. This is a very important position, and requires a great deal of military knowledge of that branch of the service, and calls for a great deal of responsibility from the person who occupies that position. For those duties he gets $1,800 and his staff allowances —for he has to travel a good deal—making altogether $2,300. It is one of the most important positions in the Department and in the service, after that of major general commanding the forces, and that of adjutant general. He is really in command. The hon. gentleman says that compared with a deputy adjutant general the number of men under his command would be very small indeed. But the hon. gentleman must remember that from the Atlantic to the Pacific Colonel Irwin is in charge of and responsible for the management of the artillery force. I think these facts justify the discrimination in his favor, possibly, as against the position held by the deputy adjutants general, a most responsible and important position, but not one that calls for the same amount of responsibility and travel and work as that incurred by the inspector of artilleries and warlike stores. He is at headquarters, where he has to direct; and is practically the head of that branch of the service.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister says that there are men enough in two batteries to form a regiment. When we established the regiment of artillery it was to consist of A, B and C Batteries.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The two batteries, A and B, have 150 men each, rank and file, and that makes 300 men, taking in the officers.

Mr. CASEY. Was there not some special authority given for constituting a regiment of artillery?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No. It was done by departmental regulation.

Mr. CASEY. Then the Minister thinks the duty of commanding this regiment of artillery is worth $1.50 a day.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He is inspector.

Mr. CASEY. As commandant of the regiment of artillery he received $457.25 last year. Now, if he actually performed any duties as commander, I think he was underpaid; if the position is merely nominal, he was over-paid. I confess I do not understand what are the duties of commandant of this regiment of artillery. He was in command of the regiment in the field, I suppose. Were the batteries commanded by their own lieutenant colonels when they were on active service, or were they commanded by Colonel Irwin? In the first place I would ask, what are the duties of Colonel Irwin as commandant of the regiment of artillery?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that as commandant his duties are to look after his regiment.

Mr. CASEY. Oh! but he does not.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Well, but he does.

Mr. CASEY. In actual service?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, he does. The commandant may command his battalion and still not be on active service. His duty is at headquarters here, and all the regimental orders have to go through Colonel Irwin, just as every regimental order goes through the colonel of any other regiment.

Mr. CASEY. Do regimental orders emanate from him?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. Does he issue orders to them in the field?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, as commandant.

Mr. CASEY. Then, did Colonel Irwin, at headquarters, direct the movements of those batteries in the North-West, or were they commanded by others?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman knows that is too simple a question to require an answer. He must know that when the batteries were at the front they were under the orders of the Major General who commanded every regiment.

Mr. CASEY. I know it is too simple to ask seriously, and merely put it to bring out the statement that has been made. And Colonel Irwin made it his headquarters here, and having really nothing to do with the batteries, was practically, to all intents and purposes, an ornamental attachment. That is all I can make out of it. No one imagines that Colonel Irwin actually commanded those batteries, but as nominal commandant he gets $1.50 a day. Now as to the inspection of artillery. The Minister states that the inspector has serious responsibilities and valuable stores under his care which require him to travel all over the Dominion. But he has two assistants in the inspection of the artillery, Colonels Cotton and Montizambert, commanders of the batteries. So that Colonel Irwin does not have to go all over the Dominion to inspect the artillery. No part of this money, of course, goes for travelling expenses. If he travels of course his expenses must be paid. But, I fail to see that the Minister has made out any case why a thousand dollars difference is made in the salaries. I fancy that in the Toronto district, or Quebec district, or wherever there is a considerable amount of military stores, the deputy adjutants general have quite as much property to care for as the inspector of artillery. No reason has been given for this discrepancy. I find that Colonel Holmes got last year over $2,900 as commandant of C Battery, that is the battery which does not exist, which leaves the regiment of artillery incomplete. I find that on page 204 of the Auditor General's report.

Mr. MULOCK. He has a force, he has a sergeant?

Mr. CASEY. I believe he has, and for commanding that sergeant he gets $2,920. I have no doubt that in

his case command is more actual than that of Colonel Irwin, because he has to superintend that large force. As deputy-adjutant of British Columbia he also gets $365. The Department evidently values the services of an adjutant general for British Columbia at $1 per day while it values the services of the commander of one sergeant at $2,920.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Has the Minister considered the case of those volunteers who fell sick at the annual drill at Toronto a few years ago. They suffered a good deal, and lost a great deal of their time and money. At that time the Minister, I think, did not consider all the facts of the case. Now that he has found out the value to the country of our soldiers I hope he will be prepared to make some compensation and will pay the volunteers that which they are justly entitled to.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In regard to Colonel Holmes, who is the commandant of the military district in British Columbia, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) seems to be blowing hot and cold. Some time ago he complained that the deputy adjutants general were not sufficiently well paid. Now he complains that Colonel Holmes gets more money than he should receive. The hon. gentleman should remember one thing, which has been explained already. Colonel Holmes was placed in command of Battery C, which is to be organised, and which, from the information which the hon. gentleman no doubt has received from official sources, is now composed of one sergeant only.

Mr. CASEY. I received it from my friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) to-night.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The British Columbia military district is a very extensive one, and it is of great importance to the Dominion on account of its strategic value. Colonel Holmes receives as commandant of the Artillery School, or C Battery, the same pay which is given to commandants of the other artillery schools in the Dominion; and he received it both last year and this year. He received besides a small payment to represent the extra work he naturally would be supposed to do as deputy adjutant general, for the formation of that school is not yet completed. The Imperial and Canadian Governments have been in communication, and the result of the interchange of despatches between the two countries is that that artillery school will be formed out of men drawn from the naval reserve in England and pensioners who receive pensions from the Imperial Government. The great difficulty the Department encountered in organising C Battery, in British Colombia, was the fact of the limited labor market there, and that it was almost impossible to get men for the pay given to regulars. From the fact that the Imperial Government has consented to allow pensioners who will become incorporated into our Canadian force to draw their Imperial pensions and become Canadian soldiers, under the command of Canadian officers will enable us to organise C Battery, and make it, I hope, as successful as either A or B Batteries. Moreover, it is of the greatest possible importance to have a force properly organised in British Columbia, the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and a Province far removed from the other portions of the Dominion. The position which Colonel Holmes now occupies is one of very considerable responsibility. It is true that for the last two years he has not been in command of a battery which is not complete, so far as numbers are concerned, but which will be completed in a short period. I expect in the Estimates we shall be called on to vote money for the purpose of erecting the necessary buildings in British Columbia. As to the question put by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) I have reconsidered it almost every year as the hon. gentleman in his zeal has brought it before the House. The conclusion at which I arrived previously was based upon the decision of the doctors who had been consulted in the case, and I thought I could not do better than follow their ideas.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Militia states that Colonel Holmes is in receipt of a salary of $2,920. It is not necessary for us to seek information from official sources. At page 204 of the Auditor General's report we are informed that Lieutenant Colonel J. G. Holmes received pay for one year at $8 per day, amounting to $2,920, for commanding a staff composed of Staff Sergeant T. Kinsella, who received 75 cents a day. T. Kinsella also received as compensation in lieu of clothing to the amount of $37.62. This force was for the protection of our coast in the west and the cost was $3,231. I am sure the country will feel absolutely safe that our western shores are in safe hands.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Could not the Minister give just a little from the salary of that officer and pay those volunteers.

Mr. CASEY. When we have again rumors of a Russian difficulty, and when we again hear that Russian cruisers have been seen in the vicinity of British Columbia harbors, we will put our faith in Col. Holmes and Staff Sergeant Kinsella. But it is a little odd that out of a total payment of $3,231, no less than $2,920 should go to the commanding officer and the rest to one sergeant. The Minister's explanation has not made matters any different. He has said I complained because the deputy adjutants general were not sufficiently paid. I did not. I complained that Colonel Irwin was paid too much, and I have the same complaint to make about Colonel Holmes. The Minister also said that Colonel Holmes was paid the same as the other commandants of batteries. Now, if I am not mistaken, Colonel Montizambert and Colonel Cotton were paid for all their duties, as commandants and as assistant inspectors of artillery, only $2,208 a piece, of which only $1,600 was for commanding batteries A and B. So that Colonel Holmes really gets $1,000 more for commanding a battery composed of one sergeant than they get for commanding full batteries, and, as the hon. gentleman said, large batteries of 150 men each. Now, he said in a very naive manner that for the additional duties of acting as deputy adjutant general Colonel Holmes got an extra allowance of $1 per day, or $365 per annum, in addition. I am not aware how many volunteers there are in British Columbia, but I believe there are at least three or four hundred, so that he gets about one eighth or one-ninth as much for acting as deputy adjutant general for those volunteers as for acting as commandant for that one sergeant. Now if Colonel Holmes is intended to be employed and paid as deputy adjutant general, then he should appear on the Public Accounts as such. Even in that case it would be absurd to pay him as much as the deputy adjutants general in the large districts of Quebec and Ontario whose duties are so much heavier. The whole arrangement seems to me so remarkably absurd and unfair that the Minister should give some explanation of it to make it less so, or else he should reduce the pay of Colonel Holmes so that it would be equal to that of these other gentlemen who really have some duties to perform. The hon. gentleman says the battery is growing though it is not completely manned. Will he tell us how many there are in the battery at present?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I shall give the hon. gentleman all the information I possibly can, and I have no doubt it will satisfy him. The extra amount he has referred to as being so extravagant is merely to meet the allowances which Colonels Cotton and Montizambert receive in the shape of fuel, barrack accommodation, &c., that is not to be found in British Columbia, because we have not got the school of artillery organised as we have in Quebec and Kingston. The hon. gentleman must know that, previous to Colonel Holmes being sent there, he had been a deputy adjutant

general and was paid like other officers of that class in other parts of the Dominion. Moreover, Parliament adopted the policy of organising a battery in British Columbia. It was necessary to send another commandant to take charge of that battery, and I thought it was an economy to place the whole military district—as I had done the others—in the hands of the commandant of the artillery school. When the school is organised—which I hope will be within a short period of time—the hon. gentleman will find that the school is under the command of Colonel Holmes, and the military district will also be under his command. When barrack accommodation is given him, like the other commandants of military schools, he will receive, in the shape of fuel and light, and other allowances, the amount of money which is paid to him to meet his expenses which he is entitled to receive, as other officers in his position receive, from the Government. That is really the explanation the hon. gentleman asked me to give him.

Mr. CASEY. The question with which I concluded, was whether the Minister could tell how many men are in the battery at present.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am expecting the news every day. They are gradually increasing, but I could not tell the hon. gentleman at present.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think it is very hard to count them. The hon. gentleman's explanation of this increase of salary is simply, that because there is no barrack accommodation and no school of artillery to command, he gives Colonel Holmes as much, in addition to his regelar salary, as the other commandants receive in the shape of barrack accommodation, fuel, light, &c. I think it is the lamest and most absurd excuse that could be given. I would ask him if an armament has been obtained for Battery C?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We have a large number of guns in British Columbia—much larger than are required to arm this battery.

Mr. CASEY. Field guns?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We have all sorts of guns up there—field guns, garrison guns and pop-guns.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria.) Some of the big guns are over here just now.

Mr. MULOCK. For how long a time has Colonel Holmes been drawing this salary?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think he was appointed about two years ago.

Mr. MULOCK. Was he appointed then as commandant of Battery C.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. And for two years he has been drawing this salary, and not discharging any of the duties of that office.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have already explained the difficulty we had in finding men to organise the British Columbia battery at the time; but the school has now arrived at such a stage that I expect it will, in a very short time, be completed. When appointed, Colonel Holmes was appointed not only as commandant of that school, but as deputy adjutant general of the district. He is a very able officer, and has made very valuable reports, and I do not consider the salary excessive.

Mr. CASEY. The difficulty of getting men is a good reason for not filling up the school; but that was no reason for continuing the salary. If the Colonel's other duties require a salary, it should be given to him under that heading, and it is utterly misleading and improper to put items in the Estimates to pay a man for certain services when they are meant to pay him for services in another capacity. The people ought to know what they are paying for. The hon. Minister tells us that before this school was created, there was a deputy adjutant general in British Columbia who was paid as deputy adjutants general were in other Provinces. Why did he not revert to that plan when he found it impossible to get a school together?

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to ask the Minister of Militia when he proposes to bring down to the House the report of the board which was appointed to enquire into the war claims. I submit that that report should have been on the Table before we were asked to consider these militia estimates at all. The very first item in these estimates is the salary of General Middleton. That report has been promised to us, and although we are in the third month of the Session, we have not yet seen it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think the hon. gentleman will admit that we have done really more than could be expected of any Department. In the very middle of the Session we were still settling up claims. Every day since the unfortunate troubles in the North West closed, the commission was kept busy night and day investigating those claims, which had to be submitted for my approval before being paid. The whole history of that campaign is in this report. When an hon. gentleman asked me when it would be down, I said in a day or two, and since that time I have telegraphed to the printer, and I have ascertained that, although he is working on it night and day, it is impossible for him to hurry it. I hope it will be down in a few days, but I cannot be held responsible if it is delayed beyond the time I expect. Knowing how difficult and almost impossible it was for the commission to arrive at a conclusion before Parliament met, I say they have done very well indeed, and as soon as it is possible to bring down the report it will be brought down, probably in the beginning of next week.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is this report being printed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In Quebec or Montreal, I cannot exactly say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the object of printing it at Quebec or Montreal? This report, for which General Middleton is responsible, ought to be printed here, I should say.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The correction of the proof sheets required special supervision; and one of the members of the commission, Colonel Forrest, was charged with the correction of the principal and most extensive part of the report. That is the reason the Order in Council was passed allowing it to be printed outside of the Queen's printing office.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Are the commission still in session, or have they closed their labors?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They have not now and have not been for a long time, under pay, except the chairman, Colonel Jackson; but it will be necessary to call the commission again, because since they have sent in their report, we have received other claims which must be investigated; and that commission, being composed of officers who were in charge of the various departments during the troubles, and who are thoroughly acquainted with everything connected with them, will naturally have to investigate those claims. But there are very few, and I expect that a couple or three days will be quite sufficient to close the labor of the commission.

Mr. LANGELIER. At what establishment in Quebec is the report being printed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It was given to the Quebec *Morning Chronicle*.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Are they printing it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I expect so. I do not know what arrangements they have made for the printing, but they are responsible to us.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Perhaps the Minister will also tell the committee when the report of the field operations in the North West will be submitted, or is it part of the same report?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The report of the Major General commanding, and the reports of the commandants of the various columns, all form part of that report, which also includes all the war claims. I though it better to make one special report of all the transactions, including the field operations and the expenses of the campaign, and I hope it will be considered interesting.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me the House has not been treated well or fairly on this point. There are two distinct subjects included in this: One of very great general interest, not merely to this House, but to this country, the reports of the officers in command of the various columns. These could, with great ease, have been laid on the Table when we met, as they must have all been in before the 1st of January.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They ought to have been in before the 1st of January. There is no excuse, where field operations terminated at or about the 1st of August, why the reports of the various officers should not have been in the hands of the Department long before the 1st of January. These certainly ought to have been printed and laid before the House. Now, what is the result? The result is that we are not in the possession of the leading facts in respect to the operations and the war claims, which we require to enable us to discuss the matter intelligently. I cannot see why the Government could not have brought down these reports at the opening of the Session. If there were difficulties, as I can understand there would be, in settling the war claims, that is all the more reason why the other reports should have been disposed of first. What were the several officers who sat on the commission engaged in? Colonel Forrest was acting chief of the transport, but in what capacity were the other two employed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Colonel Jackson was sent at the beginning of the outbreak and put in charge of the whole commissariat department at Winnipeg; Colonel Forrest was sent to the front and became paymaster for all of the columns that were sent to the front. After a certain period of time it became necessary to give to Colonel Jackson, who was overworked, assistance, and we sent up Colonel Whitehead, who became chief of the transport service particularly, and these three officers were selected to form a commission to investigate the war claims.

Brigade majors' salaries, transport service, &c... $12,700 00

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia when he will place the report in the hands of the printer?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot say the day, but will be happy to give all the information on concurrence, if that will satisfy the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. That will not satisfy me.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am sorry I cannot satisfy the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. We are being treated in the most cavalier way by the hon. Minister. There is a well founded opinion in the country that the Militia Department, so far as the management is concerned, is broken down, and we want no further evidence of this than the fact that the hon. gentleman is now trifling with the House and country by withholding this important information. He admits he has taken the report of the general commanding and locked it up until he could couple it with the other reports.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I did not say that.

Mr. MULOCK. I take what the hon. gentleman has stated, and that proves the case against him. He admits he has done what any man would condemn as—shall I say, stupid? Or it was done by design to conceal the report. He is combining two reports which are in no way connected with each other, and therefore makes the one wait upon the other. What else does he do? When the report has to go through the printer's hands, he sends it to his own constituency.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not my own constituency.

Mr. MULOCK. To his own constituent.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not my constituent.

Mr. MULOCK. And he sends it there, he says, because he required the presence of a military man to correct the proofs. But why not have brought the military man up and let him correct the proofs here? When asked what he did with the report, he said he did not know; it might have been printed in Montreal or Quebec, but, on being questioned by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier), he said it was printed in Quebec. He remembered that very suddenly. Did he not remember, when first asked what he had done with that draft, where he had sent it? This transaction presents a most unsatisfactory appearance, and it is unbecoming the Minister of Militia, who has been treated with generosity in excess of his deserts, to treat the people of Canada in this way. He asks us, at the last days of the Session, to pass upon these estimates and let this House adjourn, without giving us the means of having a proper examination into the various matters which affect his Department. If there is a man in Canada who is bound to act in good faith, it is the hon. gentleman. Hon. members may laugh, but for a man who has received what the Minister of Militia has received from the Crown and the country—for him to have allowed his Major General commanding to suppress a report, to keep his report in private, or not discharge his duty of preparing a report during six months, and not laying it on the Table, shows that either the Minister or the Major General is incompetent, or that both are incompetent. A great many believe that both are incompetent. I am not one of those, I am not going to express my personal opinion as to the Major General, but I may say I have never recovered confidence in the Minister of Militia after the way he undermined and drove from the country, the officer who commanded our forces previous to the coming of General Middleton. He drove him in an unmanly way from the country, and on that occasion the First Minister——

Mr. O'BRIEN. I rise to a point of order. We are discussing the question of brigade major's salaries and transport expenses, with which General Luard has nothing to do. If anybody has been unfairly treated, it is the hon. the Minister.

Mr. MULOCK. It is all right for an officer to defend his Minister, but I have a right to discuss——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. You have the right to discuss only the item before the Chair.

Mr. MULOCK. When an hon. member addresses me in that way, I have a right to say why his opinion is what it is.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I raise the question of order. The hon. gentleman has the right to discuss the question of brigade major's salaries, and nothing else.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have already said he is out of order.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not dwelling on the subject now. I was simply asserting, when interrupted by the hon. gentleman, who is in the service, and I cannot expect him to do otherwise than to defend his superior officer——

Mr. O'BRIEN. He is not my superior officer in any sense.

Mr. MULOCK. To come back to this question, the Minister of Militia, when I first asked the question, when we would have the report, said we would have it in a few days; but we have the announcement of another Minister that the House will prorogue in a few days. We ought not to proceed to discuss these militia estimates, involving so much that concerns the management of the Department and the campaign, without having the report before the committee.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). There is still further reason why the Minister should really not proceed with the estimates to-night. The ordinary report of the Department has been brought down to the 30th December last. It is clear that the operations which closed in the middle of the year should be before the committee to enable us to discuss the estimates with a full knowledge of details. There are facts in connection with the two items, the one just passed and the one under discussion, into which I would like to make further enquiries. Some of the gentlemen, whose names appear in the report of last year, have been mentioned here as having been at headquarters investigating accounts. I refer particularly to Lieut.-Colonel Jackson. He is permanently in the employ of the Militia Department as a deputy adjutant general, and I understand he is engaged on a commission examining the accounts that were contracted while the operations were in progress in the North-West, and that he was also employed during those operations. Did he draw any other pay than that of deputy adjutant general, during the time that he was so employed?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He did receive extra pay.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Was it his regimental pay that he drew?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I do not know how the committee may look upon that, but I take decided exception to it. If the pay Parliament have provided for a deputy adjutant-general is not enough, it should be increased, but I have always assumed that the deputy adjutants general were in the permanent employ of the Government, just as those in A and B Batteries or in the schools, and that their services are available for any purpose the country requires. Making an exception of this kind is unfair to the country and to others similarly employed. I can understand any one in the civil employment of the Government, who is attached as a volunteer to any of the battalions, being also entitled when called out to draw the pay of his rank, but that is not the position which the country expected these men to occupy. When they were allowed their field allowance, in addition to the pay the House provided, that sum ought to have been ample. I gathered from the discussion on the appointment of a commandant to the school in British Columbia that it was the ultimate intention of the Minister to transfer the districts to the command of whoever happened to be the commandants of the permanent force in the particular localities. Do I understand that that is the policy of the Government in British Columbia solely or throughout the Dominion?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Lieutenant Colonel Jackson was receiving his pay as lieutenant colonel when he went up to Winnipeg. I think most hon. gentlemen will agree that, for the most extraordinary arduous duties which he was called upon to perform, it would be unfair to expect him to do the work without extra allowance. For weeks we expected almost to have to bring him back to his own district, from the fact that he had been worked to such an extent, sitting up night and day for weeks at a time, that his general health broke down. I for one would not have agreed to send him up to fill the very important and responsible position which he did fill, and filled very well indeed, if he had gone simply on the pay of a deputy adjutant general. I think he has not been paid too much for the services he has performed. The reductions made by that very commission of which he was president, have resulted in saving an enormous amount of money to the country. According to the reports contained in papers representing the side of politics to which the hon. gentleman belongs, it was probable from the great incapacity of the Minister of Militia, as the hon. gentleman so very courteously stated, or of those composing the Department of Militia, the amount of war claims would approach $10,000,000, but, by the exertions of men like Col. Jackson, and possibly by a little supervision on the part of the Minister, the amount has been reduced to a little more than $5,000,000; which very few people expected in view of the enormous expense we had for transport service and otherwise. It is the policy of the Department to do, as much as possible, what we have done in the district of New Brunswick, placing under the command of the commandant of our regular school or infantry corps or artillery corps, whatever branch of the service it may be, the command of the military district. It is far better that an officer who is continually attending to the military organisation of our permanent force should be placed in command of the military district. We sometimes have to add a lieutenant who helps him in looking after the correspondence, and so forth, which is required to administer the military district, but we have found the plan more economical and a great improvement on the old system. The reports are sent in regularly like the reports from the military schools, and the Department has found it an advantage to have the command as much as possible centralised in the hands of the commandant of the school.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman be able to lay those reports on the Table before concurrence? Will he engage to do that?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not want to engage to do more than I have said. I telegraphed, and the answer was such that I expect they will be here by Monday or Tuesday, and as soon as they do come they will be placed on the Table. I have done all in my power to get them before. The report of the Major General only reached me in February, and there were several reports which came from the expeditionary column of General Strange which had to be deferred because these claims had to be investigated, and it was impossible to make any report until all the information was brought down. I hope in a day or two to have them, it may possibly be Monday, or Tuesday, or Wednesday, but I am doing all I can to hasten the production of the report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At any rate, the hon. gentleman expects them in the course of next week?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we ought to have them before concurrence. Are any claims for losses by Indians or Metis included in these war claims?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No; those are entirely outside of my report. All the claims are for transport, and purchase of provisions, and whatever purchase we had to make in the shape of ammunition; but there is no claim whatever for any damage or loss caused in consequence of the campaign.

Mr. VAIL. While it was no doubt commendable of my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Cameron) to ask the question, I must say that I have no fault to find with the Minister of Militia for the course he has taken in regard to Colonel Jackson. I do not think it would have been fair to take a deputy adjutant general from his district and send him to the North-West on active service, and call upon him to perform arduous duties there without giving him the same pay that other officers receive for a like service. In connection with the $1,200 reduction for the brigade majors, I understood the Minister to say that he intended to dispense with the services of Colonel Milsom, for the reason that he had accepted his position subsequent to the time this arrangement was made of transferring brigade majors from one part of the Dominion to another. I think that is hardly fair to Colonel Milsom. He is one of the oldest officers in the service, and was in the service in Nova Scotia for a long time before he was removed, against his own wishes, to Toronto. He was in military service before he joined the volunteer force, and I think it is hard that he should be cut off from service at his age. I think the Minister ought to consider his case.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am glad to inform the hon. gentleman that I did consider Colonel Milsom's position, and he has been granted a retiring allowance, and so far as I can judge from what some of his friends tell me, he is satisfied. The trouble was to discriminate in his case, he joined the service twenty-nine years ago. He must have expected that he could not have a permanent appointment, and I made the difference in his case and granted him the retiring allowance.

Mr. LANGELIER. Amongst those whose salaries are included in this and the following items, are Colonels Taschereau, Duchesnay and Forrest. It is to my knowledge that they occupy buildings belonging to the Government in Quebec, some of them worth at least $300 a year. They are very efficient officers and I have nothing to say against them, but I would like to ask if they get those buildings free, or are they included in the salaries mentioned in the report?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It has been the invariable practice, wherever we had military quarters, to give them to our officers for their use. We have done this in Quebec and Kingston and other places. In the case of the gentlemen mentioned by my hon. friend, they do occupy the military quarters in Quebec on the property which was handed over to Canada by the Imperial Government. I only regret that it is not possible for the department to give quarters to our officers in all the other districts where there is military property.

Mr. VAIL. In reference to Colonel Milsom, I think he has some claim upon us. He fought in the Crimean war, at the battle either of Inkerman or the Redan. He was sergeant, and every officer above him was killed, and he alone came out with his company. He has been a good officer, and has been in the service so long that he deserves favorable consideration.

Ammunition, clothing and military stores..... $205,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A large sum of this is for the cartridge factory at Quebec. It cannot have escaped the attention of the Minister that there is considerable complaints as to the quality of the ammunition supplied. A good deal was said at the time of the operations in the North-West as to the inferior qualities of much of the gun ammunition as well as the rifle ammunition which was served out to the troops. A good many reports reached us from men who were in the field, tending to show that much of that ammunition was perfectly worthless. I would like to know what is the result of the manufacture of cartridges at Quebec.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. A few days ago I brought down the report of the commission appointed by the Department to investigate the whole question of the cartridge factory. This commission was composed of those most interested in rifle associations all over the Dominion, and from the character of those gentlemen their report can be implicily relied upon. The gentlemen on that commission were asked to visit the cartridge factory at Quebec, and to superintend the manufacture of the cartridge itself. Speaking from memory, I can say that the report found that the machinery was excellent, that all the different component parts of the cartridge, which were somewhat complicated, were perfectly manufactured. I need not explain that that ammunition is a test ammunition, from the fact that it requires the greatest possible accuracy in the manufacture of a cartridge for target practice. It was found that if any deficiency existed it was due to the powder itself. The powder was not as perfect as it might be, and the report goes into the scientific explanation of the powder, and the number of grains which are required to make the cartridge perfect. It was found that the powder furnished us by the Hamilton Powder Company was not as perfect as the powder which we used when the cartridge factory was first started, and which we got from England at the Waltham Abbey Royal Gunpowder Factory. On receiving the report I immediately gave instruction to get out from Halifax a certain portion of powder required, and I ordered a certain other quantity from England for the manufacture of the cartridges to be served out to our force for rifle practice and other purposes. The commissioners say that there is no reason why powder could not be manufactured by the Hamilton Powder Company, or any other Canadian company manufacturing powder; why that powder should not be just as perfect as that imported from England. The report also suggests that the powder should be manufactured upon a specification which is to be furnished by the Department. The powder was submitted to the anyalist at the Royal Military College, Kingston, and every effort was made to make that report one that could be looked upon as final in respect to the manufacture of our Canadian cartridges. When the hon. gentleman reads it he will find that in that experiment the cartridge factory has been a success; but I admit that in that particular detail, and a very important detail it is, it has not come up to the ammunition which we import from England or manufactured in Canada out of powder imported from England.

Mr. WATSON. I am glad to know that the Minister's attention has been called to the fact that the ammunition from the Quebec cartridge factory has not been as good as it should have been. That factory seems to have been a success—the only failure has been that it has failed to turn out good powder. The attention of the House was called to this a year ago, and it was pointed out that some of the ammunition was not good. I expected to see a report from Colonel Houghton of practical tests made with the ammunition, but I have failed to find such a report. The Colonel has complained of the ammunition for two or three years, although the complaint is not embodied in the reports laid on the Table. Last year, at the close of the shooting season, he made a practical test. I am not exactly sure of the figures, but the result runs in this way: Cartridge of 1879, that is, the old country cartridge, was placed at 10 per cent. discount. The cartridge of 1883, that is, the first cartridge made in the Quebec factory, was placed at 5 per cent. and the cartridges of 1885 at par. A man shooting had choice of ammunition, and those who took the 1879 cartridges, the old country cartridges, made the largest scores. I was a little surprised the other day to hear the Minister, in answer

to a question regarding that report, state that it would be found that while the ammunition was not probably good enough for target practice, yet it would be good enough for field duties. According to my idea, the best ammunition is required to be supplied to forces in the field, and if this had been done there would probably have been fewer people killed in the North-West troubles. In fact, one person present at Batoche said that about 250 men were shooting at one Indian several times in the day at a range of about 400 yards, and I believe the Indian got away. This was on account of the inferiority of the ammunition. I am probably not a very good shot, but I have used some ammunition of 1879 and 1885 and I have done better shooting with the former. It appears, as the Minister stated, that the fault was that there was not enough force in the powder.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Too much force.

Mr. WATSON. With respect to the 1885 cartridges I have seen the powder was not sufficiently strong and was not at all even. If there is any defective ammunition as there appears to be, it should be destroyed and not placed in the hands of men who are risking their lives and expect to protect themselves by the use of it.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), and I think the country will agree with me that the time when you require good ammunition is when you are risking your life. "Trust in God and keep your powder dry" is the old English motto. When our men were sent to the North-West and were called on to face men who were in some cases better armed, it was essential that their ammunition should be of the very best quality. The Minister said he thought the ammunition in question would do for use in the field, though not for target practice.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I never said that.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman will look at *Hansard* he will find that his words were to this effect, that while the ammunition might not be good enough for target practice it would be good enough for field service. The service in the North-West largely consisted of potting at Indians who were under cover of bushes or the edge of a ravine, and it was of the utmost importance that the ammunition should shoot evenly and correctly. It did not matter so much whether the cartridges were strong or weak; we have often had a lot of weak cartridges and done good shooting with them after we have got the elevation, but they were uniform. The great fault with these Quebec cartridges was that they were not uniform. The Minister has correctly stated that this was due to the powder. It appears that this powder was obtained from the Hamilton Powder Works. The Department sent a sample of powder to Hamilton, with an order for similar powder to be manufactured, without sending any specifications. The powder obtained was a mixed grain powder. It was made of pretty good material, but it was all mixed and of different force and of different grain. The result of this difference in grain was that the powder did not explode evenly. It was good material, but it was badly compounded, and the saltpetre, sulphur and carbon burned separately instead of exploding together. Mixed with the coarse grains were fine grains, and these exploded more rapidly than the coarse grains. These imperfections were due to the carelessness of the authorities at the Quebec cartridge factory in not ordering powder according to distinct specifications. Since the report of the commission, the Department has ordered powder based on certain specifications, as it should have done at the outset. From having bad cartridges our volunteers in the North-West were unable to do as much execution amongst their assailants as they should have done, owing to the irregular and erratic action of their cartridges. I do not know whether Major Prévost communicated with the Minister before obtaining that powder. If he did, the responsibility comes further home, but if he did not, then it rests upon him. I must at the same time corroborate what the Minister has said, that the report does speak in the highest terms of the mechanical perfection of the metallic parts of the cartridges, with one or two slight exceptions. Now, Sir, that is the theory. As a matter of practice it was found, not only in the North-West, but on the ranges here, that this ammunition did shoot in a most unsatisfactory manner. I have copies of some letters which passed between the Militia Department and different volunteer officers and officers of rifle associations, with regard to this ammunition. I supposed that some of the officers on active service would have reported on this ammunition, but I have not found their reports here. One of the letters I shall read is from Captain Perley of this city. After some preliminaries, he refers to a letter of Major Prévost of the 20th May:

"I note in Major Prévost's letter of the 20th May, that he charges this splitting of the shells to defects in the rifles used, and further that the powder in the cartridges fired on the 14th of May was of English make. Be this as it may, the fact remains that many cartridges split, and in some instances split badly."

There are perhaps some gentlemen in the House who do not realise the effect of a cartridge splitting the chamber. In the first place, there is an escape of gas which weakens the discharge. In the second place, the split shell jams into the breech, and cannot be extracted without a ramrod to knock it out. He goes on:

"I have been engaged in shooting with the Snider-Enfield since 1874, and have fired and seen others fire many, very many thousands of rounds of English cartridges from rifles of all classes, that is from those of the special make"——

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I rise to a point of order. I would like to ask if the hon. gentleman is speaking to the question before the Chair.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman will come a little nearer he will find that I am right on the bull's eye.——

"of a private manufacturer, to the old well-worn, badly used rack rifle of a battalion, and I can safely assert that during the ten years which have passed, I never saw so many split shells as I saw on the 14th May last.

"Major Prévost has stated that the cartridges used on the 14th May were filled with English powder. With all deference to this statement, I trust you will pardon my saying that I have my doubts respecting it, because I never saw English shells split as Canadian have done, and this splitting is entirely due to faulty powder, which that of English make cannot be called.

"That this splitting still continues I have been made aware, for I have been shown a number of shells which were fired during the matches held on the 29th June, ult., on the Lévis Range, which were split and ruptured in the same manner as those I saw taken from rifles on the 14th May."

He incorporates in his letter a cutting from the Montreal *Gazette* (and therefore quite correct), which gives the scores of some individuals on that occasion, over the same ranges on the same day and with the same rifles, but with English cartridges on one occasion and Canadian on the other. They are as follows:—

"The scores of the undermentioned shots at 500 and 600 yards were shown to be as follows:—

	Batt. match, Canadian powder.	Open match, English powder.
Wynne	36	58
Cooke	46	53
Smith	33	60
Hood	28	51
Dalrymple	32	59
Kambery	27	53

On the whole the shooting with this English ammunition averaged some 50 per cent. better than with the Canadian, and the test was made under absolutely similar conditions. Now such a degree of variation would be quite sufficient in the field of battle to turn the fortunes of the day and cause the loss of many valuable lives. I have besides this letter, one from Lieutenant Colonel Alger, of Toronto, who

is, I think, secretary of the Ontario Rifle Association. He says:

"SIR,—I regret to have to inform you that complaints have been made to me of the strength of S. B. ammunition, supplied from Quebec. Toronto marksmen have spoken of it as very ineffective, and to-day I have received an application from the Victoria Rifle Club, of Hamilton, for 4,000 rounds, 'but not to send the Canadian made ammunition, as we find it very inferior, the gas on the explosion of the cartridge escaping at the breech.'

"English made ammunition is asked for to be used on the 1st July."

Then, Sir, there is the letter of Captain Adam, of Hamilton, to which Colonel Alger refers. He goes into some further details. He says he was disappointed in getting the Canadian instead of the English cartridges which he had sent for, and he goes on:

"I was surprised to find a mixed lot in it, a little No. 9 Old Country, which is quite good, a little of '84 issue Dominion, which is no good, but the most of it was 85 of the latter issue, which I had not a chance of trying before, so as I had seen in some paper that they had improved on their first issue, I retained it, but am sorry to say only to be disappointed again, it is no better, and we do not want any more of it, our money is just thrown away. I tested it on Saturday, which was a good moist day for shooting, but I could do nothing with it at all, neither can any of my men in the company. I think the company who manufacture it are very foolish in issuing it, until they at least have it as good as the English kind, because when the volunteers cannot use it to any advantage they will be naturally prejudiced against it, and although they may in time make it good, it will be difficult to remove the prejudice."

Now, I fancy that will hold just as true with regard to the Government as with regard to the company which he supposed were manufacturing the ammunition as an investment. He said the character of the goods was such that they would ruin the character of the company manufacturing them. He refers to the fact that the 1884 ammunition was bad, so that the Government were not without warning that something was wrong. They had complaints in 1884 and even as far back as 1883. The ammunition of 1884 turned out to be bad; the ammunition of 1885 turned out to be bad; and knowing that it was bad, they send it up to be used by our troops. I have a letter from Colonel Gray to Colonel Alger on the same matter, in which he says:

"SIR,—Complaints were made to me as the senior officer present at the practice over the rifle range here on Saturday, the 4th July, 1885, respecting the defective quality of the Snider ball ammunition now being manufactured at the Government cartridge factory, Quebec, and sold to the volunteers of this district for rifle practice. I have been in attendance at the ranges during the past four weeks and casually heard complaints, from different parties, on this subject, but did not deem it my duty to report until a formal complaint, based upon proper foundation, was brought under my notice. Col.-Sergeant Knifton, Q.O.R., had ten rounds from one package very carefully analysed, giving the following result: No. 1, 68½ grs.; No. 2, 68½; No. 3, 68; No. 4, 66; No. 5, 66½; No. 6, 68; No. 7, 68½; No. 8, 70; No. 9, 68½; No. 10, 69 grs., showing a want of care in the filling, that must prove detrimental to precision of fire. The powder in some cartridges was found to be damp and caked. A number of cartridge shells were also produced for my inspection; in several the percussion cap had been blown into the shell, and others were broken off at the junction of the shell with the base disc, rendering it necessary to use a ramrod for the purpose of expelling the shell from the bore of the rifle.

"On careful inspection it appeared as though the machine used in manufacturing had cut the brass covering, near the base disc, so that after firing, on attempting to extract the shell, only the disc came out. As this is a matter of grave importance, I trust you will immediately report to headquarters, for the information of the Adjutant General.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"JNO. GRAY, Lt.-Col.,
"Major Toronto Field Battery."

This inequality in the charges of the cartridges is another defect which has not hitherto been mentioned; but I find by the report of the board that it was established that the variation in the powder charge was much greater than it ought to be. The charge ought to be seventy grains in every case, and there were from sixty-eight to seventy-two grains, a variation of four grains, which is sufficient to cause a difference of very many yards in the range of the bullet. I have also here a letter from Color Sergeant Donnelly, of A Company, Queen's Own Rifles, to the *Canadian Militia Gazette*, of Ottawa, in which he says:

Mr. CASEY.

"Having seen an article in your *Gazette*, asking for views on the 1885 Snider ammunition, I, on behalf of a large number of the Toronto Rifle Club and also of the Queen's Own, wish to state that we think it is no good; there is something wrong somewhere."

Then he goes on to give instances in the same strain as those I have already read. These are not by any means all the criticisms which I could read to the House upon this ammunition; I have here a mass of correspondence which is nearly all concerned with the subject, but I do not wish to detain the committee by reading it. I would simply mention the names of one or two others who have sent in similar complaints—John B. Mitchell, of the Bowmanville Rifle Association, and Sergeant Currie, director of stores. I am also aware that complaints were sent in by some other parties in Toronto, though perhaps not officially, on the occasion of the rifle meeting there last fall. In response to those complaints, I believe the request of the parties in Toronto was granted, and a supply of old English ammunition was got in from somewhere for use in those rifle matches. Now, I think the country must consider very seriously the facts here revealed, that ammunition not fit for practice, rejected by riflemen all over the country, and characterised by Captain Adams as being of such a character as would ruin the reputation of a private firm manufacturing it, was put into the hands of our citizen soldiers as their only defence against their savage and half civilised enemies. And the responsibility for the loss of life in consequence must fall upon those who allowed this bad ammunition to be manufactured and sent off; because they had warnings for years before that it was not satisfactory, and they neglected the very simplest precaution for making it satisfactory—getting it made of proper materials, and securing proper machinery for putting into the cartridges the right charges.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister says this factory is working satisfactorily, and the only objection taken to its efficiency is as to the quality of the powder. I do not think the report of the board sustains that position. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat, has referred to a mass of correspondence of the military men of Canada to the Government, complaining of the quality of the cartridges furnished to them in the spring of 1885. At that time, it is to be remembered, the rebellion had not been entirely quelled; and I presume—although I am not informed on that point, on which the Minister will perhaps inform us—that a portion of this defective ammunition was supplied to our militia in the North-West. In the first week of June, 1885, the ammunition was distributed amongst our volunteer forces in Canada, and they entered on their target practice. Immediately after the department here was flooded with communications from the various rifle and volunteer associations, unanimously declaring that the cartridges were very inferior. Considering that our volunteers were at that moment engaged in quelling the rebellion, what ought the Minister to have done at the very moment he learned that this most important branch of the service had broken down? I suppose he woke up to his responsibility when it was too late, for we find towards the close of the year the board sitting, and the appointment of the board does not appear, but it began its sittings, according to this report, at the latter end of October, 1885. The Minister says that the only defect in the factory, in its workings and results, was in the character of the powder used. I do not think the report sustains that position. On page 9 it is stated:

"The board did not take evidence concerning the complaints which have been made respecting the supply of shells and rifles, because they were furnished with proof in the shape of bursted shells, which had been retained by several persons, and because each member of the board present, except Professor Bayne, had personal experience in the matter."

The Minister forgot to tell the committee that the cartridges were defective, not only in respect of the powder, but in respect of bursted shells.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The bursting of the shells was the fault of the powder.

Mr. MULOCK Not at all; but because of a defective machine used in connection with the filling of the shells.

Mr. O'BRIEN. That is not according to the correspondence here.

Mr. MULOCK. We will see about that. On page 10, referring to the split shells—as to which it was argued by some that the split was occasioned by our using defective rifles—the board reports:

"That this splitting takes place in perfect rifles the board are fully aware; and, as they have never known of such happening with English cartridges, they are forced to the conclusion that it is, or was, caused by the powder used, which they believe was too sudden or unequal in its action; and this conclusion has been strengthened by the fact that after the attention of the Department and the Superintendent of the factory had been drawn to this defect, an order was given to have the powder supplied sifted, so that only the coarser grain should remain, and thus its explosiveness reduced; and since last June, and up to the enquiry in October, only sifted powder was used."

I see the split was occasioned by defective powder; it was the defect in the rim I intended to refer to. On page 12, in reference to tests, they say:

"These tests, trials and analyses are set forth in detail, and go to show that the ingredients used are pure; that in their proportions they differ somewhat from the standard laid down, and that the residuum left after the 'flashing test,' is about four times longer than that left after flashing an equal quantity of Waltham Abbey powder; and this goes to show that incorporation is not perfect.

"The conclusion arrived at with respect to the powder examined is, that it is inferior in quality, and is not that which a perfect cartridge demands; but here the board deems it only right to remark that the Hamilton Powder Company are not to be blamed, for they could not supply a powder of the Waltham Abbey grade at the price they received."

I now arrive at a very important part of the report which discloses a very grave oversight on the part of the Minister or his subordinates. At page 13 the board reports:

"As previously stated no inspection on behalf of the Crown is made during process of manufacture."

The powder is furnished by contract. The whole usefulness of the school, and of the guns, and of the safety of the force has to depend upon the honesty, or otherwise, of the contractor, The board, of course, point out, as well as they can, what a grave oversight that was on the part of the Minister, and they recommend that precautions should be taken in the future, and that a Government inspector be appointed to see that proper powder is used. I do not know whether that part of the recommendation has been adopted or not. If not, the Minister differs from the board; and if it has been, he accepts their censure, by the adoption of their suggestion. Then the report goes on further to say, in reference to the business of the inspector:

"This, the board respectfully submits, is a duty which ought not to be omitted, and the board would go further in advising that in addition to inspection during manufacture, that all powder procured or supplied under contract should be tested at the Royal Military College, Kingston, in conjunction with the tests applied at the cartridge factory, which, with the exception of that for density, are purely mechanical.

"With reference to the tests for I. V., it appears that they are made with cartridges prepared and filled with carefully weighed charges of exactly 70 grains of powder. An examination of the details of the tests for the board, which are attached hereto, shows that the average I. V. of nine such special cartridges was 1,208 feet per second, whereas the average I. V. of ten cartridges which had been filled in the ordinary manner at the laboratory was 1,662 feet per second, or a difference of 464 feet in velocity. This difference goes to show that there must have been less powder in the laboratory filled cartridges than in those which had been specially prepared, because the powder used in both lots was of the same make and character."

That report shows not only defective powder, but carelessness in the filling of the cartridges. The mistake did not merely consist in the use of bad or unequal powder, but also in the want of skill in filling the cartridges. It cannot be said that the factory was doing its duty, even if it had good powder, if it filled the cartridges in this loose and careless way. In page 15, we find the result of tests as follows:—

"At the Lévis range, on the 14th May last, a number of the best shots in Quebec were engaged in a friendly competition, and a member of the board was also present. Canadian cartridges were used and the result, as regards accuracy, were bad; many bullets going over the target whilst others struck the ground many feet in front, and similar results have obtained in other parts of the Dominion."

On page 18, we find this further statement:

"The board made enquiry into the complaint that the bottoms of cap-chambers blew out, and ascertained that at first a punch die used in the 'pressing machine,' in which the case is rivetted together, made too square a bottom with sharp angles just where fracture took place; a change was made, and now the bottom has a dome shape and the sharp angles are avoided."

That shows a defect in the manufacture of the cartridge itself, although the Minister says there was nothing but the powder to complain of. On page 21 the board reports:

"The board are not satisfied with the powder examined by them, and they have to recommend that a powder of a higher grade and quality be obtained and used, to be manufactured according to a standard duly fixed, and that samples of Waltham Abbey be not used or provided as such standard. The board suggests that all powder be inspected and tested during manufacture by an officer duly appointed."

And further on:

"They also suggest that the working of the factory and the tests, &c., made thereat should be examined at stated periods by a board of officers."

It does not appear that there has ever been any inspection whatever. In fact, a more carelessly managed institution, on which so much depends, does not exist, I think, in the whole Dominion service. Then I find, on page 22:

"The best test to which a Canadian cartridge can be submitted is, will it satisfy the riflemen of Canada? Heretofore it has not done so, the tests and trials at the cartridge factory and the standards there laid down and fixed to the contrary notwithstanding."

Then I refer to statements on page 85, speaking of the result of a test.

"With the first round of Canadian make, I experienced a stiffness in extracting the shell, and out of the twenty rounds fired, one shell had to be forced out with a ramrod, two could only be extracted by striking the breech-block against the butt to start the shell, and two others required much force to extract. Of these five shells, the bottoms of the cap-chambers of two were blown out. It may, therefore, be seen that twenty-five per cent. of these cartridges were defective, and further that the splitting or bursting should not be charged to the rifle used."

Now, what does this show? This shows an entire absence of inspection of the working of the factory; it shows that the Government did not examine the machinery as the work went along; it shows that the Government did not examine the powder in the process of manufacture; that they did not watch the filling of the cartridges, the carrying on of the work; that they allowed defective machinery to be used in the manufacture of the cartridges, and I am told in regard to the powder, though this does not appear in the report, that, instead of the Government themselves seeing that it was manufactured under direct responsibility to them, they gave out the contract to a middleman, a particular friend, and without tender, and thus, in order to enable that man to make his commission and still to supply powder within the regular price; he was obliged to buy a cheaper powder, and thus the whole trouble has come upon us. That is the whole state of this institution which the Minister of Militia says is giving entire satisfaction to the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that $1,830 appears to have been paid to Mr. Watson for inspecting clothing. Who is Mr. Watson?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Watson is the Government Inspector who inspects for the Militia Department, and also for the Mounted Police Department. He is paid so much per day. Of course, the amount paid him here is much larger than usual, and the hon. gentleman will understand that, from the troubles in the North-West, our stores were completely depleted and we had to get new stores, and he was called into requisition oftener than at ordinary times, but he is the permanent inspector of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is his ordinary occupation?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He is a merchant here. He is well known in Ottawa

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What position does he occupy in the Ottawa Conservative Association?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I believe he does not belong to it. His inspection might be more efficient if he did.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you sure he does not belong to it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am quite sure. I think he is a political friend of the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I doubt that very much.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I see there is $3,400 paid for advertising. That seems out of proportion to the amount of $90,000 for clothing, and it is a large advance on anything spent of late years.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Is it the intention to provide the force with any additional equipments?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The equipment we had of course had to be used during the campaign. We have taken advantage of that, and all the new importation is on the most perfected plan, and is adopted in the English service. A change is being made, which the hon. gentleman himself suggested, in the color of the leather, which is to be brown instead of buff as it was before.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). We might hear from those gentlemen who were in the North-West as to the clothing, whether it was of a satisfactory character.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think the Department would practice a wise economy if they were to provide the force with suits of clothing other than those they now issue. Of course we cannot keep up a force which is not attractively clothed —that goes without saying—but the Department loses by not providing the men with fatigue clothing. I have mentioned this before, and I am sure there would be a great saving in expense and a great addition to the comfort of the men if, in addition to the clothing which must be attractive and which I think cannot be improved upon, they had fatigue clothing. If you give one suit of clothes and send the men into camp and compel them to do all their work in that, you cannot expect it to last, especially on active service. I think the coats have worn well, but very many of the trousers have been very imperfect. I do not say they were imperfect in proportion to the amount paid for them, and they have been quite sufficient for the ordinary work of camp, but it would be a great point if the Government would issue fatigue clothing which would be available on active service and in camp.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the price per tunic?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Do you mean the blue or the green or the scarlet?

Mr. MULOCK. The dark.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. $6.64.

Mr. MULOCK. Do you know the price of that in England?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I will be able to furnish the hon. gentleman with that detail on concurrence.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I see by last year's report that the price paid in England for the dark tunic was $3.34, while we paid $6.29 for the rifle, and $5.76 for the artillery tunic. I presume the two latter are manufactured in this country?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. All the dark tunics are manufactured in this country. The scarlet have been imported from England hitherto, but we hope to manufacture them in Canada. A factory has succeeded in manufacturing the scarlet cloth in Canada, and it seems to be a success. By way of an experiment we have ordered some, and I hope we will have all the clothing manufactured in Canada by Canadians.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). At the price English clothing has been bought?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I could not say exactly, but the advantages are so great of having it manufactured in Canada and keeping our money at home, that I think they compensate for any increase in the price, which cannot be much, seeing that Government imports without duty.

Drill instruction and drill pay..... $920,000 00

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many troops is this intended to supply.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. 19,000 men and 1,607 horses. Twelve days' drill, city corps and brigades of garrison artillery. Drill at local headquarters. Pay by rank, without rations, 9,000 officers and men, at an average cost of seventy-two cents per day, twelve days, $77,760; 385 horses at $1, $4,620, total, $82,380. Field batteries—rural corps and brigade camps, with pay by rank, free rations, forage and transport of officers and men, at an average of $1 each, which covers pay for horses, 10,000 officers and men, and 1,222 horses, twelve days drill, $132,000; transport, say $3 per man, $30,000; camp contingencies, $5,620, making $167,620, and added to $82,380, makes up the $250,000.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I must take this opportunity of making some observations which I have already made on former occasions. In the first place, with regard to this $40,000 for drill instruction, I again desire to say that I think this money is badly expended. Under the present system, officers who are careless and inefficient, and who pay no attention to their duties, obtain precisely the same money as those who devote themselves in the most assiduous manner to the same work. I have pointed out to the Minister on previous occasions that, as a remedy for this evil, no money should be paid under this head except to officers who bring to the camp a corps which does possess a certain degree of efficiency, such a degree as will show that during the year the officers paid some attention to the work for which they are paid. Then with regard to the larger item for the annual drill in camp. I think it is evident to every one in this House that this country is making a great mistake in pursuing the system of drilling only one half of the men every year. If a man joins in a year in which the company does not drill, he does not get any drill that year; he gets drill the following year, and the third year comes round when his battalion does not go out, so that two years out of three he gets no drill. That is an absolute waste of money. This country, if it is going to make an efficient militia, must do one of two things, either reduce the active force to such a number as it is willing to pay for having properly drilled, or it must increase the grant and pay the whole force now in existence. I understand that the policy of the Government is to reduce the force. They find great difficulty in doing that for the reason that the country feels so much interest in this force; the various counties and cities feel so much interested that they spare no efforts to prevent the reduction being made. So we go on with the same system from year to year, drilling half our force and throwing away a large amount of money. Another point to which I wish to call attention is this: I think it is exceedingly unfair to the rural battalions that the city corps should be drilled every year and be paid for it every year. I think the experience of last year shows that the rural corps were got into the field as quickly and in as efficient a condition as the city corps. I know that my own battalion, gathered from two

of the largest counties in Ontario, was very prompt. I got orders on the 30th March, and on the 2nd of April my battalion, fully equipped, was on the way to Carleton Place. Now I do not think that any city corps exceeded that one in point of rapidity of concentration. As regards efficiency, as regards usefulness, as regards every quality, I think a comparison would not be against the rural corps. Under these circumstances I think it is unfair to the rural corps that the city corps should be paid and drilled every year, and thereby be placed at a great advantge over the rural corps. It tells in many ways. It prevents the officers of the rural corps from keeping up the mess, band and everything else that they take a pride in. It makes it almost impossible for us to do these things, and the tax upon us is very much heavier than it would be if it were not thrown almost entirely upon the few who are willing to do the work. The only proper way is for the Government either boldly to put down their foot and say: We will reduce our force to 30,000, which will bring it within the present estimate; or else we will ask the country to give us another $300,000, that we may drill the whole militia force as it now exists. That is the course I should like to see the Government pursue, and I think they are needlessly afraid in doing it. I think this House would support the Minister in doing it. Either adopt the one course or the other, for I look upon the present system as most unsatisfactory and extravagant.

Contingencies, including grants to artillery and rifle associations..... $38,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This appears to be a very miscellaneous item. Perhaps, in connection with that, I may call the attention of the Minister of Militia to complaints which have been made by many members of the active force, as to the shabby conduct on the part of the Government in connection with the medals recently distributed. It appears that, contrary to the usual custom, these medals were handed over without being engraved, although, I suppose, the cost would not be great. I have always understood that when medals were presented, the Government had the men's names engraved upon them. It strikes me that when men went to the North-West, and most undoubtedly exposed themselves to very considerable hardship, and were then presented with a medal by the direction of the Government, the least they could do was to engrave the man's name upon it. It is a small thing in one sense, but these small things have a good deal of effect on the minds of the men. There is another matter to which I will call the attention of the Minister. It certainly has been unusual in the regular service that, in the case of men who have been actually engaged, besides the medal, a clasp or clasps have usually been added with the name of the particular engagement in which the individual was concerned; and I observe in one of the English official lists that something of that kind appears to have been recommended by the Major-General in command, because I saw in one of those printed statements that the Major-General had a medal and two clasps, one for Batoche and another for Fish Creek .So it is tolerably clear that the officer in charge of the force had recommended something of that kind. That also might very well have been done. It is natural enough that men who have been under fire should take a pride in having some little memento, and a bar, such as is usually attached to medals distributed in the regular service, would have cost the Government very little, and have gone a long way with the men. It is not too late to remedy these defects in the action of the Government.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am in a very unfortunate position. If I spend too much money I am fiercely attacked by hon. gentlemen opposite; if I do not spend enough I am also attacked. The hon. gentleman knows that the medals which were distributed to our volunteers were sent out by Her Majesty. We had nothing to say to them, except to hand them over to the officers who commanded the various corps engaged in the suppression of the disturbance in the North-West. The cost of engraving the medals would have amounted to $1,200. I had no appropriation, when the medals came to this country, out of which to take the amount for that expenditure. I venture to say, although I do not pretend to express an opinion on such matters, that it would be impossible to have obtained clasps to commemorate the different engagements in which the men had taken part, although such would have enhanced the value of the medals. Application was made to the Imperial Government, and it was decided that clasps could not be granted. To my mind it would have been almost absurd for the Canadian Government to have added to the medals sent by Her Majesty to be distributed to our force, and to have supplemented Her Majesty's grant by adding some clasps. As the medals were sent out so we decided to distribute them. I should like to have seen the names of the men engraved on them, and I understood when the medals were sent that they would be engraved. However they came out without the names being placed on them. It was a matter for consideration as to whether I was justified in making an expenditure to which I have referred. However, I think most of the officers commanding battalions have had the medals engraved with the names.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At their own expense?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is a great credit to our volunteers that their action in the field should have obtained public approval.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman strains at gnats and swallows camels. The Government have not the slightest objection to spend under the Governor General's warrant a million and a quarter in the course of a year without having the faintest parliamentary authority for what they have done, and then come down, throw the papers on the Table and obtain the grant. But when it comes to a question of paying $1,000 or $2,000 which might very properly have been expended, the Government has conscientious qualms as to making payment. The hon. gentleman would not have received the slightest criticism for any expenditure of that kind from this side of the House, and if it be the case that officers have had to pay $100 or $200 out of their own pockets to have the medals engraved, the officers deserve great credit, but the Government that has allowed them to incur that expenditure does not deserve much credit.

Mr. FAIRBANK. The value of the medals would be immensely enhanced by the names being engraved on them. Without that I fail to see how there is any clue of the medals being in the hands of the original person. They will increase in value with coming years, and if they were engraved there would be less danger of the medals falling into the hands of the wrong persons. Without that, such liability would largely detract from their value. I do not think the Government could by any means have deserved censure for doing such an act, and they will not receive much credit for such an homœpathic dose of economy.

Mr. VAIL. I observe an item among the charges for contingencies which is irregular and I call the attention of the Minister of Militia to it. I refer to the payment of $450 to Major Macpherson of the Governor General's Foot Guards. I find that he was injured on 30th July, 1883, by a fall from his horse, and the claim for compensation for that accident does not appear to have been made until 26th June, 1884, nearly a year afterwards, and the Order in Council for the payment of that amount was not passed till 27th March, 1885. The regulations state that if illness is contracted in camp during any period of drill payment is

limited to sixty days' pay. There is also a provision that in case of accident to an officer while on duty or drill in camp there shall be a full investigation at the time by a board of officers and evidence shall be taken in writing. Those established regulations were not acted on in this case. In a report made to the Cabinet by the Minister of Militia he states the circumstances in connection with this matter, and recommends the payment of $450 as a special case. In the first place there was no authority for a recommendation of that kind, and in the next place the regulations positively state that the pay shall not exceed in any case sixty days. I notice in looking over the correspondence that Major Macpherson states that he was placed at great trouble and inconvenience and loss of time by those circumstances, which is no doubt perfectly correct; but I observe that Major Macpherson is a member of the civil service, and that during those periods in question he received his salary. So that under these circumstances it seems to me that the order for payment is rather irregular. I have not the slightest doubt that Major Macpherson is a good officer and a competent man, and I have no objection to his getting any sum he is entitled to for public service. I think, however, that under the circumstances the payment is hardly justifiable, unless some further explanation is forthcoming.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is really a very exceptional case. The major has never recovered from the accident which he experienced, I may say, in active service, because he was drilling his battalion. He was put to considerable expense. He had to consult some doctors in New York, I believe, and for a number of weeks he could not use his arm. Even now, although it is better, he always will suffer from the accident he experienced. The correspondence will show that the matter was fully considered. In an ordinary case I might have acted on my own responsibility as head of the Department; but I looked upon this as a special case; I brought it before Council, and the Order was passed for reasons which were submitted to Council. Under all the circumstances, and having looked at it as closely as possible, I think it was a small amount of money for the injury experienced.

Mr. VAIL. I think that all payments of that kind should be brought before Council, before they are allowed. In this case, I must say that I do not think the explanation of the hon. gentleman furnishes any justification for the payment. I do not think he was any more entitled to this amount than any business or professional man who had not actually lost a large amount of money would be justified in receiving such a payment. I have known a Minister of Militia, under circumstances equally strong, refuse to admit such payments, and I think that one officer should be treated the same as others, under the same circumstances.

Mr. WATSON. I would ask the Minister if he intends to provide for the new rifle associations which are being organised in Manitoba and the North-West. According to Colonel Houghton's report five new companies are being organised in Manitoba, and a number of others in the Territories. I would ask if it is the intention to supply them out of the ordinary vote.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. A grant is made to all rifle associations. We have provided in this vote for all the associations whether in the North-West or elsewhere, in the various military districts that have been reported to us as properly organised.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I see an item of contingencies last year amounting to $499.73 to J. J. Foote, for printing. Is that the same gentleman who is printing the report, the want of which the House feels so much?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The same one.

Mr. VAIL.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It is rather curious that the hon. gentleman should give the printing of his Department to this gentleman, when, according to his statement, the report has been delayed, because he has telegraphed to him about it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That does not throw the blame on him. They had been working on it night and day, and I telegraphed to know when it would be ready.

Royal Military College of Canada at Kingston... $59,000 00

Mr. VAIL. How many cadets are there there?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Seventy-two.

Mr. FAIRBANK. What provision is made at the present time for supplying the cadets with horses? I understand that they formerly used the battery horses, but that they have not been available for some time past.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman is quite correct. We have been unable, since the time of the breaking out of the troubles in the North-West, to utilise the battery horses for the cadets of the college. When these troubles broke out, the horses had to be supplied, not quite completely, but almost completely. The troubles in the North-West reduced the number of horses at the disposal of the commandant of the Royal Military College, but not expecting that the batteries would be kept away as long as they were, we considered that it would be better not to incur the expense of getting a certain number of horses exclusively for the purposes of the college. I hope, however, before long, that the batteries will be returned to the headquarters, and that the cadets will have, in that respect, the advantages they previously possessed.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I think the hon. Minister will see that it is a matter of very much importance that these young men should be thoroughly trained in horsemanship; a military man's training is incomplete without it. It is well known that this institution is largely modelled on the Military Acadamy of West Point, and there nothing receives greater attention than the training of the cadets in horsemanship. I think these cadets, whose four years will soon be passed, should not be deprived of the benefit of such an important part of their training, which they could not obtain so well afterwards.

Mr. MULOCK. I would call the attention of the Minister to the mode of keeping the accounts of the college. It receives a certain amount from the cadets every year; last year it received $16,555. I would like to know by whom that is disbursed. The gross expenditure last year was $70,086, while the House voted only $59,000, so that I presume the staff has disbursed the fees mentioned. If so, it appears to me that they should be credited in the consolidated receipts, and the House should vote the whole amount necessary to maintain the institution.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The cadets pay a certain amount for their books, clothing, &c., and that amount goes to the credit of the vote.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think that can be, as the expenditure was more than the House authorised.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my hon. friend is right enough, and the attention of the Minister of Finance should be called to this. There is no doubt it is an irregularity. In all other cases the sum received is put on one side, and the sum disbursed on the other. We ought, I think, to have the demand made here for whatever sum is required, and credit the consolidated fund with whatever the cadets paid.

Permanent Corps—Pay and maintenance of A, B and C Batteries, Schools of Artillery at Quebec, Kingston and Victoria, B.C..... $172,700 00

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The amount expended last year was $128,000, while we granted $172,000. I would

like to know how the expenditure happened to be less than the vote.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Because C Battery was not provided for, but the vote was taken in anticipation of its being organised.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The amount voted last year included the entire maintenance of that corps.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Its maintenance is not included in the war expenses?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON, No.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I suppose the same remark will apply to the infantry school?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Certainly.

Mr. VAIL. The expense at Kingston and Quebec could not have been the same, all the time while the corps were in the North-West.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman knows that we could not leave such places as Kingston and Quebec, with their valuable stores, without a large number of men to guard them. Whether we paid the substitutes of those batteries out of the war fund, or allowed the batteries to remain on the ordinary pay list, made no difference at all.

Construction and repairs of military properties....$75,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is an increase of $15,000 over last year; what is the reason?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is to meet the requirements of the buildings at Winnipeg; repairs to the infantry school and barracks. When the school was organised, the huts were in a frightfully dilapidated state, and it was necessary to provide for these repairs. There is a great deal to be done.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Will the $25,000 voted last year complete the accommodation in London?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to suggest, that item comes up in the estimates of public works and can be discussed there, but I can tell him that the $25,000 will not cover the whole expense.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 2.25, a.m. (Saturday.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 17th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Rock Lake, Souris and Brandon Railway Company.

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Medicine Hat, Dunmore and Benton Railway Company.

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Alberta Railway Company.

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Railway and Navigation Company.

MONTREAL TO SALISBURY RAILWAY.

Mr. KIRK. In answer to a question asked by me a few days ago, the Minister of Justice said a contract had been entered into by the Government with a company to build the railway from Montreal *vid* Fredericton to Salisbury. He also said, if a motion was made, the contract would be laid upon the Table. It is too late in the Session to put a notice on the paper, so, anticipating no opposition from the Government, I move:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the contract entered into by the Government for the building of the Short Line Railway from Montreal *vid* Fredericton to Salisbury.

Motion agreed to.

FOURTH REPORT OF PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. BERGIN moved that the Fourth Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament be adopted.

Mr. MILLS. I have not read the report, but I listened to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, and I do not think there is anything to warrant the censure of the Auditor General which the hon. gentleman asks the House to adopt. The intention of Parliament in appointing an auditor was that he should be perfectly independent, and, if he abuses his office, if he neglects his duty, there is a proper way of calling him to account; but for a committee to undertake to order and control the Auditor General, and then come to the House and ask for the censure of the Auditor-General because he does not comply with their wishes, I think is a monstrous proposition, and would be quite as great an abuse as to make him the mere servant of the Government. In fact, it is altogether contrary to the spirit of the law to do what the hon. gentleman asks the House to do. I trust that the hon. members of this House will not sanction the report proposed by the hon. gentleman. Certainly, if the hon. gentleman persists, I shall ask for a division on this question, and that the yeas and nays shall be recorded.

Mr. BERGIN. The hon. gentleman does not appear to apprehend the true state of the case. The hon. gentleman says it is a monstrous proposition for a committee of this House to censure an officer for refusing to do his duty. We were told the other day, from the other side of the House, that what this House required was an honest audit of the accounts. That is just what the Printing Committee of this House asked from the Auditor General and that he refused to do, and it was not until a month and two or three days had elapsed that he consented to do that which he himself admitted, the first time he appeared before the committee, that it was his duty to do, that he ought to do, and would do. As the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow) stated to the House the other day, no less than half a dozen times he stated to the committee that he would give the certificate. If I am correctly informed, the current account of this House, amounting to over $250,000, was laid on the Table without the signature of the Auditor General. Is that an honest audit, such as this House requires? The committee must not be misrepresented in this matter. The committee had no feeling whatever except to see that the duty of the Auditor General was performed. They took the most courteous way of procuring the performance of that duty by the Auditor General, and, if they refer to his refusal, it is because, by his refusing for a month to perform that duty, they were obliged of necessity to do so.

Mr. McLELAN. I think it would be better not to depart from the practice we have observed, that is, that all the accounts of expenditure in the public service should go through the hands of the Auditor General at some time or other. I think the difficulty has arisen from a misunderstanding on the part of the Auditor General

as to what is required of him in this case. After a statement has been prepared by the clerk and submitted to the Printing Committee, there can be no objection to all the accounts and vouchers going to the Auditor General and passing through his hands, as all the other expenditures under the Government do. I think it would be a better check, and the proper course to pursue that there should be a particular audit of all the expenditure that is made in the Printing Committee in connection with legislation, that it should all be audited carefully by an officer who has more time and more leisure, and is, perhaps, more familiar with it than the Printing Committee can be. They take the statement of the clerk and look at it, but they cannot give it that time and attention which are necessary, and which would be satisfactory to the House and the country. I therefore move in amendment:

That the report be referred back to the Joint Committee on Printing, with instructions to amend the resolution on the auditing of the printing accounts, by providing that any statement of the accounts which may be required by the committee, be not submitted to the examination of the Auditor General, and that all accounts, vouchers, &c., required by the Auditor General for his examination under the third resolution of the First Report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts of the Session of 1880, be, as heretofore, sent to him for audit.

That is, that any statement that may be required be not subject to his audit, but that all vouchers, papers and documents necessary to a proper audit by the Auditor General should be sent to him, as heretofore provided by the resolution of 1880.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

FISHING BY FOREIGN VESSELS.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 136) further to amend the Act respecting fishing by foreign vessels. He said: The amendment is to section 3 of that Act, the latter part of which reads at present as follows:—

"And if such ship, vessel or boat, be foreign, or not navigated according to the laws of the United Kingdom or of Canada, and have been found fishing, or preparing to fish, or to have been fishing (in British waters) within three marine miles of any coasts, bays, creeks or harbors of Canada, not included in the above-mentioned limits, without a license, or after the expiration of the period named in the last license granted to such ship, vessel or boat, under the first section of this Act, such ship, vessel or boat, and the tackle, rigging, apparel, furniture, stores and cargo thereof, shall be forfeited."

The addition to the section is as follows:—

Or has entered such waters for any purpose not permitted by the law of nations, or by treaty or conviction, or by any law of the United Kingdom or of Canada, for the time being in force, or having entered such waters, has failed to comply with any such law of the United Kingdom or of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CARLETON AND CITY OF ST. JOHN BRANCH RAILWAY.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 137) respecting the Carleton and City of St. John Branch Railway. He said: Last year an appropriation was made for the purpose of acquiring this railway, and a large portion of the stock of the company was acquired. There is a portion of it still outstanding, and it is proposed by this Bill to provide a sum of money which shall be applied to the expropriation of the remaining stock, in the same way as land is expropriated for railway purposes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVILEGE—NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Mr. McCARTHY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to rise to a personal explanation as a matter of privilege. The House will remember that in the discussion of the resolution of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), with regard to timber limits, certain charges were made against me with regard to the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway. I gave those charges a denial at the time, as I thought sufficiently explicit—at all events, as particular and minute as I was able to do at the moment, the charges having been sprung upon me without any notice whatever. I find, however, that notwithstanding the denial I made, the *Globe* newspaper has on two different occasions referred to the matter, and I desire to read what it has said upon those occasions, in order that I may give such an explanation or denial as the circumstances of the case call for. On the 8th of May the *Globe* had an article from which I take the following:—

"But while that part of the charge may be left for future consideration, the statement that Mr. McCarthy receives $5,000 a year as president of the subsidising company, stands good by his own confession. The money must go to him directly from the subsidy, because the road has yet earned nothing. This damning statement he endeavors to treat contemptuously in replying to Mr. Lister, but the effort was an uneasy one and did not succeed. Mr. Cook rose after Mr. McCarthy had spoken, determined to press home the charge, and succeeded completely, literally forcing an acknowledgment from his respectability's unwilling lips. Mr. McCarthy had to admit, in presence of the House, that he receives $5,000 a year from the subsidy which he, as a member, succeeded in obtaining from the Government."

I will read from *Hansard* what was said—and the report is a correct one:

"Mr. COOK. I much admired the ingenious way in which the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) answered the charges made against him. He said he could assure this House that he had sold no bonds, and had pocketed no money, but he did not say that he was a one-third shareholder in the stock of the Northern Pacific and Junction Railway, to the extent of $182,000 or $200,000.

"Mr. McCARTHY. If I did not say so then, I say so now.

"Mr. COOK. Well, Sir, your name is down; it is on a return brought down to this House a short time ago.

"Mr. McCARTHY. It is not correct.

"Mr. COOK. I will read the names of the parties on that return:

"'Samuel Barker, Adam Brown, C. J. Campbell, Wm. Joice, John Procter, Hon. F. Smith, John Stuart, Hon. James Turner, Hon. F. Smith, John Stuart, Dalton McCarthy'—

"Mr. McCARTHY. 'In trust,' read the whole of it, please.

"Mr. COOK. Not in trust.

"Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

"Mr. COOK. It is not so stated in the return, it is very easy to have it in trust for yourself. The hon. gentleman did not say that he was not receiving $5,000 as president of this road.

"Mr. McCARTHY. I was not charged with it.

"Mr. COOK. He did not say that he was receiving money for being solicitor of this railway.

"Mr. McCARTHY. I am not the solicitor of the road.

"Mr. COOK. I did not say you were. I say it has been charged against you that you received money as president of this road.

"Mr. McCARTHY. I do not deny that."

The subsidy to this road was granted by Order in Council on 10th April. I was appointed the president of the road in the month of June after—the exact date I do not at the moment remember—I think it was 24th June. I was appointed president, as I then explained to the House, by an arrangement between the Northern and the Hamilton and North-Western Railways, which, under the power obtained that year, 1884, from Parliament, had purchased the stock of the railway and were solely interested in it. I was appointed as president merely to see fair play between those two companies and the two different cities they represented. The bonus I did explain very clearly, notwithstanding the statement in a newspaper, and I now repeat that explanation. The bonus was handed over to the contractors as part payment for their work. It was money earned under the terms of the subsidy upon ten mile sections of the road being completed, and that money is actually to-day and has always been received under power given to the company by the contractors on account of the contract money, and not one dollar of that money has gone, and not one dollar can go, either into the coffers of the company or into the hands of any one of its officers. And,

therefore, I am able to give that charge again, as I did before, the most distinct and positive denial. However, the *Globe* has stated—or else I would not further notice the matter—in an article on Saturday headed, "McCarthy's Subsidised Impudence," as follows:—

"Mr. Dalton McCarthy receives $5,000 a year from a Government subsidy. It would be preposterous to allege that he earns the money by performing the nominal duties of president of the Northern Pacific Junction Railway. But he is too conscientious an individual to take so much cash without giving the Administration something in return. The Committee of Privileges and Elections now know what he does with his money. He has submitted to them a report on the White-Jamieson-Bowell-scandal, which, for downright perversion of the truth, and for cool impudence, surpasses any piece of paid advocacy that he can have admitted before a court. The concoctor of so remarkable a document may be worth $5,000 a year as a designer of political curiosities."

I take it that that is a very clear and distinct charge that I am receiving from the Government, or through the railway out of Government money, this $5,000 a year, to which charge I here give the most clear and distinct and positive denial. I have only further to add this: I had nothing whatever to do with the settlement of the allowance or remuneration or salary, or what you choose to call it, that I receive as president of that road. I was appointed under the circumstances I have mentioned, on 24th June, or rather on 4th June, and I left shortly afterwards for England. Mr. Chas. Moss was appointed president of the road during my absence. On my return Mr. Moss resigned, and I resumed my position. During my absence the allowance was settled, without any communication with me or without any reference to me directly or indirectly, and when I returned I was informed that the company had agreed that my salary was to be, not $5,000, a year but that my allowance was to be at the rate of $3,000 a year. During the period of my absence Mr. Moss received an allowance at the same rate or a little more, $1,000 for that period. I have simply to make this explanation, as I think it is due from me as a public man to state it in the House, because my conduct as a public man has been impugned. I have only further to add that so far as regards statements made outside I think I know how to protect myself. If these statements are repeated, I will see whether a public man is under the protection of the laws of the country, or whether he can be libelled with impunity.

Mr. BERGIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to direct the attention of the House to a misstatement made in the *Globe* with reference to myself, and which has been repeated by the Grit press throughout the country. The *Globe* does me the honor to represent me as having shirked the vote upon the Irish Home Rule question. Upon that occasion I was absent to do honor to one of the best Irishmen of my acquaintance, upon the eve of his departure for the North-West. I was there at the special request of my constituents, and before going I arranged with the Whip to secure a pair for me, and he did secure a pair with Mr. Edgar, the member for West Ontario. I do not know that I ought to have noticed this attack by the *Globe*. I know it can do me no injury with my constituents, but it is just possible that in Ireland, among some of my friends there, it may be supposed that the *Globe* sometimes tells the truth.

NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Mr. McCARTHY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 25) respecting the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the motion is adopted I desire to call the attention of the House to this Bill. The company was incorporated by this Parliament in 1881, and by that Act became entitled to borrow to the extent of $20,000 a mile on the first mortgage bonds of that railway. The road is designed to serve a very important public interest, as any one can see by reference to the Statute. It occupies a very peculiar position in connection with the railway system of the whole Dominion. It is practically a public work in which the Dominion has a direct interest, by virtue of the aid granted by the Dominion to the road. On reference to the Statute incorporating the railway company it appears that provision is made whereby the traffic shall be conducted for the benefit of the whole railway system. This railway has not got the ordinary powers of railways, whereby it can conduct its traffic as it may please, subject to Order in Council, but it is governed by some express provisions in the Statute incorporating it. Well, being so hedged round as to its powers, Parliament was called upon to aid in the construction of a line, whereby the railway system of Ontario might be able to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway, thus giving Ontario direct access to the North-West, *vid* the Canadian Pacific Railway. This line having been incorporated, it was held out to the people of Canada that it was going to be a neutral link to afford free access for the traffic of Ontario to the North-West and *vice versa*, and the railway having acquired that status in the minds of the people and in the opinion of Parliament, Parliament in 1884 was asked to grant a subsidy whereby Ontario might be connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and thus by railway with the North-West. Accordingly, in the month of April, 1884, an Act was passed authorising the Governor in Council to grant a subsidy to this road, amounting in all to $12,000 per mile on a total mileage of 110 miles, being the estimated distance from Gravenhurst, the most northerly terminus of the Ontario system, to Callander, the contemplated point of junction between our system and the Canadian Pacific Railway. At that time it was provided by the Act granting that subsidy that it should only be granted and paid over upon the railway in question executing an agreement to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council whereby the railway receiving that subsidy should bring itself under express contract to conduct its operations according to the true intent and spirit of the Act incorporating it. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, an agreement was entered into between the Dominion of Canada and the railway company, which agreement bears date 12th April, 1884, whereby the company agrees to accept the subsidy which had been granted, subject to certain conditions, and the only condition with which I propose to trouble the House is the condition which I consider is being modified by the Bill to which the assent of the House is now being asked. I may say that when the subsidy was under discussion the question arose in Parliament, what would be the cost of this railway. It was pointed out to the House that $12,000 per mile appeared to be a large subsidy to vote for the construction of a railway through the Province of Ontario, and at that time the House was informed that the surveys had been made and that an estimate of the cost had been arrived at, and to prevent mistakes I will read from *Hansard* of that date showing what was the opinion furnished to the House as a consideration for the House granting that subsidy to the company to which the Government subsequently did grant it. On referring to the *Hansard* report of the 18th day of May, page 1291, I find that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), having referred to the size of this subsidy and otherwise referred to the proposed grant, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who is now promoting this Bill, used these words in answer to the hon. member for West Durham:

"Mr. McCARTHY. I think the hon. member for West Durham is mistaken in his statement that the cost of the road will be only $12,000 per mile.

"Mr. BLAKE. I did not say that; I do not think it will be much more.

"Mr. McCARTHY. According to estimates made, the cost will be about double that, as some portions of it will pass through a difficult

country, although towards Callander the country may perhaps be easier."

Then, after further remarks, I find that hon. gentleman closed his remarks at that time as follows :—

"I think Ontario has thought, at all events western Ontario has thought, it was entitled to have communication with Callander made as easy to its people as it was made to the eastern part of the country, and we are glad to know that the Government have found their way to make the grant which will enable the road to be built, I hope, without great delay. I may state that surveys have been made, that an estimate of the cost has been arrived at, that in certain parts, and especially at difficult points, the right of way has been acquired; and if satisfactory terms to the Government can be made with the company, there is no reason why the road should not be under contract one month after the House rises."

There we have it stated that the surveys had been made, that estimates had been arrived at, and that the cost of the construction of this line would be about $24,000 per mile. It must be within the recollection of every hon. gentleman that Sir Charles Tupper, Minister of Railways in 1883, spoke upon this matter outside of this House. I do not know that I can refer to what occurred in the Railway Committee last year, but if I can, I may state my recollection of what he said, and I am sure hon. gentlemen will confirm me as to what he said when the matter came up in the Railway Committee before it came up in the House. It came up in a discussion upon one of the lines of railway, I think the Hamilton and North-Western, or some other line then seeking legislation before that committee. Sir Charles Tupper announced the policy of the Government on that occasion to be to grant aid for the construction of this neutral link, and he stated to the committee then that the grant made and to be made by the Government would be of such an amount that the country would never have to pay more than $20,000 per mile in order to obtain possession of this road, and that whatever railway got $6,000 per mile, the aid which was granted, and the $6,000 that was proposed to be granted—and which I may say was not granted that year; although he anticipated the action of Parliament in that respect, he informed the committee that the action of Parliament would be to that effect; that the country would at any time be able to resume possession of the line which received this aid at no greater cost to the country than $20,000 per mile. I presume he based that statement on some knowledge he had as to the cost of the construction of that line. Well, we find that in the month of April, 1884, an agreement was entered into between the railway now seeking this Act (the Northern Pacific Railway Company) and the Government, which railway agrees to accept a subsidy of $12,000 per mile, subject, amongst other conditions, to the following, that is, section 6 :—

"For the purpose of ensuring free interchange of traffic, coming to or going from the railways so to be constructed between the lessees' railway, and the railways connecting therewith, so far as such interchange shall be under the control of the lessees, the said lease shall also contain a provision that, in the event of the Parliament of Canada being at any time hereafter of opinion that the traffic of the railway system of the lessees, coming from or going to the projected railway, and interchanging with lines connecting with the lessees' system of railways, is not so interchanged without preference or prejudice as between such connections, then, being of such opinion, the Parliament of Canada may, if it see fit, cancel the said lease and take over the said railway free from encumbrance upon assumption of the bond or debenture debts of the lessor company to the amount of $8,000 per mile of the railway, and upon payment of such further sum of money beyond the said bond debts of $8,000 per mile, and the said subsidy, as the said railway may then be worth, the value thereof to be ascertained, in case the Government and the company cannot agree, by arbitration; the arbitrators to be appointed, one by the Government and the other by the company, and the third by the two appointed, failing agreement as to such third arbitrator, then by one of the Chief Justices of the High Court of Ontario, under the provisions of the Ontario Judicature Act in that behalf, and the award of the majority shall be binding."

This agreement modified the borrowing powers of the company as against the Crown. It is true, by the Act of incorporation the railway company was authorised to mortgage the railway to the extent of $20,000 per mile; but that Act of incorporation preceded this agreement, which expressly stipulates that if the Crown should see fit to take over this railway, it would be bound to assume a bond debt of only $8,000 per mile; and there is the further condition in this agreement that beyond the bond debt of $8,000 per mile, the Crown shall be allowed to purchase the road at its value above the $8,000 per mile, less the subsidy to be granted of $12,000 per mile; and that value was to be ascertained at the time of default, and ascertained in a certain manner. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that if to-day it could be shown that the railway were worth only $8,000 per mile above the subsidy, the Crown would only have to pay $8,000 per mile for it. That being the position this company occupies, and must continue to occupy under this agreement, we are not justified at this stage in passing a measure whereby the Crown may be called on to pay a larger sum, and whereby until that time arrives the railway may be saddled with a larger debt, and the public may be obliged to pay more for the traffic they send over the road. What does the Bill before the House propose? It proposes that this company may, in lieu of the bond issue authorised by its Act of incorporation, issue preferential debenture stock; and section 1 says :

"Such perpetual debenture stock or terminable bonds shall, without registration or formal conveyance, be taken and considered to be the first lien and preferential charge and claim upon the said portion of the railway section, and upon the tolls and property, real and personal, of and belonging to the said portion, after deducting from such tolls and revenues the working expenses of the said portion, and upon the rent payable in respect of such portion, under the lease set forth in schedule A to this Act, to the extent of the interest payable on such perpetual debenture stock or terminable bonds, and each holder of such perpetual debenture stock or terminable bonds, as the case may be, shall be deemed to be a mortgagee and incumbrancer *pro rata* with all the other holders thereof: Provided, however, that the whole amount of such perpetual debenture stock or terminable bonds to be issued shall not exceed the sum of twenty thousand dollars per mile of such portion," &c.

Section 2 provides that in the process of issuing the $20,000 per mile, the company shall first of all issue the $8,000 per mile, and the residue of the $20,000 per mile on getting the sanction of the shareholders. What is the effect of section 1, as recommended by the Committee on Railways and Canals? It authorises this company to issue preferential debenture stock to the extent of $20,000 per mile, which preferential stock it declares shall be a first charge and encumbrance upon the road. Parliament, by the agreement of 1884, was bound to pay only $8,000 per mile to resume the road in case of default; but if we sanction this proposition, it will be bound beyond all question to pay $20,000 per mile. Suppose the bonds are sold in the market, and the Government subsequently seek to take possession of the road, what will be the position of the bondholders? Suppose the arbitrators value it as worth only $8,000 per mile above the subsidy? Under the agreement we are only to pay $8,000 per mile; but if we are met with a Statute by which we authorise the company to borrow $20,000 per mile, which is to be a first charge on the whole undertaking, is it not clear, both in law and in honor, that we must allow the $20,000 per mile to be a charge on the road prior to the claim of the Crown to redeem? Perhaps the promoters of this Bill may argue that the road is worth $20,000 per mile. I submit that its value to-day is not the question. The question under the contract is, what will that road be worth at the time default is made, which may happen, to-day, to-morrow or years hence? Whatever our agreement is, under that contract we have paid $1,320,000 to this road; and certainly we are entitled to have the contract lived up to, and to refuse to pass this Bill in its present form. I believe it is contended that this road has cost a large amount of money, that the calculations made as to its cost have been disappointing, that the estimates and surveys made at the time were inaccurate. But what difference does it make, what has the road cost? I do not care what it cost, so far as this agreement is con-

cerned; the question is, what is the value of the road? And if the Crown takes the road over, the value must be ascertained, and the value will not depend on the cost, but I submit, on the earning power of the road above working expenses. That opens up another question. Suppose, at the time the Crown proceeds to redeem this road, it should happen that a rival road runs alongside of it. Will it then be worth what it cost? Clearly not; its value must depend on its earning power above working expenses. Under these circumstances, I think this House is assuming to-day the functions of a future Parliament in deciding that the road in the future will be worth $20,000 a mile above the subsidy of $12,000 a mile. Moreover, I call the attention of the Government to this point. The Crown is interested in this property. At present the road cannot be charged to a greater amount than $8,000 a mile as an obligation which must precede the Crown's right to redeem. Now it is proposed to change the Crown's right from an absolute right to redeem on payment of $8,000 a mile, to a contingent right dependent upon the value of the road in excess of $8,000 a mile. It is proposed to establish beyond all question, a further charge of $20,000 a mile which will come prior to the Crown's right. Has the Crown consented to this? Has the Crown investigated this matter? Has the sanction of the Governor General been given to this? The Government, in dealing with this matter, must take the responsibility; they must not leave it to be disposed of as an open question by the House. Considering that the rights of the Crown are being varied, or that there is the probability of their being varied, the Crown is bound to give its sanction to the measure before it can receive the final sanction of Parliament. For these reasons, I submit that the provisions in this Bill should be modified, so that, beyond all question, the rights of the Crown under the agreement of 1884 shall be absolutely guarded. Before I pass from this subject, let me call the attention of the House to the position of this company, in regard to its future operations. This company has entered into a lease with the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company and the Northern Railway Company, whereby it leases its road bed to those two companies in perpetuity. It does not lease rolling stock, it does not provide railway stock, it does not incur obligations personally to provide rolling stock. There is no need, therefore, for money to meet anything beyond what is necessary to complete the line in order to place it in a condition to be handed over according to the lease to the leasing companies. Therefore, you will see that this claim for increasing the borrowing powers cannot be pressed on the House on the ordinary grounds, that the road is in an unfinished state, that it has to provide for rolling stock and so on. The Bill shows on its face, by the schedule, that the leasing companies took it over in perpetuity and are bound to finish it. I believe it is said that the contract does not quite cover the whole ground, that the company itself is obliged to put up a telegraph line, a few stations, and so on; but these things have been done. Parliament should have evidence of the value of the company and the value of the work, before giving its sanction to place a mortgage which, beyond all question, will come before the claim of the Crown to redeem. I pass from this to another point, the obligation of the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company and the Northern Railway Company to the country. The Pacific Junction Railway has parted with all interest. The corporations which are seeking this Act are, in reality, the two to which I have referred. They take the whole benefit of the grant. The grant is made nominally to this independent line. According to the return brought down, the subscribed capital stock amounts to $200,000. How much or how little of that has been paid in does not appear in the return. I also observe a highly objectionable clause, under which stock may be handed over to contractors and directors for services rendered without the payment of cash. I object, on principle, to that clause in any charter. I am not aware it has been abused; I have no opinion in the matter, and I have no right to assume it has been. The gross interest of the shareholders in the company, at the very utmost, is the bagatelle of capital to which I have referred, and on which, if I remember rightly, there has been but 10 per cent. paid, according to the return laid before the House a short time ago. On that point I speak subject to correction, for I have not referred to the return to refresh my memory. I may say that of the $20,000 stock which, it is said, is in this road, the bulk, $182,000, was held by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and others in trust for the two leasing companies. Am I correct in that?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Out of the $200,000 nominal capital that this company boasts of, $182,000 is held by these gentlemen in trust for the leasing companies, thus leaving only $18,000 of stock that can be pretended to be held by any interest other than the Hamilton and North-Western Company and the Northern Railway Company; and if there is but 10 per cent. paid on that, it shows the introduct into the company of but $1,800 capital other than the capital invested by the two leasing companies and the subsidy granted by the Crown. That being the case, Parliament is bound to look behind the mere appearance of the thing, and see for whose benefit this Bill is being promoted. It is promoted for the benefit of the two leasing companies. That being the case, the Hamilton and North-Western must be treated as a petitioner to this House for relief, and I submit further that if any corporation or individual petitions this House for relief, it is bound to accede to any reasonable terms, as a condition precedent to its getting such relief. Why I urge that view upon the House, is this: The Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company was at one time an independent railway. Prior to its being built, the country served by it was served by the Northern Railway Company, the first railway which extended its line north-westerly from Toronto in the direction of Georgian Bay. That company is under the management of an English board, and for nearly one-quarter of a century had the monopoly of the carrying trade of the district through which it passes. During that period it conducted its operations, not to the satisfaction of the country, but in an arbitrary and tyrannical manner and thereby prevented the development of the back country and drove many interests away. At last the people rebelled under the thraldom, and thought the possibility of escape presented itself when the Hamilton and North-Western line, a railway incorporated by the Ontario Legislature, sought to build its line through a portion of the section served by the Northern Railway. The people grasped at the opportunity, and the promoters of the Hamilton and North-Western, holding out to them inducements that this new line would be a competing line, succeeded by that argument in obtaining vast bonuses from the section of the country through which the Hamilton and North-Western proposed to pass, which section was one that was practically served, on the east side at least, by the then existing railway. That section of country to the east of the Hamilton and North-Western did not want a new railway merely for the sake of a new railway. It wanted it for the sake of competition and for no other purpose, and it granted a vast sum of money for the purpose of obtaining that competition. One of the termini of the Hamilton and North-Western is on the line of the Northern Railway. The present northern terminus of the Hamilton and North-Western is at the town of Barrie through which the Northern Railway passes. It is true, the Hamilton and North-Western does give an outlet beyond Toronto, because it

goes down to Hamilton, but we know that the bulk of the trade of the north seeks its market in the city of Toronto, and therefore what they wanted was competition in respect of the railway rates to Toronto, where they could connect with the other systems, and ship their traffic beyond if they desired. The section of country to which I refer granted $375,000 or thereabouts in aid of this road, and after this Hamilton and North-Western was constructed, after the people had mortgaged their properties and paid over this money to the North-Western Railway, a short time after the Hamilton and North-Western entered into a pooling partnership arrangement with the Northern Railway, and thereupon proceeded to adopt the old objectionable rates, and thus rob the people of nearly the whole value which they had expected to get, which they had purchased, in fact, with their large aid. Of course, it is late in the day to seek redress, and I presume we could not, unless they were petitioners here, bring pressure to bear upon this company to cause it, even so late, to do justice; but the people who granted that money and mortgaged their property for twenty years are still paying. The debt is not yet paid. I suppose there are ten years yet to expire. It is only two years ago that these two railways came here, and in various guises endeavored to get an extension of that pooling arrangement in perpetuity. Fortunately the attempt was discovered in time, and I induced the House to put a clause in the Consolidated Railway Act and in their own charters to prevent its being carried out. Now we have them seeking relief, and seeking and obtaining what will be a practical argument to them whereby at another Session they may come to the House and say: Now you must perpetuate this pooling arrangement because you have given a tenant to us in perpetuity. These two railway companies, as you see by this Bill, have leased this particular railway, the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway in perpetuity. The Hamilton and North-Western, of course, is bound as the lessee to live up to its obligations under this lease, and one of these obligations is that it shall run that road. It cannot run that road except with the assistance of the Northern Railway, because it is not within perhaps fifty or sixty miles of the southern limit of the Pacific Junction Railway, and this lease to the joint roads in perpetuity is referred to in this Bill. We know how little argument is required at times to convince the House that it would be right to grant legislation. Next year, or the year after, or in a short time, therefore, if this Bill is made law without some safeguards in it, we shall find these two leasing companies coming down to Parliament and asking to have that pooling arrangement which I have referred to extended in perpetuity. I may say that that pooling arrangement expires in twenty-one years from the date of its commencement. I do not remember the date, but I think it was some six or seven years ago. It could only be made under the Consolidated Railway Act for the period of twenty-one years at most, and therefore, unless it is extended in the meantime, it must expire at the end of twenty-one years. One-third of the time has run out, and before it expires, before the people have become alive to their interests, we shall find these railway companies from time to time endeavoring in various ways to get legislative sanction for the extension of that pooling arrangement; and then what will Parliament be told? Next year perhaps my hon. friend himself may be promoting such a measure, and he will produce this Bill, if it goes through in its present form, and will show that, although it does not exactly ratify this lease, it refers to it and adopts it. He will say it is incorporated in the measure, it was before Parliament, Parliament was aware of it, and Parliament did not take care to expressly guard its future action in respect of the case referred to. In view of that, in view of the past, in view of the possibility of the future, in view of the fraud committed on the people of that section, it appears to me that we are only justified in granting this relief upon condition that the petitioners do equity themselves, and I submit that there is only one kind of restitution that the petitioning railway can grant to-day, and that is, before they obtain legislative sanction to any measure from this House, they shall make restitution to the section of country from which they obtained the money in respect to the violation of the agreement on the faith of which they received this money. Therefore, when this Bill is in the Committee of the Whole, I intend to call the attention of the committee to that feature of it as well as to the other feature, and to move, as I have given notice that I will, such amendments as will meet the cases in question. I intend to move that the Act shall not take effect until the Hamilton and North-Western makes restitution by returning to the people of Simcoe and the various municipalities that voted money the moneys that they did so vote. I also intend then to move that the borrowing powers shall be so modified as in no way to interfere with the rights of the Crown or the rights of the public who may become customers over that line.

Mr. McCARTHY. This matter can be perhaps more properly dealt with in committee than in the House. I only regret that my hon. friend, who has made so long and labored an argument on the subject, and who is a member of the Railway Committee and was present when this Bill was considered, did not make his objections there, where the manager of the road was present who could have answered many of the matters to which he has made reference.

Mr. MULOCK. The reason why I did not was this: The Bill was called on a few minutes before one o'clock. I arose and proceeded to address the committee. I dealt with only one clause. The Minister of Public Works, who was in the chair, was impatient, intimating that there was a meeting of the Council and he had to leave. The committee did not seem desirous of delaying the Government or the Minister, and accordingly all that I could do was to intimate that, not having the attention of the committee or a reasonable opportunity there under the circumstances to press my case, I would take the opportunity of doing so in the House. I mentioned that to the committee, and my hon. friend heard me.

Mr. McCARTHY. He mentioned one matter to the committee, and but one.

Mr. MULOCK. I had not an opportunity to go further.

Mr. McCARTHY. He had not an opportunity to go further. He mentioned that he would bring before the House this last question that has been raised as to the *quasi* ratification caused by the adoption of this Act. Now, I think I can explain in a very few words what my hon. friend means, and give the answer to what my hon. friend has stated. The Bill has merely one object in view, and that object is to give the company power to borrow by debenture stock or terminable bonds instead of by the ordinary bonds. That is the sole provision of the Bill, and, added to that, it is intended to make these bonds of the Callander and Gravenhurst section of the road sectional. The hon. gentleman's argument amounts to this, that if this enactment is now passed, the effect of the contract between the Crown and the railway company will be practically done away with, if not in law, at all events in good faith. All I can say in answer to that is, that if that is the effect of it we can add in committee any words my hon. friend may suggest to neutralise that. That is not the intention of the promoters of the Bill. They simply desire, instead of issuing ordinary bonds, to issue debenture stock. I explained that to the Railway Committee, and I repeat it here. That is the whole object of the section, to make these bonds sectional; and if there is any doubt at

all that passing this legislation would have the effect of nullifying the contract in any way, then an amendment can be put in, and I have prepared an amendment which I think will meet the view of the hon. member, which amendment is to the effect that nothing in the Bill contained shall interfere with the contract between the Government and the company. Now, a word as to the last statement made by the hon. gentleman. He is very much afraid that the effect of this legislation will be to ratify the pooling arrangement between the Northern Railway Company and the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not say so.

Mr. McCARTHY. What did the hon. gentleman say as to that?

Mr. MULOCK. I said it would afford an argument to the company to ask Parliament to ratify it at a later time. I made an exception of that legislation that has taken place already.

Mr. McCARTHY. If that is all I do not think the hon. member need be much alarmed, because I find that the 8th section of the Act passed in 1884, says:

"The company may agree with the Northern Railway of Canada to extend the duration of the agreement of the 6th day of June, 1879, between the two companies, to the term of 999 years or from time to time for any shorter term or terms, and may make such changes therein and modifications thereof as may be deemed necessary or advisable in respect of substantially the same matter and subjects as are dealt with by that agreement, referred to and scheduled in the Northern Railway Company's Act, 1881."

Mr. MULOCK. No, I do not know anything about that. I was referring to the agreement, or to the section, which said they should not make the agreement except on getting the sanction of the Crown.

Mr. McCARTHY. The section goes on: "Providing always."

Mr. MULOCK. I only put in the proviso.

Mr. McCARTHY. Now, what the hon. gentleman is complaining of is that by innuendo, or by a side wind, this pooling arrangement between the Hamilton and the North-Western and the Northern will be ratified, or effect given to it in a modified way which will give ground for these companies coming to Parliament at a subsequent date and asking for such an arrangement. But it is plain that has been already done. Now, Sir, I, for one, was as much opposed as any one could be to this arrangement that was made between the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company and the Northern Railway Company. The validity of that arrangement was tested in the courts. It came before Vice Chancellor Blake, then on the bench, and he decided in favor of the validity of the arrangement. I was solicitor for the county council at the time, and I advised an appeal, but they did not think fit to prosecute it. It has now lasted since 1879, so long that I doubt very much, legal or illegal, if the courts will interfere with it. So we may conclude that the arrangement which is to exist for a period of twenty-one years will continue. The proviso which the hon. member says he put in this Act, certainly gives sufficient protection for the future, because it says:

"Provided always, that no extension of such agreement shall be valid unless and until approved by the Governor in Council, and that before such approval shall be given, notice of the application thereof shall be published in the *Canada Gazette*, and in some paper published in the county of Simcoe, &c."

If, therefore, the hon. member still thinks there is any doubt there is no objection to putting a clause in this Bill that nothing in it contained shall affect the provision of this section 8 in the Act of the Hamilton and North-Western Company and the corresponding section of the Northern Company's Act. I am not promoting a Bill here, certainly, which is intended to have the effect of making that agreement of 1879 any more valid or effectual than it already is. As to the other part, I will meet the hon. member's views by submitting an amendment to the clause which, I think, he will agree protects the rights of the Crown, and the rights of Parliament, and it is in the words following:—

"Provided that this enactment is without prejudice to the agreement with the Government of Canada and the company, bearing date 12th April, 1884, and respecting the assumption by Parliament of the portion of said line of railway between Gravenhurst and Callander."

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would state whether a clause of that kind would relieve the Government, if they should be called upon to take over that railway hereafter, from the liability to pay this $20,000 per mile in addition to the $12,000 bonus already given—in other words, making the whole liability of the Government, if they take over the road, $32,000 per mile. I do not enter at all into the legal questions which have been raised; I do not know much about them; but I do think, in the public interest, it is our duty as legislators to look carefully into an Act involving so much money, where the company was as liberally dealt with as this has been, by the Government, to which $12,000 per mile has been given as a bonus to build it with, on condition that if they failed to carry out the arrangement, or if the Government took possession of the road, they should take it over after paying the difference between the $12,000 and the cost of the road. All I am aiming at now in calling the hon. gentleman's attention to this point, is to have such an explanation as will satisfy this House, and to know whether he can put a clause in the agreement by which the public interested can be protected, where authority is given to issue railway bonds for $20,000 a mile, if the bonds get into the hands of the general public; I want to know how, after we have passed legislation and these bonds have been circulated, and passed into the hands of private parties, perhaps, without their knowledge of the Government lien, how he can put a clause in that Bill that will protect the public against having to pay $12,000 a mile over what they agreed to. It seems to me a monstrous proposition, and I would like to have a clear understanding of it.

Mr. COOK. It is a very great pity that we have not a general railway Act which would save us the difficulty that we have experienced in this and previous Sessions. The Sessions would be much shorter, it would do away with the Railway Committee, and the results would be that our Sessions could be shortened at least one month. We would not have all the charter selling, we would not have all the difficulties and scandals in connection with railways, that have been developed this Session and previous Sessions. Any person who wanted to build a railway would only have to furnish means and locate his line and build the road, irrespective of the Government. I think if the Government act wisely they will introduce some plan of this sort. In this case as well as in other cases that have been brought up in this House, there appears to be an underground railway, some members of this House taking a sleeping car; or if they are not in a good comfortable sleeping car, they are in sleeping apartments, or so it is rumored outside. As for the veracity of that statement, I do not know whether it is true or not, but still such rumors are afloat.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman refers to me I desire him to say so, and I will have his words taken down.

Mr. COOK. I will talk to the hon. gentleman when I am ready, and I will say what I see fit. I will give him to understand that I am a member of this House, and understand my rights and privileges as such. Some reference was made to the *Globe*. I am not here to defend the *Globe*, for it can defend itself. Then, as to the question of $3,000 or $5,000 paid to the hon. gentleman as president of this railway, the principle is all the same.——

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will address the Chair and confine himself to this Bill.

Mr. HESSON. He cannot do it.

Mr. COOK. The hon. member for North Perth had better hold his tongue. It is well known that the contractors of this company and the company itself have been at loggerheads for some time back. It is well known that they have only just settled the difficulties between them. They took the advice probably of some older and more experienced men than themselves because they did not wish to have developments made like those respecting another railway company whose charter is held by a gentleman in this House. The Government of the country are interested in this road to the extent of $12,000 a mile. They have a right at any time to take back the road if they pay the amount over and above $12,000 a mile, the actual cost of its construction. The company wants to bond the road for $20,000 a mile which will make a total of $32,000 a mile. In the event of Parliament wishing to take the road back they will have to pay $20,000 of bonds per mile to parties who will, no doubt, purchase the bonds, because I understand they are to be guaranteed by the Northern and North-Western to the extent of 4 per cent. Those bonds will, no doubt, be placed on the English market, and will be sold very readily. Such being the case, if the Government intend to take back the railway they will have to pay this extra $20,000 a mile. It is pretty well known that the road cost only between $20,000 and $25,000—say $25,000. So there will be a balance of $7,000 a mile above the cost. It will not be a matter like that of the member for West Toronto, but an amount of $770,000 which will go into the pocket of someone. Where will the money come from? Into whose pockets will it go? Among whom is it to be divided? The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says he has not a cent. No, he has not a cent; nor have the rest of them. They have not got the money yet; I do not know how soon they may get it. There was something fishey about letting the contract—there was a great deal of manœuvring. A large number of parties tendered for the work. There were: John Carroll, St. Catharines; B. J. Brown, Ingersoll; James McMann, St. Catharines; D. S. Booth, Brockville; James Cosgrave, Prescott; John Ryan, Brockville; P. Larkin, St. Catharines; Alex. Manning, Toronto; Frank Manning, Toronto; — Peterson, Buffalo or Lockeport; Henry McFarlane, Toronto. Manning & Peterson's tenders were the lowest. The specifications were got out in such a way that a large number of men experienced in railway building did not tender for the work. It is pretty well understood that——

Mr. HAGGART. I rise to a point of order. That has nothing to do with the Bill before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is on the whole principle of the Bill, which provides for additional bonds to be issued.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. HAGGART. This is a statement of the contractors who contracted for the building of the road.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is about the contract for the building of the road.

Mr. COOK. The House is interested to the extent of $12,000 a mile.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is in reference to the contract of building the road. Are additional bonds to be issued?

Mr. McCARTHY. No. The power is to issue one kind of bonds instead of another. There is power to issue bonds to the extent of $20,000 a mile, and it is proposed to issue debenture stock instead of bonds.

Mr. COOK.

Mr. MULOCK. I hardly think the hon. gentleman has put the issue correctly. It is true, as he pointed out, that the Act of incorporation gives power to bond the road to the extent of $20,000 a mile, but subsequently their borrowing power was modified by the contract made with the Crown. It is the position of the Crown we are seeking to protect.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will introduce a clause to cover that.

Mr. MULOCK. This Bill modifies that.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not the point of order.

Mr. MULOCK. I say that this Bill if passed to-day will make the Crown liable for $20,000 a mile, whereas under the contract previously the company only had power to issue bonds to the extent of $8,000 per mile as against the Crown.

Mr. SPEAKER. For what is this schedule required?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is the lease between the two roads, this road and the Northern and North-Western Railways.

Mr. SPEAKER. This refers to the construction of the road. Is this schedule to be confirmed?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, it is just referred to.

Mr. EDGAR. If I recollect correctly there was a petition presented to this House against the Bill by the contractors, who were spoken of just now by the member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook), and giving the particulars of their claims. That petition is before the House.

Mr. MILLS. Unquestionably the hon. member is in order. He is discussing the whole policy of the Government, he is dealing with that policy, and the manner in which the work has been done. If there was anything improper in letting the contract, if there were larger liabilities being incurred than were necessary, if the securities were being diminished, certainly the member has a right to discuss the whole matter for the purpose of making that clear to the House.

Mr. COOK. I recognise that I have hit gentlemen pretty hard.

Mr. HESSON. Oh, oh.

Mr. COOK. The chirping member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) had better hold his tongue. I was about to say that the rumors current at the time of letting the contract were that the specifications were specially prepared in such a manner that the contract must fall into the hands of a certain party. It is understood that is so. The other gentlemen who tendered, who were the lowest and who were likely to kick up a row, were taken into the contract. The contract was let to Dawson, Hendrie & Co., with several others whose names were not mentioned. The sureties are William Hendrie and Dr. Ferguson, M.P. for Welland, I understand.

An hon. MEMBER. Were those two of the contractors?

Mr. COOK. Those were the sureties; I do not know about the other matter. However, it is said that the spoils are to be pretty equally divided. They are going to bond the road for $20,000 and build it for $25,000 per mile. They are going to divide spoils to the extent of $770,000, which is a greater amount for a small road than any one I know of. The member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), I believe, has a road 400 miles long; his plunder is $640,000; but this road is only a little over 100 miles, and they propose to distribute in the way of grab no less a sum than $770,000.

Mr. MILLS. There are more boys in this.

Mr. COOK. Yes; and in consequence of this a large number of gentlemen through the country refused to tender. Bailey & Co., for instance, who did tender, were very much annoyed; Mr. Bailey talked very loud because his tender, being the lowest, was not accepted. But he was provided for, like many other contractors whom it was necessary to take in so that they would not squeal. Mr. Bailey became engineer-in-chief of this railway. He was so capable a man and so able to perform work of this kind that they employed him in that capacity, and by doing this they closed his mouth. Mr. Alexander Manning was one of the lower tenderers. It could not be said that he is not an able and capable man and a man of means—a man who has money at his command at all times to go on with such work. Mr. Peterson and Mr. Frank Manning were also low, but young Mr. Manning was taken in, Mr. Peterson was taken in, and I suppose by young Mr. Manning being taken in the elder Mr. Manning was satisfied, and the company was made up of men of this class. It was stated at the time that the only reason for giving the contract to this syndicate was that there was scarcely any one else capable of furnishing the money necessary to go on with the work. I do not know about that; I think myself there are plenty of men who are capable and I know the part of the country through which the road runs. There is no part of Ontario where a road can be built much cheaper or better. It is a level country; they have at their disposal the necessary wood for ties and fencing; they have good gravel pits all along the line and the road could be built very cheaply. The company also endeavor to work cheaply in the construction of their stations. At one place that I know of, a station was to be placed at a village called Utterson, they discovered that the people there were very anxious for the station, and gave it out that they were going to build it two miles away. In that way they forced the poor settlers there to give them a bonus of $1,000, provided the station would be built at Utterson. I understood they did the same thing at several other places, and this shows the economy of the contractors for the construction of this road. I suppose they proposed to use the same means as are used by other parties. They have received and will receive from the Government in subsidies the amount of $1,320,000, and they propose to bond this road for $2,200,000 at $20,000 per mile. The road should have been in operation long ago; the people are very anxious for it, but the difficulties between the contractors and the company were such that the road could not be opened, and the consequence is that freight, which were contracted for to be carried over the road, is lying there and cannot be removed. Well, I am glad they have come to a settlement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. COOK. I have no doubt that the gentlemen who chirp so loudly, probably if they have not an interest in works of this kind would like to have. You will always find that men who call thief the loudest are generally the biggest thieves themselves. I wish to say something now about these two companies which are about to lease the neutral line, although that subject has been gone into pretty extensively by my hon. friend for North York. These roads run through the constituencies of the hon. members for South and North Simcoe, and they are largely interested in the matter; they are interested to the extent that the county council passed a unanimous resolution memorialising the Government that the bonuses which were paid by the Simcoes should be refunded to them, as the works had been taken over by the Dominion, as they were supposed to be works for the general advantage of Canada. Therefore, I expect to hear from my hon. friends, whose reeves and deputy reeves were so unanimous in that memorial. The Simcoes were laboring under the monopoly of the Northern Railway for a great many years, and to break that monopoly they entered into an arrangement to build a competing line from Barrie and Collingwood to Hamilton, called the Hamilton and North-Western. Large bonuses were given by municipalities in the county, on the express and distinct understanding that it should be a competing line. The hon. member for North Simcoestated a short time ago, that he was acting for the county council and was solicitor for the county of Simcoe. He drew up those agreements with the various municipalities, and I am sorry to say that they were drawn in so loose a manner that a coach and four was driven through them almost before the ink was dry on the paper. However, the people know the circumstances, and they see the connection the hon. gentleman has now with the men who promoted the Hamilton and North-Western Railway. The result of it all is, that, to-day, instead of competing lines of railroad, they have a greater monopoly than ever they had before. Wheat last year was carried from Collingwood at a cent and a half a bushel, while at 30 miles nearer to Toronto they charged the farmers 8 cents a bushel to Toronto. That is the monopoly that has been created, and I think it is time the Government should interfere to put an end to matters of this kind. The monopoly is greater now because they know they cannot get another railway. They know they have all the lines they possibly can expect in that part of the country, and as long as the amalgamation continues the people are to be swindled by the increased cost of carrying their produce to market. I just wish to make one more statement, that is, in reference to the visit of the committee of the County Council of Simcoe who waited on the Premier. On that occasion the hon. leader of the House stated to the deputation——

"The words of the Act of 1883 declared certain roads for the general advantage of Canada"——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that has really nothing to do with this Bill. That is an Act relating to certain railways in the Province of Ontario and declaring them to be railways for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. COOK. Well, I do not wish to bring this up in a hostile way at all. I merely wished to draw the attention of the Premier to the statement he made, and the result of that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will see that that opens up a vast field for discussion on a public Act, while this is a private Act.

Mr. COOK. I will not attempt to discuss that matter. I hope I will have an opportunity of discussing it again, when I will show that the statement the hon. Premier made on that occasion was entirely fallacious, I think I have about stated my case so far as this railway is concerned. I trust that the Government will see that the road is opened at a very early date. It is of paramount importance to the people along that line. One thing I will mention. I received from the reeve of the township of Monck a letter stating that in crossing from Muskoka to the township of Monck the railway crossed on the side line, blocking the road, so that the people have to travel two and a-half miles to get around. I applied to the Department of Railways, and asked for communications that had passed between the reeve of Monck and the Government, and I propose when I get those letters to lay them before the Minister of Railways. I have no doubt, as soon as his attention is called to it, that he will settle the matter, because it is one of those grievous and vexatious incidents that injure the feelings of people who have to travel long distances, particularly when the roads are bad. I hope in a day or two to get the correspondence, when I will lay it before the Minister of Railways, who I hope, will be recovered from his illness, and will be able to give his attention to it.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MULOCK. I beg to amend this clause as follows:—

By striking out of the 32nd and 33rd lines of the first paragraph thereof the words: "The sum of $20,000 per mile of such portion," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following words: The value of said railway over and above the Government subsidy of $12,000 per mile, such value to be ascertained, in case the Government cannot agree, by arbitration, the arbitrators to be appointed, one by the Government and the other by the said company, and the third by the two so appointed; failing agreement as to such third arbitrator, then by one of the chief justices of the High Court of Ontario, under the provisions of the Ontario Judicature Act in that behalf, and the award of the majority shall be binding.

Mr. McCARTHY. The effect of that amendment would be to destroy the Bill. No bonds could be issued if it were adopted. Its meaning is that bonds may be issued to the value of the railway. How are the purchasers of the bonds to ascertain what the value of the railway is? The bonds are offered on the market for sale.

Mr. MULOCK. That is your present proposition?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, it is not. The hon. gentleman will see by the contract that there is no limitation of the bonds.

Mr. MULOCK. As against the Crown there is.

Mr. McCARTHY. The company had the right to issue bonds to the extent of $20,000 a mile. The lease between the two companies provides that up to $12,000 the bonds shall be issued by the consent of the directors, and beyond that amount by the consent of the shareholders; but it was never supposed that $8,000 a mile would build the road. As the hon. gentleman knows, in 1883 it was estimated that it would cost $24,000 a mile. As I have stated, I have no desire at all that the contract between the Government and the company should be in the slightest degree affected, and I propose to add at the end of the clause the words:

Provided that this enactment is without prejudice to the agreement between the Government of Canada and the company, bearing date the 12th day of April, 1884, respecting the assumption by Parliament of the portion of said line of railway between Gravenhurst and Callander.

I move that in amendment to the amendment of the hon. member. Perhaps I may now explain what the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) asked. I think he has misunderstood the contract between the Government and the company. The company was formed for the purpose of building this railway. The Government subsidised it to the extent of $12,000 a mile, and the company had power to borrow to the extent of $20,000 a mile; but the agreement between the Government and the company was that if at any time hereafter, Parliament, not the Government, was satisfied that the company was not acting up to its engagements or discharging its chartered duties fairly, then Parliament might cancel this lease and assume the bonded debt of the company absolutely to the extent of $8,000 a mile and to so much more as the road at that time might be worth. Therefore the power to issue bonds was given in this way. There was power to issue bonds to the extent of $20,000 a mile and the bondholders took their chances as to whether the road at that date would be worth $20,000 a mile or not. If not, then the bonds would not be assumed by Parliament. That is the position the contract was in, and it is not proposed to disturb that positoin in the slightest degree.

Mr. MULOCK. Does not the section disturb that?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think so. The company do not, in the slightest degree, desire to affect its contract with the Government by a side wind, but understands that Parliament, should the company not do its duty by the public, may at some future time come in and redeem the bonds, and the bondholders will buy on that chance. It was perfectly understood more bonds would have to be issued, and that perhaps application would have to be made to Parliament for relief in that regard. That is the explanation, and I hope the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) will find it satisfactory.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to get that explanation, but must ask my hon. friend to give a little more explanation before I can be satisfied that we should give the legislation asked for. I am not at all interested locally, as my hon. friend is, who moved the amendment, and do not profess to interest myself in the local question affected by this measure. The one thing that interests me is this: Parliament agreed to give the magnificent subsidy of $12,000 a mile for the construction of what was a very desirable link between our Western Territories and Toronto, the distance being, I believe, about 110 miles. In the contract between the Government and the company, if I understand it rightly, the company agreed, in the case of certain contingencies arising, which it is quite possible might arise—if, for instance, at any time they did not run the road satisfactorily, or if they failed in the payment of the interest on the bonds, or if it became a matter of national interest that the Government should assume the road—that the Government, authorised by Parliament, could take over that road for its cost, less the $12,000 a mile subsidy. This would leave $8,000 a mile to be paid by the Government, assuming the road to cost $20,000 a mile, as estimated at the time. The Bill we are discussing introduces an important alteration as regards the amount of bonds to be issued, by providing that the company may issue bonds to the entent of $20,000 a mile on the road. The company have been paid already $12,000 a mile subsidy, and if they now get authority to issue bonds for $20,000 a mile, that will make $32,000 a mile; so that before the Government could take the road over, they would have, besides the $12,000 they have already paid, to assume the bonds to the extent of $20,000 a mile.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened with some attention to the explanations of the hon. gentleman, and my conviction is that the construction put upon the clause will be this. My hon. friend says "no;" but I would like to ask him, if these bonds to the extent of $20,000 a mile be in circulation, amounting to millions, on the public markets of Europe and America, and the Government decided to take over the road, in the public interest, either because the interest was not paid on the bonds, or because the company refused to run the road, so that they might force the Government to take it over, would not the Government be in the position I describe? The Government have already paid $12,000 per mile, and they would have to redeem the bonds floated to the extent of $20,000 more per mile. It is all very fine to say that the purchasers of the bonds will have to take them with the responsibility that attaches to the company. Would that be in answer to the private holders or even to public opinion? Would it be an answer to the sensitive feelings of the stock exchange people and the investors both in Europe and at home? No, Sir; the Government would be bound to pay, in addition to the $12,000 a mile, the whole amount of the bonds issued. There is no other construction to be put on that clause. My hon. friend says he is willing to put a provision in the Bill to the effect that nothing in the Bill shall alter or affect the original contract. That would be all very well, if the bonds were in the hands of the company; but when the bonds have gone into the general market and out of the control of the company, how could the Government take that position? The answer would be that the Government had been a party to deceiving the general public by so wording the clause

that it would bear the construction that if the Government took over the road with the issue of $20,000 per mile in bonds upon it, they would have to pay the $32,000. This would make a difference to the country of $1,300,000 in all, if the Government took over the road. I do not know any clause the hon. gentleman can put in, on the line he has suggested, which can remedy this defect in the Bill, if the bonds once become public property and circumstances force the Government to take over the road. The popular view of a measure of this kind which would come before Parliament, would be to compel the Government to pay the whole $32,000 a mile. I might illustrate this by a parallel case that occurred here a few weeks ago when the ship canal Bill was up, in which we got involved to the extent of some $3,300,000, that I consider was practically thrown away.

Mr. McCARTHY. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am in order; I am illustrating, by an argument that I used then, the effect this Bill will have, if we adopt a similar course now to the one we adopted then. I am endeavoring to show that when the hon. gentleman puts the construction he does on this Bill, the answer is given by saying: "Oh, you are bound already by the issue on our part of $20,000 a mile." I do not know whether we are or not. That is a point I need not deal with as far as this question is concerned; but if we are so bound, I say it is by mistake, or worse still, by collusion; and as to either horn of the dilemma, it is a wrong upon the public, and when these gentlemen ask further facilities to enable them to carry on their scheme, it is in the right of Parliament to say: We will be compelled by the construction of the Act passed to carry out what you have proposed, and let you have the advantage; but we can refuse to give you further facilities, and prevent further legislation to-day by refusing to confirm a mistake or error or collusion, if such exist, and if so which ought never to have existed. Something has been said about the cost of this road. I am told there is no rolling stock on the road, but that simply the road-bed is leased to the Northern and North-Western Railways, and an agreement made to pay interest upon $8,000 a mile and the interest on the bonds. The interest they have to pay is on $8,000 a mile, not on the bonds, I believe I am not wrong in that. That is to be paid as a rental. Where, then, is the necessity for issuing this $20,000 a mile? What is it for?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is not the rental. The rent is the amount of the bond issue, whatever that may be, and 4 per cent. upon the paid-up stock. That is what the rent is. If the hon. gentleman reads the lease, he will find that out.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps I am in error. I accept the hon. gentleman's explanation and suppose I am in error, as he states so, but I read it that they were to pay rental upon $8,000 a mile, and then there was the difference between that and $20,000. I understood the cost of the road was estimated at $20,000 a mile. That is amply sufficient, I should think, to cover the cost of a road with nothing but a road-bed, and with such a character of country. I am told that the greater portion of the country is not very severe to build over. Some of it is pretty severe, I am told, but I am informed that $20,000 a mile is ample to complete it. Whether it is so or not I do not know, but, after looking over the agreements and looking over the Bill now before the House, I think it rests with gentlemen who wish to guard the public interest to prevent them from getting confirmation of any mistakes the Government may have made. If they have a right, legally, under existing legislation, let them keep it, but let us not confirm it and fetter the chains upon us by sanctioning, after it comes to our knowledge, either any mistake which has occurred or an advantage obtained over the Government to the extent of $1,300,000, which I believe there has been.

Mr. McMULLEN. We ought fairly to understand what effort has been made to find out the real cost of this road. It would be exceedingly imprudent for the House to grant the company power to issue bonds beyond the actual cost of the road. If we can find out what the amount of that cost is, it would be within the duty and power of the House to grant that privilege, but, if the road has not cost $32,000 a mile, it is clear the country is running great risk in granting this power to the company. There is one or other of two difficulties that we have to stare in the face. Either, in the first place, the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company, along with the Northern Railway Company, want to use the security they have got under their hand by becoming the owners or lessees of this road, or else the contractors are in collusion with the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company, whereby there is going to be a very large amount of money pocketed by some person. Before the company are granted the power to bond this road, the Government should employ some person totally outside and independent of the company and of everyone else interested in it to make an actual careful calculation as to what the real value of the line is, and then it would be fair for the company to ask this House to grant them power to bond the road to a sum sufficient to meet the actual cost over the amount which has been already granted towards its construction, but to ask us to permit them to issue bonds to the amount of $20,000 a mile when we are virtually in the dark as to the actual cost of the road is too much on the part of that company. I do not think we have any right to consent to a course of that kind, because, if we do that, and, through the company not efficiently operating the road afterwards or through any necessity which might happen, if Government take possession of the line, those who hold the bonds and who are outside holders would have a fair ground of claim against the country for a refund of the money which they have invested in these bonds. The Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company do not ask that these bonds should cover the other portion of their line, but that they shall merely cover the 110 miles of new line to which the Government has granted this money. They will clearly be against that and not against any other portion of the Hamilton and North-Western or Northern Railway, so, if the Government should see it necessary to take over this line in the interest of the company they would have to settle with those bondholders, because they will say: You sanctioned those bonds, they were placed on the market under a law of the Parliament of Canada, and you cannot repudiate the bonds now on the ground that the road did not cost the money. Thus we would virtually be in for the whole amount of the bonds we are going to allow them to issue. The whole Dominion is deeply interested in this matter. The Province of Ontario is deeply interested in it. It is important that the road should be run efficiently, and we should take great care before we permit the issue of the bonds. I do not believe that that road ever cost $20,000 a mile or anything like it, notwithstanding the estimate which has been submitted and the certificate which has been given. I know men of extended experience in the construction of railways who have passed over the road from one end to the other who have seen every foot of it, who have walked all over it, and they have declared that it cost nothing like $20,000 a mile, ironed and everything else, and I am satisfied they are correct. I venture to say that, if the Government will appoint three competent, experienced engineers, men who have extended experience in building railways, totally independent of both the Government and the railway company, to value that road, they will not say it cost $20,000 a mile or anything like it. I am satisfied it never cost any

such money, because there are portions of it that can be quite easily built, though other portions are perhaps harder to build. From the manner in which the contract was let, from the collusion which existed between the parties tendering for the work, the whole thing from beginning to end bears the evidence of a huge job, inaugurated and carried on as far as the construction is concerned, carried on as far as the railway company is concerned, and it is going to be carried on as far as the bonded debt is concerned. It is quite clear that there is some thing wrong in this matter, and the House is assuming a serious responsibility in lending its countenance to the issue of a bonded debt upon a road which we have a right to take over at its actual value without learning the actual value now, and limiting the issue of bonds to that actual value. In going beyond that we are committing a very grave mistake, because we are committing the country to an extensive bonded debt that there is no necessity for. It is quite clear that the Hamilton and North-Western and Northern Railways are going to use the credit of that road to improve their own condition as corporations, or else they are going to divide the spoil between the contractors and the parties interested.

Mr. EDGAR. In connection with this Bill, there is a matter I would like to draw the attention of the president of the road and of the Government to. In the lease, which is a schedule to this Bill, there is a provision that the Canadian Pacific Railway shall make an arrangement for through rates and fares in connection with this railway within six months after the date of the lease, and there is an elaborate provision for an arbitration in case they do not do it, and the clause goes on to say that this clause shall have no effect, unless the Canadian Pacific Railway shall do so within six months. I understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway have not done so, that they did not do so within six months, and, what is more, that they have not done so yet. It is all very well for us to legislate for a railway and try to make provision to assist this line, or the lessees, but unless provision is made to give the company or the lessees the benefit of through rates and fares, and proper connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Callander, we might just as well not legislate at all, and the Government might just as well not have given a cent of the $12,000 a mile. Now, I think it is exceedingly important that the House should have an idea of what has been done recently, because it was not done the other day, for, in reply to my enquiry, the Government said it was not; and if it has not been done, what arrangements are being made that it should be done?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) misunderstood some matters which, perhaps, are of importance. There seems to be an impression on the other side of the House that this company has no rolling stock on the line. I do not know where they got that idea. Rolling stock is to be put on the line, and rolling stock is now being procured at Cobourg and elsewhere.

Mr. DAVIES. How much a mile will that cost?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think in the neighborhood of $300,000, that is, $3,000 a mile, somewhere in that neighborhood. Then I do not know what the hon. member means by saying that there was a conspiracy, in point of fact, that the directors of this road would eat up the whole amount of this bond issue. Now, I submit that it is very unfair for any member on the floor of Parliament to make a statement of that kind unless he is prepared to back it up. If the hon. member will make that charge on his responsibility as a member of the House, and formulate a clear statement, he shall have full opportunity of proving it, that I tell him. I say there is not a word of truth in it,

there is not the slightest ground for it. So far as the contract is concerned, I was not in the company at the time it was made, and I do not know the terms upon which the specifications were issued. I do not know who were the tenderers, for I had nothing at all to do with it. But I am quite satisfied in saying that Mr. Charles Moss, who took a great interest in it, was privy to no fraud, that I will venture to say, and I think no gentleman who knows Mr. Charles Moss will venture to contradict my statement. Now, the question really is whether these parties who are interested are to have the means of placing these debentures or bonds upon the market. The bonds are at present held mainly by the Bank of Montreal; $12,000 have been issued and handed over to the contractors, and there is still a considerable sum due to the contractors—I do not know how much—a large sum, I believe. Hon. members will see that no bonds can be issued beyond $12,000 a mile without the consent of the Northern Railway shareholders and stockholders, and the Hamilton and North-Western Railway shareholders. Now, if hon. members will reflect that these bonds became a charge upon both these roads, and these roads are paying concerns, they will understand how impossible it is that the companies should be parties or privy to anything that is charged here by hon. gentlemen opposite. That they should issue bonds beyond the actual construction upon which they would have to pay interest, appears to me so absurd that if hon. members would reflect for a moment they would not assume it to be possible unless they assume that all the gentlemen on this side of the Atlantic from Mr. Barker, the manager and representative of the Northern, and the bondholders who own that road, and everybody else connected with it, should lend themselves to this gigantic fraud. There is not a word of truth in the accusation, and I challenge any hon. member to formulate the charge and he will have full opportunity to prove it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I stated in my remarks that I had met, a few days ago, a gentleman who walked over the entire line of road and he stated to me that it was his candid opinion that the entire road did not cost $20,000 a mile. I say that I believe if the Government instituted an investigation to ferret out the exact value, they will find that it is not worth more than $20,000 complete, with the steel on it.

Mr. BOWELL. That is not what you said.

Mr. MILLS. I think the House is entitled to more information than those who are interested in this charter have given us. We are entitled to know what this road cost.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not completed yet.

Mr. MILLS. I understood that the work is nearly done.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman will understand that it is not a lump contract, it is so much according to measurement, a schedule contract, and this contract is made in such a way that in case of disagreement between the company and the contractors, Mr. Hobson—and every body will say he is a responsible engineer—is to settled disputes as to the quantity.

Mr. MILLS. Certainly the company have had the quantities estimated and have sent an engineer over the road, they know what the amount of traffic is, they know the amount of building, and they know the terms upon which their contract has been made. Why should they not give to the House that estimate? Why is that information not given to the House upon this subject?

Mr. McCARTHY. When Mr. Barker, the manager of the road, was here before the Railway Committee, why did not hon. gentlemen ask for information on any of these

points? They could have got it all in detail. These matters ought to have been brought up in the Railway Committee.

Mr. MILLS. It is quite clear that these matters ought to be brought before the House, and if they were not brought before the committee this House would be altogether wanting in its duty if, in the case of a road which has been subsidised to the extent of $12,000 a mile, it permitted amendments to be made in its charter, and additional powers given it which might seriously affect the public interest, without insisting upon the fullest information. I do not say that the amendment asked is unreasonable. So far as my information goes, the company are asking permission to issue bonds to the extent of $8,000 to $10,000 per mile, beyond what is necessary. Now, what is the effect of that upon the arrangement between the Government and the company? Certainly after those bonds are issued, the Government could not invoke any contract making them liable for a less sum in case they took over the road. I think the Government would be liable, if called upon to pay, not for the amounts specified in the original contract, but for that amount as modified by the additional powers that the company have acquired by the legislation now being sought. Why should we give the company power to issue bonds to the amount of several thousand dollars per mile beyond the actual requirements of the company? The hon. gentleman says that the company can have no interest in the arrangement of this sort; but I say that if the Government is to buy out the company, if it is to make a public appropriation to it, if the company's interests and rights are to be extinguished, the company have a great interest in the legislation that is being sought. It has an interest of from $7,000 to $10,000 a mile, according to representations that have been made to me. I think we ought not to sanction legislation of that sort, and the hon. gentleman, before he asks for it, should give that information which ought to have been given in committee, but which it is not too late to give now, and which this House ought to insist upon before it permits a further step to be taken.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I think this House has had already some information in the matter. In the first place the contract was let by Mr. Moss, who was president of the road, for so much per yard, so much per pound of iron. It has cost $27,000 a mile, and yet the road is not complete. Now, how can the company tell that it will not take $3,000 a mile, or in all, $32,000 to complete the road? The hon. gentleman from Wellington says that a gentleman walked over the entire road and said it could have been built for $20,000 a mile. That is a very strong statement for any hon. member to make to this committee. The work is being done by the yard and the iron is contracted for by the pound, and it will be very difficult to state the extent of the work, but it has been announced that up to the present time the expenditure has reached about $27,000 a mile. Under these circumstances how can an hon. member, who professes to be a practical man, declare that the road will be built for $20,000 a mile? It is unreasonable for any hon. member to make a statement of that kind, and thus try and convince the committee not to grant this Bill. If I understand the matter rightly, the Government have to pay what the road is worth if they take it over. Suppose bonds are issued to the extent of $20,000 a mile; the Government give $12,000 a mile, making $32,000 a mile in all. Suppose further, that the Government three or four years hence decide to take over this branch. Suppose the value of the road is $25,000 a mile, the parties holding the bonds will have to lose the other $7,000 a mile. The Government is not bound, if the road has been built for $26,000 or $28,000 a mile to pay $32,000 if they desire to take it over. That matter was before the Railway Committee and was fully discussed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Yes, and it was before a subcommittee.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, it was the other Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). This Bill was before the Railway Committee at all events and the committee were satisfied to grant what is asked in this Bill, $20,000 a mile. The contractors have received already $26 000 or $27,000 a mile and the road is not yet completed. The have got the Government's $12,000 a mile, they have bonds for $12,000 a mile and the company owes them $3,000 or $4,000 a mile, and the road is not yet completed. The contract was let by Mr. Moss of Toronto, a gentleman who would not lend himself to anything either dishonest or imprudent. We should grant this company what they seek because they are asking only what is reasonable and right.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman's argument may be very good, but it does not meet the point suggested by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I would be sorry to give a vote that would prejudice the undertaking, but the point raised by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) seems worthy of consideration. Let us get down to the actual dispute between that hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The Bill proposes to allow the company to bond the road for $20,000 a mile. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) says: I move that that arbitrary sum be struck out of the Bill and that there be inserted $8,000 a mile and such other sum as it may cost. He practically allows the road to be bonded to the full extent of its cost. If any dispute should arise the value would be decided by arbitrators. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) states: What difference is it to the Government if the company wants to bond the road for $20,000 a mile, why do you want to limit it? The reply is that the agreement entered into between the Government and the company before the Act was passed provided that if the Government choose to acquire the road they should pay to the company some $8,000 a mile ——

Mr. McCARTHY. Not to the company. They will assume the bonds.

Mr. DAVIES. $8,000 a mile and such further sum beyond that amount as the said railway may then be worth. Now here comes in the force of the position stated by the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). That agreement allows the company to bond the road for $8,000 a mile, and if this Bill is granted and Parliament allows the company to bond the road for $20,000 a mile and those bonds pass into the hands of private persons and they are made preferential bonds, if the Government attempt to take advantage of the expropriation clause, they would be bound in honor and in equity not to pay what the road would then be worth but the amount of bonds they had authorised to be issued. That would be the effect of the Bill if it were passed, and the committee should hesitate before passing it. What I desire to know is this: It is said by two or three gentlemen who are acquainted with railway building that the road will not cost more than $20,000 a mile. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said it would cost $3,000 a mile to provide it will rolling stock, which would raise the sum to $23,000 a mile. The company have the Government subsidy of $12,000 a mile and they propose to issue bonds bringing the amount up to $32,000 a mile, leaving $9,000 a mile surplus.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to explain. I think I have said already that there has been placed in the contractors' hands $12,000 a mile. There is due to the contractors a very large amount, the exact sum of which I am not able to give; they have also received $12,000 a mile in bonds, making in all $24,000

which they have received; and in addition $3,000 a mile will be required for equipment. The hon. gentleman will see that there will not be very much left to go upon. When it is considered that the Ontario and Quebec, which runs through a much better country, cost about $30,000 a mile, it will be obvious that this road is not going to cost an exorbitant sum.

Mr. DAVIES. Accepting the hon. gentleman's statement as correct there is still a large margin.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman explain in what part of the agreement he finds a provision in regard to providing equipment?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will do so.

Mr. MITCHELL. The promoter of the Bill has stated that these objections ought to have been taken in the Railway Committee. He is quite right in that the objection should have been taken before the Railway Committee. But the hon. gentleman knows, and the House knows that unless a person is specially interested in a Bill before the committee, the chances are that little attention will be paid to it, and I frankly own that I neglected my duty in the matter, because I believe it to be the duty of every man who is a member of that committee to attend to every Bill that comes before it. But in the multiplicity of other business that is sometimes impossible, and I confess that I did not look into this Bill very closely. It was only called to my attention when the hon. member for North York got up in the committee about one o'clock to move an amendment to the Bill, or to seek information, or to make some explanation, and then the chairman of the committee, the hon. minister of Public Works stated that he had to attend a meeting of Council and the time was up. Then the hon. member for North York stated that he would bring the matter up before the House. Now, while I say that this ought to have been done in committee, the responsibility still rests on us, and if we neglect anything in committee it is our duty to bring it up in the House, especially when so important a question is involved. Another point taken by the hon. gentleman is that Mr. Barker was before the committee, and that he could give the information which my hon. friend cannot give, not being a practical railway man. Well, it is easy to get Mr. Barker to come; he should have stopped here to give the information, and the House should not be asked to pass legislation so important in ignorance of the actual facts. There is another point to which I shall refer. I must express my surprise that the Government of the day sit in their places hearing this discussion, knowing that if the statements made are true, if the facts and the construction put upon them in connection with this Bill are logically stated—knowing that the country is liable to be called on to pay $1,300,000 more than the agreement with the company who are promoting this road. Now, if that is true, it behooves the Government to get up and explain what that agreement was, what they understood by it, whether or not they understood they were to pay for the road the full amount of the bonds which were issued, in addition to the $12,000 already paid. That is the crucial point in this matter from the standpoint from which I speak—in the public interest. It is the duty of the Government to explain their construction of it, and if they do not, if it can be proved that in case of there being a desire to take over the road for any reason, they will be held responsible for that amount over and above the agreement, and the country will hold the Government—whose duty it is to watch these private Bills and guard the public interests—responsible for neglect if neglect there is in this matter.

Mr. DAVIES. According to the statement of the hon. member for Simcoe there will be $27,000 required, and then he says there is a sum still due to the contractors. The $20,000 bonds and the $12,000 subsidy make $32,000 which he proposes to raise, leaving a difference of $5,000 per mile or nearly $600,000 in all. Now is there any such amount due to the contractors? That is a very important point upon which we should be correctly informed, because if that sum is not due we should not authorise the company to bond the road for the amount they now ask, viz., $600,000 beyond its actual requirements. By adopting the proposition of my hon. friend for North York the company bond the road to any amonnt over and above the Government subsidy of $12,000 per mile. He allows them to bond the road to the full extent of its value, and he says, if the Government and the company cannot agree as to that value let them appoint arbitrators. Now do they want power to bond the road for a larger amount than its value? If the Government were not interested they might say: This is a matter which you can arrange among yourselves; it does not affect the public interest. But if we are to be in the position of expropriating this road and to pay this amount, it will materially affect public interests. The question is, may not this new legislation compel us to pay in the full amount, and, if not, what is the objection to expressly limiting our liability in case we do expropriate the road to its actual value? I do not think the amendment of the member from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is very explicit, because no bondholder reading that proviso would imagine it had anything to do with the private arrangement.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is referred to, and the date is given

Mr. DAVIES. In such general terms that nobody can understand it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no objection, if you like, to put it in the schedule.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not see that the company is bound under the lease to provide any rolling stock at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. They are doing so, and under the 3rd clause of the agreement there is a reference to it.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the agreement of 1884.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the lease.

Mr. MULOCK. As it is six o'clock I have drawn up an amendment and have tried to meet the views of the hon. member for Simcoe.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the hon. gentleman will be satisfied to put it in as a schedule.

Mr. MULOCK. Let me read my amendment, and I will explain wherein I think it is better than the other arrangement.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULOCK. I understood when the Speaker left the Chair that the hon. member for North Simcoe was about to propose some other amendment in lieu of the one he had offered.

Mr. McCARTHY. What I told the hon. member was that I would schedule the contract, and instead of referring to it by the date, would refer to it by the schedule, by adding the words; "And which said contract is set forth in schedule B to this Act."

Mr. MITCHELL. This amendment is not entirely what I would like, but on the whole I think it is the best thing we could do in the public interest. I for one am prepared to accept it.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Minister of Justice is of opinion that that contract leaves the rights of the Crown just as they are under the contract of April, 1884, I have nothing further to say on this question.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no doubt at all that the clause which the hon. member in charge of the Bill has introduced would save all the rights of the Government.

Mr. MULOCK. That being the case, I am prepared to accept the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe.

Amendment (Mr. Mulock) negatived, and amendment (Mr. McCarthy) agreed to.

On section 5,

Mr. EDGAR. As I see the First Minister in the House, I would like to ask him as to a point I raised this afternoon when he was absent. This section confirms the lease which is made a schedule of the Act, and in the lease there is a provision that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall, within six months from the date of that lease, make an agreement with this company to fix their rates and fares in favor of that line, so that the Ontario system of railways, which is to tap the Canadian Pacific Railway at Callander, may have something like a fair chance of getting its share of the trade of the North-West, over the Canadian Pacific Railway, without its having to come around by Carleton Place. It is of vital importance that this should be attended to. The grant of $12,000 a mile to this railway is entirely without justification if it is to be considered a purely local road. The only possible reason for giving that subsidy was to make an independent connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway for Ontario, and the provision made in this lease was in order to secure a fair chance for that connection. Without that, of course, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have the matter absolutely in their own hands. They need not send a pound of freight over the Ontario line unless they chose, because they can establish such rates as will throw all the freight to the east. I asked the Government whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had made the agreement within the six months provided in this clause, and I was told that they had not. Before this Bill goes through the committee, I am sure the House would like to know what prospect there is of the Government securing that arrangement from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If they have not done it there is nothing in the lease that I can see to enable the Northern Railway Company to compel them to do it. The matter must be dealt with by the Government. I have no doubt they will be able to secure that from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company if they say so, and I would like very much to hear from the Government what prospect there is of getting that agreement made, because without it all our legislation is useless, and this railway will only be a fair road for opening up the Muskoka district.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has made some remarks about the agreement in relation to traffic over these lines. I am not here to speak for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I do not speak for them now; but as the Government remain silent, and do not give the hon. gentleman any answer, I will state what I believe to be the facts, from information I have casually gained; and if I mis-state any of those facts, I shall be only too glad to correct them. The remarks of the hon. gentleman on my left have left the impression that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have refused to do something that they agreed to do. I have heard within the last ten days a good deal of conversation on that point. I believe, so far from the Canadian Pacific Railway having refused to carry out any engagement they have made, either with the Government or the Northern Pacific Junction, or any other inheriting or possessing their rights, have always been prepared to carry out whatever they agreed to. In other words, they claim, that under the agreement which was put in their Bill a few years ago in the interest of Toronto, the Canadian Pacific Railway should carry traffic over their road to the west at the same *pro rata* rate as on their own line, say from Carleton Place, Ottawa or Montreal. That agreement the Canadian Pacific Railway entered into and are prepared to carry out, but, as I understand it, the gentlemen who represent the Hamilton and North-Western and Northern Companies, and who own this Pacific Junction Railway now practically, claim that the Canadian Pacific Railway, under that clause of the agreement in their Bill, should carry freight, not at the same *pro rata* rate, but at a great deal lower rate. I am interested, as a representative of an eastern county, at seeing that no unfair privileges are given to the Northern Pacific Junction, which will interfere with the traffic through my section of the country. The distance from Thornhill, which is substituted for Callander, to Toronto is about the same as that to Carleton Place, 225. There are a few miles difference, the distance being shorter to Toronto than it is from Thornhill or Callander to Carleton Place. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in fact, say this: Our rates are fixed from Carleton Place, which is about the same distance as from Toronto to Thornhill, at say $10 a car, and we are willing to carry freight from Toronto at the same rate; that is our agreement and that is the law. But the gentlemen who control the Hamilton and North-Western or Northern Railway say: that is not the agreement; the agreement is: If you carry goods from Montreal or Quebec or St. John or Halifax, no matter how low a rate as through freight you may take, you have got to carry goods on our 220 miles at the same *pro rata* rate as you do on the long haul of 1,000 miles. To illustrate this more clearly I will take Toronto as the starting point. The Canadian Pacific Railway say we will carry from Toronto to Thornhill or Winnipeg at the same rate as from Carleton Place; but as we joined a portion of the system of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Ontario and Quebec road at Carleton Place, in order that we might get a share of the Toronto business, both east and west of Toronto, and that the people of Ontario, more particularly of Toronto, should have competition in that trade, we will carry, if it is necessary, freight over the Ontario and Quebec road, giving you the same rate exactly from Toronto that we charge from Carleton, which is comparatively the same distance. In other words, if the contention of Mr. Barker, who represents the Hamilton and North-Western and the Northern Railway, is maintained, the effect will be that it will drive the Canadian Pacific Railway out of the Toronto and Ontario business, by competitors for business to Winnipeg and further west, for the simple reason that they cannot carry 400 miles as cheap as they can 200; and it will prevent their giving special rates from the Eastern Provinces for their manufactures and products, because Mr. Barker will contend, whatever you give as through rates for a 1,000 miles east, I demand you should give on my 220 miles. That never was the intention of the clause which the Government put in the Bill, and I would like to have an explanation from the Government, because this question interests my constituents. When this clause was inserted, no one dreamed of such a construction being put upon it as that put upon it by Mr. Barker. If his contention be maintained, he will have a monopoly of the whole trade; and at whose expense? At the expense of Ontario, at the expense

of Toronto, and most decidedly at the expense of the eastern people, because if they get through rates on 1,500 miles to Winnipeg, Mr. Barker will get a *pro rata* reduction over his road. My constituents are interested in this matter. They do a very large trade of fish with Boston and New York, and they hope to open up a trade with Toronto and Winnipeg; but if the contention of Mr. Barker be maintained, that will be impossible, for they will not be able to get through rates such as will enable them to send their fish in that way. I may be misinformed, but from what I can gather that is the true state of the case, and I am told to-day that there is a discussion going on before the Board of Trade in Toronto at which this question is being considered. I would like to hear from the Government what construction they put on the clause which was inserted in the interest of Toronto, but which will work to its detriment if Mr. Barker's contention is maintained.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That question does not at all arise on this Bill, it may possibly arise on a discussion on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MITCHELL. It may not arise on this Bill, but when it has been raised by an hon. gentleman and the impression left by him contrary to what I believe to be the facts, and contrary to the interests of my constituents, I felt it my duty to explain what my understanding is upon this matter.

Mr. EDGAR. The reason I raised this point is because it appears upon the face of the lease, which is in the schedule of the Bill, as originally introduced at any rate, and is referred to in the clauses of the Bill which are before the House now. This is an exceedingly important measure, relating to the running and working of this railway, and I am very glad, indeed, that there was an hon. member in the House who took some interest in this, if the Government did not, and endeavored to have it made clear. I have not been complaining about the Canadian Pacific Railway not carrying out their agreement, because there is no agreement.

Mr. MITCHELL. My explanation was to correct an improper understanding of the clause on your part.

Mr. EDGAR. What I complain of is not that the Canadian Pacific Railway did not carry out their agreement, because there was no agreement, they did not sign any agreement that amounted to anything. The Government gave this subsidy of $12,000 a mile to this road to make this connection. They did not see that the Canadian Pacific Railway were bound by anything that amounted to a row of pins. There was an optional clause left in for them to carry out or not as they chose, and now, after the Government money is all spent, they are negotiating and saying what they would like to do. I thought the Government, when they gave $12,000 a mile for this road, would be able to say what they got for it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This clause is between two railways. The Government are no parties to it and can be no parties to it. They have not come to an agreement. Whether that is the fault of the one railway or the other we do not know. At all events, that rests between themselves. The Government have full power under the General Railway Act, and under the Canadian Pacific Railway Act for that matter, to settle the rates satisfactorily to the country and satisfactorily to trade and the interests of commerce.

Mr. MULOCK. I quite agree with those who say this discussion is not in order on this Bill. *A propos* of what has taken place, however, it appears to me that the Government might and ought to have made all provision in respect of the matter now in controversy between these two railways before they handed over the subsidy.

On the schedule,

Mr. MULOCK moved that the following be added as the seventh section :—

This Act shall not come into force unless and until the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company shall repay to the county of Simcoe and the various municipalities therein all moneys paid by way of bonus by said county and municipalities respectively in aid of the construction of the railway by the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company.

Mr. McCARTHY. I suppose the hon. gentleman is not serious in this proposition. How this company should be deprived of its right to issue debenture bonds until some other company is to pay a debt which the hon. gentleman says it owes, is a curious proposition. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not intend to press it.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman has no right to assume that I am not serious. I was never more serious in my life. I firmly believe that it is necessary that such provision should be made. I have proved that this is really the application of the Hamilton and North-Western for relief. I proved to the satisfaction of the House that there is only $1,800 in this company except money put in by the Government and by the Northern ad North-Western.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is all wrong. I know myself that there was $25,000 paid up at all events.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think that is possible.

Mr. McCARTHY. I know it as a fact.

Mr. MULOCK. The returns do not show it. The returns to the House show that the gross amount of capital stock owned is $200,000.

Mr. McCARTHY. And 10 per cent. on that?

Mr. MULOCK. Before we say 10 per cent. on that, we must remember that the hon. member himself stated, in answer to my question, that $182,000 of that was held by himself and his co-trustees.

Mr. McCARTHY. Precisely, but 10 per cent. had been paid on it before.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman stated that of the $200,000 subscribed stock $182,000 was really stock of the Hamilton and North-Western and Northern Railways, so that there is only $18,000 subscribed capital which has been subscribed by persons or corporations not being the Northern and the Hamilton and North-Western; and of that only 10 per cent. has been paid up, so there is only $1,800 in this enterprise except money which has come out of the Hamilton and North-Western and Northern. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct, there is not as much as that. I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. I thought he meant there was only $1,800 paid up altogether.

Mr. MULOCK. Very well. This is called a Bill of the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, but really it is a Bill promoted by and for the benefit of the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company and the Northern Railway Company; and I proved to the satisfaction of the House, to the satisfaction of every independent minded person that a gross fraud was perpetrated on the people of the county of Simcoe by those two roads combined. Now that they come and ask for relief, I say they must do what every suitor is bound to do who appears to a court for relief, he must make restitution before he is entitled to consideration, and so this railway is bound to make restitution. I never presented a matter to this House with greater seriousness or one that I felt required the judgment of the House in favor of the amendment more than this. I therefore hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. COOK. The town of Collingwood, the town of Barrie and the township of Nottawasaga contributed very largely towards the building of this North-Western Railway in bonuses for the express object of having a competing line, they have been deceived, woefully deceived. The agreements that were drawn by the solicitor of the county were no better than waste paper. There was no doubt at all in the minds of the parties who controlled or promoted that railway, at the time when the contracts were signed with the municipalities, that those contracts were worthless. I believe I will have the opportunity now which was denied me a short time ago by the Speaker, in reference to the matter of the deputation that waited upon the hon. Premier in connection with this same affair. The hon. gentleman's reply was in these words:

"The words of the Act of 1883, which declared certain roads for the general advantage of Canada, were of no consequence. They were put in every Railway Bill granted by the Dominion Parliament in cases where the railway or railways affected were all within one Province in order to show that the Federal Parliament had a right to deal with the subject. The words 'for the general advantage of Canada,' were merely a phrase."

At the time that question was being discussed in the House it was stated by the supporters of the present Administration that it would make no material difference, the roads would not be removed and the very fact of the Government of the Dominion taking charge of those roads made no difference whatever in the condition of the railways. A short time ago, there was a man injured on the Midland Railway, he brought an action for damages in the courts, and the courts decided that, in consequence of the road being transferred from Provincial authority to Federal authority, his case could not lie. It was in reference to the filling up of frogs. Some years ago, I introduced a Bill into this House for the purpose of filling up frogs on railways, so that parties in the yards, brakesmen and yardmen, would not be caught and injury would not be sustained in that direction. This man was injured in that way. When I had the honor of a seat in the Local Legislature in 1879, I introduced the same Bill there and it became law. The man who was injured by being caught in the track and run over by the car appealed to the courts, and the courts decided that he had no case, that the Local Government had no jurisdiction, and, as the Dominion Government has no law by which the frogs of railways should be filled, he could get no damages. There is a direct point in issue, contrary to the express words of the hon. the Premier that it was merely a phrase. Now, Sir, if there ever was an unrighteous act of a railway company towards a municipality, it was the conduct of the North-Western Railway in connection with the bonuses received from the municipalities. It was upon the distinct understanding that that line should be a distinct, a separate and competing line to the Northern Railway Company, that the bonuses were granted. I called upon the hon. member for South Simcoe on a former occasion to vindicate the rights of his friends in his riding, and I hope he will now take an opportunity of expressing his views in connection with this matter.

Bill reported.

Mr. McCARTHY moved the third reading of said Bill.

Mr. MULOCK. I beg to move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend the same by adding the section of which I have just given notice. I have before me now a letter showing something of the practices of the Hamilton and North Western and the Northern. This letter gives a sample of the treatment received by the community served by these railways. It is to be borne in mind that these two railways are worked now by a joint company. This particular letter refers to rates upon the Northern Railway. The rating is fixed by the joint company—and fairly illustrates the policy of both these roads towards the people. Last Session I gave to the House some statistics upon this matter, and by way of illustration I may tell you that the Hamilton and North-Western Railway charges for hauling grain from the village of Cookstown around by Barrie to Toronto, and charges for the haul by its own line and down upon the Northern again, being an unnecessary haulage, and unnecessary mileage, of perhaps forty or fifty miles. I do not speak accurately as to the distance, for I have not the figures before me. I think the House ought to have some consideration for the people in question. Upon this point I shall read a letter dated March, 1886, from R. & G. Strickland. I may say they are at present owners of a large lumber mill in the vicinity of the village of Bradford, succeeding Thompson, Smith & Co. I may say, too, *à propos* of this question, that I was informed by Mr. Sage, who formerly lumbered on the line of the Northern, that he abandoned his whole Canadian trade on account of the tyranny of this road in exacting rates. Now, the Messrs. Strickland, who are at present doing the only lumbering that I can think of at the moment, in the vicinity of Bradford, in this county, have written me on the subject. I met Mr. Strickland upon the train one evening going to Toronto, and had a conversation with him upon the subject, and he wrote me afterwards as follows:—

"DEAR SIR,—In connection with our conversation in regard to the Northern Railway, I beg to say we have determined to stop operations at Bradford owing to the excessive rate charged for carrying lumber from that point. The rate charged on lumber from Bradford are $1.60 per M. feet, board measure, to Toronto. The Grand Trunk rates from Lake Field to Port Hope, the same distance are $1.15 per M feet, and this excessive over-charge applies to all kinds of freight The following is an extract from a letter written by our agent at Bradford last January."

He then goes on with some further complaint. That shows the way our section of the country is discriminated against by this joint system of railways, and unless the Legislature will intervene and come to our relief, it will be very difficult for us to build up enterprises upon that line of railway. There is only one way by which railways can be taught to live up to the spirit of their contracts, and that is to cause them to make restitution unless they do carry out in good faith the understanding on which they obtain the money which practically brings them into existence.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. member's zeal is rather late. There was a Bill here presented by the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company, presented in its own name, and for its own purposes; the hon. member was then in the House, and he told us this afternoon that he aided in promoting one of the clauses of that Bill. That was the time for the hon. member to have moved, that was the time for him to have insisted, when the relief granted by that Bill was accorded to the Hamilton and North-Western Railway——

Mr. MULOCK. It is never too late to do right.

Mr. McCARTHY,—upon the justice which he speaks of towards the municipalities in the county of Simcoe. The present motion is one which, if it were characterised in the terms in which I would like to do so, I should probably incur your censure, Mr. Speaker, which I refrain from doing, though I dare say we all understand what is meant by it. Now, the effect of it is this: This railway company, which is to connect the Ontario Railway system of Ontario with the Canadian Pacific Railway, is to be obstructed, is not to go on. Rolling stock is not to be acquired, the road is not to be carried on unless—what? Unless a railway which runs from the town of Collingwood to the city of Hamilton, does what the hon. member says it ought to do, pay back its bonuses obtained under the circumstances which he referred

to. Now, that would hardly be robbing Peter to pay Paul, because it would be a much more nefarious transaction than that. The effect of this amendment is that so far as the Bill is concerned, it would be waste paper, no advantage could be taken under it; and if it is necessary to have this piece of legislation, in order to carry on the work of connecting the railway system of Ontario with the Canadian Pacific Railway system, then this amendment of the hon. member obstructs it.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mulock.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Edgar,	McIntyre,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	McMullen,
Auger,	Glen,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Guay,	Mitchell,
Béchard,	Gunn,	Mulock,
Bergeron,	Harley,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Innes,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Huron),	Jackson,	Scriver,
Campbell (Renfrew),	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright(SirRichard)	Kirk,	Trow,
Casey,	Landerkin,	Watson,
Casgrain,	Langelier,	Weldon,
Charlton,	Lister,	Wells,
Cook,	Livingston,	Wilson,
Davies,	McCraney,	Yeo.—48.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Ferguson (Leeds&Gren)	Mackintosh,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Welland),	Macmaster,
Baker (Victoria),	Fortin,	Macmillan (Middlesex),
Barnard,	Foster,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Bell,	Gagné,	McCallum,
Benoit,	Gaudet,	McCarthy,
Bergin,	Gault,	McDougald (Pictou),
Billy,	Gigault,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Blondeau,	Gordon,	McLelan,
Bowell,	Grandbois,	Moffat,
Bryson,	Guillet,	Montplaisir,
Burnham,	Hackett,	Orton,
Burns,	Hall,	Paint,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hay,	Pruyn,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Campbell (Victoria),	Hickey,	Rykert,
Carling,	Hilliard,	Scott,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Homer,	Shakespeare,
Cochrane,	Hurteau,	Shanly,
Cockburn,	Jamieson,	Small,
Coughlin	Jenkins,	Smyth,
Daly,	Kilvert,	Taylor,
Dawson,	Kinney,	Thompson,
Desaulniers (St Maurice)	Kranz,	Townshend,
Dickinson,	Labrosse,	Tupper,
Dodd,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tyrwhitt,
Dugas,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Vanasse,
Dupont,	Lesage,	White (Cardwell),
Everett,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Renfrew),
Farrow,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wigle.—90.

Bill read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF FLORA BIRRELL.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton), moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 129) for the relief of Flora Birrell (from the Senate).

Motion agreed to, on a division, and Bill considered in committee, reported and read the third time and passed, on a division.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 97) respecting the London and Ontario Investment Company, Limited.—(Mr. Beaty.)

PUNISHMENT OF SEDUCTION.

Mr. SPEAKER reported that the Senate had passed Bill (No. 20) for the punishment of seduction with amendments, to which they desire the concurrence of this House.

Mr. MCCARTHY.

Mr. CHARLTON. At this stage of the Session it is evident that if this Bill is placed upon the Order paper it is entombed. All days of the week are now taken by the Government for their own business, except Monday. Next Monday is Queen's Birthday and there will be no sitting on that day, and if the House is to act upon the Bill it will have to act in some other mode than by the regular mode of placing it on the Order paper and reaching it in its regular course. The Bill passed this House by a large majority, by a majority of more than two to one. The amendments made by the Senate are not of importance, except in the case of one section, that relating to the punishment of seduction under promise of marriage. The Senate has provided that a male shall not be liable until after he is twenty-one years of age and a female shall have no recourse after she is eighteen years of age. This amendment is of course not satisfactory to the friends of the measure; still the balance of the Bill is a copy of the Imperial Statute of last August and is a great improvement on the present law, and in order to save what is left in the measure I am quite prepared to accept the amendments of the Senate. I hope the Government, in view of the fact that the Bill received such an overwhelming support in this House and is evidently favored by a large majority of the people, will accept the amendments. I move that the amendments of the Senate be concurred in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think this Bill that has just come down from the Senate should remain before the House so that we can consider what the amendments are. It is a Bill that was not passed in this House without opposition; I was opposed to the principle of the Bill, and it should remain before us before we proceed to consider it. The hon. gentleman says at this stage of the Session there will be very little chance of passing the Bill as amended. I do not know how far we have gone in the Session; it is evident we are not near the end yet by what we saw on Friday, and therefore I think we had better give time for the consideration of this Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. With regard to the hon. gentleman's estimate as to the length of the Session, it is the general impression that the Session will end soon. If we had another private members' day I would not feel very apprehensive as to the fate of the measure, but as we have not, and as the general impression on this side of the House at least—and I suppose we are in as good a position to know as gentlemen on the other side—is that the business will be completed next week, the course of the Minister of Public Works simply amounts to killing the Bill. Now, I am quite aware that he is opposed to this Bill, but because he is opposed to it I do not think he should interpose his individual opinion against an overwhelming majority of the House, and the evident wish of the country in favor of the Bill. Certainly if I were in his position I would waive my own individual opinion in the face of the opinion of the House and the evident opinion of the country. It is not for me to say, but if he wishes to assume the responsibility of killing a measure which is demanded by the public sentiment of the country, which was passed by an overwhelming majority of this House, which has passed the Senate with amendments which can be understood by any man of ordinary intelligence in five minutes—if he takes that position, and requires that this Bill should be put on the order paper, with the clear result that the Bill should be killed, then I throw on him that responsibility.

Mr. SPEAKER. The first motion is whether the amendments shall be considered now. That is equivalent to a first reading, and I understand that the House are willing to consider it now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then the question is whether the amendment shall be considered now.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. CHARLTON moved that said amendments be now read a second time.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is for the House to say. Rule 23 of the Commons provides:

"Amendments made by the Senate to Bills originating in the House, shall be placed on the Orders of the Day, next after Bills reported on by select committees."

Upon that rule Mr. Bourinot, in his work on "Parliamentary Procedure and Practice," remarks:

"The practice in both Houses with respect to amendments is the same. When the amendments are of an unimportant character, or there is no objection to their passage, they are generally read twice and agreed to forthwith; but if they are important, their consideration is deferred until a future day. The Speaker of the English Commons lays down the English practice as follows: 'In cases where expedition is necessary it has been the practice of the House occasionally—especially late in the Session—to order that these amendments shall be considered forthwith. But on such occasions the member in charge of the Bill is bound to satisfy the House that expedition is necessary.'"

So that I think it is for the House to decide whether they shall be gone on with.

Mr. CHARLTON. I assert that expedition is necessary, and that unless it is taken up now the Bill will be lost.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman who has made the motion can tell us what the amendments are, but for my part I do not know; they have not been read.

Mr. CHARLTON. I stated what they were before, but I shall be happy to repeat them. The first amendment is in the second clause of the Bill. As it stood before it provided that any person who, under promise of marriage, seduces an unmarried female of previously chaste character, and under 21 years of age, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. The amendment made by the Senate adds, after the word person, the words "over 21 years of age," and further provides that any such person seducing an unmarried female of previously chaste character, and under 18 years of age, instead of 21, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. It also makes a change in sub-section 1 of section 4, by making the maximum term of imprisonment for inveigling a child under the age of 10 years, ten years instead of five, at the discretion of the court. These are the amendments.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is a proviso in the second clause struck out.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, the proviso that in the case of an unmarried man the subsequent marriage of the parties may be pleaded in bar of a conviction, for seduction under promise of marriage, is struck out.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that is rather important.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it is an important provision to lose, but still we can understand it.

Amendments concurred in.

MATHEW ROCHE, OF LINGAN, N.S.

House resumed further consideration of proposod motion of Mr. Blake for a select committee to enquire into certain allegations respecting the case of Mr. Mathew Roche, of Lingan, N.S., and the action of Mr. Dodd, M.P., and Mr. McDougall, M.P., for Cape Breton, in connection therewith.

Mr. DAVIES. When the hon. member for West Durham moved this resolution, he did not consider it necessary—and in that I think the House approved of his course—to make any lengthened remarks upon it. He was content with making the charge, which he did deliberately from his place and on his responsibility as a member of the House, and then leaving the House to refer the charges to a select committee to enquire into their truth or falsity. I, myself, would have imagined, looking at the gravity of the charges made against the hon. members, that the committee would be granted without any hesitation; and I must say frankly that it was with no small surprise that I found the hon. Premier, the hon. Finance Minister and other members of the Government taking a line in the debate which indicated that they did not feel disposed to grant the committee. I may be wrong, Sir, but we shall learn directly whether my belief was correct or not. Of course, it was perfectly proper and right that the hon. member for Sydney (Mr. Dodd) should have made the personal explanation he did after the resolution was moved. After he had made that explanation, I thought for one that the House, recognising the truth of the remark made by the hon. Finance Minister that the resolution contained charges of a very grave and serious character against hon. members of the House and against the Government, would have at once acceded to the proposition to let the case go to a committee. But, Sir, it appears that such is not to be the case; and I only rise on the present occasion to make a few remarks because an attempt was made, whether unwittingly or otherwise, to present the charges made by my hon. friend in an aspect altogether incorrect and improper. Sir, the hon. gentleman's charge was a very plain and simple one. I am not going to read over *verbatim* the charges made in the resolution, but they amounted to this, that a public officer had been threatened by a member of this House that if he voted according to his convictions, if he voted against the candidate put forward by the Government in their own interests, it would be at the peril of his office. Mark you, there was no charge against the officer of using any undue influence; there was no charge that he had attempted to act in an offensively partisan way; there was no charge that he attempted to take an active or improper part in the election. The charge simply was that by acting within his perfect right as a citizen of this Dominion, the right accorded to him in our Franchise Act, of voting in favor of the candidate of his choice, he incurred the peril of dismissal from office. Well, Sir, what will be the effect on the country—what is the only consequence that can flow from the refusal of the House to grant this committee? This consequence, that members of the civil service, be they few or many, be they numbered by hundreds or by thousands, are to be simply the slaves of the Administration of the day—that they are bound to vote in favor of the Government candidate, whether that candidate represents opinions in which they share, or represents opinions from which they dissent—I say that position involves very grave consequences; it affects the independence and the efficiency of the entire service. If that position is deliberately adopted by this House after reflection, it will have the effect of driving both political parties into a policy destructive of the best interests of the civil service. It is not to be expected for a moment that one of the great parties in the State can lie by and see a doctrine promulgated by the party for the time being in power, to the effect that every civil servant is bound to vote for them at the peril of his place, without, from pure self-defence, being driven to the resolution, whatever their private views may be as to the consequences upon the efficiency of the civil service, to announce to the members of the service: If you vote for the Government, you must do it at your peril in case we come in. It amounts to this, that the old doctrine of "to the victors belong the spoils," is to be again introduced into our political life. It amounts to this, that if the Opposition came into power after that doctrine had

been accepted, they would be bound to dismiss every man who, exercising his franchise in an honest way, voted against their candidate at an election. I hope the House will not accede to that proposition. I hope the hon. First Minister, after reflection, will see the gravity and the seriousness of it in its effects on the efficiency, the independence and the loyalty of the civil service at large. I do not wish to express any opinion as to the truth or falsity of the charges themselves, that will, of course be enquired into by the committee; but I wish to refer to some remarks that fell from the hon. gentleman who made the personal explanation, which he had a perfect right to make. That hon. gentleman took three positions antagonistic to each other. He started with the assertion that the charges were utterly unfounded. They may or they may not be; that is a matter entirely for the committee; but the charges have been made on the responsibility of an hon. member of this House. Precedents and practice alike point to the course we should adopt, and that is we should treat those charges with the respect due to the member who makes them, by referring them to a committee of enquiry. This House must have been surprised, after hearing the statements made by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Dodd) to hear the letter which the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Blake) read in reply, a letter which, if it turns out to be authenticated, will, to a very large extent, prove the charges the hon. gentleman made. The hon. member for Cape Breton first said the charges were unfounded, then that the official had not been removed, and he wound up by the statement that he had been removed, and that in removing him he (Mr. Dodd) had simply discharged his duty. In the latter part of his speech, the hon. gentleman advocated the rule, which, afterwards, I was sorry to see was endorsed by the Premier and the Minister of Finance, that to the victors belong the spoils. The Minister of Finance attempted to interpolate into the letter words that were not there and were never intended to be there, by insisting that Mr. Roche had taken an active part in politics, and that it was because he had done so the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Dodd) had insisted on his dismissal. The Minister of Finance insisted that words to this effect were in the letter, but they are not to be found there. The reason given by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Dodd) was, not that Mr. Roche had taken an active part in politics, not that he had made himself personally offensive, not that he had displayed partisanship in the discharge of his duties, and brought undue influence to bear on those under him, but simply that he had voted at the election. Let me refer to this once more because I think it is right the House should understand what the charge is. The charge against Mr. Roche had nothing to do with undue partisanship, but simply with his right as a citizen to record his vote. The following is the hon. gentleman's letter:—

"HOUSE OF COMMONS, OTTAWA, 21st April, 1885.
"TO MR. MATHEW ROCHE,
"Lingan, Cape Breton.

"DEAR SIR,—It is quite true that it is in view to remodel the pilotage commission. You must remember that it is the invariable rule, where a Government officer votes against the Government candidate, as you did in the case of the election of McDougall and Mr. McKay, that he runs the risk of being turned out. Mr. McDougall thinks that a friend of his should have the position which you hold, and I cannot object to him placing him there, for the reason that I personally told you what the consequence would be if you voted against him, and further asked you to vote for him because he was the Government candidate brought out and selected by them to carry the county if possible in their interests. Knowing all this, you assumed the responsibility of the course you pursued, and having done so I fear you must submit to the consequence.

"Yours very truly,
"MURRAY DODD."

That is to say, Mr. Roche had the honesty and the manliness to record his vote for the man of his choice, and because he did so the hon. member told him he must assume the responsibility of taking that honest course, the consequence of which, according to the opinion held by hon. gentlemen opposite, was dismissal from office. That is the notice to be sent to the civil service, should this House endorse the action of the hon. member, as it is asked to do. The civil service will be told: If you dare to exercise your franchise and vote for the gentleman of your choice, no matter if you abstain from partisanship and undue influence, you are to be dismissed from the service. The thing comes back to the position formulated in the old phrase: "To the victors belong the spoils." If we are to introduce that principle into our politics, well and good. I, for one, much as I believe it would be to the detriment of the service, am prepared to accept it. If the position is to be taken by the Government side that the civil servants hold their offices at the beck and whim of Government supporters for the time being, the contra position must be assumed by us that every man who ventures to vote against us will have to go out. I would be sorry to see the House repeal the Civil Service Act, and introduce that system which has many vicious principles in it and perhaps some merits, but if it has to come let us know it. Some of the Government side are quite willing to accept it. The Minister of Finance had perspicacity enough at first to see that the charge was a very grave one, but the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) did not see that there was anything serious in it at all. He is willing to dismiss every man in the service who votes against him, and so are many others behind him. If that be the case let us know it, and if the issue is forced on the Opposition they will be driven to accept the alternative position. I do not wish to enter into a long discussion as to whether the hon. member for Cape Breton's statements are consistent with the facts or not; that will be for the committee to determine. I am merely dealing with the refusal of the House to enquire into the truth of the charge made by the hon. member for West Durham.

Mr. JENKINS. I am much surprised and gratified at the zeal displayed by my hon. colleague and his leader in favor of the independence of civil servants. It is not a very long time ago, it was in 1874, when the late Government, by what I think I may say was one of the greatest political flukes on record, gained power. At that time there were some fifteen or twenty members of the civil service dismissed, not with any friendly warning, not for any reason, either official or political, but simply because it was necessary to fill the hungry maws of the supporters of the Government with the positions held by Conservatives.

Mr. MILLS. Appointed the night before they went out of office.

Mr. JENKINS. No; but even supposing that was true, it is well known that the Government has the power of making appointments until they give up the reins of office. Under the British Government it is done whenever a Government goes out of office. That is no excuse, however, in my case, for I held office for eleven years previous to the time I was dismissed, and I was dismissed for no official reason and for no political reason, because I had strongly urged the advisability of having no opposition to the then candidates of the Government, and there was no opposition, they were elected by acclamation, there was, therefore, no reason, either official or political, for my dismissal. When the Government came into power my friends urged that I should be reinstated. The leader of the Government said no; it is a hard case and I am sorry, but I will not infringe on this system we have adopted, of the independence of the civil service, and I and a number of others who had been dismissed were not reinstated, and those who usurped our positions were allowed to retain them. That fact alone is quite sufficient to save this Government from the charge made by the leader of the Opposition and my hon. colleague.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I had not the advantage of hearing the preliminary discussion, but I may say, in regard to the dismissals complained of by the hon. gentleman who sat down, that I do not think that the First Minister himself would say that he held that a Government were always bound to sustain the nominations made by its predecessors under all circumstances, and I think that his own course afforded some very striking illustrations to the contrary; but I do not think it is at all desirable, in the discussion of this particular question, to complicate the matter by a reference to what happened either in 1874 or 1878. I have no doubt that, if I were disposed to do so, I could bring forward a very great number of illustrations of the application of the doctrine of which the hon. gentleman complains, but, as I understand, the case is simply this: My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition made a certain statement which I believed was traversed, in part if not in whole, by the two hon. members against whom it is directed. Now, the course of the House always has been heretofore on such occasions to give the accuser and the accused the opportunity of bringing forward what evidence they could respectively submit to a committee of this House, either to a select committee or in some cases to the Committee of Privileges and Elections. My hon. friend's statement was briefly, as I understood the matter, that a certain officer of the Canadian Government had been dismissed, not for interfering actively in elections, but simply for casting his vote. That statement, he declares, he is prepared to prove; and most assuredly, if he is prepared to prove it, I think that the House must see that it is utterly impossible for us to admit that act by itself to be a valid excuse for depriving a man of his position, unless we are prepared to adopt the doctrine alluded to by my hon. friend that, if you make the civil servants the absolute political serfs of the Government of the day, you put the whole civil service in jeopardy of being displaced whenever a change of Government occurs. Now, I have always myself contended and I am quite willing to give the gentlemen opposite the benefit of that contention, that, if a civil servant, a man in the employment of the Government, chooses to step out of the line and chooses to canvass or to make himself conspicuous in opposition to the candidate of the Government, he must take the consequences. I have always believed that it is impossible to maintain the discipline of the service if that occurs, but there is a most extreme distinction between the case of a man who does that and the case of a man who simply exercises his franchise; and, if it has come to this, that the mere exercise of the franchise is to expose civil servants to the risk of being deprived of their places, then it would be infinitely better to take away their vote from them altogether. There are reasons, and reasons which deserve serious consideration, why civil servants should be treated as we treat judges, those of them, at any rate, who occupy offices which may fairly be called offices of emolument and permanent offices. I do not hesitate to say that my own individual opinion is that the great majority of the civil servants would be better without votes, but, while we allow them to retain votes, it is very unfair and unjust to threaten them, as is stated to have been done in this case, with deprivation of their office if they choose to exercise it. If the hon. gentlemen who are the subjects of this motion are prepared to show that this gentleman actively interfered, I say that I for one would sustain the action of the Government in dismissing the civil servant, but, unless that is done, I think it is an extremely harsh act to take away the position he held.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) in commencing the brief remarks he made, said he did not desire and did not think it proper that we shoud complicate the discussion by references to matters of 1874 and 1878. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) further said during the debate some days ago that there was too much text and no commentary.

Mr. MILLS. I said there was too little text and too much commentary.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Well, I propose to give the hon. gentleman a little text and a great deal of commentary this evening. I think the question itself is one of vital importance, and when reflection is made on hon. members of this House, we are bound to look at the record of hon. gentlemen opposite and consider how they acted under similar circumstances. It must be apparent to every man in this country, to every man who thinks and who desires to think, or who observes human nature and political affairs, that a wonderful transformation passes over the so-called Liberals whenever they are in Opposition. We remember, going back not very far, that there were several planks laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite, each one of which was ruthlessly smashed the moment they got into power. I remember well, some years ago, there was to be no provincial alliance, no alliance between the Ontario Premier and the Dominion Premier. We all know, as politicians and as public men, how hon. gentlemen opposite fulfilled that pledge. Then, again, there were to be no extra portfolios in the Government. The House was to be kept clear from the influence of the Administration of the day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I will give the hon. gentleman all he wants before I get through, both of text and commentary.

Mr. DAVIES. Is this the question?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I am simply showing that, while these gentlemen in opposition are such carpers and advocates regarding the purity of elections and the purity of Parliament itself, they have, every time they got the opportunity, strangled their pledges and broken their promises. I was simply laying the foundation of my argument, not for this House alone but for the country, calling attention to the fact that on no occasion did those gentlemen keep a promise or, when they uttered a profession, maintain it by their actions.

Mr. DAVIES. Is this in order?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is leading up to the whole question about the dismissal from office. It is a political question.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. As my hon. friends opposite do not desire me to refer to the past beyond this particular question, I shall come to the question at issue itself. We remember that there was to be no Government interference in elections. That was a solid plank in the Liberal platform. I hold in my hand a statement made in the House in 1873, in connection with an election in the County of Welland. In 1872, Mr. Griffin, Post Office Inspector, wrote to a postmaster in Welland:

"If you cannot support Dr. King, who is the ministerial candidate, take no active part against him, and give no ground of complaint against yourself."

We remember what a thrill of horror passed through the Reform party then, as a thrill of horror has passed through hon. gentlemen to-night at the unseemly act, as they insinuate, of two hon. gentlemen who are respected in their constituencies and in the country where they are known, because one of them wrote to a friend of his to take no active part in the election——

Mr. DAVIES. No.——

Mr. MACKINTOSH,—and not to place himself in the position of being dismissed. My hon. friend says "no." I shall quote from the letter, as hon. gentlemen have quoted

from it. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Dodd) wrote:

"You must remember that it is the invariable rule where a Government officer votes against the Government candidate, as you did in the case of the election of Mr. McDougall and Mr. Mackay, that he runs the risk of being turned out."

Hon. gentlemen opposite have talked of the ballot. What is this a proof of? It is simply a proof that Mr. Roche had publicly made himself known, being one of those who issued pilotage certificates, as one of the opponents of Mr. McDougall, and his personal friend Mr. Dodd spoke to him to do nothing to jeopardise his position, and for giving him that advice and approaching him in such a way as Parliament itself might countenance, certainly not censure, he is to be censured by the leader of the Opposition:

"Mr. McDougall thinks that a friend of his should have the position which you hold and I cannot object to him placing him there, for the reason that I personally told you what the consequence would be if you voted against him."

Now, I ask hon. gentlemen to look at it plainly and honestly, without any captious political feeling, and what will they find? That Mr. Dodd, a friend of Mr. Roche's, told him not to make himself known, not to demonstrate the fact outwardly that he was opposed to Mr. McDougall, not to place himself in such a position so that, should Mr. McDougall be asked to make an appointment he would have to refuse him such appointment; and because of this the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), says that the great Reform party must now adopt the alternative of either bowing submissively to the decrees of the Conservative party, or to declare: "To the victors belong the spoils." Sir, it is like the general platform and policy of the party itself. It never rises higher, and never will rise higher, I fear, than appeals to race, religion or section, and certainly not higher than this case regarding Mr. Roche, who, when receiving $30 a year, is transferred from one point to another at the same salary, and yet this is a scandal for which two hon. members are indicted with as much gravity as though the fundamental principles of the Constitution had been ruthlessly violated. In 1872 Mr. Griffin, Post Office Inspector, wrote to a postmaster in Welland:

"If you cannot support Dr. King, who is the ministerial candidate, take no active part against him, and give no ground of complaint against yourself."

When this case of Mr. Griffin's came before the House the hon. member for East York, then leader of the Opposition, moved:

"That it is highly criminal in any Minister or Ministers or other servants under the Crown directly or indirectly to use the power of office in the election of representatives to serve in Parliament, and an attempt at such influence will be at all times resisted by the House as aimed at its own dignity, honor and independence."

"Servants under the Crown!" Why, I remember, in 1874, in this very city, when the Hon. R. W. Scott, then a Minister of the Crown, openly canvassed the civil servants in favor of his candidate, Dr. St. Jean, against Mr. Lewis, a lamented friend of mine. I remember when a test question came up in 1874 in this House with regard to the mayoralty, and there are members of the civil service living now who will bear me out in saying that some deputy heads went to the Departments and spoke to their clerks, and said: "Either vote for Mr. Featherstone for mayor, or do not vote at all." That is the way hon. gentlemen carry out their pledges and professions when in power. Then, again, in the Kingston election, the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) will, no doubt, have a lively recollection of certain orders given to the post office and customs officials to "vote for Mr. Carruthers or not at all." Then in West Toronto when the late Chief Justice Moss was a candidate. Why, at that time Mr. McKellar, then Minister of Public Works, was shown to have written to the Superintendent of the Central Prison telling him to give the men a half holiday and pay them out of the public funds, in order that they might vote for the Reform candidate. These men were driven as serfs to the polls, at a time when the hon. member for South Huron, the then Minister of Finance, was picturing gloom and misery, creating depression through the influence of his speeches; these men, I say, were driven to the polls like serfs in Russia, to vote for reform and the elevation of the standard of public morality. Then, Sir, we come nearer home. I hold in my hand a report of the trial in South Renfrew, in 1874, in which Mr. McDougall, the present Auditor General, was respondent. Mr. McDougall was asked:

"Q. Had you any other friends to help you in the county, friends who wrote letters?
"A. I think the Hon. R. W. Scott was the only person.
"Q. Did you request Mr. Scott to write letters?
"A. I don't think I did, but I think he did write."

Here we find a Reform Minister, if one can call the Hon. Mr. Scott a Reform Minister, going out of his way to strangle the pledges of the Reform party, not that any one urged him to interfere in the election for South Renfrew, for the candidate himself says:

"I found after the election, and during the election, that the Hon. R. W. Scott wrote a large number of letters, using his official position to secure votes for the Government candidate." Again: "I did not ask him to write."

Was not that coercion of the electors? I will prove, by the evidence of the court, that there was something beneath that, that beneath these letters there was a promise from a Minister of the Crown of a large amount of money to assist in colonisation roads in that district, in the township of Brudenell. Mr. McDougall's evidence proceeds:

"Q. The Hon. R. W. Scott was then in the Dominion Government?
"A. Yes.
"Q. What position did he hold?
"A. He was then without portfolio. He spoke to me about having grants for this part of the country, but the exact sum he did not mention, but that night in Shamrock village, Hudson told me Scott had fixed the sum at $8,000."

Yet my hon. friends behind me are to be condemned for advising a personal friend of their own what he should do in an election, while a Minister of the Crown, under a Reform Government, is to write letters and form alliances with the Ontario Government, and promise $8,000 for the township of Brudenell in order to secure votes for the Reform candidate. Then there is the case of Dr. Strange, of Kingston, and I think the hon. member for South Huron remembers that. Dr. Strange held a semi-official position, and his great crime was that in 1874 he voted for the then right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald), who had no patronage to bestow, and nothing to give. That was his crime, and it is a crime, perhaps, in the eyes of the Reform party that men should stand by their leader, even when he has fallen. There was some discussion over it in this House, and also rather a serious discussion in court in regard to that case. I remember that the hon. member for South Huron read a letter to the effect that Dr. Strange went to the house of a voter and upon discovering that the man had voted for Mr. Carruthers, he told that voter that his wife need never enter his house again for medicine? The Reform Government could not stand such a threat as that. The idea that that unfortunate woman whose husband had voted for the Reform party, was denied the privilege of taking Dr. Strange's medicine, was so unpleasant that the hon. gentlemen opposite, then in power, administered a dose to Dr. Strange, and he immediately disappeared from the scene of action and was also deprived of his salary. Then take a case in this vicinity; hon. gentlemen remember that Mr. James Harvey was dismissed in 1876 from the charge of the works on the Madawaska River. The reason given was that he had, in 1871, caused financial loss

to some lumbermen by carelessness. The member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) gave it as his opinion that the reason was that he had spoken disrespectfully of the Government. Turning to the debates of 1877 we find that Mr. Mackenzie said on 11th April of that year:

"There was never a clear case made out of any person neglecting his duties, but that person was dismissed without the slightest hesitation. He protested against anyone bringing up a case in the House when a man was removed for sufficient cause. He was quite sure that the hon. gentlemen opposite knew very well that it had not been a peculiarity of his own or of the Government to dismiss people for political reasons. They had great reason to do so on many occasions, and they had exercised a forbearance towards people in office that never was manifested by the hon. gentlemen opposite. They had allowed that forbearance to go a great deal too far in protecting men who had used their offices in order to injure the Government they served. But he could tell the hon. gentlemen opposite and all such office-holders that that was at an end."

The hon. gentleman also said:

"The remarks of the hon. member for North Renfrew were generally speaking correct. He did state to a deputation that called upon him, that he had been informed that this man had spoken most disrespectfully of the Government and himself, and he told that deputation, as he now told the House, that he would permit no public officer to speak disrespectfully of the Government they served."

The headsman's axe fell; the fiat went forth that Liberals would not permit even an expression of opinion on the part of officials. Why, Sir, had hon. gentlemen opposite been able to dismiss the whole electorate in 1878 they would have done it, for no Government that has ever been in power or ever will be in power were more disrespectfully spoken of and more summarily and disrespectfully ejected from office than was that Government when appealing to the country in that year. More than that, when you look at the case of Mr. Harvey, a man of position and influence, who has served the country twenty years, and who, since being reinstated, has filled a similar position and discharged his duties with every satisfaction, both to the Government and to the people of the district where he lived, I think it will be admitted that political feeling came in and that his dismissal was because Mr. Harvey had spoken against the Government or dared to remain a pronounced Conservative. Take again a case alluded to by the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum), that of J. B. Smythe. He was superintendent of the southern section of the Welland Canal, dismissed on the 16th of January, 1874, by the personal order of the then hon. Minister of Public Works. On the 16th of January, 1874, a telegram from the Public Works, at Ottawa, directed: "Suspend John B. Smythe, because there are serious charges against him." He was suspended forthwith, although up to that time a faithful public servant. On the 21st of January a largely signed petition, bearing the names of many leading Reformers, asked that he might be restored. On the 3rd of February, Mr. Page, the chief engineer of canals, endorsed upon the petition: "Mr. Smythe, was, I believe, a foreman on the central part of the Welland Canal, but having no knowledge of the reason of his suspension, I am unable to say whether or not he should be reinstated." On the 20th of February, Mr. Smythe wrote, demanding an investigation, and in May Mr. Bodwell, the superintendent, wrote concerning the matter. On this letter the following endorsation appeared: "Will attend to this when I visit the canal. A.M." Brief, but expressive; in fact, all Liberal Ministers acted similarly; but the Minister of the Interior was more concise; he always disposed of cases with "No.—D. M.;" and "No.—D. M.," it was. A Grit was afterwards appointed, and it was subsequently discovered that the heinous offence of which Mr. Smythe was guilty was that he declared himself to be an out-and-out Conservative. He had a right to vote; but because he signified his intention of using his franchise he was dismissed and only restored to office five years afterwards. I refer to another case from Ontario: That of Lewis Hodgins. He was a gentleman respectably connected, of unimpeachable character, being a lighthouse keeper at Salmon Point, Prince Edward County, in 1874. He was charged with using abusive language towards the Government, in which the late Sir Albert Smith was Minister of Marine and Fisheries. A copy of the charge was sent to Hodgins, who replied:

"I beg to say that I did vote against Mr. Walter Ross at the elections in 1874; but as to using any violent or profane language concerning the present Government, I deny it altogether, and I furnish you with a statement signed by supporters of Mr. Ross, and all immediate neighbors, and who would have heard me if I had been guilty of any of the charges with which I am accused. Party feeling runs very high in this county, and this is done simply to injure a political opponent."

In corroboration of this the following certificate was forwarded to the Minister:—

"We the undersigned supporters of Walter Ross, M.P., for the county of Prince Edward, hereby certify that we are personally acquainted with Lewis Hodgins, lighthouse keeper, at Salmon Point, and we also certify that we never heard him use any abusive language concerning Mr. Ross or the present Ministry, but on the other hand we have heard him speak in their favor. We believe Mr. Hodgins is a faithful and efficient servant, and one who has discharged the duties of his office to the satisfaction of the public generally."

Twenty Reform supporters of Mr. Ross signed this, but he was dismissed by the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries and another man appointed. I desire now to show that these were not isolated cases, but that officials were doomed to submit to the guillotine, not only in Ontario but in Quebec and in Cape Breton as well as Nova Scotia generally, and at other points. I will take some Quebec cases. Here is the case of Philipe Loiselle, postmaster at Paspebiac. He was dismissed on mere suspicion; no evidence was produced showing that he had been guilty of any crime or offence against the postal regulations. He asked for an investigation, was refused, and that was all the satisfaction he got.

Mr. LANGELIER. He was dismissed by the present Government.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I can only inform the hon. gentleman that if he has been a close observer of the political history of Canada he will find this case mentioned; an investigation was asked for and refused, and although no charge was made against this postmaster he was dismissed.

Mr. LANGELIER. He was dismissed by the previous Government, he was reinstated by this Government and again he was dismissed by this Government.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman must see that I am quoting cases which occurred at the time when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was in power. Then there was the case of Mr. Cyr, postmaster at Maria. Perhaps the hon. member for Mégantic (Mr. Langelier) knows him. Then there was the case of Mr. Vallée, postmaster at St. Thomas, the son of a leading politician, afterwards member for Portneuf. The son was one of the ablest young men in the Province of Quebec, and because he was an able young man, and, unfortunately for himself, because he was a Conservative, his father was dismissed from office. Then there was the case of Mr. Jolicœur, postmaster at Crane Island, who was dismissed without any investigation whatever. In 1879, Mr. Vallée, member for Portneuf, stated in his place in Parliament that:

"During the general elections of 1878, one of the principal officers of the Dominion Government at Quebec had on the morning of the 17th of September declared to the employees under him: 'Gentlemen, if to-day you do not vote as you should, to-morrow you will be dismissed.'"

Here was a public official, receiving the public money contributed by the Canadian tax-payers generally, telling those other officials that if they did not vote for the Government candidate that day they would be dismissed. The next day, the 18th September, 1878, the employees remained on and the Government which made the threat were dismissed instead. In Quebec county, at the same election, one O'Brien, then drawing a large salary in the Customs at Quebec, left his

official duties for days and weeks to canvass against the Conservative candidate. Captain Lavoie of the Government vessel *Rimouski* abandoned his boat to go to Rimouski to work against Sir Hector Langevin, the present Minister of Public Works. And so far back as 1874, the commander of the Government steamer *Glendon* violated his duties by using the boat on an electioneering tour along Gaspé Bay, collecting money to protest the election won by Dr. Fortin, the present able member for Gaspé.

Mr. MILLS. There was a boat of that sort used in Lambton in 1872.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I think that was a boat of larger size, and only wish it had been used with better effect. Then hon. gentlemen will remember the case of Régis Cardinal which came up in this House in 1879. Although hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially those who come from the Province of Quebec, knew that Régis Cardinal had in the election of 1878 interfered in the election of Jacques Cartier—whether he had anything to do with the celebrated ballot box case I do not know—but we know that he went to Mr. Cook, a contractor and urged that if he would vote for Mr. Laflamme he (Laflamme) would look after him and his contracts afterwards, and yet, despite the truth of these statements hon. gentlemen opposite had the audacity to bring up the case of Cardinal's dismissal in the House. The hon. member for South Huron said if it could be shown that any man had used his public position as an official to influence an election, he would be the first to dismiss him. The hon. gentleman's friends—I do not know that he did personally—were the first to take up Cardinal's case, and the first to condemn the Government for punishing him for interfering in an election. Now let us go to Nova Scotia for a short time. The late Mr. Howe once said that the smaller the pits the fiercer the rats fought. I find that the little Island of Cape Breton has seen some hard fighting politically, and men there have their misunderstandings and disagreements, many of them not merely political in their character, but personal. Hon. gentlemen will remember that Mr. Ross, Mr. Vail and Mr. Jones were Ministers of Militia at that time—a long line of chivalrous warriors, who believed in decapitating their enemies. With the exception of the assertion which was made that the hon. member for Digby once said that he wished the Fenians might come into Canada, so that he might be able to show what our men were made of——

Mr. VAIL. I never used such an expression.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. It was asserted that the hon. gentleman said so. I do not think he did, if he says he did not, but at the same time the assertion was made.

Mr. VAIL. It might be made by some very irresponsible man, but no responsible party ever made it.

An hon. MEMBER. Probably it was Mr. Jones.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. No, it was the hon. member for Digby, and it appeared in the papers at that time.

Mr. VAIL. I do not think such a thing appeared in the papers.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I do not wish to insinuate anything, I merely say that the hon. gentleman displayed a great deal more activity than his friends gave him credit for if he made the remark. But these gentlemen certainly believed in the torture of official decapitation in the Province of Nova Scotia. And in Cape Breton I have a long list of cases where such official decapitation took place; there was a perfect slaughter of the innocents there. I find in the list five pilot commissioners, five shipping masters, a postmaster, a collector of customs, a lighthouse keeper and a preventive officer. In fact business was suspended all along the line, for every man in the island who had an office was suspended.

Mr. MACKINTOSH.

Mr. MILLS. When was that?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. In 1874 and 1875. I do not think the hon. gentleman was then in office.

Mr. VAIL. Give the names and circumstances?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I will give the hon. gentleman the names and also introduce him to his newly found friend Mr. Roche. In the shipping master's department: Captain McGregor, of North Sidney, was replaced by Mr. Corbett; Captain Brookman, of Port Sidney, by Mr. William Oliver; R. McDonald, of Lingan, by Mr. Roche (the gentleman of whose welfare the leader of the Opposition is so solicitous); Captain McNeil, of Little Glace Bay, was dismissed and reappointed, but again dismissed.

Mr. VAIL. When was this done?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman was in the Province then and should remember the names.

Mr. VAIL. Give the dates.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. It was between 1875 and 1876; the hon. gentleman can look them up at his leisure. Jos. McPherson, of Cow Bay, was replaced by R. Macpherson, and one, by some mistake or other, voted for the Reform candidate, and by some mistake or other he was reappointed; and to add to the ghastly irony of the economical cry—for the Reform party always do everything with a view to economy—they put the Conservative out of the office, and what took place? They added another to the list and appointed two in place of one.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Dandelions.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman may talk about dandelions, but it is far preferable to belong to that honorable brigade than to a brigade of dandy liars. When these hon. gentlemen came up to Ontario, what did they say? They said: We found scores and scores of men appointed to offices in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and we deemed it proper in the interest of public economy, and in order that we might cover the expenditure by the revenue—we found it necessary to dismiss those men. But when we look at the records of the country, it is found that in every case where they dismissed a Conservative, either his office was filled by a Reformer, or else the office was split in two, and two Reformers put there. We find in the case to which I was alluding, that W. H. McAlpine was appointed to Louisburg, and they dismissed five, and in the interest of economy they appointed six at the same salary. The collector of customs at New Glasgow filled a position at $200 a year, and to the new man whom they appointed in the interest of economy, they gave $600. Then, in 1876 the Reform party became bold, either because they had been losing a number of elections, or else that they hoped by announcing the policy that "to the victors belong the spoils" they would induce the honest yeomanry of the country to stand by them. In 1876, John Baine, Angus Morrison and Charles L. Campbell were dismissed from office as landing officers at Great Bras d'Or, Cape Breton—because they voted for the opposition candidate, and the terrible offence of which young Campbell was guilty was that he voted confidence in his own father. These hon. gentlemen were so amazed at a son voting confidence in his father, that they dismissed him on the ground that he was too young; and then, by way of proof that they did everything honestly and above board, they dismissed three men on the alleged ground that they were too old. There is no report in the Department against them; they asked for an investigation, but they got no satisfaction, being told that it was because of their age. One was sixty-two, another seventy-two, and the other twenty-three; and yet they dismissed young Campbell because he voted for his father, one of the most respected

men in Nova Scotia, or in this House; and to day they try to desire to pillory two hon. members of this House because an hon. member advised a friend to do what was right—advised him that he had better keep clear of all entanglements, and vote for the Government candidate. But hon. gentlemen may ask for the proof of all this. I am here to give the proof. Some hon. gentlemen opposite were in this House in 1879, when the proof was produced; when Mr. Huntington in his place challenged those opposite to give proofs, and Mr. Robitaille, then a member of this House, gave several instances, one after another, which none of them denied. I also find that Mr. Macdonald, of Cape Breton, read from official documents as to a case in his county in which the unfortunate wrote:

"I have been superseded in the way office very suddenly, and without warning. Would you be pleased to favor me with the cause of my dismissal?"

Here was an honest, straightforward man putting an honest, straightforward question to the department, and here is the answer:

"I am desired by the Postmaster General to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st instant, and in reply, beg to inform you that it was found expedient in the interest of the public service to supersede you in the charge of the way office in the county of Cape Breton."

That was the reply. It was in the interest of the public service to supersede him without giving him any character, to dismiss him in disgrace, to send him out to be sneered at by his neighbors; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite assert my hon. friends have on this occasion been guilty of a great crime because they advised a friend not to put himself in a false position, and to beware of the terrible results of the policy applied by the Reform party to their opponents. I have mentioned this case simply to show where Government coercion was used either directly, or through the members. But there are cases of coercion on record which gentlemen cannot deny. I take the case of A. McIntosh, a railway mail clerk of Glengarry. In the local elections of 1875, Mr. McDonald, Postmaster General, wrote to Mr. Mowat:

"We are doing all we can for you. Eastern counties solid."

This is the way he did it:

P.O. INSPECTOR'S OFFICE, MONTREAL, 7th Jan, 1875.

"To A. McINTOSH, Railway Mail Clerk, Island Pond.

"The Postmaster General has been pleased to grant you ten days' leave of absence, dating from Friday next, the 8th inst.

"E. F. KING, P.O.I."

The Postmaster General deemed proper, in his great kindness and consideration, to allow him ten days' leave of absence, because there was an election pending in Glengarry, where this young man was popular and had a large number of connections. But, although that was not put in the letter, his eyes were opened when he got to Montreal, where he read:

"P.O. INSPECTOR'S OFFICE, MONTREAL, 7th Jan., 1875.

"Memo. for Mr. McIntosh,

"Mr. Murphy will show you the memo I have just addressed to him. You will doubtless have received a letter from the Postmaster General, who expects to see you at Alexandria on Saturday. You thus, of course, continue west at once, on Saturday.

"E. F. KING, P.O.I."

Here was the Postmaster General himself instilling into the mind of an official the worst kind of corruption—corruption paid for out of the public exchequer—corruption which, if it succeeded, would end in producing absolute chaos in this country. We find the Postmaster General of that day ready to degrade himself by leaving his office and going to Alexandria to meet a clerk to see how, by means of corruption, an election could be carried in the county of Glengarry. When the Postmaster General met young McIntosh, what did he say? That he heard that he had a great deal of influence in Glengarry, and he asked him to take ten days' holidays, and go quietly through the county canvassing it for the Government candidate. Well, Sir, this young man declined the offer; he said he was a Conservative, and could not face his friends if he deserted his party; he said besides that, that he never would desert his party; and for that act of bravery and loyalty to his chief, his junior was appointed over him. That was an election for the Local House. Then came an election for the Commons, in which Mr. McNab was the Government candidate, and Dr. McMillan, the Opposition candidate. A letter was again written to Mr. McIntosh offering him promotion, but he refused to oppose Dr McMillan, and then the following letter was written:—

"P. O. INSPECTOR'S OFFICE, MONTREAL, 13th July, 1875.

"Mr. A. McINTOSH, Railway Mail Clerk, Island Pond,

"SIR,—I beg to inform you that I am advised by the Secretary of the Department that the Postmaster General has been pleased to dispense with your further services as railway mail clerk. Will you please therefore transfer to Mr. Wm. Murphy at Island Pond, your mail keys and other post office property that you may possess.

"Yours very truly,

"E. F. KING, P.O.I."

After the elections, because McIntosh would not work in the interest of Mr. McNab, and because he worked for Dr. McMillan, he received his dismissal from the Reform Government, some supporters of which are to-day condemning an hon. member because he wrote in the most generous spirit, advising his friend not to interfere in the election unless he voted for the Government candidate. Here is a telegram which was sent by Mr. McDonald, the Postmaster General, to the postmaster at Carillon in the election between my hon. friend the member for Argenteuil, (Mr. Abbott) and Dr. Christie:

"You are reported as taking a very active part against the Government candidate for Argenteuil county. I will only add, I think you are making a mistake. Government officials should not oppose Government candidates.

"D. A. McDONALD."

And because my hon. friends from Cape Breton make the same assertion, and give their friends the same advice, hon. gentlemen have for six weeks been gibbetting these gentlemen in newspapers, placing their names upon the Order paper, postponing day by day their case, and now bringing it up at the end of the Session, when they know there can be no ample examination into the charge. Hon. gentlemen will remember that in 1874 the Government banks used coercion. They will remember the coercion exercised by the Hon. John Simpson, when $400,000 was deposited in the Bank of Ontario for electioneering purposes, and we all remember the evidence given by that lamented gentleman when he was in the witness box before a jury. He said: "I mesmerised them in batches of fifteen and sixteen, and turned a hundred that night at Glen's." I hold that was not simply Government coercion, but far worse than Government coercion, because the public money went to pay that expenditure—went to meet the loss of interest upon such deposits. Look back to the election in Muskoka in 1872. We have all heard of D. M. Card, who figures at every election, and whose name appears in every page of the Public Accounts in Ontario. That gentleman is ubiquitous and a reformer of Reformers, because, whenever he gets a chance, his hand is in the public purse. He was sent to do work in Muskoka for the Ontario Government. He took a letter from Mr. Paxton, M.P.P. for Peterboro', to Mr. Cockburn, the Grit candidate for Muskoka. I will not read the whole letter because it will take too long, but in it Mr. Paxton was told: "You will find D. M. Card a splendid man in elections." He was found a capital man in the elections, and the following year we find his name figuring in the Public Accounts of Ontario to the extent of $3,500 for colonisation roads. But there is another case I desire to refer to. The leader of the Opposition brings this charge and is supported by his friends. He poses as a purist, as a gentleman whose hands would never be soiled by an act of corruption; but I will

say, what I would say to his face if he were here, that he allows others to stain their hands while he pulls the wires and endeavors to keep his reputation clear. He does not take the responsibility of the actions of his supporters and protect them as a brave and chivalrous leader would, but sacrifices his friends for the sake of protecting himself. I go back to the entrance of the hon. gentleman into official life. We all remember the terrible Proton scandal, and I will read a telegram which was produced in evidence before a committee of the House, and which would have been produced officially, as official evidence, in the Sessional Papers of Ontario, had not the Reform Government, when they got a subservient majority in Ontario refused to print the report, and to day one cannot find in the Ontario Sessional Papers the report I have now in my possession. I am glad I have it, and will take this occasion, as hon. gentlemen opposite have brought up a discussion as to the purity of parties, to put it on record. On the 23rd December, 1871, this telegram was sent to Adam Oliver, M.P.P. fort West Durham, then M.P.P. for West Bruce:

"Where is Lewis? He is wanted in Proton at once. Can you start him to-night? Most important.

"J. K. KERR."

Mr. Kerr is brother-in-law and partner of the hon. member for West Durham. And what was Lewis wanted for?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Immense.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I challenge hon. gentlemen to deny a single point I have made. I am reading from the report of the committee, and challenge them to deny it. Hon. gentlemen will remember that that committee was moved for in the House. That committee was given, and it was then re-arranged so that the Grits could put upon it more reliable friends. But despite that, the committee reported as follows:—

"The Government of Ontario, in order to defeat A. W. Lauder, Esq., in South Grey, resorted to the unconstitutional practice of employing Government employees to canvass the electors of Proton. Mr. Lauder moved for a committee to enquire into the circumstances, but Mr. Blake thought fit to name his own committee. The committee, after hearing the evidence, unanimously report as follows:—

"'That the evidence adduced before the committee, confirms the statement made in the affidavits of John McDowell, John Abbott, William Hughes, William Robinson and James Hay, in so far as regards the interference of John W. Lewis, a Government land valuator, with the recent election in South Grey, and that the said Lewis made the statements to certain electors in the township of Proton, which are set forth in said affidavits.'"

Those affidavits stated that Lewis was a Government official, that he was sent by members of the Government, not to coerce the electors, but to advise them, that he was a valuator of the land and used his position to coerce the electors into supporting the Government candidate.

An hon. MEMBER. When did that happen?

Mr MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman is perfectly well acquainted with the facts, and I am satisfied were he standing on a public platform to-day he would defend every one of them.

Mr. McCRANEY. Give us a little of the Pacific scandal.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. This was in 1871-72.

Mr. McMULLEN. Give us a little about printing contracts.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The reason I allude to these facts is that I have to go back to the time when hon. gentlemen were in power. So seldom have they been in power and so many years have yet to come before they will be in power, that they cannot blame me if I am unable to find any other period of their official life than that referred to.

An hon. MEMBER. They are in office now.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I would advise the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to keep very quiet.

Mr. MACKINTOSH.

Mr. McMULLEN. Tell us about printing contracts.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I hope the hon. gentleman will never get anything more serious than a printing contract before he leaves the city. The report proceeds:

"That the said John W. Lewis was at the time of such interference by him, in the employ of the Government as a land valuator. That the said John W. Lewis had with him, at the time of the election in South Grey, the book which he originally used while valuing the lands in the township of Proton, and from which the books returned to the Crown Lands Department were made up. That the said Lewis was telegraphed to go to Proton by Adam Oliver, M.P.P., while he was engaged in Houghton in the discharge of his duties as a Government land valuator, and that such telegram was sent in consequence of a receipt of a telegram from J. K. Kerr, barrister, of Toronto, in reference to said Lewis going to Grey. That subsequent to the receipt by said Lewis of said telegram from said Oliver, the said J. K. Kerr and he met at the railway station at Hamilton (on the return of the said Lewis from Houghton) and subsequently during the evening of the same day, the said J. K. Kerr, in Toronto, furnished the said Lewis with $25 to assist in attempting to secure the defeat in South Grey, of A. W. Lauder, M.P.P."

An hon. MEMBER. How much?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. $25, but his regular salary went on. At that time, you could buy Grits very cheap. They were more plentiful than at present.

Mr. MILLS. They were not Grits; it was the other side he bought.

Mr. MACKINTOSH:

"That no evidence has been adduced to show that the Hon. E. Blake knew that Lewis was going to Grey, or that he had any communication whatever with him."

No evidence was aduced. Mr. Kerr, his brother-in-law, sitting in his office, evolved this out of his own imagination, got up from his chair, telegraphed to Mr. Oliver, met Lewis at the train, gave him $25—and the leader of the Government knew nothing whatever about it! But more:

"That evidence has been adduced to show that the said Lewis, on the night before he proceeded to South Grey, had a personal interview at the American Hotel, in Toronto, with the Hon. Archibald McKellar, Commissioner of Public Works, and a member of the Ontario Government

"That at the time of the said interview, the said Hon. Archibald McKellar knew, or during it learned, that the said Lewis was going up to South Grey to assist in attempting to secure the election of N. Dickey, the candidate who was running in opposition to A. W. Lauder, M.P.P., and that at that time the said Hon. A. McKellar knew that the said Lewis was a Government land valuator."

Here we have it brought home by a partisan committee appointed by the hon. gentleman, then leader of the Government, the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), that Mr. McKellar, his Commissioner of Public Works, knew that Lewis was a Government land valuator, and knowingly sent him into South Grey in order to coerce the electors of that county, knowing also that he took with him copies of the Crown lands books. Yet hon. gentlemen would vote that perfectly pure and honest. There is not one—nay, perhaps there are a few who would not do it—but the majority of them would say that was angelic in its inspiration, and that my hon. friends, the members for Cape Breton, have been guilty of the blackest crime, because one of them simply wrote to a friend not to vote against the Government candidate, because he would likely be dismissed, for the reason that the patronage would belong to Mr. McDougall, one of the members for that district, if the board was changed at all. Then the report goes on:

"That, at the said interview, the said Hon. A. McKellar assured the said Lewis that the Blake Government would deal liberally with the electors in Proton, and that it was their policy to carry out with reference to the valuations in the county of Grey the same policy which they advocated while in Opposition.

"That no evidence has been produced before the committee connecting any other member of the Government with the South Grey election."

Here was a Minister of the Crown, a colleague of the hon. member for West Durham, found guilty of sending a land valuator out to coerce electors, and, with this evidence on record, hon. gentlemen opposite ask the House, and through the House the country, to believe that the

Conservative party is guilty of coercion in elections, guilty of degrading the electorate, guilty of using their power in a tyrannical manner. Why, the ballot was a protection for Mr. Roche, but the fact is he must have publicly said he was opposing the Conservative candidate, thereby coming within the rule laid down by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Dodd warned him against doing it, warned him against using his office, against using his influence with pilots, for he must have been doing that.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. No?

Mr. MILLS. He must have been asked for his vote by the other side?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Does the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) imagine that the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Dodd) followed him round and watched to see who asked him to vote? Mr. Dodd told Mr. Roche, who virtually asked him for advice afterwards, what the rule was, that the patronage belonged to the member, and that, if any changes took place he would get his dismissal, he would be removed, he would lose his office. That being so, why does the hon. gentleman try to make out that there was anything wrong with regard to my hon. friend? I shall not detain the House any longer.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has said nothing about the Weeks case yet.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I do not think, as far as that case goes, that there was any Government coercion. I have not said anything about the Weeks case, but I am reminded by the interruption of the hon. gentleman of the case of O'Brien, who went into Lennox with his dark lantern, who sat in a room, and, when the victims were brought in, turned his dark lantern on them, and, as he identified his men, the cash of the Reform party of Toronto was paid over for votes. That was proved in court, and yet the hon. gentleman asks what about the Weeks case? The hon. gentleman should remember that there are cases after cases in which they have been guilty of these offences, and at every period of their offence, whenever a great corruptionist is identified, he is either a relative of or a Reformer who holds a public position from the Reform party. Who are their champions to-day? Who are the frontispieces of the Reform party to-day? The very men whom the courts of law have condemned for corruption, and yet my honorable friend from Bothwell falls back on the Weeks case. I could mention case after case. There was the case in Toronto where the law clerk was sent away because he was afraid of an investigation. When the hon. gentleman talks about Weeks, I ask him to stamp O'Brien on his escutcheon, Jimmy O'Brien as they call him there, who is sitting in the library, doing nothing, drawing his salary, and is used by the Government of Ontario for elections, making promises of office to the people of Lennox, giving them money, violating all the rules of Parliament and every law of the land. Hon. gentlemen opposite would defend that, and to-day because my hon. friend from Cape Breton cautions a man against being too active in an election and voting against the Government candidate, because he does what all hon. gentlemen opposite have been guilty of, a quarter of what they have been guilty of, he is to be condemned and consigned to oblivion. Their record is too well known, and I have placed these cases on record in order to get them in the concrete. They will go to every part of the Dominion, and the people will see, as they always do when we discuss public affairs, that the Conservative party is at all times prepared to defend itself and to give fair play to all men, and I do not hesitate to say the country will consider that, in holding my hon. friends up to public execration for six weeks past, a great wrong has been done. They have not committed the wrong, but wrong has been done to them. If they had committed a crime, they should have been indicted immediately on the meeting of the House, but hon. gentlemen opposite kept the papers in their hands; they said they had been corresponding with Mr. Roche, they said that the evidence was damaging against those hon. members, and yet—knowing had they violated their positions as members of Parliament, they should be tried and forthwith suffer the penalties of their offence—they kept the documents back, they kept the charge hanging over them, they sent the papers over the country condemning them, and now the House is about to prorogue, they indict these gentlemen and endeavor to injure them. I do not think they will injure them. I think the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in explaining this case, will be satisfactory to all men, and I trust, so far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, they will take all these cases that have come before the House this Session and seriously consider the consequences. What have they produced? They have produced only acrimony, ill-feeling and misunderstanding. The member for South Grey laughs. I dare say he would laugh if his nearest friends were suffering, but let hon. gentlemen remember not only those who are present but the hearts at home they are lacerating. Let them think of the mothers at home and the children at home who are shocked by the charges preferred, who are pained by the ruthless attacks made upon those they have loved and respected. When they can do that, they will be fit and worthy members of Parliament; and I feel when such a marvellous change takes place the result will be that they will no longer remain with their present party. I will not trouble the House longer. I seldom occupy the time of Parliament at any great length, but think it right to place this statement on the official records of the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Tell us more about Proton.

Mr. ORTON. I desire to move an amendment to the motion before the House. It is this:

That all the words after the word "that" to the end of the question be left out and the following be inserted instead thereof:—

The Order for the second reading of Bill (No. 104) to amend the Canada Temperance Act of 1876, be now read.

Mr. Speaker, in moving this amendment——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. ORTON. I think I am perfectly in order. The course I have taken may appear an extraordinary one, but the importance of the question, which must be admitted by all in this House, is a sufficient excuse for my course. The Session is now drawing to a close, and the questions involved in the various amendments to the Canada Temperance Act are of the greatest importance to a large class of people. Numerous representations have been made to this House from large portions of our people in reference to this important question. Some have prayed that amendments be made to the Canada Temperance Act to make it more effective, and this is a very important phase of the question. It has been shown by many representations to this House that so far the Act has been utterly inoperative. We have had memorials, not only from a large number of electors in this country, but from municipalities where the Act has been tried, and it is found by these memorials that the Act has not been as useful as its advocates hoped it would be. We are all thoroughly alive to the importance of doing away with the evil of intemperance, and if amendments can be made to this Act that will make it more effective in that direction, I think they should receive the consideration of this House, and that even at this late period of the Session

this question should be taken up. I will read t you one of the reasons why I have introduced a measure for the amendment of the Canada Temperance Act. It is a resolution of the town council of Orangeville in my own county, one of the largest towns in that district. They have had the Act in operation for one year. The electors of the town of Orangeville voted for the Canada Temperance Act by a large majority, about two to one, and after the experience of one year their representatives in the town council passed the following resolution :—

"Whereas the Scott Act has been in force here from the 1st of May last without furthering the cause of temperance or morality, and at the same time a large monetary loss to the town.

"That we believe an Act of Parliament cannot be properly enforced where a large number of the people are opposed to its working, and only tends to educate the people to be law-breakers rather than good citizens;

"That we believe the only successful course for temperance people to pursue is moral suasion, and that a well regulated License Act is far superior as a temperance measure to any Act of total prohibition. Therefore be it resolved :—

"That a wise course for the Federal Parliament to pursue at the present Session would be to amend the Scott Act by allowing the issue of a wine and beer license and that the clerk be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to Dr. Orton to present to the Government."

That was one reason why I introduce the present measure. I will also read what the town council of Milton stated in reference to this subject. That council sent the following petition to this Parliament :—

"To the Honorable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled.

"The petition of the undersigned council of the town of Milton humbly showeth :—

"That whereas the town of Milton and the county of Halton are under the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, commonly known as the Scott Act.

"And whereas as the welfare of the town of Milton demands that the representatives of the people shall exercice their thoughtful and serious convictions of the value of the aforesaid law, it is hereby

"Resolved—That it is the opinion of this council that, after a trial of the Scott Act extending over a period of four years, and based upon the very strongest evidence and our own observation daily, notwithstanding the lost of revenue consequent upon this law being in force, the results are that the town has been seriously injured; the drunkenness has increased instead of diminished; that the drinking of intoxicating liquor has not been confined to those who, before the Act came into force, were considered habitual drunkards, but has made fearful havoc among our young men, who have been inticed into shebeens, as well as plied with liquor on the streets; that these shebeens have been the cause of serious immorality in our midst, and that, owing to these undoubted facts, which may be verified by anyone desirous of so doing, it is almost impossible for the local authorities to maintain that condition of law and order which is desirable, and which was the wonted condition of our town before the advent of the Scott Act. Therefore this Council prays your honorable body to remove the cause of so serious a scandal from our midst :—

"1st. By repealing the Canada Temperance Act of 1878.

"2nd. Or granting the right to bring on a repeal vote on a petition signed by one-third of the electors in any constituency in which it is in force.

3rd. Or amending the said Act so as to permit the sale of ale, beer, and light wines, and your petitioners will ever pray."

Now, Sir, I might read any number of memorials of the same character. I have one in my hand from the municipality of Alliston, another from the municipality of Seaforth. I will just read the one from the municipality of Alliston :

"The memorial of the council of the corporation of Alliston, in the county of Simcoe, respectfully showeth :—

"The municipality of Alliston and the county of Simcoe are under the operation of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, known as the Scott Act, from which much revenue is lost, both in the municipality and the remaining municipal corporations in the said county of Simcoe;

"That against the falling off of receipts, there is no corresponding gain, nor as a matter of fact, any gain whatever.

"On the contrary close observation and undoubted testimony establish the fact that the operation of the Scott Act in this village is a great blow to morals,—that drunkenness has increased, that the sale of intoxicants is not confined to a limited number as heretofore having largely gone into the hands of the lawless who have opened up disreputable shebeens in which outlaws are sheltered despite the prohibitive character of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878.

"That in view of the upper failure of this measure to reach the end it professes to aim at, it is well-nigh impossible for the local authorities to maintain that desirable condition of law and order which was the wonted state of affairs in Alliston previous to the inauguration of the Scott Act.

"Wherefore the council of the corporation of the village of Alliston humbly and respectfully pray that Your Excellency will remove the cause of the many troubles the Scott Act has caused by having the said Act repealed, or by amending it so as to legalise the sale of ale, beer and light wine in counties where the Canada Temperance Act is inforce."

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the amendment that I have brought before this House, it is for the purpose of amending the Scott Act so as to allow the sale of beer and light wines of a certain strength, wines of a certain per-cent. of alcoholic strength, and beer of a strength of 7 per cent. I wish to state this in order that the House may be possessed of the intentions and character of the amendment. In the second part of the Bill, I propose that in counties where the Act has been in operation, and is in operation now or is about to be put in operation, it shall not come into force in those counties, but after the lapse of one year the electors of such county or city, or such electoral district, may, upon petition of one-fourth of the electors qualified to vote, obtain a new election in order that the people may decide whether they will allow beer and light wines to be exempted from the operation of Canada Temperance Act. In reference to the probable effect of this amendment, I desire to state, in the first place, that by such an amendment of the Scott Act, the temperance party would obtain a large accession to their strength, a large accession of people to assist them in carrying the law into effect; and even the people engaged in the trade would assist them in carrying it out. It would be in their interest to do so. There is not an hotelkeeper, but it would be in his own interest to abstain from selling ardent spirits, because it is more profitable to sell beer and light wines; and also because a provision could be made, under the licenses granted them, that bonds should be given to a very large amount, which would no doubt be carried out by the local authorities, so that in the event of an infringement of the law, the parties would loose their licenses and would have to pay a heavy sum by way of forfeitures. So, everything goes to indicate that permission to sell beer and light wines would do great and permanent good to the cause of temperance. If, after that Act had been in force for a certain length of time, it was bound to be inoperative, then the only other course open would be total prohibition. That gives the only proper mode by which this evil can be done away with—to prevent the manufacture and importation of spirits of all kinds. I have always maintained that in my opinion that is the only course likely to succeed, and if that was done, the honest and proper way would be to compensate those who have invested largely in the manufacture of ales and beer and alcoholic beverages. What is the character of the present law? It prevents the sale of wine and beer in those districts where the Act is passed. On this point I may refer to a judgment recently given in the State of Kansas. A brewer brought an action in regard to this very question and the decision given by the judge was that the State had no right whatever to prohibit the manufacture and sale of an article of that kind or to prohibit the business without awarding some compensation; and the judge gave very many strong and able arguments in support of his decision, which, were it not so late an hour, I would read to the House. I call the attention of the House to that fact. It is a question whether the Canada Temperance Act in its present shape is constitutional, and can be at all carried out. I therefore say that the only possible way to cure this evil is to have a prohibitory liquor law, and the only honest way to carry that out is to give a fair compensation to those who have been carrying on the business in accordance with the law. I ask the House to go into the consideration of the amendments to the Canada Temperance Act. Before doing so I had hoped that the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) who has introduced a motion also amending the Canada Temperance Act with the object of making it more effectual, would have had his Bill brought forward. I do not desire to override that Act, but I wish to

have these amendments introduced, and I believe they will be effectual amendments, and such as will commend themselves to the country at large.

Mr. ALLISON. Notwithstanding the amendment of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Orton) it appears to me that in justice to the hon. members for Cape Breton (Mr. Dodd and Mr. McDougall) this question should be first settled, and while I do not desire to weary the House with a lengthy speech I desire to offer a few remarks in reply to the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) and also corroborate some of the remarks of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) with respect to dismissals in Nova Scotia by the Government presided over by the hon. member for East York. I take this opportunity of saying that in the county which I represent not a single dismissal was made by the Government of the present Premier from 1867 down to 1873, and that during the *régime* of the Mackenzie Administration in three Departments, which I distinctly recollect—the Department of Railways and Canals, the Department of Marine and Fisheries and particularly the Post Office, a number of dismissals were made solely for political reasons. In some instances, particularly with respect to the Post Office Department, those who were dismissed were among the young men of the county and among those against whom no charge was made or could be made of malfeasance in office. They were dismissed on political grounds and to make room for violent political partisans of the Reform party. It will be remembered that shortly after the advent of that party to power it was announced by its leader that he would "elevate the standard of political morality and conduct public business on principles which honest men could approve and by practices which could bear the light of day." And it remained for that party to commence the dismissal of officials for political reasons. Those gentlemen had come into power with an immense majority at their back, with a splendid arena in which to exhibit the scrupulous and manly virtues they professed, with a commanding position on which to "elevate the standard of public moralty," and with none to oppose but a party that was so routed that it could not rally, and so trampled on that it could not rise for twenty years; a party which they pronounced not only injudicious but infatuated in retaining as its leader a general who, it was their boast, was so wounded that he would never be able to recover. After five years of such exceptionally favorable opportunity and trial they at length came before the tribunal of the people of Canada, in whose intelligence and impartial justice as their judges they had expressed the utmost confidence, day after day, down to the very hour of trial, and what was the result? The result, as you know well, was that the very party which these gentlemen only five short years before pronounced to be routed, shattered and demoralised, with the selfsame leader at its front, came into possession of the field. And at the next meeting of Parliament, the very man on whose political neck it was their boast they had their triumphant heel for the term of his natural life; the very man as to whom they confidently and contemptuously boasted that he would never again occupy the exalted position of the premiership, again walked into this Commons House, by the will of the people, as Premier of Canada, with two-thirds of the members of this august body at his back. And when he returned to power what was his conduct with regard to political dismissals? I recollect very well, and if the hon. member for Halifax, the Deputy Speaker of this House, is present he will recollect very well, a meeting which the supporters of the Government, elected in 1878 from Nova Scotia, held, when they went to the Premier, not for the purpose of obtaining the dismissal of political opponents, but for the purpose of obtaining the reinstatement of those who had been dismissed, wholly and solely on political grounds. The supporters of the Government from Nova Scotia met to demand, or to request, as I believed then, and as I believe still, justly to request, the reinstatement of those whose dismissal was solely due to political consideration. What was the reply which the Premier of the Government gave? It was as nearly as I can recollect in these words: "I am exceedingly sorry if any of our own friends have been unfairly treated or unjustly dismissed, but so opposed am I to the principle of political dismissals that I would rather, if possible, provide for such of our friends as had been treated in that manner in some other way, and allow those who have been appointed to those places remain where they are, and for this reason:—those men who have been called by the Reform party to those positions may have been called in good faith, they may have given up other positions for that purpose, and I am not willing, hard as it may appear to you, to disturb them; it is the fault of the other party, and not ours." And, as the members for Nova Scotia know, the right hon. the Premier positively refused us that which we considered but justice. Coming here as new members we asked it in all good faith, and I repeat the statement that a number of dismissals were made in my own county solely on political grounds, and in the persons of men against whom no possible charge was made or could have been made. Now I do not wish to detain the House, but have given a few plain statements of facts, to which I invite attention and to which I challenge contradiction, and I leave the members of this House and the people of this country, irrespective of party, to draw their own inferences therefrom.

Mr. BERGIN. I move in amendment to the amendment that all the words after that be struck out and the following inserted:—

Resume the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Taylor for Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution declaring it expedient to bring in a Bill to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, butterine and other substitutes for butter.

I propose to give you something more substantial than beer and wine. I propose to give you something solid, and before proceeding with the discussion of the dead dogs and the glandered horses, let me say that I regret that the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) did not move the Bill of the hon. gentleman for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), so that we might have had an opportunity of discussing fairly and squarely the temperance question. I am one of those who believe that the Canada Temperance Act ought to have a fair trial in the counties in which it has been adopted by the people. And I think, Sir, that we are not in a position to pronounce either for or against the success of that Act until it has been provided with the necessary machinery for its enforcement. But as the hon. gentleman has not chosen to do that, but to make another motion, I have thought it well to take the opportunity of supplementing to-night the remarks which I made when the motion of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue was before the House some time since. You will remember that on that occasion I showed the material of which oleomargarine is made and the process of manufacture; but I did not on that occasion explain to the House the manner in which the refuse was disposed of, and I think that, perhaps, I had better do that now. I do not know that many gentlemen in this House understand how hogs are manufactured in certain portions of the United States. When explaining the other night how glandered horses and choleraic hogs and animals dying of pleuro-pneumonia were converted into oleomargarine, I mentioned that the offal went to the bottom of the vats, and that it was then taken away, but the places to which it was taken I omitted to mention. It is taken to the piggeries attached to the factories, or sold to the pork-packers and butchers in the cities in which this oleomargarine is manufactured, and

there converted into pork. The hogs that, during the process of consuming this refuse, die, are again returned to the oleomargarine factory and once more converted into oleomargarine. Those that do not die are sold to the butchers and taken to the slaughter houses, and visitors from Canada and other portions of the civilised world are treated to the pork so manufactured, and upon their bread they take a little of the oleomargarine that was manufactured from them before they were converted for the first time into pork. This is no fancy picture, but it is the truth and from actual observation. No more gigantic fraud has ever been perpetrated on the people of this country than the manufacture of this stuff, but is it confined entirely to the so-called factories of oleomargarine and butterine? Many of the finest soap factories in the country, and many of the well-puffed oil refineries of the country are nothing more nor less than oleomargarine manufactories. In fact, Sir, it is not quite a settled question yet, whether or not the first stage after the separation of the fat in the production of oleomargarine is not the production of soap. In fact oleomargarine is nothing but a highly purified kind of soap, and, as you perfume it, or do not perfume it, you have oleomargarine or scented soap. This compound of pork, as I told you, of diseased animals, is also made from the various fats that are picked from kitchens and gutters and the vilest purlieus of the different cities, and it is sold in almost every town in Canada as butter. Why, Sir, it is not over a fortnight since, in conversation with a lady from Montreal, when she was boasting of the delicious butter they got there, manufactured by the Messrs. Jones, of Brockville, and for which she paid only 45 cents, that I discovered she was feasting upon oleomargarine. The Messrs. Jones sell all their butter in New York at $. per pound, and this lady fancied she was buying it in Montreal at 45 cents a pound. I discovered that it was the same article which was sold as gilt-edged Eastern Townships butter in the markets of Montreal, whereas it is oleomargarine, manufactured at Hunter's Point, New York. This is the sort of stuff that it is proposed we shall license the manufacture of in this country, that we are asked to substitute for the product of the cow fed upon the rich natural grasses of the country - the product of the labor of the wives and daughters of our farmers; and we know how the wives and daughters of our farmers work to make good butter, in order that they may support themselves and their families. If this material is allowed to be manufactured and sold in Canada, there is an end to our dairy business; it will be no longer profitable for the wives and daughters of our farmers to manufacture butter. The material of which it is made does not cost more than a cent a pound; the manufacture does not cost much more than a couple of cents in addition; and by the time it is put in packages and offered for sale as pure butter, it does not cost much more than 4 cents a pound. And, Sir, when I tell you that it can be made so closely to resemble the genuine article as to render it difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish the genuine from the fraudulent, you will see how necessary it is that the strictest precautions should be taken to throw safeguards around the manufacture of butter in this country. Perhaps it may not be out of place to read to the House an extract from the *Globe* of Thursday last. It is not often that anyone who desires that any weight should be attached to what he says will quote from the *Globe;* but I propose to quote from it to-night in support of my argument, and not alone because of that, but because it gives, as a reason for its advice, a reason which does away with all the arguments hon. gentlemen opposite have used in favor of free trade—in fact, gives away their whole case, and shows that protection, and protection alone, is the true remedy for the troubles of the farmers of this country. The *Globe*, with an impudence most astonishing, in the face of the fact that a member of the Opposition from one of the western counties had the audacity to stand up in this House and advocate the use of this vile material, which he said he fed to his men without their knowing what it was—the *Globe*, with equal audacity, claims, forsooth, that the Reformers of this House are the men to whom the farmers of Canada are indebted for the prohibition of the manufacture of oleomargarine in this country. Then it says:

"The consumers of butter also will be saved from the danger of using as butter a compound of the most villainous character, which is often poisonous."

This is true, and it is not often we read anything true in the *Globe*.—

"But something more is necessary to make the protection to health and industry complete. Some kinds of oleomargarine resemble butter so closely in appearance, taste and smell, that its true character can only be ascertained by careful scientific test. We do not import butter, nor do we want to import any. A prohibitory duty on butter or any article entered as butter, added to the prohibition of oleomargarine or other imitations of butter, would certainly exclude the noxious article. In default of this prohibition of the import of butter, oleomargarine will certainly be brought in."

Now, what is the difference between a prohibitory duty and prohibition? A difference but of degree. Here the whole case is given away. The *Globe* frankly, but perhaps not knowingly, tells the farmers of this country that protection is necessary for them, otherwise their dairy industry will be destroyed. How can the farmer compete with the product of these dead and rotten animals? The produce of the cows will soon entirely be displaced, and milk that ought to be made into butter and cheese will be driven from the market. True butter is driven out of the market by thousands of tons of this oleomargarine which is imported to take its place, at a loss of tens of thousands, I might say hundreds of thousands of dollars to the farmers of the country. The reports of the agricultural boards in England show that the yearly loss to the English farmers amounts to many millions of pounds sterling. In this connection it is well to take a passing glance at the value of our dairy products in this country. It is well to do this in the face of the large quantity of the imitations of butter which is being imported. I have not been able to procure satisfactory statistics as to the full number of cows in Canada; but I am able to give the statistics relating to twenty-three counties in Ontario, which are fairly average counties and from which we can see the terrible loss which is being inflicted on the people of this country by the manufacture of this article. In 1884 there were 710,511 cows in Ontario. The produce of butter from them per cow for the season was $30.34, and the daily average 18 cents and a fraction. The amount of butter made was 32,844,269 lbs., which was sold at an average of 21 $\frac{62}{100}$ cents per lb. Now, to show how this article was injuring the butter trade, let me quote the quantity of butter that was made in twenty-three counties in Ontario in 1883 as compared with 1884. In 1883, there were made in these counties 243,902 lbs. of butter, and in 1884 only 147,924 lbs., or a falling off of 95,978 lbs. If you multiply that number by nine, which would be nearly the proportion for the whole Dominion, you will find that the falling off was something over 1,000,000 lbs. of butter in one year in the product of the country. Now, Sir, what was done with the milk which under other circumstances would have been used? The farmers resorted to making cheese, the result of which was a large increase in the quantity of cheese and a decrease in the quantity of butter. The market in consequence became, not only here but abroad, flooded with cheese, because in the United States the same effect followed the manufacture of butterine and oleomargarine as follow its importation here. They were unable to make butter and sell it at a profit, and were obliged to make cheese, which we have been doing since 1883. Owing to the over supply, prices fell, and at one time this year cheese was almost unsaleable. In 1883 the value of

butter was $51,817 according to the returns of the Bureau of Agriculture. In 1884 its value was $32,087, showing a total falling off, in the 23 counties to which I refer, of $19,729 in butter alone. In 1883, the value of butter per cow was $17.21; in 1884 it had decreased to $13.71, showing a loss of $3.50 per cow. Multiply the number of cows 710,519 by $3.50, and you will find that the loss on this account was $2,486,730 on butter alone. The report of the Ontario Bureau of Agriculture concludes thus:

"If the returns establish anything, it is that a larger return is received from creameries which make butter and cheese than from creameries which make butter alone.

In 1883 the manufacture of cheese amounted to 134,446 lbs., and in 1884, to 259,688; or in place of the butter made in 1883 we made in 1884, 155,242 lbs. of cheese, and a consequent diminution of butter. The increase in the value of cheese in 1884, was $9,000 over its value of $11,218 in 1883, which entailed, of course, a corresponding falling off in the value of butter. No one can view these statements without alrarm. They confirm the statement I made that if importations be permitted, we will soon destroy our dairy interests, as it can be manufactured at about 4 cents a lb. If it were manufactured out of good healthy fat, as it could be, one would almost be inclined to admit that at certain times, during periods of depression, it would be well to have such a substitute, but we cannot trifle with the danger; we cannot permit it to be manufactured, because experience has shown that the manufacturers will not use healthy material. They use nothing but diseased animals and the very filthiest material, besides chemicals which are of poisonous nature, and there can be no doubt whatever that many diseases are the result of the consumption of oleomargarine. Therefore, we ask the Government, and, in fact, the Government has promised to do so, to prohibit the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine, and if we have to-night resumed the discussion on this subject, it is that we may impress more forcibly on the Government, not only the mode by which, but the material of which this stuff is made. We wish to impress upon the House the injury which will result from its manufacture, and the injury goes even further, because we have presented to us as food, pork, the refuse from the manufacture of this oleomargarine, and we have, besides, the terrible loss inflicted on the dairy interests of the country. For these reasons, I feel it is in the interest of the farmers that the attention of the Government should be directed to a trade which can have but most pernicious results, and I trust the Government will prevent the manufacture of this article, not only by prohibiting the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine, but also by establishing such a rigid inspection of soap factories and oil refineries, that it cannot in any shape or form, or under any pretence, be offered for sale.

Mr. JAMIESON. I have a good deal to say on this complex question. I fear I shall not be able to get through to-night, but I do not intend to make all my remarks at present, because we will likely go into committee, where I will have an opportunity of discussing it more at length. It is an old adage, that it is generally the unexpected that happens, and I think that adage has been verified to-night. When the question before the House was presented, I had no idea the hon. member for Wellington would complicate it by making the amendment he has made. It was certainly a pretty sharp curve, but when the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bergin) brought on his amendment, and drew on this triangular fight, it was still more unexpected to me. I am heartily glad my Bill amending the Canada Temperance Act is not mixed up with oleomargarine and butterine, being the product of rotten dogs and horses, and with the poor man's wine and beer, the product of log wood and bluestone, and some other substance, of which I am not aware, but of which, I have no doubt, the hon. member for Centre Wellington could give a very honest definition if time permitted. It seems to me this unrestricted manufacture of oleomargarine is going to be a great calamity to the notorious Mathew Roche. What will history say when this celebrated gentleman goes down to oblivion, submerged by oleomargarine, butterine, wine and beer? I cannot answer that question, but will leave it to the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) when we get into Committee of the Whole. I suppose he has already spoken on this question, and cannot make his speech over again. The hon. member, perhaps, should he have an opportunity of replying to me, will say that I set the example last year, when I took a similar step to that which he has taken to-night for the purpose of furthering a Bill which I then had in charge. I made an explanation on that occasion which I think was satisfactory to the House. At all events, the House were convinced, and I took it for granted they were satisfied with the explanation I had made. It will be within the recollection of the House, perhaps, or of those who were present on that occasion, that the reason which I gave for setting aside the rules of procedure was this, that after the Dominion Alliance had held their meeting here in the city of Ottawa, the legislative committee of that alliance were requested to press for what they considered necessary legislation for the purpose of perfecting the Canada Temperance Act. It was after the commencement of the Session when the Dominion Alliance met, and it necessarily took some time to draft a bill such as the Bill we submitted to the House on that occasion. After that Bill was drafted, it was one of the instructions of the alliance that the Government should be asked to take charge of it in the interests of the Temperance legislation known as the Canada Temperance Act, and, after the committee were called together, they waited upon the Government and placed the draft of that Bill in the hands of the Government. I do not pretend to say that the present Government are less expeditious in their movements than any other Government. I think in that respect they are just about as good, if not a good deal better than most of the Governments the country has had. However, I suppose owing to the vast importance, the length and depth and breadth of the question, it took them a long time to arrive at a conclusion whether they would take charge of the measure or not. It seemed to be conceded at the outset that, seeing that the Canada Temperance Act was in the first instance a Government measure, introduced in the Senate and passed by this House and placed upon the Statute-book of the Dominion, in consequence of that it was the duty of the Government to provide proper machinery for its enforcement. I believe it was two or three weeks before we got an answer from the Government, and that answer was in the negative. After we got an answer from the Government on the question, we again had to call together the legislative committee of the Dominion Alliance in order to take counsel together as to what course we would pursue in reference to the measure. It was then decided that we would introduce that measure at once into the House, and I had the honor of being selected by that committee for the purpose of taking charge of it. When I introduced the measure, I explained these circumstances to the House, and gave that as a reason why we were so late in the Session in bringing it in, and, when I moved to place that measure higher up on the motion paper, or at least to give it precedence over other measures on the Order paper, I gave that as the reason why I thought it advisable to disturb or set aside the ordinary procedure of the House. No such reason has been given by the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) for pursuing the extraordinary course he has pursued on the present occasion. I have charge of a measure which is now on the Order paper, and which, in my

judgment, is a measure much more worthy of receiving the prompt consideration of this House than that which has been introduced by the hon. member for Centre Wellington. But I was rather late in introducing that measure. I had, and have not yet lost, hope that I may be able to reach it this Session. I confess that the discussion of this multifarious question is likely to interfere to some extent with the consideration of my Bill, but that cannot be helped. I trust that the Canada Temperance Act will be worked, imperfect as it may be, if we are not able to secure the passage of the amending measure which I have had the honor of introducing into this House. I make these remarks for the purpose of informing the House why I did not on this occasion pursue the same course which I pursued last Session. I thought from the temper of the House on that occasion, it would not be a wise thing to repeat the course of procedure which I pursued last Session. If it had not been for that fact, I would have been only too anxious to ask the House, as my hon. friend from Centre Wellington has asked the House, to give preference to my measure. I do not know anything, or at least very much, about oleomargarine or butterine, and I know just about as little about wine or beer. I am glad to say we have the Scott Act in my county and we have not much wine or beer now, and I never saw oleomargarine or butterine in my life. My constituents do not deal in these spurious articles. I am much surprised at the nature of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Centre Wellington. I do not wish to take up the time of the House unnecessarily, but, as this is a very important question and this is a very indulgent House, I have no doubt it will indulge me while I make a few explanatory remarks in reference to the condition of the Scott Act in this country, and, after I succeed in doing that, I shall possibly deal in a very succinct way with the Bill of the hon. member for Centre Wellington.

Mr. IRVINE. What is the attitude of the Government towards the Canada Temperance Act?

Mr. JAMIESON. If I have time, I shall be most happy to deal with that question, but now it has got so complicated, I think I will leave it in the hands of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Irvine), and I have no doubt he will ably deal with that phase of the question. Seeing he is in opposition, it will be more in keeping with his position to do so than for me, seeing that I am a loyal supporter of the Government. The hon. member for Centre Wellington has thought proper to disturb the Canada Temperance Act. I think he is taking upon himself a work which he will regret I believe the hon. member for Centre Wellington has the Canada Temperance Act in force in his own county. I understand that, in addition to that, he has some five or six breweries in his county. I do not know, I would not insinuate that the hon. member has anything to do with breweries. I believe he is a medical man. Unless it may be in the way of chemical analysis, or something of that kind, of the compounds used in the production of beer, I do not suppose he would attempt for a moment to have any other interest in it or contact with it. And, Sir, the Canada Temperance Act has been submitted to a very large number of counties and cities in this Dominion. It may be new to some that the Act is now in force in sixty-six counties and cities, where it has been brought into operation by the votes of the respectable electors of those several counties and cities. By the provisions of that Act, once it is adopted, it must continue in force for a period of three years. Now, Sir, I lay it down as a fair proposition, and I defy the hon. member for Centre Wellington to controvert my proposition, that when once the people of any county or city have by their votes solemnly approved of this law, this Parliament has no right, no moral right, at all events, to deprive them of the advantages which they have secured for themselves by the adoption of this Act. But what does the hon. member for Centre Wellington attempt to do by this measure? Why, Sir, he asks this House to deprive the people of those counties of their just rights under the Canada Temperance Act. I think it would be a most unfortunate thing, and one which the people would resent, whether Conservatives or Reformers, if this House were to sanction any such measure as that proposed by the hon. member. He proposes by his Bill that in every county and city which has adopted the Canada Temperance Act, a repeal vote may be brought on immediately after the Governor General gives his sanction to this measure, should it pass this House, But, Sir, I have no apprehensions whatever; I am not at all afraid that this measure will ever pass this House. I believe that on both sides of this House we have men of principle, men of character, who will not be parties to any measure which would deprive the people of this country of their just rights upon this question. Why, Sir, it is the most extraordinary proposition I ever heard in my life. It is monstrous that after the people of this country have passed upon a measure by such great majorities, their rights should be taken from them at the instance of the hon. member for Centre Wellington. After 124,212 electors of this Dominion have pronounced in favor of the Canada Temperance Act, the hon. member comes here and pulls out of his pocket a resolution, or a petition, or something of that kind, from some obscure town or village in his county, and he says: The people of this Dominion are tired of this Canada Temperance Act. In face of the figures that I have quoted I say that it is preposterous to introduce such a Bill, because some obscure town or village in western Ontario, perhaps by a narrow vote in the council, asks this Parliament to repeal this Act—for that is practically what the hon. gentleman asks us to do. Sir, if the alternative were placed before me at this moment, whether I would accept a repeal of the Canada Temperance Act or accept the Bill of the hon. gentleman, I would not hesitate a single moment, I would say: Repeal the Act at once, do not trifle with it, do not make a mockery of it. If the Act is not working as it should do, if it is not fulfilling the expectations of those who promoted it, and those who adopted it in the several counties, then, in the name of all that is just, when the proper time comes for the people to pronounce upon its efficiency or deficiency, let them do it in the same way in which they ratified it. Repeal it, but do not attempt to mar it, don't attempt to destroy it, and then turn round and say to the people that the Act has been a failure. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman professes to believe that this measure is in the interest of temperance, that it is for the purpose of promoting sobriety and ultimately promoting prohibition in this country. Sir, I am astonished that any hon. member possessing sufficient intelligence and ability to find his way into the Parliament of this country, should advance such an argument as that. I contend that it is the duty of both the great parties represented in this Parliament to give to those who are promoting the Canada Temperance Act such machinery as will enable them fairly to test this question. I tell you, Sir, that there is a sentiment in this country that will not quickly subside upon this question; I tell you, Sir, that the people of this country, from one end to the other, have been aroused upon this question, and will not submit to be trifled with. Let this Parliament, for a single instant, entertain the principle embodied in the measure of my hon. friend from Centre Wellington, and I say that when they go back and surrender to the electors of their constituencies the trust they have reposed in them, they will find that that trust will not be again reposed in them, because I believe that it will be the opinion of the electors of this country that the men who have, by their votes in this House, impaired the Canada Temperance Act,

have been recreant to the trust imposed in them. Now, Sir, there is the wine and beer question. I have no faith in wine and beer. I lost faith in them long ago, because I never had any. There was in England a Reformer once, I suppose somewhat of the character of the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton). The drinking of gin and ardent spirits was the general habit among the enlightened people of our mother land, and the great politicians of that day suddenly awakened to the fact that some remedy might be provided by which the people would be weaned from the use of ardent spirits and induced to use milder and more nutritious beverages. The idea suddenly occurred to them that the use of ale and cider would be a very fine and proper substitute for ardent spirits, and in 1830 on that line an Act was passed to permit the general sale of beer and cider by retail in England. By that Act any householder could, on giving bonds and sureties and paying a guinea, obtain a license to sell beer and cider. The Act was passed almost unanimously I believe by the House. Everybody took a fancy to it and thought it a very good measure. However, it turned out that they were very much mistaken. The Duke of Wellington was one of the able champions of that measure; Lord Brougham also supported it; and the Duke thought the carrying of that measure was about as great a triumph as his victory over Napoleon at the battle of Waterloo. But let us get at the sequel. The Rev. Sydney Smith depicted the effects of that measure. I read:

"The Rev. Sydney Smith, who had expected and predicted great and beneficent results, wrote only two weeks after the Act took effect: 'The new Beer Bill has begun its operations. Everybody is drunk. Those who are not singing are sprawling. The sovereign people are in a beastly condition. The demoralisation was so general and continuous, that the Duke of Wellington and Lord Brougham confessed to a change of opinion before a year had elapsed.'"

Such was the result in the mother land of a measure similar to that introduced by the hon. member for Centre Wellington, and I have no doubt that in the Dominion of Canada the result would be almost similar. I am entirely opposed to the measure introduced by the hon. member for Centre Wellington. I believe if a man drinks at all, it should be on the *multum in parvo* system. I do not think that the use of beer would be beneficial to any class of the people. A medical man with whom I was conversing the other day, a very high authority, denounced the use of beer in the strongest terms. "Why," said he, "beer is the very worst drink a man can take; it makes him stupid and stolid, and takes all the life out of him. If a man drinks at all he should drink something exhilarating and stimulating, and not something that will make him torpid and stupid." I believe that will be the effect if this measure introduced by the hon. gentleman should become law. Let me illustrate. He said the difference between a man who drinks beer and a man who drinks ardent spirits was about the difference between a bug and a flea; one was sleepy and stupid and the other was lively and active. I give that as an illustration, though it is not quite in keeping with the subject; it would be more in keeping with the oleomargarine and butterine question than with the wine and beer question. However as this is a complex question I trust some liberty will be allowed. Indeed, the House has been very indulgent, but I do not desire to trespass upon the time of other hon. members who are skilled in the discussion of questions of this kind, seeing that this is a very complicated and difficult question; and with these disjointed remarks I will allow the question now to fall into the hands of those members who are more able to deal with it than I am.

Mr. ORTON. I desire to offer a few remarks. Although oleomargarine is a most important question I had thought that it was permanently settled by the Government promising to take action on the matter, and I have heard it said outside this House that the reason why that order was kept on the paper was for an object which I would not like to state here as actuating any hon. member. It has been stated outside of the House, however, that it was kept on the Order paper for the express purpose of preventing an expression of opinion on this very important question of the Canada Temperance Act. I hope that to-night the House will express through its representatives its opinion in regard to this question, as to whether it would not be advisable in the interests of temperance to pass such an Act as I have introduced for a second reading. Notwithstanding the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I think this Act would do a very great deal of good to the cause he has at heart. I hope instead of arguing in favor of postponement he will accede to the vote being taken, and I shall be happy to assist him forward with his measure so as to make the Canada Temperance Act, what I believe it will be, a useful temperance measure.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not desire to prolong the discussion. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) was not here last Monday when this question was under discussion and therefore he moved the amendment. That as the Government intend dealing with this question and although they have not done so yet, I expect they will during this present week; and owing to the article which appeared in the *Globe* this week, I think it is all the more important that it should be dealt with promptly. I would therefore prefer having the matter remain on the Order paper as it is, and so I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentlemen having seconded the other motion, cannot move the adjournment of the debate.

Amendment of Mr. Bergin to the amendment negatived.

Amendment of Mr. Orton negatived.

House then divided on motion of Mr. Blake.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Edgar,	Lister,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	Livingston,
Auger,	Fisher,	McCraney,
Bain (Wentworth),	Forbes,	McIntyre,
Béchard,	Geoffrion,	McMullen,
Bourassa,	Gillmor,	Mills,
Burpee,	Girouard,	Mulock,
Cameron (Huron),	Glen,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Guay,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Harley,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright (Sir Richard)	Holton,	Springer,
Casey,	Innes,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Irvine,	Vail,
Charlton,	King,	Watson,
Cockburn,	Kirk,	Weldon,
Cook,	Landerkin,	Wilson,
Davies,	Langelier,	Yeo.—51.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Farrow,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McCallum,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Ferguson (Welland),	McDougald (Pictou),
Baker (Victoria),	Fortin,	McGreevy,
Barker,	Foster,	McLelan,
Bell,	Gagné,	McNeill,
Benoit,	Gandet,	Massue,
Bergeron,	Gault,	Mitchell,
Billy,	Gordon,	Moffat,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	O'Brien,
Bowell,	Guilbault,	Orton,
Bryson,	Guillett,	Pruyn,
Burns,	Hackett,	Reid,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Riopel,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hickey,	Rykert,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hilliard,	Scott,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Shakespeare,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jamieson,	Small,

Chapleau,	Jenkins,	Smyth,
Cochrane,	Kaulbach	Taylor,
Colby,	Kilvert,	Thompson,
Coughlin,	Kinney,	Tupper,
Curran,	Kranz,	Tyrwhitt,
Cuthbert,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Ward,
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desjardins,	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Dupont,	Macmaster,	White (Renfrew).—89.
Everett,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	

Motion negatived.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 12:45 a.m., (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 18th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE FRANCHISE ACT, 1885.

Mr. THOMPSON, in moving for leave to introduce Bill (No. 138) to amend the Franchise Act, 1885, said: I will explain to the House briefly what the provisions of this Bill are. The first provision is intended to dispense with the necessity existing under the present Act for the assessment rolls being procured by the revising officer in each year. That has been attended with considerable expense, although in the present year it was necessary in order to form the first list. The lists having been once formed and established by proper revision, it will be a comparatively easy matter in future years to proceed without the same information in detail which is involved in the provisions followed this year, of having the assessment lists and the rolls of electors. The second provision of the Bill of importance is to make it clear that in all parts of the Dominion, as was provided in respect of one or two of the Provinces, the revising officer need not hold the court for the revision of the list in every polling sub-division. It was provided in the Act of last year that in the Province of Nova Scotia he should sit for not less than three sub-divisions, and that provision is, by this Bill, extended to the whole Dominion, so that there shall be no sitting for revision of the lists in districts of less than three polling sub-divisions. There is also a provision that one applicant may be substituted for another in the case of an applicant desiring to object to a vote, or to have a vote put on, so the right of the voter shall not depend upon the withdrawal or perseverance of the applicant, but that, if the applicant should withdraw his application, another person may be substituted for him, and the enquiry may be continued notwithstanding the withdrawal. Some inconvenience has been found also to arise from the requirement of the existing Act, that whenever more than 200 voters appear on the list of any polling sub-division the limits of that sub-division should be changed so as to reduce the number again to 200. Departing so frequently as that would require the revising officers to do, from the established and known limits of the polling sub-divisions, is attended with some inconvenience, and seems unnecessary, because a larger number than 200 might, with propriety, be included in the polling sub-division. For the present, it is suggested that the existing polling sub-divisions shall stand, until the number of voters that shall be included in them by the various revisions that may be made from year to year shall reach 400, and then the limits of the division shall be changed, in order to reduce the number, as is provided in the Act of this year. There is also a clause intended to cheapen somewhat the printing which the Act requires, by making more simple the revising officer's list. It was found in practice that there were more columns for information in reference to voters than were absolutely required, and we propose to dispense with three of these columns, thereby considerably lessening the cost of the printing.

Mr. MILLS. What columns?

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot state from memory, but we take off four columns and add one, and make a net gain of three. The hon. gentleman will see that the other columns are ample to provide for all the information that is required. In addition to that, I have only to mention that the oaths to be put to the electors are provided in this Bill, as I stated the other day they would be.

Mr. MILLS. No change in the qualification of wage earners?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. MILLS. May I ask whether the voters' lists are to be reprinted? The hon. gentleman knows that under the law as it now stands the voters' list is made up and prepared in the first instance, and when a large number of names are added it becomes necessary, under the present law, to reprint the voters' lists in consequence of the additions and erasures, and the change of the polling division limits. That system is not interfered with?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is proposed, as regards the list this year, that it shall not be necessary to change the existing limits of the sub-divisions, I mean the provision that there shall be no more than 200 in each; and year by year the operation of this Bill will be that the revising officers, as soon as possible after the 1st of January, shall make a yearly revision of the lists and cause them to be printed and posted up, and then, after the final revision, the lists are printed and established as the voters' lists.

Mr. SCRIVER. Do I understand the Minister to say that the changes already made by the revising officers in the polling sub-divisions will continue?

Mr. THOMPSON. Those will have to be established. The lists, in so far as they are made, are confirmed by this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE QUEBEC HARBOR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House do, to-morrow, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That in addition to the sums authorised by the Acts 36 Victoria, chapter 62, and 43 Victoria, chapter 17, to be raised in the manner hereinafter mentioned, for the relief of the Quebec Harbor Commissioners and the improvement of the said harbor, it shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to raise, by the issue of debentures bearing interest, payable half yearly, at a rate not exceeding 4 per cent. per annum, a further sum of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars.
2. That the sum so raised may be advanced, from time to time, to the said commissioners, to enable them to complete their wet and tidal docks, now in course of construction in the said harbor.
3. That the repayment by the commissioners of the sum so advanced shall be provided for in the manner prescribed by the Act first above cited, as amended by the Act 46 Victoria, chapter 39, for the repayment of the sums advanced to the commissioners under it, and subject to the provisions of the said Act in that behalf.

Motion agreed to.

THE HON. J. S. C. WURTELE.

Mr. LANGELIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the Secretary of State a question. A

few weeks ago I asked if the commission of the Hon. Mr. Wurtele as a Judge of the Superior Court had been sent to him. I received a reply from the Government that the commission was being prepared, and would be sent down in a few days. Some days have elapsed, and I understand the commission has not been received. I should like to know whether the thing has been forgotten, or when the commission is to be sent?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The thing has not been forgotten. The gentleman has received an official communication of the Order in Council appointing him, and Mr. Wurtele has not yet accepted.

NORTH-WEST DISTURBANCES—CLAIMS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the absence of the Minister of Militia, perhaps the hon. Minister of Public Works will know when the report of the North-West operations and the war claims, as the Minister calls them, is to be presented. The Minister of Public Works will remember that, when passing the Militia Estimates, the Minister of Militia intimated that this information would be brought down, perhaps, early this week.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am unable to answer the question; the Minister of Militia will be in his place in a short time.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. COOK. I wish to enquire from the Government when the return respecting the estimated cost of the Trent Valley Canal will be submitted. The Chief Engineer was here some days ago, and no doubt the information has been obtained.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The report is in course of preparation and will be brought down as soon as possible.

CUSTOMS SEIZURE AT MONTREAL.

Mr. GAULT. Seeing the Minister of Customs in his place, I should like to ask if a settlement has been made with respect to the seizure that has taken place in the city of Montreal. A most important seizure took place there some time ago, and it created much excitement. It is stated that the Government had compromised the matter——

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman wishes to put a question to the Minister, he may do so, and the Minister may reply if he pleases; but the hon. gentleman must not discuss the matter.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. McLELAN moved the third reading of Bill (No. 131) further to amend the Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. WATSON. Before this motion is adopted I wish to move an amendment. I think another opportunity has been provided this House when they can ask the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to make certain modifications in their contract. The modifications which I seek to have granted are in connection with the monopoly clause. We had hoped, in Manitoba, that ere this the right to build railways to the southern boundary of the Province would have been granted, and the local charters not have been disallowed. We had reason to hope that such would be the case from the repeated representations made by members of the Government, both in the House and out of it; but such, unfortunately, has not been the case, and this is therefore a suitable opportunity to ask the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to concede the right to grant charters to railway companies to build lines in south and south-eastern portions of Manitoba. It is not necessary for me to occupy much time in order to impress the House with the importance of this subject to the Province. I need only refer to the fact that there have been some seven or eight charters applied for this year that are in conflict with the monopoly clause of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we had the report of the chairman of the Railway Committee yesterday that four different Bills were rejected on account of that particular clause, clause 15 of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. Besides, the member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) had a Bill which he saw fit to withdraw; the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Pruyn) had also a Bill which he withdrew—in all there was six different Bills. One Bill was passed and a charter granted, but with a special clause inserted. It is a Bill to grant power to build a railway in British Columbia, and because that railway will run in a different direction from what is stated in clause 15 of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, there is a provision placed in the Bill that the Canadian Pacific Railway has to consent to the construction of the work. To my mind that is a very humiliating position for this House to occupy. While the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are seeking modifications from year to year, this House has it also in its power to ask certain modifications from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and this is an opportune time to do so. When the company have squared up accounts with the Government we shall have no power to ask modifications unless we pay for them. It has been contended by Manitoba that the Province has a right to charter railways to the limits of the Province. They contend that they possess that right under the British North American Act, and that such right is granted to all the other Provinces, and Manitoba should not be made an exception to the rule. We enjoyed that right previous to the granting of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract in 1880, and prior to the assent being given by Parliament to that contract the Local Legislature protested in the most strenuous terms against the Government entering into such a contract as would prevent the building of railways in the Province. The motion was moved in the Manitoba Legislature by the present member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross). It was passed on 24th December, 1880, and reads as follows:—

"Mr. Ross moved an address to the Governor General, praying that the contract proposed with the syndicate may not be entered into, inasmuch as said terms we find unacceptable to the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, more particularly part of clause 11 and clauses 14, 15 and 16."

Clause 15 relates to disallowance, and clause 16 is another very unjust clause and it relates to exemption from taxation. That was the view expressed by the Local Legislature previous to the contract being entered into. The Government were aware that it was not acceptable to the Province of Manitoba. Although such was the feeling, the people were satisfied to a certain extent by the explanations made by the First Minister and the member for Cardwell, who is now Minister of the Interior. At that time both those hon. gentlemen stated that clause 15 did not interfere with the rights of the Province. I will read the words used by those hon. gentlemen during the debate. The First Minister, in discussing this question on January 17th, 1881, said:

"In order to give them a chance, we have provided that the Dominion Parliament—mind you, the Dominion Parliament: we cannot check any other Parliament; we cannot check Ontario, we cannot check Manitoba."

Those were the words used at that time, and the people of Manitoba thought, by such statements being made during the discussion on the Canadian Pacific Railway by the First Minister, that Manitoba would have the right to

grant charters to a railway for any route within the boundaries of the Province, without being interfered with by the Dominion. The hon. member for Cardwell, the present Minister of the Interior, in discussing the same question on January 20th, said:

"But we are told now that because of the fifteen miles there never can be any other railway into this country. To what does that apply? Simply to the territories over which the Dominion Parliament has control. There is nothing to prevent Manitoba now, if it thinks proper, granting a charter for a railway from Winnipeg to the boundary line. At this very moment there is a company in course of organisation to build a railway from Winnipeg to West Lynn, on the boundary. And after this agreement is ratified, this provision does not take away from Manitoba a single right it possesses; in fact, this Parliament could not take away those rights. It has the same rights as the other Provinces for the incorporation of railway companies within the boundary of the Province itself, and there is nothing to prevent the Province of Manitoba from chartering a railway from Winnipeg to the boundary to connect with any southern railway. The only guarantee which this company has under the contract is that their traffic shall not be tapped far west in the prairie section, thus diverting the traffic away from the line to a foreign line, but there is nothing to prevent a railway being built in Manitoba, within the Province, that would carry the traffic to any railway that may tap it from the American side."

That is the position with respect to this matter.

Mr. WOODWORTH. What page?

Mr. WATSON. Page 576, Volume 1, of the *Debates* of 1880-81. That was the position of affairs at that time, and those were the views expressed by the Minister of Interior, and since that time that hon. gentleman has apparently held the same views, because I find that the impression he left upon the minds of the people, when he made this visit to the North-West, according to the reports of his travels, was that he still held the same views to which he had given expression in 1881. I find in the Winnipeg *Commercial*, in a review of the year's work by the Board of Trade of that city, a paragraph which shows that that was the impression left upon the minds of that board, by the remarks he made during his visit there last summer. It states:

"During the past summer and fall several prominent individuals from Ottawa have visited this city, and your board have not been slow to impress matters in the interests of Manitoba trade upon such. A petition asking for the discontinuance of the railway disallowance policy of the Dominion Government, which has been such a burden on the trade of the Province, was presented with the signatures of the best men of this city attached, to the Honorable the Minister of the Interior during his late visit, and elicited from him an expression of the hope and belief that the policy of the Government would soon cease to call for the maintenance of this railway restriction."

That is the impression he left on the Board of Trade, which I may say is composed of the best men of the Province of Manitoba, men who have an interest in looking into all matters affecting the welfare of that Province. But, notwithstanding that, an Act was disallowed last March, after those statements were made. Last Session before the Railway Committee we were given to understand, when an application was made for a charter to build a road from Portage la Prairie to Lake of the Woods, and that charter was not granted because it conflicted with clause 15 of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, that we would have the right, so soon as the road was completed North of Lake Superior, to obtain such a charter; but that charter was applied for this year, and it was reported on unfavorably as a road which should not be constructed. The people of the Province of Manitoba have not been complaining of this monopoly for the last two years, for the reason that it was stated by Sir Charles Tupper, in his speech on the Canadian Pacific Railway loan, that as soon as the road was constructed north of Lake Superior the Government would no longer see fit to disallow those Acts. Sir Charles Tupper, during that debate in 1884, Volume 1, page 109, of *Hansard*, states:

"I am glad to be able to state to the House that, although, true to that policy, the Government refused to give assent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba to connect with American railways to the south, such is the evidence presented by the operation of the line so far as it has gone, such is the conclusion arrived at by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself in regard to the ability of a through line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to take care of itself, and by the inherent power of its own advantages to maintain its position notwithstanding any competition to which it may be subjected, although we have no power, under the charter, to touch any portion of the country in the North-West Territories, we are now in a position to review and to reconsider the policy of the late Government, and the policy of the present Government, as to the continued necessity for any long period of protecting the Canadian Pacific Railway against competition."

He said further:

"I am glad to be able to state to the House that such is the confidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the power of the Canadian Pacific Railway to protect itself, that when the line is constructed north of Lake Superior, the Government feel it will not be incumbent upon them to preserve the position they have hitherto felt bound to preserve, that of refusing to consent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba, connecting it with American railways to the south."

Now, Mr. Speaker, at that time the Minister of Railways, to my mind, practically pledged this House and the Government to the fact that, as soon as the road was constructed north of Lake Superior, the Government would no longer see fit to disallow the local Acts of Manitoba, and would allow competing lines to the south. Making this statement when he was asking the House to grant a large loan to that company, he gave a pledge to the people of the Province of Manitoba, and the Dominion as a whole, that, as soon as this work was constructed, the Government would grant the right to the Province of Manitoba to build lines to the south, and this being the case, the people of that Province have remained quiet, fully expecting a fulfilment of that promise. But such has not been the case. The best hopes of the people of the Province have been disappointed, and now they are rousing up to the fact that the Government do intend to allow this monopoly for twenty years from the passage of the Act; and there is a great feeling of discontent rising in that Province with the conduct of the Government in disallowing those charters. In 1881 the Manitoba Legislature passed several Acts for the building of railroads; there was an Act passed for the building of a railway from Winnipeg in a south-easterly direction, there was the Manitoba Tramway Company's Act and the Emerson and North-Western Railway Act. Those charters were disallowed, notwithstanding the statements made by the First Minister and the Minister of the Interior during the Canadian Pacific Railway debate in 1880, and, as was further stated by different gentlemen while this matter was under debate in 1884, that roads should be allowed to the south as soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed to the north of Lake Superior. Fully believing that the Government did intend to ask the Canadian Pacific Railway to relinquish their right to this monopoly, they remained quiet. But I may read a report of a portion of the proceedings of a meeting which took place in Winnipeg on March 19th, 1886. This was previous to the disallowance of the last local Act for the Manitoba Central Railway, a railway which was entirely within the boundaries of the old Province of Manitoba. This meeting was called by proclamation of the Mayor of Winnipeg, who presided, and there were a large number of very prominent gentlemen who addressed the meeting:

"In his opening address, the chairman observed that the question before the meeting was one of the most important that ever came before the people in the interests of this country.

"He trusted that nothing of a political nature would enter into the complexion of the meeting. It should be a business meeting, as the question was one in which all were interested."

The Mayor of Winnipeg is a very prominent Conservative, and so is Mr. James H. Ashdown, the mover of these resolutions. Before moving them he said:

"The matter was one in which all were vitally interested. As an old resident, one who had come here in 1868, when Winnipeg was in its infancy, and who had joined in all the battles fought, and whose voice

had been heard with no uncertain sound when the occasion justified, he felt that one of those occasions had arisen, and that he was justified in coming and speaking with no uncertain sound upon this subject. He trusted that the resolutions which it would be his duty to move would meet with the support of every loyal man, whatever his nationality, color, party or creed might be. On this subject there could be no dividing line. The chairman had well said that this was purely a business question. There was not upon the continent of America a single city that had been prosperous but had found in its day the question of railways to be the great burning question, and no city of prominence that he knew had succeeded without more than one line of railway centreing in it. He moved the following resolution, which was applauded during the reading and at its close:—

"That whereas, the Province of Manitoba at the time of the passing of the Canadian Pacific Railway charter, had the undoubted right to grant charters for the construction of railways within its boundaries;

"And whereas, there is no provision in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter inconsistent with the right of the Province to charter such railways;

"And whereas, the action of the Dominion Government in hitherto disallowing Provincial railway charters has had the effect of rendering inoperative such right of this Province;

"And whereas, the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, the then Minister of Railways and Canals, in his speech in the House of Commons during the Session of 1884, in moving the House into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the resolution granting a loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway, said that as soon as the road was completed the monopoly would be withdrawn;

"Be it resolved that this meeting affirms the right of this Province to charter its own railways.

"That it is absolutely necessary in the commercial and all other interests of this city and the Province, that the Dominion Government should not disallow the charter of the Manitoba Central Railway, by the construction of which a competitive route to the east would be secured.

"That this meeting affirms and concurs in the position taken by the Board of Trade and City Council in relation to the vital importance of securing such communication.

"That this meeting humbly prays that His Excellency the Governor General may be graciously pleased not to disallow the said Manitoba Central Railway Act."

Mr. Ashdown continued to speak to the resolutions in the same strain. Now, it cannot be claimed that this question is one raised for mere party purposes, in order to find fault with the Government or the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is raised because it vitally affects the interests of the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. The railway is now constructed, and we have to accept the situation, whatever differences of opinion we may have had in the past, as to the mode or the time of construction; and while I wish all success to the Pacific Railway as a Canadian enterprise, I also feel that the interests of the territory through which it runs should be considered. The company have it within their power to control the freight rates of the Province of Manitoba. I am not going into any lengthened comparison of its froight rates with those of other roads. I know it is contended by hon. gentlemen opposite that the freight rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway are more reasonable than those of any other railway. I do not wish to argue that question; but if such is the case, there should be no necessity for continuing the monopoly clause, as the low rates should themselves be sufficient protection for the company against competition, and I think the promise made by Sir Charles Tupper in 1884 should be carried out, and that the company should have such confidence in their carrying powers as to be able to defy competition to the south. Notwithstanding that, we have the fact before us that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company do take advantage of the monopoly they enjoy in Manitoba, for freight from the south is practically shut off. I will give the rates charged from Montreal to Winnipeg over the different roads. The Grand Trunk Railway receives, for 850 miles haul, from Montreal to Chicago, 30 cents per 100 lbs.; the union roads from Chicago to St. Paul receive, for 409 miles haul, 40 cents per 100 lbs.; the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway, for 393 miles haul, from St. Paul to Emerson, receive 60 cents per 100 lbs.; and the Canadian Pacific Railway, for 65 miles haul, from Emerson to Winnipeg, receives 40 cents per 100 lbs. While the rates may be reasonable for some long hauls, the local rates are not reasonable; and these figures show that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company do discriminate against any roads but their own carrying freight into the country. While we have no right to interfere with the freight rates of American railways, still we know that the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway is a monopoly road. For carrying freight from St. Paul to Emerson, 393 miles, that road charges 60 cents per 100 lbs., and the Canadian Pacific Railway for carrying freight from Emersom to Winnipeg, 65 miles, charges 40 cents per 100 lbs., that is, for carrying freight 456 miles, these two monopoly roads charge $1 per 100 lbs., while roads conducted on commercial principles charge 30 cents per 100 lbs., for carrying freight upwards of 1200 miles. These figures show that the monopoly roads do take advantage of their monopoly. The North-West Council have complained against the rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway. In a memorial from the members of that Council who visited Ottawa a short time ago, which memorial was laid on the Table of the House a few days ago, they state:

"That notwithstanding the repeated assertions to the contrary, the freight rates imposed by the Canadian Pacific Railway are yet found to be a severe tax on the productions of the North-West. This Council therefore respectfully suggest that the influence of the Government should be used to induce the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to reduce their rates so as to compare favorably with the rates in the Provinces of the Dominion, who have the advantage of railway competition."

Now, as I believe we should not overlook the present opportunity, but should make an attempt to obtain from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the release of the monopoly in Manitoba, I beg leave to move:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with the instructions to provide that as a condition of granting the proposed relief to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, it shall be stipulated that the company shall no longer claim that no lines of railway shall be permitted to be constructed within Manitoba south of the Canadian Pacific Railway, except such lines as shall run south-west, or to the westward of south-west, and that no line of railway should be permitted to be constructed within fifteen miles of latitude forty-nine.

Mr. ORTON. I wish to make a few very brief remarks in reference to this motion. No doubt it is very important to the North-West that it should have the cheapest possible rates provided for people coming in to settle, but I do not think the course the hon. gentleman has taken is one calculated to bring about that desirable result. I believe it is of the highest importance to the future railway development of the North-West that the absolute and complete success of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be assured, so that the capitalists of the world, upon whom we depend in the future for building our roads, should have the utmost possible confidence in railway enterprises in that country. I do not think the time has arrived when it is in the interests of Manitoba or the North-West to agitate in a manner that would cause the people of Canada to break faith with the Canadian Pacific Railway, who have just, and only just, completed one of the greatest railway enterprises of the present age. I think the right course is to wait patiently until that country becomes a little further settled, and to unite the efforts of the whole people of the North-West in developing that new pathway to the granary markets of Europe, the Hudson Bay Railway. What would be the effect of the resolution of the hon. gentleman upon that channel of trade? It would be of a most disastrous character. There is not a step the hon. gentleman could take which is more calculated to injure that great enterprise than the one he has taken, because it would have the effect of completely destroying the confidence of British capitalists in the good faith of the people of Canada. The course the hon. gentleman has taken is calculated to do the greatest possible amount of injury to the district he represents. He also is attempting to advocate the interests of the people of Winnipeg. How does that tally with his advocacy of a railway to the south, extending from Portage la Prairie to the

Lake of the Woods? That may be a most desirable railway, but I hold it is essentially important that we should secure the absolute success of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and certainly the railway the hon. gentleman advocates would not conduce to the best interests of Winnipeg. I do not think the people of Winnipeg have very much faith in the hon. gentleman's advocacy of their cause. Winnipeg is at a disadvantage to-day, and it would be better in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway if she were placed more on an equality with Montreal in her commercial relations. She is to-day the commercial and financial centre of the whole North-West Territories, and I hope good counsel will prevail in the board of the Canadian Pacific Railway, by which Winnipeg will receive more favorable terms in freight. At the same time, I have not yet discovered that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has said or done anything in all his course to advance the interests of that important city of the North-West. His course, in the various discussions which have taken place concerning the Canadian Pacific Railway, has been at variance with the best interests and the future welfare of the North-West. What was that country under the *régime* of the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite? I know settlers from my own county, neighbors of the hon. gentleman living opposite him in the county of Marquette, living at Portage la Prairie, who went there years before the hon. gentleman saw the country and struggled along without hope. Not one, but hundreds and thousands of people, the early adventurers who went there, waited, hopelessly watching, under the policy of the late Administration, for a change; and if it had not been for the wise and discreet policy of the present Government, the very town the hon. gentleman represents would not have had railway communication. We would instead have had the Canadian Pacific Railway running from Selkirk through a most barren district, entirely escaping the most important portion of Manitoba and the North-West; to-day the city of Winnipeg would be largely cut off from the trade of the west, while Portage la Prairie would be without any railway facilities whatever. Therefore, I say that the course of the hon. gentleman has not been a patriotic one; it has not been in the interests of the people he represents. If he were to advocate other railways through his own constituency going north, for which there is plenty of room, through that country about to be settled by Scandinavians, he would do better than he will by trying to deprive the Canadian Pacific Railway of its right and bring ruin upon the railway enterprises of the great North-West.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think before the amendment is voted on that the House ought to hear from the Government what their policy is on the important question raised by my hon. friend. I do not, however, refer so much to the question of what is to be done with the territory outside the old province of Manitoba, as to what the Government's policy is with respect to railways chartered through the original Province of Manitoba. Over and over again, hopes have been held out to the people and the Legislature of Manitoba, that, as soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed, the restrictions imposed by the Government, through the veto power, would be removed. Over and over again, during the debate, on the inception of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as my hon. friend has truly said, the House was led to understand that the Government would in no way interfere with Manitoba charters; and over and over again, since that time, notably by the present High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper, hopes, I would almost say assurances, were held out that as soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed, all restrictions should be removed in that particular direction. Now, apparently the policy of the Government has altered again. They have again disallowed an Act of the Manitoba Legislature, and I think before this Bill goes through they ought to state what they propose to do—at any rate, with respect to the old Province. There can be no doubt that the question is becoming a standing grievance in the minds of the people of Manitoba. Myself, I shall not enter now into the discussion of the question whether it was wise or not to confer a monopoly power on the Canadian Pacific Railway. My views on that are sufficiently well known, but I say that, in any case, even admitting, for the sake of argument, that that may have been justified, the time has arrived for a liberal policy being adopted now. I believe it would be in the highest degree in the interests of the people of Canada, in the interests of the people of Manitoba, and, in the long run, even in the interests of the proprietors of the Canadian Pacific Railway themselves. No man can deny that up to the present time our efforts to colonise Manitoba and the countries adjacent have been very far indeed from a success. The total population that has gone in there is pitifully small, and that has been largely due to the existence of this identical monopoly clause. However, the present point is to know what the intention of the Government is on that point, and that I think they ought to state to the House. Not merely has settlement been impeded, but it is quite clear to all who have paid the least attention to the doings of that Legislature, that so keenly is this felt that they are obliged to seek now for other outlets through the Hudson Bay and elsewhere. I am strongly inclined to think that a mere statement made in this House by the Prime Minister, that they were going to give effect to the promises held out by Sir Charles Tupper as long as two years ago, would have an extremely beneficial effect on the settlement of the whole Province of Manitoba at least, and indirectly on the North West; and looking at the very liberal manner in which we have treated the Canadian Pacific Railway, I am bound to say I think the least the Government could have done would have been to obtain some relaxation of the terms; but, if they cannot or will not do that, the least they can do is to state to the House that they intend henceforward to carry out, as far as old Manitoba is concerned, the pledge which was made by the First Minister, then Minister of the Interior, and subsequently by Sir Charles Tupper, that now that the Canadian Pacific Railway is completed, they will no longer exercise their veto power to the disadvantage of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. ROYAL. It seems to me there is something else in connection with this question which it is important to know, and I may be permitted to make one remark in connection with it. For the last five or six years, in the Province of Manitoba, there have been renewed attempts to excite public feelings on that question of the disallowance of charters. With regard to the true spirit of the excitement that is being raised now and then in that Province, I will repeat here what the First Minister of the Province very recently said on this question. He said in the Legislature of the Province:

"Gentlemen will come to this House with charters and insist on having those charters just as they place them before the House, that no interference be made by the House with their particular desire in that respect, and when, after they have been informed that these Acts would be subject to disallowance, and when they have insisted on their passage as they presented them to this House, then they should not be chagrined at the consequences It would appear that the desire of these individuals was that those Acts should be disallowed. Charters were presented to this House more for the purpose of excitement than for the purpose of promoting any other object."

I may also be permitted to read an extract from a paper which is published not very far from the county I have the honor to represent, a county which is very much interested in the question now raised by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). The *International* of Emerson said recently:

"The people of Manitoba have again been thrown into a state of irritation by the disallowance of two railway charters granted by the Provincial Legislature, the Emerson and North-Western and the Manitoba Central. Practically, we do not suppose the disallowance of these two charters will affect the material interests of the Province one iota, because we do not believe that, if allowed to stand, one mile of railway would have been constructed under them. They were paper charters, that is all. The promoters could not put a dollar into them, and could not induce anyone else to."

I do not believe that the hon. gentleman from Marquette could have established by facts to this House that this disallowance has been a cause of ruin to the Province of Manitoba, while, on the other hand, we have the fact before the Parliament and the country which was stated by the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), that we have lost nothing by that disallowance so far, but have gained the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is the very life not only of Manitoba but also of the North-West Territories.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) says "that the Bill should be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with power to provide that as a condition of granting the proposed relief to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company." Well, some portion of the Bill is a relief to the Dominion of Canada, and not to the Pacific Railway Company. The hon. gentleman proposes, under this amendment, that we shall not take the $20,000,000 which the company are to pay back.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The $30,000,000 were such an excellent security, we were told a year ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope I shall not be interrupted, at any rate. This is part of the relief to be granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The terms, with the exception of one clause relating to the $5,000,000 of bonds held to secure the continuous running of the road for ten years, form one agreement. The company agrees to pay us $20,000,000; we agree to take the money, and we agree to take for the payment of the balance which is under $10,000,000, lands at $1.50 an acre. That is the agreement as a whole. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not wish to repudiate that. They must go together. The condition on which we get the $20,000,000——

Mr. MILLS. And give them $10,000,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,—is that we buy back, as it were, a number of acres at $1.50 an acre to cover $10,000,000, or whatever the amount may be. I hear the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) speaking about that arrangement, and I would say it was a most satisfactory arrangement. I heard it said on the other side, while this Bill or the resolutions were in progress, that we were merely taking our land back again. By the Bill of last year with respect to this sum of $10,000,000, or $9,800,000, I think it is, we were to look to the lands to pay it, and, in case the sale of all the lands of the subsidy proved insufficient to pay the $10,000,000, we had an ultimate claim upon the railway itself. Now, everyone knows that we should never arrive at that ultimate claim. The lands are so valuable that there cannot be any doubt that they will pay the $10,000,000. The hon. gentlemen opposite will not deny that, in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they would amount to much more than $10,000,000. The hon. gentleman cannot deny that some of them contended that these lands would amount to much more than $10,000,000. The hon. gentleman knows that the leader of the Opposition stated that these lands were worth from $2 to $10 an acre, according to their position. I will not read the extracts—I have got them here—on the various subjects, the leader of the Opposition stating that within the railway belt a considerable portion of which will fall under this arrangement to the Government, the lands were worth from $5 to $7 an acre. Under these circumstances, when we get the land back at $1.50 an acre, I think we are making a very good bargain, and that there is not the slightest danger of the Dominion Treasury not being recouped to the utmost extent out of the land that we take. We are to have a fair average value of the land in taking it over, a fair average value of the quality and the situation of the land; and, according to the reiterated statement of the hon. gentlemen opposite, we would have infinitely more in the Dominion Treasury when these lands are sold, than $10,000,000. My hon. friend who sits behind me, the Minister of the Interior, will sell those lands just as well as Mr. McTavish sells the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; he will sell them at the same prices, he will receive the money, and he will keep an account of that money, and when all the sales of these lands are footed up, it will be found that we have not only received $10,000,000 with interest, but much more. In the meantime, while we make this arrangement, making a final settlement with the Canadian Pacific Railway with respect to the indebtedness which was incurred only a year ago, that company will stand in the markets of the world free and unencumbered from any claims on the part of the Dominion Government. They will want, as we know they will want, from their statements of what their future developments are to be, what they design it to be, and what they are going to make it, they will want a large sum of money, and these sums of money are to be expended in Canada, or for the benefit of Canada; and they will be able to raise this money when they go into the markets of the world to New York, Paris or Amsterdam, as they have done before; they can raise money on the most advantageous terms, because there is not the sign of a claim against them by the Dominion Government. Therefore the arrangement is a most satisfactory one, satisfactory in the highest degree to the company for the reasons I have given to you. They are freed from any claim or encumbrance held over them by the Dominion of Canada; they can go into the markets free and unencumbered, with all their road finished, with all their future before them, with the prospect of an enormous trade; they can go into the markets of the world, after this measure is passed, with every prospect of becoming a great commercial success. On the other hand, the Canadian Government and the Canadian Parliament are, by assisting them in this arrangement, aiding and assisting in the development, the growth, the progress and the prosperity of Canada; they are at the same time taking care that by no possibility can there be any pecuniary loss, if my hon. friend who sits behind me only sees that the land which he takes back is held at the same prices for which these very lands are put into the market by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is an arrangement satisfactory to both sides. I am quite sure that this House and this country will consider that such an arrangement is advantageous to both sides, assisting at once, not postponing it to the future, but assisting this company in raising money, or by pledging the main road and their various auxiliary roads, to enable them to raise the sums of money that they need by which means that road will become a great factor in the future progress and the prosperity of Canada. Now, Sir, with respect to what the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has said as to the policy of the Government with respect to the disallowance of railway Bills. I can only say, Sir, that the policy of the Government is one which will commend itself, I think, to the common sense and patriotism of every man in this House—it is simply to keep as much of the trade of the western country for the benefit of Canada as a whole, as we can secure. I say, Sir, at once, that even with that praiseworthy object, this Parliament ought not to make any restriction that would injure the North-West itself. In the course that was taken in the original agreement with the

Canadian Pacific Railway in the first place, we put in these clauses, giving them a certain protection for twenty years and giving them certain advantages. These clauses were put in not only for the benefit of the company, but for the benefit of the trade of Canada. We did not want to build a road running from the Pacific to Winnipeg, from the west to the east, and have that road tapped by continual lines running to the south, and running with the United States railways from the extreme west to the extreme east, so that every few miles as we are coming eastward, we will say, from the foot of the Rocky Mountains, every few miles we find local railways built by American money, built by American railways, for the purpose of taking off the legitimate trade of our own country, bleeding it, leading off the trade by these little streams, so that by the time it got to Winnipeg, there would be no trade left, it would all have gone to the United States. The Canadian Pacific Railway has been compared in that regard to the River Rhine which, starting from its source a mighty river, is bled by small streams and before it arrives at the ocean, it is almost lost in the sands. So would be the Canadian trade of the Canadian Pacific Railway coming eastward, if it were allowed to be bled and depleted every few miles by railways running to the south and carrying off the trade to the United States. I quite agree with my hon. friend for Wellington when he says that the speech of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) will not be received favorably by the people of Winnipeg when he advocates strongly as many lines as possible. The idea my hon. friend speaks of, that as many lines should be run towards the south as possible, will not be popular there, these lines becoming the law of the land, so many rival charters being held in the hands of speculators to sell, because every one of these lines will be quoted in the market in England as a reason for not investing in the Hudson Bay Railway. But, Sir, when the hon. gentleman speaks to us about our policy, I will see what was the policy of the Government of which he was himself a member, of the Government of the hon. member for East York. This was their policy, stated in the measure introduced, I think, by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills); we find their policy in a clause which they put in the Railway Bill:

"No company shall be incorporated under the provisions of this Act for the construction of any railway having the same general direction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any branch thereof, at a nearer distance than forty miles."

My hon. friend from East York announced in his speech, and I think also in State papers, that he would not allow the trade of the North-West Territory to be carried off into American channels, taking it away from our Canadian railways. Who built the railway, whose money was it? It was the money of the older Provinces of the Dominion, it was the money of Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. Did they build that railway as a local road to run from the foot of the Rocky Mountains to Winnipeg, a mere local road allowing every kind of branch line to be built to carry away the trade of our great North-West off to the United States? That was not the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. That is not our policy. Allusion has been made to the remarks of myself when the Canadian Pacific Railway charter was before us, and that I had stated we would not interfere with the action of the Manitoba Legislature. I did say so, and that is true. We cannot interfere. We were then legislating as a Legislature, we were proposing to pass the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, and part of the agreement which was before the House, and to which the sanction of the House was asked, was this clause:

"For twenty years from the date hereof no line of railway shall be authorized by the Dominion Parliament to be constructed south of the Canadian Pacific Railway from any point at or near Canadian Pacific Railway, except such lines as shall run south-west or to the west of south-west."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

And so on. So we were asked, would this clause be obligatory on the Legislature of Manitoba? We said: No; we cannot legislate for the Province of Manitoba."

Mr. MILLS. You cannot "check."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman need not interrupt me. We can only legislate within our power. Suppose we placed in that Act a clause that the Manitoba legislature should not for twenty years grant any charter for a railway except in a particular direction, that would have been an infringement of provincial rights, and we would have heard no end of howl about it. I said we could not interfere with the Manitoba Legislature. I said they can legislate in any way they please, and we can only pledge ourselves as to what the Dominion Parliament would do. In the same we cannot interfere with the Legislatures of Ontario, of Quebec, as I said in my speech which the hon. gentleman quoted. But that does not interfere with, it has no connection with, the executive power given to the central authority to exercise the power of disallowance as regards any Act passed by any Legislature which is detrimental or injurious to the interest of the whole Dominion. Why, I have heard the hon. gentleman quote again and again as against me and as against the course of the Government, the rules that were laid down in a minute drawn by myself, pointing out the occasions on which the Executive Government of the Dominion could properly interfere with legislation of the Provinces; and that has been quoted approvingly as against the action of the Government. It has been said that we have gone further in our anxiety for centralisation; that we have gone further than the principles laid down in the minute. That has been accepted by the other side, and acted upon, and it is charged that we did not adhere to that minute. I do not admit that those statements were correct. But the principle is laid down there, that in any case where an Act was *ultra vires*, of course it ought to be disallowed; or if an Act was contrary to the interests of the Dominion as a whole, the Government ought to exercise the power of disallowance, just in the same spirit, to no greater extent, but to the same extent, as Her Majesty's advisers in England could and would properly exercise the power of disallowing any Act of this Parliament if it was found to be injurious to the interest of the Empire. Her Majesty's Government would disallow any Act, although within our power if not objected to, if in their opinion it was opposed to the interests of the Empire as a whole. So we claim, and that paper claims the same power here: That we might disallow any local measure which was contrary to the interests of the Dominion as a whole. In regard to the disallowance of those Bills, it was done in a great degree to help the Canadian Pacific Railway; it was not to allow other companies to take away their trade before the line had begun to be operated, that before the company could have the railway finished or a locomotive running on it or a single train moved, lines would be built, in effect foreign railways, to carry the traffic of the North-West to the south of the line, before, I say, the Canadian Pacific Railway had the opportunity of showing what they could do, before they made their great connections and established trade from the extreme west through the Province of Ontario to the sea at Quebec and Halifax. I say that the people of the older Provinces who built the road had a right to expect that their interests would be protected; that they would not be taxed, and we have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite how much we were to be taxed—to say nothing about the bonds or the land we have advanced, $25,000,000 in cash, and we have given them hundreds of miles of line already built by us—that they should not hand over the money to the injury rather than to the advantage of the older Provinces which provided all the money and had undertaken all the responsibility. That is the policy of the Government, and to that

we will adhere. Suppose, and it is very unlikely, that the Canadian Pacific should for some reason or other—the ways of railways are inscrutable—desire to have a number of railways running from their line in the North-West in connection with the railways of the United States, would we, if we thought it was against the interest of the trade of Canada, yield to that proposition because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company thought it would suit the interest of their shareholders? No. This provision is laid down not only for the interests of the railway but still more for the interest of the trade of Canada as a whole. I have said more than I intended to say and more perhaps than my slowly returning strength makes it prudent for me to say, because I feel very strongly on this matter, that we must adhere to the principle adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite then in power and carried out by us in the same spirit, the patriotic spirit, of making this railway the greatest channel for the trade of the whole of Canada, not of any section of it or of any locality, but of the Dominion as a whole. Now the road helps British Columbia, the great North-West and Manitoba—it helps all the Provinces; and we are now rapidly bringing in the little Island of Prince Edward, which might have seemed to be cut off from the advantages of the railway, we are even bringing in that Island by our legislation and subsidy to have a direct interest in the trade of the Canadian Pacific Railway like the larger and older continental Provinces. I think that this House, concurring in the views which I have so imperfectly expressed, will vote down this amendment.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has expressed himself with a good deal of warmth and vigor upon this very important question. He has intimated that it would be in the highest degree detrimental to the public interest to allow the Canadian Pacific to connect with railways in the United States. The hon. gentleman has shown a good deal more interest, it seems to me, in protecting in this way — if that be called a necessary protection — the Canadian Pacific Railway Company than he has in protecting the railways that are more immediately under the control of the Administration. Now, Sir, we have railways in the eastern portion of this Dominion which have been built at the expense of the public Treasury. We have railways that are at the present time officered and manned—if I may use the expression—at the public expense, and if I remember rightly the hon. gentleman has voted a large subsidy to build a railway in competition with this railway of Canada—in fact to build a short line across the State of Maine. Now if the hon. gentleman had told the House what there was specially in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to make such a policy in the North-West absolutely necessary to the well-being of the country, and absolutely necessary to the maintenance of our common sense and patriotism—for the hon. gentleman said that both the patriotism and the common sense of the House showed that such a course was the only proper one to pursue in the public interest—I would like the hon. gentleman to explain to the House how it was not even permissible, or consistent with the common sense or patriotism, to have railway connection with railways south of the 49th parallel, while to the east we have not only railway connection permitted, but we have large subsidies granted from the public Treasury to construct those railways on the other side. Now, I say that the policy of the Government and the course they are pursuing to the west of Lake Superior, and the course they are pursuing to the east of the St. Lawrence, are wholly different; and the hon. gentleman would have done well, when he undertook to emphasise this feature of their policy to the west, if he had given some explanation of their policy in the east, and had pointed out how it was right and proper and in the public interest to subsidise a railway in the State of Maine, while it is not even permissible west of Lake Superior to permit railway connection with the railways of the United States. Now, the hon. gentleman said that he informed the House that we could not legislate for Manitoba. Well, I do not know in what sense he used that expression. Did he mean to say that we cannot here pass legislation which is within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature of Manitoba? Nobody ever pretended any such thing could be done. No, Sir, the hon. gentleman did not use such an expression; he did not speak in the direction in which he spoke to-day. Then the Canadian Pacific Railway charter was under consideration, the question was whether the Government were going to exercise their power of disallowance, in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and in the furtherance of those provisions contained in the contract, and the hon. gentleman used the expression—not that we cannot legislate in the interests of Manitoba, but that we cannot check Manitoba. Those were the words he used. He intimated then that it was not in the power of the Government, acting in the spirit of the constitution, to disallow Acts passed by the Local Legislature, within the authority of the Local Legislature, nor was it their intention to do so. Now we have the words the hon. gentleman used in that discussion. He said:

"In order to give them a chance we have provided that the Dominion Parliament—mind you the Dominion Parliament, we cannot check any other Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. Yes: The hon. gentleman says we cannot, what? We shall not legislate here in this House contrary to the provisions of this contract, but that we cannot prevent the Province of Manitoba from so legislating; we cannot prevent the Province of Ontario from so legislating. Well, Sir, did not the hon. gentleman prevent the Province of Manitoba from so legislating when he disallowed their legislation? Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that he meant that we would not undertake to prevent an Act formally being passed by the Local Legislature, but we intend to disallow it? Is that the meaning of the expression used by the hon. gentleman? Why, Sir, it is perfectly clear that what he wished to convey to the House was, that in the furtherance, the fulfilment, of the engagement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the Government here would not advise the exercise of the prerogative of disallowance, with reference to the legislation of the Province of Manitoba or the Province of Ontario. He says:

"In order to give them a chance we have provided that the Dominion Parliament—mind you the Dominion Parliament, we cannot check any other Parliament, we cannot check Ontario, we cannot check Manitoba—shall, for the first ten years after the construction of the road, give their own road, into which they are putting so much money and so much land, a fair chance of existence."

That was the position taken by the hon. gentleman, and so the House understood him. Those words will admit of but one construction. There was no expression about legislation which would have had any meaning that would not have been inconsistent with that faculty of common sense to which the hon. gentleman has appealed. It is clear that he meant one thing, and that was that we would not undertake, by the exercise of the power of disallowance, to control the action of the legislature of Manitoba with reference to railways chartered by that Province. The hon. the First Minister was followed in that discussion by the present Minister of the Interior; and that hon. gentleman's speech shows how he understood the expression. We have only to look at the point which was under discussion to understand his meaning. The question was, how far the Government would undertake to interfere with the freedom of the Local Legislatures of the different Provinces in carrying out their provincial policy, and the hon. gentleman said, in speaking of that question:

"We are told now that because of the fifteen miles there never can be any other railway into this country. To what does that apply? Simply to the Territories over which the Dominion Parliament has control. There is nothing to prevent Manitoba now, if it thinks proper, granting a charter from Winnipeg to the boundary line."

The hon. gentleman says that is true. But did the hon. gentleman mean that the Province of Manitoba was to be free to pass its laws? Everybody knew that; nobody questioned that. That was not the point at issue. The point at issue was, will the Government interfere with the freedom and the rights of the Province, for the purpose of furthering its policy—its contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That was the question, and the hon. gentleman and the present Minister of Interior both said. It shall not be done. There is nothing required by this contract on the part of the Government to interfere with the Province. Now, I will go further and maintain that the hon. gentleman violated the spirit and intent of the constitution in the exercise of this power of disallowance. I say that we in the Parliament of Canada, while we have a right to legislate in the interests of the public, have only a right to do so within the limits of the constitution, as set forth in the British North America Act. We are told there that certain powers which belonged to the Provinces before there was a British North America Act—because certain powers are defined and limited, and a portion of them are taken away; the residue of them, under the 92nd section of the Act, were powers which they possessed before. Well, Sir, in the exercise of these reserved powers they may see proper, in the interests of the Province, to pass a certain railway charter, or adopt any other act of public policy, within their constitutional limits. I say that neither this Parliament nor the Government can exercise the prerogative of the Crown, to interfere with them constitutionally, any more than they can with the people of the State of New York. They have no more right in the one case than in the other. That power of disallowance can be only properly exercised when the Provincial Act is *ultra vires*——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was no necessity for disallowance then.

Mr. MILLS. I admit it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. I have always contended so, and I think the abuse that has been made of that power shows that to be the case. The speeches of both the First Minister and the Minister of the Interior show that in order to get the assent of Parliament to that arrangement, they sought to satisfy Parliament that this power of disallowance would not be used for the purpose of encroaching upon the freedom of the Provinces in carrying out their own views of public policy within their own jurisdiction. Now, the hon. gentleman says that we have to consider the public interest as well as the interest of the railway company in the arrangement which is now being made. Well, Sir, when it is proposed to take $20,000,000 in payment of a debt of $30,000,000, the concession will be held to be on the side of the party receiving the money; but the hon. gentleman says: Oh, the company are giving us back lands that are worth more than the difference between the $30,000,000 and the $20,000,000. That may be so, but the statement of the hon. gentleman does not add anything to the evidence of that fact. The hon. gentleman cannot have forgotten that he made a statement of his expectations in 1880 in reference to those lands; in fact, he had then great expectations. He told us what he expected was going to be the increase in population in the Territories year after year, the cost of the management of public lands, the area sold, and the amount of money realised. I have before me that statement, and I find that the hon. gentleman calculated that by the year 1890 we should receive $71,000,000 in cash, and that we should pay out for the management and survey of public lands $2,400,000, leaving us something like $69,000,000 in cash to apply towards recouping ourselves for the money we had advanced towards the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Six years of that period have now elapsed, and in looking over the Public Accounts I find that we have paid out over $3,600,000, instead of $2,400,000, for the management and survey of public lands, and we have received something like $4,000,000; so that instead of having $69,000,000 to apply towards the cost of construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we have less than $1,000,000. Therefore we cannot attach very much importance to the conclusions the hon. gentleman has reached.

Mr. BOWELL. How many Acts did you disallow while you were in power?

Mr. MILLS. We never disallowed an Act that we believed to be within the jurisdiction——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman cannot find an Act that was disallowed on any other ground than that it was *ultra vires*.

Mr. BOWELL. How about the Act respecting Escheats?

Mr. MILLS. I will not further tresspass on the indulgence of the House. I think it will be in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company themselves that the Government should not exercise the power they propose to retain on behalf of the company. Listening to the speech of the First Minister, one would suppose that the country was held in the interest of the railway. I do not take that view. I suppose the railway was constructed in the interest of the country for the purpose of developing it. I admit that we have no possible interest to do anything but what is best for the railway company. The construction of other railways, and the furnishing of facilities for settlement may not be regarded by the railway company as advantageous to them; but I believe that whatever will contribute to the settlement and the general development of the country will in the end prove beneficial to the Canadian Pacific Railway itself. I am satisfied that the removal of these restrictions would largely promote the prosperity of the country, and would be in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway itself.

Mr. FOSTER. I should not have said a word in this debate except for the position in which my hon. friend who has just taken his seat has sought to put this question. It is not the first time he has evinced his hostility to any measure which has tended to lighten the disabilities or to increase the commercial prosperity of the Maritime Provinces, not only as a member of this House, but as a publisher and editor of a paper. In both of these situations, he has taken occasion again and again to evince that hostility to the Maritime Provinces, of which he has given another instance this afternoon. He has spoken of the subsidising of a railway, commonly known as the Short Line Railway, to unite the Maritime Provinces by a shorter line of communication with the central part of Canada and the Great West; and if there was any point in his argument at all, it led to this conclusion, that it was a wrong action on the part of this Government to subsidise a road leading to the Maritime Provinces by a shorter route than any existing at present—that it was wrong to subsidise the Short Line Railway running through the State of Maine.

Mr. GILLMOR. He never said anything of the sort.

Mr. FOSTER. He did say that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen, although they have a great deal of prescience, and a great deal of prophetic vision, should wait until they hear what my statement is before they attempt to divine the meaning of

it. My hon. friend said that the Premier was wrong in adopting the policy that the Canadian Pacific road should be subsidised from the Great West round by the head of Lake Superior, and that no road should be allowed to lead the freight down to the United States border and through the American States; and the hon. gentleman wanted to know, if it was right that the road which runs around Lake Superior should be kept from being tapped by branches running into the United States, how it was right to subsidise with the people's money a line running through the State of Maine, to cut off what he considered the profits upon freight going by the longer route of the Intercolonial Railway. That was the position my hon. friend took; and if there was any point in his argument it was that it was wrong for the Government to subsidise the Short Line Railway running through the State of Maine. I say there is no inconsistency in those two positions. The line running through the State of Maine was subsidised in order to enable the Maritime Provinces to reach the great line around Lake Superior and the lines running through the central part of Canada by the shortest possible route. It was that reason which animated men of both political parties in the Maritime Provinces to demand a subsidy for that road from this Government year after year, and not to rest satisfied until it was granted. I know that the hon. member for Bothwell did not vote for that subsidy; he left very suddenly at the time the vote came on; and he has evinced his hostility to it on several occasions. By the longer route, the Intercolonial Railway, passing where it does, the Maritime Provinces were placed at the greatest possible disadvantage in their trade relations with the central and western portions of Canada, and the object of building the shorter line of communication was to put the Maritime Provinces in as good a position as they could be placed in that respect. The very reason which dictated that wise policy is the same reason which says that for a period of years at least that road, which is meant to bind the trade of the central portions of Canada with the west, shall not be tapped by roads which will dissipate that trade, and, instead of binding this country together in a commercial whole, would send the commerce of the country dribbling out in little streamlets all along that line of railway.

Mr. MILLS. Why was the road built in the first place? Why did the Government spend $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 in building the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will tell you why by-and-bye.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman knows why well enough. The debate on Confederation, the arguments which led the statesmen of that period to consent, as a condition of Confederation, to that road being built in the way it was, the hon. gentleman knows quite well. My hon. friend says that the great expectations of the party in power have not been realised. Well, there are great expectations and there are little expectations; and I will never charge the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) with nourishing great expectations with reference to this country. If he nourishes any expectations at all, they are expectations which are small and minifying of the prospects and the future of this country, and it ill becomes him, or the hon. gentlemen for whom he speaks, to talk about the failure of expectations. I have here a little volume which, if I were to read it, would show the little expectations hon. gentlemen opposite held with reference to there ever being a single dollar of the amount which was loaned to the Canadian Pacific Railway being paid back to the country. Nearly every hon. gentleman who spoke on that side declared, if not with the same emphasis, yet almost to the same effect as the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) did, when, in one of the debates, he said: "I would as soon believe that the waters would flow back from the sea to the lakes as that one cent of that money will ever come back from the Canadian Pacific Railway exchequer to the Dominion Exchequer." That is a sample of the little expectations which hon. gentlemen opposite indulge in. I would rather indulge in great expectations, if they looked forward to a noble and grand future, and be somewhat disappointed, than indulge in small expectations of the future of the country. I simply rise to state to the House clearly, so that they will see, as I have no doubt they have seen the drift of the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the inconsistent position the hon. gentleman took when he attacked, as he has so often attacked, the vote of money this House gave to build up the trade interests of the Maritime Provinces, by securing to them what hon. gentlemen on each side of him voted for and spoke for and were very anxious to get.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I shall detain the House but a few moments. I wish first to express my satisfaction, and I think the feeling is common to the entire House, at the vigor with which the First Minister addressed the House on this subject. It gives us unmistakeable evidence of his restoration to health. For the disallowance of Manitoba local charters, the Government is from day to day responsible, and they do not shirk that responsibility, but rather glory in it. For the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway and its effects they are also responsible. They are also responsible for monopoly west of Manitoba, but that responsibility was incurred at the time of making the contract. We are all glad to get back two-thirds of the money, and I believe there would be no serious objection whatever to taking back the land if it were free land. If it were free land, it would be worth considerably more than we are paying for it. It may be worth, under existing circumstances, all that we give for it, but I do not rise to discuss that portion of the question. That the land is not free of railway monopoly is the reason we are offered it instead of money. Had it been free, it would not have been the company's land to-day to offer to us, because it would have been in the hands of settlers who had purchased it. The reason it is not, is because it is suffering from the disavantages of a monopoly. Hon. gentlemen may quote rates. I do not care what the rates are; I do not care even if they be cheaper than they are anywhere else, the settler rests under the liability that he may at any time be charged rates above what he can pay or what he may be willing to pay. That is the great drawback to the settlement of the country, as the last few years have shown. To my mind—perhaps it is not a logical mind—there is a strange want of logic in the reasons advanced by the three speakers opposite. First, we are told by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) that the railway charters are disallowed because they are mere paper charters, because their promoters cannot build a mile of railway and cannot put a dollar into the concern. We are told, in the second place, by the right hon. the First Minister, that he is opposed to roads being built every few miles along the line. There are two sets of objections: One that the roads would not be built, and the other that they would be too many. As a final argument, we are told that we should not allow the people to enjoy their natural rights of building their railways where they choose, because the old Provinces have advanced the money to build the main line; and in the same breath the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) says to disallow the charters is the best possible thing that could happen to the North-West, because disallowing them will probably have the effect of bringing about the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway. If the Hudson Bay Railway is to be built, how are the old Provinces going to be recouped for their expendi-

ture on the main line. What is the practical difference to the old Provinces if the trade drifts into the United States, or goes by the outlet of Hudson Bay? Is Hudson Bay or its outlets in the old Provinces? Where is the great advantage of preventing trade going to the United States in order to foster a line going to Hudson Bay? The First Minister is undoubtedly sincere, but many men before him have been sincere on a wrong policy. He has, rather indirectly intimated that the railway company themselves are not wedded to this policy. He has said that if they choose, as the courses which railways pursue are doubtful and uncertain —if they believed it to be their interest, at any time, to allow roads to be built, running to the south, the Government would not allow them. The last speaker has referred to binding the Provinces together. My opinion is that the best way in which we can possibly bind the Provinces together is by promoting content among their inhabitants, making the people of the North-West satisfied, contented, and you have produced the strongest possible band with which you can bind them to the Eastern Provinces. I believe they are not contented. I have myself heard language in that country which I am sorry to hear in any portion of the Dominion upon this subject. What have we to fear, or what have the railway company to fear from competition from the other side? With the great cash subsidy that they have received, with the large land subsidy that they have received, with the free railroads that they have received, with their proximity to the head waters of the St. Lawrence, at Thunder Bay, I believe they are in a position to compete successfully, very successfully, with any possible railway on the American side or any system of railways. I believe, furthermore, that with these great advantages it is quite possible, and I hope yet to see it, that they will penetrate the line that we are now debarred from crossing, and will draw business to our side rather than take it the other way. There are two policies in relation to dealing with the expressed wishes of the people. One is to concede to them gracefully and fairly; the other is to concede to them when you can no longer resist them. I fear very much that in this question of railways in the North-West, we are pursuing the latter policy. We are debarred from crossing the line with railroads, but the right hon. the Prime Minister must know that, though the Government may prevent railways from crossing that line, they cannot in the future, any more than in the past, prevent our citizens from crossing it, and, if discontent reigns in that vast country, they will, not only from it but from the old Provinces as well, continue to cross that line, although railroads are prevented from crossing.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman would have the House believe that there is great discontent in the North-West occasioned by the rates that are being charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have waited patiently thinking that perhaps, when hon. gentlemen were making the statement, they would come down to the figures and would attempt to show that the Canadian Pacific Railway is charging more for the carriage of freight from the North-West eastward or in any other direction than competing railways in the United States. When we turn to the figures, we find that the inhabitants of the North-West are especially favored in freight rates compared to the settlers in the American North-West. In 1884, a comparison was given of the charges on freight between the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Union Pacific, and the St. Paul and Minneapolis Railway for 500 miles. The charge on 100 lbs. of wheat was 30 cts. by the Canadian Pacific Railway, $1 by the Union Pacific, 68 cts. by the Northern Pacific, and 30 cts. by the St. Paul and Minneapolis. In 1885, the Canadian Pacific Railway give a comparison of their rates with the rates charged by a number of railways in the United States. The rate charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway per ton, per 100 miles, is $1.20; by the Northern Pacific, $1.96; by the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba, $1.80; by the Union Pacific, $1.91; by the Central Pacific, $1.96; by the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, $1.28; by the Chicago and North-Western, $1.31; by the Atcheson, Topeka and Santa Fe, $1.79; by the Illinois Central, $1.31; by the Boston and Lowell, $2.33; by the New York and New England, $1.72; and by the Boston and Providence, $2.83. So that from the figures given hon. gentlemen opposite will see that the Canadian Pacific Railway are not using any monopoly that they claim they have, and that the hon. gentlemen stated they have, injuriously to the settlers of the North-West, that their average rate for freight is actually less than on all these railways I have named, showing that there is nothing to complain of in the rates of freight as compared with other railways in the United States and more particularly in the North-West. Hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken of Manitoba and the disallowance of Acts in Manitoba, forgetting that Manitoba to-day is very different from the Manitoba of 1881, when the Canadian Pacific Railway charter was granted and assented to, that the Province of Manitoba is ten times as large to-day as it was then. On the 15th February, 1881, when the Canadian Pacific Railway charter became law, the total area of Manitoba was 9,500,000 acres. At the same Session, after the railway charter was granted, the Province of Manitoba came here asking that her boundaries should be extended, and they were extended, so that she at present has an area of 96,000,000 acres. The Province of Manitoba accepted that increased area upon the condition that all the provisions that we had made in the railway charter should be observed and held over that acquired territory. The Government of Manitoba acknowledged and accepted the principle that the traffic and trade of the Canadian Pacific Railway should not be tapped and should not be drawn south into the United States, the principle which we had acted upon and which the hon. gentlemen who preceded us in the Government acted upon in the legislation which they passed in 1878 in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. WATSON. In the added territory.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, Manitoba acknowledged the principle that it was right and proper that that traffic should not be drawn south.

Mr. WATSON. Not the old Province.

Mr. McLELAN. And nine-tenths of the area of the Province of Manitoba has been acquired and given to the Province since the Canadian Pacific Railway charter was assented to.

Mr. WATSON. All the Acts that have been disallowed have been in reference to the old Province of Manitoba.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has referred to a statement made by the right hon. the Premier, respecting the expectations we had of receipts from the North-West, and has made a comparison, limiting it only to the cash receipts by the Government. The House will remember that the Premier made his calculations before the granting of the Canadian Pacific Railway charter, and that he embraced the whole of the receipts from the lands to be sold in the North-West. Since the railway charter was granted, in 1881, the receipts by the company and by the Government for lands, in cash, have been $14,361,406, a pretty fair return since 1881; and there have been lands sold, exclusive of those sold to colonisation companies, upon which there is due, and will be paid to the company and the Government, about $6,500,000; so that the return, either in cash or in the balance yet uncollected, is nearly $21,000,000 since 1881. When we look at it in that respect, and take the amount of cash received by the company and by the Government since the granting of this

charter in 1881, we find that there has been a pretty fair return from the lands, from which we can, I think, calculate that in the next few years, when the road is in operation and the country is opened up, the returns from the lands of the North-West will be a very considerable augmentation to the revenues of the country.

Mr. DAVIES. I cannot see what conclusion the hon. gentleman intended to draw from his argument that a certain amount of money had been received from the North-West lands by the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was not the question under discussion. The only point alluded to by my hon. friend was the question of the amount of money we have received, from the sale of land in the North-West Territory, and how nearly the prediction of the hon. Premier of the enormous number of millions we would receive, has been verified by the fact. That, Sir, is not the question under discussion. I am sure the Premier must have appreciated both the motive and the result which followed from the rising of the Minister of Marine to make clear that which he did not make clear himself. The Minister was very much afraid that the policy of the Government was not fairly understood, although the leader had taken no small pains and no little time to explain that policy; therefore he rose to throw a little more light upon the subject. And what is the result? The hon. gentleman avoided the question under discussion altogether, and attempted, not willingly, I hope, to distort the argument advanced by my hon. friend at my left. Now what was the position which the hon. member for Bothwell took upon this matter? He says the policy of the Government, when they built the Intercolonial Railway a few years ago, was to build it on British territory altogether, was to ignore commercial reasons altogether, and to build it as far away from the American frontier as they possibly could. The result of that policy was the useless expenditure of some twenty millions of money; I use the word useless, because now, as he says, you propose to run a new and short line from Montreal to the east, not through British territory at all, but through American territory. Now he says, the money of the people of the Dominion built the road to the east of Montreal, and it builds the road in the western country, so that if it is right and proper that in the eastern portion of the Dominion you should expend the public money in subsidising a road which is to run through American territory, how can you justify a refusal to allow private corporations to build roads in the western part of the Dominion which may run from the Canadian Pacific Railway to American territory—not with public money, but with that of private companies? Now, Sir, I do not think that upon this matter Parliament has been treated fairly by the hon. gentleman. It has been shown already that when he sought to induce this House to agree to the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, he explained clearly that the intention was not to hamper or to check the increase of roads from the Canadian Pacific Railway to the American boundary. He explained that clearly and distinctly, and afterwards what policy did the hon. gentleman adopt? When the Manitoba Legislature took him at his word and passed charters allowing the construction of roads from the Canadian Pacific Railway through the territory of the old Province of Manitoba, the hon. gentleman says he penned a Minute of Council overriding their legislation and preventing it from becoming law, upon several grounds, one of which was that it did interfere and did conflict with the charter granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman says "no," but I referred a short time ago to the Minute of Council which he mentioned, and if the hon. gentleman will refer to it he will find that he distinctly takes both grounds. I will refer the hon. gentleman to the Sessional Papers in volume 18, 1885, page 44, where he will find that the Acts for the construction of the Winnipeg and South-Eastern Railway Company, the Manitoba Tramway Company, the Emerson and North-Western, and the Manitoba Act, and the Acts for the construction of two lines in British Columbia, were reported upon by the Minister of Justice, and in that report those Acts were recommended for disallowance. Why? Because their terms conflicted with the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, in the first place, and because the policy of the Government, which was confirmed by Parliament and acquiesced in by the Legislature of Manitoba, with reference to the added territory only, was intended to prevent that diversion. So that the hon. gentleman asked in his recommendation for the disallowance of these Acts, and he did so on the grounds that they were distinctly at variance with the contract of the Canadian Pacific Railway, notwithstanding the pledge he had given in this House, that it was not the intention of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract to interfere with the construction of these roads. Now, what was the other ground? On the ground that it was not in the interest of the public that these lines should be allowed to be built to draw away traffic from the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, that policy was repudiated in this House by the Minister of Railways, in 1884. When the hon. gentleman sought to induce this House to agree to the contract, he, as First Minister, put a construction upon that contract which, when it suited his purpose, he afterwards repudiated, when he wanted these Acts to be disallowed. Afterwards, when the Government sought to induce this House to agree to a loan of $30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway, what inducements did they offer? The Minister of Railways, speaking on behalf of the Government, speaking as the mouth-piece of the Government, distinctly told to the House if we would grant them that $30,000,000, the policy of the Government with regard to disallowing these Acts, would be reversed. The Minister of Railways, on that occasion, made a lengthy speech in the course of which, he said:

"I am glad to be able to state to the House, that such is the confidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the power of the Canadian Pacific Railway to protect itself, that when the line is constructed north of Lake Superior, the Government feel it will not be incumbent upon them to preserve the position they have hitherto felt bound to preserve, that of refusing to consent to the construction of lines within the Province of Manitoba, connecting it with American railways to the south. I can give no better evidence to the House and the country of the advanced position which we consider this great enterprise of the Canadian Pacific Railway has attained, than when I say that I feel it is consistent with what we owe to the people of this country and to that great national work, that the Government should not deem it incumbent upon themselves to pursue the restrictive policy within the Province of Manitoba which we have hitherto been obliged to maintain."

There, Sir, was a solemn pledge and compact made, so far as a Minister could make a pledge to, and compact with, the House, that if we would loan $30,000,000 the previous restrictive policy of the Government would be reversed, these lines should be allowed to be built, and we stand in that position. To-day we have a construction placed by the First Minister upon the contract of the Canadian Pacific Railway at variance with that placed upon it when it was brought down for ratification; and we have the pledge given by the Minister of Railways—that if we would make that loan to the company their policy should be reversed—deliberately repudiated. We have that pledge broken, and we have the First Minister coming here to-day, snapping his fingers at that pledge, and saying it is not the intention of the Government to reverse that policy at all, and that after the House had been induced to vote money on that pledge. I say the House has not been treated fairly, I say the people of Manitoba are not being treated fairly. The Minister of Finance intimates that a com-

parison of the rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway with the rates of several lines of American railways, will be in favor of the Canadian line. That may or may not be, I have not had the opportunity of comparing them. But, Sir, what answer is that to the people, to the farmers, to the settlers, to the immigrants, who went within fifteen miles of the boundary, and who have yet no railway facilities, and no hope of getting any, if the policy of the hon. gentleman is persisted in? Why, Sir, growing grain there will have to be abandoned, for they will have no means of getting it out of the country. The hon. gentleman states in this House that he has two distinct policies; one, as far as the North-West is concerned, directly at variance with the policy which he has adopted in the eastern part of the Dominion. In the eastern part of the Dominion he allows this Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway to be tapped, and runs the former railway into a foreign country. He adopts a policy the effect of which will be to divert trade from British soil. Sir, we know how this Chamber rang a few years ago with the grand policy which was comprised in the words: "Our railway shall run from ocean to ocean on British soil." All foreigners were to be excluded; there was not a foreigner from the south to be allowed to tap our roads or trade with us at all. All those statements, all that is reversed now, so far as the eastern Provinces are concerned, all that policy with regard to building the railway on British soil, and all that policy was approved by the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of Marine and Fisheries and it was cheered to the echo by hon. gentlemen opposite. When that policy was reversed and one directly opposite was introduced and the hon. gentleman declares that he intends to prevent the construction of those roads, that policy is also cheered to the echo, and it really appeared that any policy which the right hon. gentleman chooses to announce will receive the cheers of very many hon. gentlemen behind him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And of the whole country.

Mr. DAVIES. Not of the whole country, as the hon. gentleman will learn to his cost before very many months have passed over his head. The hon. gentleman is crowing before he is out of the woods. He is going to appeal to the people shortly, we understand, and I venture to predict that when he does so some of his brightest aspirations will receive a very rude shock. But that is not exactly germane to the particular point now before the House. That particular point is, whether the pledges given by the Government in this regard are to be kept; whether faith is to be kept with the people of Manitoba; whether this policy, the results of which are so detrimental to the interests of the settlers in Manitoba, is to be maintained or not; whether that country is to be opened up by new lines, or whether the restrictive policy which had been repudiated in 1884 is to be again restored and maintained intact.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). In regard to the hon. gentleman's remarks with respect to hon. members following the policy laid down by the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, all I can say is, that we have on more than one occasion in the past appealed to our constituents on the policy so provided, and have not been met with disapproval, but, on the contrary, that policy has been sustained. So I believe it will be at the next election, when we have to go before our constituents. Upon this particular question before the House, as a representative from Ontario I have no hesitation whatever in following the leader of the Government, and I am very much surprised to hear hon. members from Ontario or Quebec or the Maritime Provinces expressing any doubt as to the propriety of the legislation of the Government and the course which the leader has announced as the policy of the Government on this question, or expressing approval for one moment of the amendment of the hon. member for Marquette. Looking at the question from the standpoint of the older Provinces, we cannot but say that the direct effect of a policy such as the amendment now before the House proposes to introduce will be injurious to the interests of Ontario, Quebec and the older Provinces. We have risked our money, we have sacrificed our money, we have been told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we have gone into a ruinous experiment, that we have loaded ourselves with debt in order to build the Canadian Pacific Railway; and are we to stand by and see our interests threatened and everything done that will assist in procuring legislation, the effect of which will be to take the whole benefit of the trade of Manitoba and the North-West into the United States and through the United States and divert it from the older Provinces. To support the amendment of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) would be suicidal on the part of representatives from Ontario or Quebec, and probably the representatives from the eastern Provinces are in the same position. Certainly as to the representatives from Ontario and Quebec there can hardly be more than one opinion on this point, that the construction of lines tapping the Canadian Pacific Railway and leading in an easterly direction from that line into the United States, into Minnesota or Dakota or the Territories, will most directly injure the interests of the older Provinces. We do not feel as if, after risking so much for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, having built it as we have done with such wonderful success as to evoke the admiration of the world, and having secured an all-rail route through Canada on our own soil, we do not approve of the idea of the whole benefit of that great enterprise being diverted from the paths of those whose money has built the road. I grant that in some points of view it might be beneficial to residents of Manitoba and the North-West to have railway competition and American railways tapping the Canadian Pacific Railway, competing with it and dividing trade with it. But with all kindness and consideration for the interests of our western fellow-subjects I submit that it is not for them to urge such demands upon us at the present moment. I submit they ought to consider that we have made sacrifices, we have risked our money in building the railway, and it is only right and reasonable that we should protect the interests of the older Provinces in securing the trade of the country coming through Canada rather than through the United States. I was, therefore, much gratified at hearing the statement of the leader of the Government that if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should come to the Government and say they wished clause 15 repealed, it would then be a matter for consideration by the Government as to whether in the interests of the whole Dominion it was right and proper it should be repealed. For that clause is as important in the interests of the older Provinces as it is in the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. As a matter of fairness to the Canadian Pacific Railway under the circumstances of the case I do not think it is right we should now seek the abandonment of that clause, which is part of the contract and upon the faith of which the road was built. No, we should not in fairness endeavor to exact such terms from the company; but in looking at the question from the standpoint of the interests of the older Provinces I was gratified to hear the declaration of the leader of the Government, and it was with surprise I heard any hon. member from the older Provinces advocating the amendment of the hon. member from Marquette.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am only going to occupy a very few moments in expressing my opinion of the amendment. As a motion I entirely disapprove of it. I have been an advocate of the Canadian Pacific Railway on public grounds, because I believed it was in the interest of the country that it should be built. I have sustained the Administration in

every measure brought in in connection with it, and I give them credit for having displayed the courage to go through with it, and it required a good deal of courage to go on from time to time in the face of the opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite. I have been astounded, and I have been more than surprised to-day to find the opposition still maintained on the other side of the House. To what is it those hon. gentlemen object? Do they still want to discredit an enterprise that is a credit and honor to Canada, because that is what several of the speeches have done this Session? I am surprised that the hon. gentleman who is in my eye, who is so vigorous in his expressions and clear in his utterances and whose speeches are always attentively listened to by this House—I regret to find that he, at this late date, keeps up this antagonism, not to the Government alone but to the enterprise itself; because whatever he may choose to do with respect to the Government that is a matter for himself; but that hon. gentleman and the leader of that party who is not now present and those who support him should long ago have become convinced that the Canadian Pacific Railway was an institution bound to be completed. It had received the aid of the Government—and magnanimous aid was given to the company,—and public confidence, and certainly within the last year we were surprised into the belief that this undertaking would be completed. There was a time when there were grave doubts as to whether it would be completed or not. And I have no doubt of this, if it had not been for the aid the Government rendered, and the manly stand they took—and I give them great credit for it—in coming to the assistance of that great enterprise and that combination of men who deserved every support and encouragement the country could give them, it was questionable whether the railway would have been in such a position that we should see it completed in our time. Sir, it is about time that the opposition to that scheme should disappear from the other side of the House. Let us look at the matter from a practical point of view. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they hope to carry the country at the next election. Well, he would be a pretty wise man who could predict the result of the next election, but I think there is a growing party between the two great parties, and when the appeal is made to the country, and when I issue my manifesto to the people, as I may possibly do before the general election, many of these gentlemen behind the Government, and many of those behind the leader of the Opposition, who vote on party lines, will find, when they go to their constituents, that they will ask them to entrust them with some discretion, to vote outside of party whips, according to their judgment, their conscience and their sense of right. Hon. gentlemen opposite, as a matter of policy, should bear in mind that the strict party line of voting on questions of public importance is not the course which is likely to create confidence in them in the minds of the public. Is it policy for them to drive away a great institution which has power in the State, and is bound to govern the State some of these days; it governs the House now just as powerfully as the Grand Trunk did a few years ago, but it is more discreet and it does not threaten them. It endeavors to accomplish the object in another way, by showing that the public interests are involved, and that as a matter of policy, hon. gentlemen should cease their opposition to an enterprise which, however much they may have attacked the Government for entering upon it, they should discuss matters on their merits, but not in a way which will throw discredit on it, or create a want of confidence in it. That is all I have to say on that point, except this, that I am going to vote right straight through for the resolutions. If any of you had any doubt about it, you have none now I hope. And now a word as to what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said, when he asked the question about the Intercolonial, and endeavored to contrast the different policy of the Government with regard to the clause in the Manitoba resolutions, and pointed out that they were subsidising the Short Line Railway to the Maritime Provinces. Well, Sir, I am no dog in the manger. I advocated the Intercolonial road; I believe I was, in my own humble way, a factor in endeavoring to secure it, and I take this opportunity of paying tribute to gentlemen from the Province of Quebec, and especially to one gentleman from that Province who occupied a position in the Cabinet. I take this opportunity of saying that to the late Sir George Cartier we are largely indebted for the Intercolonial Railway. In saying that, I do not wish to detract in any way from the credit which is due to the right hon. Premier, who behaved through those long negotiations with a great deal of skill and judgment, who was prepared to ascertain and to accept what was public opinion as he found it, who endeavored to gauge public opinion and judge what would be best in the interests of the country. I give the right hon. gentleman credit for that, and in my opinion he adopted that course, after the matter had been discussed for six months in the Cabinet, and for months, I believe, or certainly for many weeks, in this House, the right hon. gentleman decided in the Cabinet to adopt the route by which the Intercolonial now runs. The hon. member for Bothwell says: Why was that route adopted; why did not they adopt a shorter line then? I presume that was the line of the hon. gentleman's argument. A shorter line would not have attained the object in view then, because it would have gone through foreign territory, and we wanted, first of all, to promote the security of this portion of the Empire, by giving us a military line, by giving us connection from Halifax to Montreal, as we partly had at that time for the west. It was partly on military grounds and partly for other reasons. It was not a question of a short line through Maine, but of a line by the River St. John or one by the present route—that was the question; and after a full consideration, after elaborate surveys and reports had been made at considerable expense, the Government came to a decision which I do not regret to-day, although the distance may be longer to certain points of the Lower Provinces than by the proposed new line. Now where is the similarity, where is the comparison of such a policy as that and the policy which has been adopted in the west? Sir, as has been better said by gentlemen who have preceded me than I can say it, the older Provinces of the Dominion have spent their money and risked the credit of our nation—for nation I shall call it—in endeavoring to promote the settlement and development of the West, in endeavoring to extend its population and open up communication with the Pacific. They have done that, and when they have done that, I would say to the people of Manitoba, through their representatives and through the press, that Manitoba has been pretty well attended to. And, while I am anxious as any man to settle up Manitoba and promote her interests, she must not expect that every other interest is to be sacrificed to her. Sir, our first duty is to Canada, and not to anyone Province, not to New Brunswick, or Nova Scotia, or Prince Edward Island, or Ontario, or Quebec or Manitoba. Our first duty is to Canada, and the interests of Canada at the present time call for us to maintain the trade of that western country for the communication which we have opened up at an enormous expense to the Treasury and to her people. Sir, there is a time coming, and I believe it will come before long, when that restriction will be removed. I believe it should be removed as soon as it can be done with safety to that great enterprise and without detriment to the interests of the people of Canada at large. But this is not the time to do it. This is not the time, when there is a Bill before the House to get back $20,000,000 of cash, and the restoration of a portion of our lands to wipe out the debt, which hon. gentlemen opposite said never would be

paid. In saying that they did great discredit to the enterprise, which was then struggling into existence; and they should now atone for it by coming out manfully to support that enterprise, and by saying to the country by a unanimous vote: We approve of this; we never thought that money would be paid back; we are proud to see it, and accept it; all party interests will sink before the public interest and our desire to promote the public credit.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I wish to say a few words on this question as it is so important that I think it should not be hurried through.

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

After Recess.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I for one would like very much to know that the Government could see their way clear to have such an arrangement made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that this objectionable clause restraining others from building railways within fifteen miles of the border would be done away with. It certainly has created a great deal of contention. It has been the cause of more contention, perhaps, than the thing is really worth; for, I believe, if the concession were made, that there would be only such railways built as would be paying enterprises, and that a great many charters which are now thought of because the clause is there would not be dreamed of if the clause were removed. It is true, as has been argued by some hon. gentlemen, among them by the hon. member for Marquette who moved this amendment, that hopes were held out to this Parliament that when the road was completed this clause would be swept away. Last Session there were several Bills before the Railway Committee, which were objected to by the Minister of Railways and thrown out, because the road was not completed. This year we had it announced in His Excellency's Speech from the Throne that the railway was about completed; we know that it is, to all intents and purposes, completed to the Pacific coast; the last rail has been laid; therefore the contention of last Session cannot be made this Session. I listened with the greatest interest and attention to the able speech of the right hon. leader of the Government, who, in his usual exhaustive, clear and convincing manner, argued that it would be bad policy for the Government to have this clause swept away; and I understood him to say, what I never before heard contended, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself could not build lines south and east or south-west to the border.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Then I was misinformed. I understood the hon. Premier to say this—perhaps he did not intend it—that suppose they themselves proposed to build lines to the border, tapping the great trunk line stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the Government would not allow them to do so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me, or perhaps I may have expressed myself imperfectly. I said the clause in the Bill was for the protection of the Dominion particularly, as well as for the benefit of the railway, and that even if the railway company desired to give up that clause, if we thought it was in the interest of the Dominion to keep it there, it must remain there.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Then the railway company themselves can build all the lines they like. They now own two lines running from Winnipeg into Dakota and Minnesota. It is proposed to run a line from Brandon to the boundary line; but the Canadian Pacific Railway Company say, no, you must not do that, because it will tap our trunk line. Well, suppose it does. I do not believe it will carry grain into the United States, because—I believe I made use of this argument in this House before, and I know it is a correct argument—grain is sold at a higher price in Manitoba than it is at St. Vincent, across the line; in fact, Americans have sent their grain into our country, paid the duty, and sold it there; therefore it is not likely that grain would be taken from a richer market into a poorer market. Then, why should not we have the freest intercourse with the neighboring republic so far as passenger traffic is concerned? We are doing it down here; why should we not do it in the west? The railway company say, we will build lines, but you shall not build them except where you get our consent. I understand that the other day in the Railway Committee, the consent of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was said to have been obtained that a line should be built in British Columbia against the spirit and the letter of this clause. Now, the charter which the company obtained from this House is not a cast iron charter; they have been the first to break it, if it has been broken. If a man contracts with me to build a house, and puts all the clauses in which are necessary to protect himself, and agrees to build that house within a certain time, and represents himself as wealthy and able to build the house, and after he has been two or three months at the work comes to me and says, I shall utterly fail and be ruined if you do not advance me more money than the contract stipulated; and if he does that, not once merely, but two or three times, I do not think he can come to me afterwards, when I want him to release some clause in the contract, and say, no, that was not the agreement between us; but I say, were you not the first to break it, and come to me and ask me to help you out of holes and quagmires, and why should you not help me now? Now, I think this great railway company, with their enormous wealth and capital, after coming here and being aided by us so liberally, after we lent them $30,000,000, and gave them all sorts of concessions since, can fairly be asked, when the interests of a large section of people of this country, a daily growing people—the right arm of this Dominion, to quote the words of the hon. member for East York—demand it, and when it is necessary, in order to allay discontent, and strife, and wrangling, that they should give up this clause, and let anybody build a railway who has money to build it. If that were done you may be sure that a great many charters would disappear, and only the wholesome, the useful, and the sound charters would stand. I presume my hon. friend who moved this amendment does not intend to press it to a vote. He has heard the Government announcement of the policy to be pursued; but while I have been, and am to-day, an advocate of this road, while I admire the energy with which the company have carried on their work, and give them all the credit that is due to them, yet, as representing an eastern constituency which tells me to my face every day, you have taxed us to build this road, and I have said to them over and over again, there are objectionable clauses which will be swept away as soon as the road is built, and we shall have our money back and this great country will be on the line of prosperity with other countries, going on conquering and to conquer, growing wealthy and great. But I shall have to tell them that the time has not yet come when this objectionable clause can be swept away, when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will allow it to be swept away, although the railway is built. I find myself in that awkward position, but I trust that when we meet here again next Session, then at least we shall get relief from this clause, and shall be allowed to build our roads where we like. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have certainly had a great many concessions granted to them; and there is, perhaps, nobody who ought to be more congratulated than the hon. Premier himself upon this, almost the work of his

life. It has, no doubt, been a cause of anxiety and solicitude to him far beyond what most people think; and he is, perhaps, a little more solicitous on that account for the creation of his own hand. Perhaps the child has attained such beautiful proportions that it has really mastered the parent, to the extent that his affections are completely with his offspring, and he can see no wrong in it, and cannot do too much for it. It is such a fat, sleek, well-fed young one, so handsome, promising and lusty, that he bestows all his affections on it, while the rest of the children have to go without proper clothes and necessary nourishment. His affection is pardonable. We all have our pets, and I was never more struck in my life with a picture than I was last fall with a cartoon in *Grip*, and *Grip* often gets off very good things. The cartoon represented a fair in Toronto. There were all kinds of animals there and manufactures, and all sorts of things, and prominent in the show was a great big pen with one solitary big sow in it. She was too fat to stand almost, and she was labelled "C.P.R."—and there stood the Premier, in the garb of an old farmer, pointing to the sow with a look of pride, saying: "Look at her; fatted all myself;" and certainly he has got the fattest sow ever fattened in the North-West or in the Dominion of Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. North-westerly not son'-westerly.

Mr. WOODWORTH. No wonder, he looks at the curl of the sow's little tail; the sow is so fat that it has almost no tail at all, and the feed that has gone into it and the proportions it has attained, have made it so dear to his affections, that I am afraid he has taken all the swill and given it to this pet. However we can pardon this, because, no doubt, it is necessary to the happiness and prosperity of the animal that it should be well fed. But I think now it has been so well fed and taken care of, a little exercise might do it good, so that it would not want to lie down all the time. I am no pessimist in regard to the road; I believe it is going to develop the country and give an impetus to it nothing else could have given. I believe we are going to see the fruits of our labors in that direction; I believe it is a continental road; I believe that it has a geographical position which is going to baffle the most astute engineers on the continent of America in endeavoring to establish competition with it; but while I believe in the road and in this great country, and while I am of that age that I can look forward with great hope to see the fulfilment of a great many, at least, of the glowing predictions that have been made, yet I think there should be reason and moderation shown; and while this great enterprise enjoys the confidence of this Parliament and the country we should not have it larger than Parliament, we should not have it dictate to Parliament, but Parliament should still have the control and management of that road, which is so closely interwoven with everything that pertains to our life as a Confederation.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Watson.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fairbank,	Livingston,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	McCraney,
Béchard,	Geoffrion,	McIntyre
Bernier,	Gillmor,	McMullen,
Bourassa,	Glen,	Mills,
Burpee,	Guay,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Gunn,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Harley,	Scriver,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Irvine,	Springer,
Casgrain,	Jackson,	Trow,
Cockburn,	King,	Watson,
Cook,	Kirk,	Weldon,
Davies,	Langelier,	Wilson,
De St. Georges,	Lister,	Woodworth.—49.
Edgar,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Auger,	Fortin,	McLelan,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	McNeill,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gagné,	Massue,
Baker, (Victoria),	Gaudet,	Mitchell,
Barker,	Gault,	Moffat,
Barnard,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Gordon,	O'Brien,
Bell,	Grandbois,	Orton,
Benoit,	Guilbault,	Paint,
Bergeron,	Guillet,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergin,	Hackett,	Pruyn,
Billy,	Hay,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Hesson,	Riopel,
Bossé,	Hickey,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hilliard,	Royal,
Bryson,	Homer,	Rykert,
Burnham,	Hurteau,	Scott,
Cameron (Inverness),	Jamieson,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Shanly,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kaulbach,	Small,
Carling,	Kilvert,	Smyth,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kinney,	Sproule,
Chapleau,	Krans,	Taschereau,
Cimon,	Labrosse,	Tassé,
Cochrane,	Landry (Kent),	Taylor,
Colby,	Landry (Montmagny),	Temple,
Coughlin,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Thompson,
Coursol,	Lesage,	Townshend,
Curran,	Macdonald (King's),	Tupper,
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tyrwhitt,
Daoust,	Mackintosh,	Valin,
Dawson,	Macmaster,	Vanasse,
Dickinson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wallace (Albert),
Dodd,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Ward,
Dugas,	McCallum,	White (Cardwell),
Dundas,	McCarthy,	White (Hastings),
Dupont,	McDougald (Picto	White (Renfrew),
Farrow,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Brockville)—116.
Ferguson (Welland),	McGreevy,	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I beg to move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same by striking out the provision for cancelling $10,000,000 of the Canadian Pacific Railway debt to the Government by the retention of a part of their land grant.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. TROW. I think when hon. gentlemen opposite understand the motion I am about to make, they will have no objection to it. The fundamental principle of Government is to tax all properties alike, and I presume it is the interest of the country, and of Manitoba and the North-West in particular, in this case, that all properties should be liable to taxation. I have no desire to move any amendment that would interfere with the settlements already made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; my amendment is merely that the property sold by the company will be liable to taxation. Taxation is the basis of municipal government, and all lands that are not subject to taxation are a drawback to immediate settlement, for the construction of roads, and the erection of school houses. The amendment I intend to propose will do no injustice to the syndicate; it is merely intended to meet the case of capitalists who purchase at times a whole township and whose purchase is not known to the public. I do not mean to say that the syndicate would connive at keeping secret the purchase of lands, so that they might not be taxed, but there are cases of purchases of lands which are not known to the municipal authorities for years after the sale was effected, and the result is these lands do not contribute, as they should, to municipal improvements? Let a return be made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company similar to a return made by the Crown Lands Department in Ontario, either quarterly, semi-annually or annually, and the public will be greatly benefited. I beg therefore to move in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same

by providing that it shall be the duty of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to publish periodically to the proper authorities a list of the lands forming part of their land grant, which they have sold or may from time to time sell, with the intent that such lands may be taxed like other lands in the same municipalities.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman said he was going to make a very reasonable proposition. I think it is a reasonable proposition, that is to say, that the Canadian Pacific Railway shall publish regularly, either by laying before the House or in some other way by which publicity is given, the lands that they sell. I was at first under the impression that the hon. gentleman was going to attack the privilege the company have got in the Act. Of course we could not do that. There would be a direct breach of the contract. Has the hon. gentleman got a clause prepared to put in the Act?

Mr. TROW. No, I have not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a reasonable proposition. I do not know that we ought to stop the passage of the Bill for that purpose, however.

Mr. TROW. Will the hon. leader of the Government prepare the amendment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no. I have no ojection to go into committee on it.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TROW moved that the following be added as section 7*a*:—

The company shall lay before the House of Commons, within the first fifteen days of the meeting of Parliament, a list of all lands sold by them during the year ending on the 1st day of October in each year, together with the names of the purchasers.

Motion agreed to.

Committee rose and amendment concurred in.

Mr. McLELAN moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. McCARTHY moved in amendment:

That the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same by embodying therein the provisions of the resolution prepared by the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto, at the request of the then Minister of Railways, and which was referred to by him in his place in Parliament on the 7th February, 1881, providing for equal mileage rates going from or to Toronto by Ontario railways.

He said: This, in substance, is to provide for an equal mileage rate for the traffic passing over the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is to go to the Ontario system of railways south of that line. By the charter, provision was made that all reasonable facilities should be afforded to the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway when it should be completed to the point of junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canada Central Railway Company, for the receiving, forwarding and delivering of traffic upon and over the railways of the said companies respectively, and for the return of carriages, trucks, &c. Then it went on to provide, that the rate of carriage should be the same for that particular line of road as it was upon the Canadian Pacific Railway itself east of Callander, that is to say, that the rate which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company charged should be made equal for the benefit of the Ontario system of railways. During the passage of the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, the Toronto Board of Trade became alarmed at the prospect that the Canadian Pacific Railway would acquire the Canada Central, and further, that the railway would acquire, or might acquire, as seemed then quite probable, what was known as the Ottawa and Occidental, the road from Ottawa to the city of Montreal. They memorialised the Government and asked that provision should be made, which was not quite made in the charter itself, that if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company did aquire this continuous line of railway from Callander, which was to be the terminal point of the road, to Montreal, the freight which might come from Callander to Toronto, Hamilton and the western part of Ontario, should be carried at a fair and equal mileage rate, so that the Province of Ontario and the chief cities of that Province should have fair play in the freight that came from the North-West, and in the goods that were to go from the older Provinces to the North-West. The memorial which was presented to the Government contained these provisions: It was represented that it would practically transfer the terminus of the road from Callander where, as we thought probable, it was arranged that the terminus of the road was to be, to Montreal, and the result of that would be that it would give the Province of Quebec a strong and direct interest to divert the traffic of the North-West away from the Ontario system of railways and centres of trade, so as to pass it over the whole length of their easterly lines. Therefore the Board of Trade went on in their memorial to say, that they protested against power being granted without a most stringent provision being made to prevent injustice to Ontario traffic, and they urged upon the Government that in order to protect Ontario interests it was absolutely necessary that no higher mileage rates should be charged on Ontario traffic over the Canadian Pacific Railway west of Lake Nipissing, than that which would be charged *pro rata* on eastern traffic in proportion to the whole distance of its carriage by the railways owned or operated by the syndicate; or, in other words, that the syndicate should not be permitted to place any higher mileage rates on the portion of their railway through which the Ontario traffic must pass than on the portion over which the eastern traffic must pass. The result of that memorial to the Government was that negotiations were entered into between the Government and the railway company and the Government reported to the deputation that the railway company had agreed to the following proposition. It was the determined intention of the Government, as represented by Sir Charles Tupper, the then Minister of Railways, that the interests of Ontario should be fully looked after. It was their aim that each Province should have the full benefit of its natural position, and they would regard it as a national calamity if they failed in providing equal facilities for all. The understanding with the railway company was clear upon that point, and as it was proverbially difficult to provide against the ingenuity of the railway management, the Minister of the day promised that he would be glad to have the advantage of any suggestions from the board, which would serve to strengthen the clause, so as to procure this desirable result. The Board of Trade thus invited to formulate a proposition, did so, and they sent to the Minister of Railways this clause, which I will read:

"And in the event of the (Pacific) company's acquiring, amalgamating with, or leasing, or holding and operating the said Canada Central Railway, or purchasing, acquiring or holding or operating any line or lines of railway, or acquiring running powers over any railway, as in this section provided for, then and in any such case, it shall be unlawful for the company to make, and the company shall not make, any greater or higher charge for the carriage of traffic passing to and from the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway over any part of the company's line, west of Callander station, than the lowest mileage rate charged by the company for the carriage over such part of their line, on other similar traffic, and such lowest mileage rate shall in every such case be ascertained by apportioning upon the mileage of such part of an equal *pro rata* share of the whole charge made by the company for the carriage of such similar traffic over the whole of that portion of the line of railway operated by the company, or over which they shall have such running power, lying to the eastward of the point of shipment or destination, as the case may be, upon their said line, of such traffic passing to or from the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway."

Now, the meaning of that in less technical language than is used in the resolution, is this: That whatever charge the Canadian Pacific Railway makes in carrying goods from the North-West to the city of Montreal, or from the city of

Montreal to the North-West, that rate should be made into a *pro rata* mileage rate, and the Ontario system of railways should have the benefit of that *pro rata* mileage rate. Now, nothing can be fairer than that proposition. Some portions of Ontario have natural advantages in their nearness to the North-West, as the cities of the sea-board have natural advantages in being free from the expense of carriage, and it is only reasonable and proper, and I am not surprised to find, that the Minister of Railways did promise that these natural advantages of proximity should be enjoyed fairly by all the Provinces of the Dominion, each having contributed, according to their means and according to their population, to the building of this great national highway. All the Province of Ontario desired then, or desires now, is that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be equal to the Province according to the rate they charge yearly to the great competitive point of the city of Montreal. Let me explain, Mr. Speaker, what I mean by that. If goods are brought to Winnipeg from Montreal, the distance being somewhere, I believe, in the neighborhood of 1,400 or 1,500 miles, then the charge is made for that whole haul, and is to be put into a mileage rate, and when that traffic reaches Callander and it is delivered over to any Ontario railway, the rate to be charged to the Ontario railway, be that railway one or another, is to be its fair mileage proportion of the whole carriage to the city of Montreal. After this deputation came to Ottawa and presented this memorial to the Minister of Railways, and after he had required that they should formulate some resolution to be placed in an Act of Parliament, the hon. member for West Durham asked in his place in the House, what had been the result of the resolution of the Board of Trade, and what the railway company had said upon the subject. I find it is reported in *Hansard* of 7th February, 1881, that Mr. Blake made this enquiry:

"Whether there has been any correspondence between any member of the Government and the Toronto Board of Trade on the subject of rates to be charged on the Canadian Pacific Railway; whether any agreement has been made on the subject; at what date such agreement, if any, was made; and whether it will be laid on the Table."

Sir Charles Tupper answered as follows:—

"A communication was received from the Toronto Board of Trade suggesting a clause"——

I have just read the clause.

"which would provide for equal mileage rates for the traffic going from Toronto on Ontario railways. That proposal, made by that Board of Trade, as to what would meet their views, was considered unobjectionable and has been agreed to. The date on which that communication was made by me to the president of the Toronto board was, I think, the 2nd February. I do not see any objection to laying the communication on the Table."

So here we have first the memorial of the Board of Trade directing attention to this very important matter in the interest of Ontario; we have the request of the Minister to the Board of Trade to prepare a resolution on the subject, which was to be incorporated in a Bill or some agreement with the railway company; we have the Minister stating in Parliament that the resolution had been shown to the railway company and accepted by them as being unobjectionable; and now I want at this stage, probably the last we shall have to do with this railway company, and before they get liberty from this House to take the step proposed, to carry out this arrangement and embody it in an Act of Parliament. But I will direct attention to what the railway did do. The company passed a resolution which will be found in the Votes and Proceedings, and also in the schedule to the Act incorporating the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, providing, among other matters, or running powers over any road which they might build rom the junction at Warrapit River to Sault Ste. Marie in ase they should build that branch. It then went on to rovide for the matter to which I am calling attention, as ollows:—

"In the event of the company purchasing, acquiring, amalgamating with, leasing or holding and operating the Canada Central Railway, the said Callander station shall continue to be a neutral or receiving and distributing point common to the Canada Central Railway and any railway in the Province of Ontario, running southwards from said Callander station; and in that case all traffic to or from any point in the West or North-West, coming from or destined for any such Ontario railway shall be carried to or from Callander station at the same mileage rate as similar traffic to or from such point coming from or destined for the said Canada Central Railway; and such mileage rate shall not be greater than the average rate per mile charged for similar traffic from the point of shipment on the Canadian Pacific Railway to the point of destination on the Canada Central Railway, or from the point of shipment on the said Canada Central Railway to the point of destination on the Canadian Pacific Railway, as the case may be."

The resolution goes on to provide as to what the meaning of the word traffic shall be, and so on. I did not read, as I ought to have done, the earlier part of the resolution. It is as follows:—

"And whereas in the course of the debate upon the Canadian Pacific Railway Act certain questions arose which the contractors present at Ottawa deemed it expedient to meet, by agreeing that this company would enter into certain undertakings with the Government of Canada so soon as it should be organised, and it is expedient to provide for entering into such arrangements."

I have read the portion which pertains to the present point. The company then undertook, on its being arranged, to enter into an agreement to the effect that the same mileage rates will be charged, practically, on the goods passing over the line of railway and coming to the Ontario system of railways as was to be charged on the goods which passed down to the city of Montreal. But this resolution has never been carried out. The company have never entered into any such contract or agreement with the Government; and the resolution does not go so far as the resolution of the Board of Trade; it does not go to the full extent, although I have no doubt it was supposed at the time that it did carry out the spirit and intent of that resolution, because the resolution merely binds the company with respect to traffic which passes from the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Canada Central and from the Canada Central back to the Canadian Pacific Railway—in other words, it merely obliges the railway company to charge a mileage rate divided as it was between Ottawa and the North-West instead of Montreal and the North-West, leaving this loop-hole for the railway to discriminate against Ontario and its chief cities. They could charge a sum, say of $100, for a car between Winnipeg and Montreal. In adjusting the rate they can put all the $100 on that portion of the traffic which ends at Ottawa, leaving the portion fr m Ottawa onwards to be carried free—I know I am giving an extreme case—so increasing the mileage rate on traffic to Ontario so much per mile, whereas it ought to be the same if the sum were distributed over the whole length of line between Winnipeg and Montreal. I do not think the House will object to such an amendment of the charter of the company as will carry out what was intended by the charter. I am not moving in the direction of imposing any greater burdens upon the company; I do not design to alter their contract or do anything not intended from the first in the contract made between the company and the Government, because by section 24 of the charter it will be seen they did intend, and Sir Charles Tupper so stated to the Toronto Board of Trade, by section 24 to make those ample provisions for the protection of the trade of the chief Provinces, if I may so term it, of the Dominion. That clause provides merely, however, for an interchange of traffic and fair mileage rate with one particular railway, namely, the only railway which then had a charter to build the link—the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway. That railway has not been built, and therefore that clause of the Act which was intended to give that link which it was supposed would be constructed between Callander and Toronto, this interchange of traffic and fair mileage rates does not apply. Instead of that railway there is

another road respecting which we had so much discussion last night. But the resolution does not speak merely of one road; it speaks of all roads; it refers to any road which may at any time be brought to the mutual distributing point, Callander. So I submit that my resolution ought to be adopted, and I trust it will be adopted by this House. To summarise the points in order to make them plain, I would repeat that the spirit of the contract between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government did provide, or there was an intention to provide, for free interchange of traffic between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Ontario system of railways; that that clause now fails of its effect because the particular railway then chartered and then supposed to be the line which would go to Callander has not been built and may never be built, for another road has taken its place. And then I point to the resolution which the contractors, who were present when the discussion took place in the House, agreed that they should enter into with the Government, which they had not yet done, providing for an equal mileage rate on this system of railway in the manner I have pointed out. Now I will carry this resolution one step beyond the express language of the clause. No one, no matter what his interests in the Canadian Pacific Railway may be—no one, I submit, can object to the incorporation of this resolution made by the company, in which they pledged themselves to enter into a contract with the Government to the purport and effect set forth in this resolution: I say no person can object to that. They have not done so, and it is certainly a most inefficient way of binding a railway company to perform its duties to the public. A contract by the Government, not incorporated in an Act of Parliament, is one which it would be very difficult to enforce. For my part, I do not know exactly how it could be enforced. Let us assume for instance that the contract is made, that the Government on the one part had entered into a bargain in writing with the company under the seal of the company, that they would carry out this agreement; if that contract was violated I would like to know—I ask any gentleman who is opposed to this motion to point out—by what means, by what process or what suit might be instituted which would enable the company which was not getting the benefit intended to be derived from this system, to have this carried out. I do not think it could be done, Sir. The only way, it seems to me that could be done, is to make it part of their obligation to the public, which, if they violate, it will be open to any member of the community who is damaged by the violation of it to seek the ordinary and proper redress. But, as I stated, this resolution goes one step further, because, technically, the resolutions stop short here at Ottawa. It binds the company to an equal mileage rate from the North-West to any point on the Canada Central, and we know that the Canada Central stops here at Ottawa; but it does not bind the company to what was intended by the Board of Trade of Toronto, or to what the Minister of Railways told this House the company had agreed to, though I have no doubt it was done in perfect good faith all round. I have no doubt the members of the company at that time, having acquired or being about to acquire the Canada Central, not having at that time acquired the Occidental road, were dealing merely with what they had, and doing all they could to carry out the desire of the Toronto Board of Trade and fulfil the obligations which the Minister thought they ought to assume. But, as a matter of fact, we find that couched in this language it is not in my judgment sufficient to enable the system of railways in the Provinces to have that fair right and that fair play to which they are entitled. Now, I may mention, Sir, that this matter was under discussion of the Board of Trade of Toronto yesterday, and I have received a telegram from the vice-president of the Board of Trade, the acting president of that board, saying that the council of the Board of Trade not having come to any determination, the matter has been postponed for consideration at a meeting of the Board of Trade, to be held to-morrow at 3 o'clock. In the meantime the Bill is now being read the third time. The position is therefore this: A bargain has been made between the Government and the company, that the Government would release the indebtedness of the $10,000,000, and in lieu of that would accept so many millions of acres of land. If this Act of Parliament was merely carrying out that particular bargain, I, for my part, would not be here making this motion. The Government having made that bargain and the company having paid the $10,000,000 in pursuance of that bargain, I do not think it would be either just or right, for me, at all events, supporting the Government, to impose on the railway company a term which is not to be found in this latter agreement. But the company have asked the Government to release $5,000,000 of bonds. The company are not entitled to that release. It is a matter of favor. I have no objection to it. I think the purpose for which that $5,000,000 was deposited has been practically served, but, at the same time, this is the last link binding the company to the Government. Deliver up the $5,000,000 of bonds, the debt being practically paid, and the connection between the company and the Government seems to me to be at an end. Before, therefore, the people of this country part with the $5,000,000 of bonds to the railway company, is the proper time, it appears to me, to have a resolution, or any matter of this kind, placed in the charter which ought to have been placed there at an earlier date. Now, it is argued, on behalf of the company themselves, that this is a scheme or device on the part of the Northern Pacific Junction Company to obtain all the traffic coming over the Canadian Pacific Railway destined for Toronto and the western part of Ontario. It is a scheme upon their part, it is said, to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway Company carrying round by Smith's Falls and by the Ontario and Quebec, which is part of their system, so much of that traffic, if they choose to do it, at an equal or a less rate. There is, no doubt, some force in that objection, but if nothing is done what will be the result? The result, undoubtedly, will be this—that if the Canadian Pacific Railway is to be permitted to carry over its own system of railways, by discrimination against the Northern Pacific Railway—if it is to be permitted to carry over its own system of railways, so as to compete with this Ontario link, the Ontario link will be starved out. No man sending goods from, or forwarding goods to, the North-West, if he can get the same rate around by Smith's Falls, although it is 200 miles further, will think of sending goods by the more natural channel, because he will have to run the risk—I may say he will have to see the certain fate staring him in the face, that his goods will not be so expeditiously shipped by the Canadian Pacific Railway, who will be in active competition with this link between Gravenhurst and Callander. So the first objection I make to what the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are now seeking is this: They ought not to be permitted, I submit, to monopolise that trade in such a way that they can absolutely control it to the prejudice of this Ontario link, because, if it is controlled, if that trade is diverted, the Ontario link will undoubtedly be squeezed out, and must ultimately fall into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because it cannot live. But the means I propose in these resolutions that the competition, which it is so desirable in the interests of the whole Province that they should exist, shall not be done away with. What I submit as a fair result is this: If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company charges an equal mileage rate, the road having the shortest haul, as this Ontario link has, will undoubtedly have an advantage, an advantage it is entitled to by reason of its being a shorter line; but if that line assumes to charge exorbitant or improper rates, it has

always a competitive road by Smith's Falls, a part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to keep it in check. I, therefore, propose to move:

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with power to insert the following clause:—

Section 24 of the Act, passed in the 44th year of Her Majesty's reign, chapter 1, is hereby repealed, and in lieu thereof it is enacted that, notwithstanding the acquisition by the company of the Canada Central Railway and other railways beyond the original eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, near the east end of Lake Nipissing, the point of junction of the Canadian Pacific Railway with the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway, now constructed southward from the said original eastern terminus, shall be, and continue to be, a neutral or receiving and distributing point, common to the Canadian Pacific Railway and to all railways running southward from the said point of junction.

The reason the Northern Pacific Junction Railway is mentioned here, is that it does not strike the Canadian Pacific Railway at the exact point that is called Callander, or rather Callander has been a moveable quantity; it has sometimes been at one point and sometimes at another; but the design of the amendment is that that point of junction which may be called Callander, shall be the point where the distribution of the traffic shall take place, and that that point shall be a neutral point. The proposed section goes on:

And all traffic coming or going by way of the portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, westerly of such neutral junction point, and by way of any of the said railways running southward aforesaid——

That is, the Northern Pacific Junction or any other railway—

shall be carried by the company upon the portion of its railway westerly of such neutral junction point to or from such point at the same mileage rate as the company shall carry thereupon similar traffic coming or going by way thereof, and by way of the said railway formerly known as the Canada Central Railway; and such mileage rate shall not be greater than the average rate per mile of any through rate charged or received by the company for similar traffic passing such neutral junction point from the place of shipment or any part of the company's present or future system of railways between Callander and Montreal—

The resolution as placed in my hands originally read, "between Callander and any point on the Canadian Pacific Railway system," which would not be fair to the Canadian Pacific Railway and would not be fair, I take it, to the people of Ontario, because it would practically prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway, by means of the Ontario and Quebec, acting as a competitive line with the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, and I do not desire that that competition should be in anyway limited.—

to the place of destination thereon, whether such traffic shall originate or terminate thereon, or be received from or delivered to the other railway companies or other carriers at such places respectively; and without granting or allowing any preference or advantage to the traffic coming from or going by the company's own railways over such traffic coming from or going by any of the said railways running southward as aforesaid; nor shall the company subject any railway company operating any of the said railways running southward as aforesaid, or any particular description of traffic, to any prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever, reserving, however, to the company, the right of making special rates——

The usual reservation found in charters—

for purchasers of land or for immigrants or intending immigrants, which special rates shall not govern or affect the rates of passenger traffic as between the company and any company operating any of the said railways running southward.

Then it goes on to describe the meaning of the word traffic, and the rest of the clause is, I think, in the usual terms. I think the House will understand the purport of the amendment, which I move, seconded by Mr. O'Brien.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the House would be much wiser, Mr. Speaker, if you had the labor of reading that long amendment over again in English and French, because it is so long and so complicated that it would not in any way enlighten us as to the effect of the amendment, even after the lucid statement of my hon. friend; and nobody can be more lucid than my hon friend when he likes. My hon. friend, of course, knows perfectly well that this House cannot and would not make a leap in the dark at the very last moment by adopting this long and elaborate resolution which he has explained at such length and with such ability. I remember reading about the trial of Thelwall, I think, for high treason, at which Lord Eldon, then Sir John Scott, made a speech nine hours in order to prove that Thelwall was guilty of high treason; and the court and the country said that if it took him nine hours to show that Thelwall was guilty of high treason, he ought to be acquitted. So, if it takes a resolution of this length to set forth what is fair to Ontario, I think that is pretty fair *primâ facie* evidence against the resolution. Of course, my hon. friend could not think, and does not think in any way, of obstructing that portion of the Bill which provides for the payment of the $20,000,000 and the acceptance of land for $10,000,000. He merely says that as the company are asking for the release of the $5,000,000 of bonds, that is a favor, and he therefore moves this resolution. Well, there is no connection between the $5,000,000 of bonds which are pledged to the Government for the running of the road for ten years, and a tariff arrangement like the one proposed. My hon. friend very astutely talks about this railway being in the interest of Ontario and Ontario trade. This resolution has very little to do with Ontario trade, but it has a great deal to do with the attempted monopoly by Mr. Barker of all the trade over the Northern Railway. It is really such an attempt made by Mr. Barker, who is a friend of mine, and whom I greatly respect, and who thinks a great deal of his railway; and my hon. friend admits that the original draft of this amendment, as prepared by Mr. Barker, would simply hand over a monopoly of all the traffic west of Toronto to the Northern Railway. My hon. friend would not stand that, and he proposes this resolution, which would not so completely monopolise the trade in the hands of one railway as it would in the form originally drawn by Mr. Barker. My hon. friend has read the resolutions which were passed by the Board of Trade in Toronto some years ago. My hon. friend has correctly stated the proposition that board made; but there were negotiations afterwards, and the resolutions arrived at are contained in schedule B attached to the charter of the North-Western and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company. The conclusion of the whole matter was that an arrangement was made, which I think the House will consider a fair one, that Callander, which was then considered the terminal point of the Canadian Pacific Railway, should be the distributing point for traffic. The distance from Callander to Toronto is the same within three miles as the distance from Callander to Ottawa; and therefore it was understood that there should be no cutting down of rates as between Callander and Ottawa and between Callander and Toronto, but that they should be the same to both points. That was perfectly fair and has been acted upon ever since. The Board of Trade of Toronto was quite satisfied until Mr. Barker became alarmed lest his monopoly or attempted monopoly might be affected, and now the proposition is this: That although the distance from Callander to Montreal is 119 miles longer than the road from Callander to Toronto, the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be obliged to carry from Callander to Montreal.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I am afraid I have not been very lucid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That, I think, is the proposition of my hon. friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not at all. The proposition I make is this: That the Canadian Pacific Railway should carry

from Winnipeg or any other point in the North-West to Montreal at an equal mileage rate, and that, as Toronto is 100 miles nearer to the North-West than Montreal, Toronto and the western Provinces should have the benefit of that equal mileage rate. That is the effect of the proposition, so that if the traffic that passes to Montreal is $100 per car, a proportion of that $100, divided according to the mileage proportion, shall end at Callander, and then the traffic shall go from Callander to be distributed over Ontario, with its fair proportion of that mileage rate. It is not at all proposed to discriminate against Montreal, but to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway discriminating against Toronto in favor of Montreal; or, in other words, carrying to Montreal on the same terms as to Toronto.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The proposition, as expressed by Mr. Barker, was simply this: The Canadian Pacific Railway is a very powerful road, and can do what it likes; it can, from Winnipeg to Callander, put on heavy rates, and therefore afford to carry from Callander to Ottawa and Montreal for nothing or for a nominal rate. That cannot be. The Railway Committee, under the control of the Minister of Railways, can fully settle that, and under the General Railway Act that can be prevented; and when my hon friend succeeds, as he will some time or other, in getting a railway commission, that will prevent any injustice of the kind; but after all, the whole scope of this resolution, if carried, is that it will, in fact, as I am informed by the president and the vice-president and manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway, be equivalent to saying that the Canadian Pacific Railway shall not compete for the traffic of Western Ontario.

Mr. McCARTHY. That was the resolution as drawn up by Mr. Barker, but the resolution now drawn up has no such effect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The original proposition was really to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway having anything to do with the traffic west of Toronto by the railways that touch at or near Toronto.

Mr. McCARTHY. Over the Ontario and Quebec.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. This proposition is simply to keep up high rates for the benefit of the Northern Railway, and I am quite satisfied that, as much as the Canadian Pacific Railway, would desire to have the means of selling $5,000,000 of bonds and applying the amount to the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they would much rather keep the clause out than have this proposition of my hon. friend made. They consider it altogether contrary to the arrangement made in the schedule, which my hon. friend has read, which was in fact accepted by both railways and the Toronto Board of Trade, until Mr. Barker went to Toronto and stirred up the Board of Trade there last week. I believe the board met yesterday and could not come to any agreement. They were stirred up by the authorities of the Northern road, and Mr. Van Horne went there to fight the battle of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is just equivalent to this, that I consider we will be depriving the Canadian Pacific Railway of the use of $5,000,000 to extend their road in order to assist the Northern to keep a *quasi*, if not an actual, monopoly to the full extent.

Mr. MILLS. What would be the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway if Callander had been the eastern terminus, and if arrangements had been made to give equal facilities to the railways connecting there? Would it not have been to give effect to precisely such a proposition as the hon. gentleman has moved in amendment to this Bill. Supposing the terminus had been at Callander, railways from Montreal and Toronto, wishing to connect at that point, would, if the Canadian Pacific Railway applied anything like uniform rates over its entire line, have stood on exactly the same footing, because the Canadian Pacific Railway would have had nothing to do with the regulations of rates further east than Callander.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS. Very well. Then if the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway is placed at Montreal, the hon. gentleman's proposition is that whatever rates they make between Winnipeg or any western point of Montreal per mile shall apply to that portion of the road eastward to the point where the Toronto railways connect with it. That is precisely the effect of the hon. gentleman's proposition. It does not give any special advantage to the Toronto traffic, but places it upon the footing of equality, and it places a large portion of Ontario, which otherwise could not use the road, but which has been obliged to contribute towards its construction, upon a footing of equality. At present, I know that a large section of Ontario will never use the Canadian Pacific Railway, and can never use it, because their connection with the West generally must be through American territory. Take the whole country almost from Brantford westward. I could leave the city of London and go to St. Paul as easily as I could get the nearest station on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That must always be the case; geographically it is the case. In order to give a large section of a Province some compensation for the large contributions which they have made to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there should be a provision in the Bill such as that proposed by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy).

Mr. EDGAR. I am glad that at last the hon. member who is president of the Northern Pacific Junction has interested himself sufficiently in the question which I have endeavored to bring before the House on two or three occasions—that of giving the Ontario connection of the Canadian Pacific Railway something like a fair chance of competing with the eastern portion of that line for the freight of the North-West—to address the House. Although he has not succeeded in convincing the leader of the Government or the House that there is much in the question, I venture to say that it is for all that a very important one. I find by a report in to-day's paper that the council of the Board of Trade in Toronto had a very important meeting. Mr. Van Horne was there and Mr. Barker was there, and they discussed the matter very fully. This difficulty has all arisen from the fact that this thing has been allowed by the Government to drift, the Government who gave this $12,000 a mile to enable Ontario to form this connection with the Pacific Railway. They entered into a contract with the Northern Pacific Junction, under which they agreed to give this $12,000 a mile, and also made certain stipulations about an agreement of this kind being made with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Government, ever since they entered into that agreement, have not seen that it has been carried out at all. The result is that everything is at sixes and sevens, and nothing has been done in a business-like way. Neither the Canadian Pacific Railway, nor the Northern Junction, nor the city of Toronto, nor the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), nor anybody else, seems to be satisfied, because nothing whatever has been done, and the thing has been left in a hopeless state of confusion, notwithstanding that the contract made in 1884, under which the $12,000 a mile was given, stipulated that this thing was to be attended to within six months, that is, in October, 1884, it has been allowed to drift, and we find that even the hon. member for Simcoe, with his lucid powers of exposition, has been utterly unable to make anyone in this House understand how the thing stands to-day. There is something to be said, too, for the view put forward by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think, while it would be a most deplor-

able thing that there should be a monopoly in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway to serve Toronto and the west, it would be still more deplorable that any agreement should be entered into which would give the Northern Railway a monopoly of that service. What we should aim at is to give fair competition, to allow the Northern Railway to have its rights, and to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to have a right to carry freight round by the longer branch, by the way of Smith's Falls if they like. If they choose to carry it at a loss all that way, let them do it, it may not benefit them, but it will benefit everyone else, and it does not lie in the mouth of the Northern Railway, getting their $12,000 a mile subsidy, to complain, if they get fair play. It seems to me that a reasonable and fair and proper solution of this difficulty would be to place the Northern Pacific Junction Railway exactly where the old Ontario Pacific Junction Railway was placed by the Canadian Pacific Railway charter, section 24. That charter specifically provides that the Ontario and Pacific Railway Company shall have fair play as between it and the old Canada Central, and that not only the traffic arrangements shall be fair, but the mileage rates also. I think that was drawn with considerable care. I know that gentlemen connected with the Toronto Board of Trade had something to do with preparing it, and that the Minister of Railways then, Sir Charles Tupper, conceded to their view, and that section was drawn. Now, instead of creating new conditions and new terms, I am sure the Canadian Pacific Railway ought to be satisfied; and the Northern Junction ought to be perfectly satisfied if this section 24 of the Canadian Pacific Railway Act is made to apply to the Northern Pacific Junction instead of the Ontario Pacific, which has not been built. Therefore, if it would not be delaying the passage of this important measure very long, and I do not think it would, I would suggest a short clause of this kind, which I think would be fair all round, and, as far as I can see, would meet the case:

That the provisions of section 24, of 44 Victoria, chapter 1, so far as the same relate to the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway, shall also apply to the Northern Pacific Junction Railway Company.

That does not take anybody by surprise. It is not unfair to anybody. It may not give Mr. Barker the monopoly he seeks, but I do not think it is desirable he should have it, and I do not think it will give the Canadian Pacific Railway a monopoly of that trade either.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The proposal of the hon. member who has just spoken is very nearly that of the resolution now before the House, the only difference being that, I think, it is less favorable to the general interests of the Dominion, because it regulates the rate simply by the distance to Ottawa instead of by the distance to Montreal, and I think the mover of this resolution has shown very good ground why the rate should be based on the distance to Montreal and not on the distance to Ottawa. That is a matter of comparatively less importance. The right hon. the head of the Government has a happy way of laughing out of the House anything he does not wish to oppose on more serious grounds, and, on this occasion I think he has shown his usual skill and ability in accomplishing that object.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not yet.

Mr. O'BRIEN. But I venture to appeal from Philip after dinner to Philip before dinner, and I think I can answer the right hon. gentleman's speech after dinner, by the speech he made in this House before dinner. I think everything in his argument, which has reference to the amendment of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), applies with equal and even greater force to the resolution which is now before the House. If the policy is the correct one, and I am not going to dispute it now, though I think that, if it were pressed very much further, it would be attended with very serious results—if it is right to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway shall, in the public interests, be fenced about with all sorts of protection in Manitoba and the North-West, if that is sound, and I am not now questioning it, it is equally right and consistent with the general trade interests of the Dominion that all the Provinces with whose money this railway has been built, for whose interests we fence this railway about in the North-West, should be secured fair play when the trade comes down to those older Provinces. The original arrangement was perfectly fair and reasonable, and it is embodied in this resolution. It is that Callander should really be the beginning of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the principle laid down by this resolution is that all lines east of that shall be entitled to stand on precisely the same footing, whether they run to one part of the Dominion or to the other. The argument in favor of the Province of Ontario I think stands beyond all question. I think it is perfectly clear that, if those Provinces have an interest in the trade of the Pacific Railway, in the trade which is to be brought by the Pacific Railway, it is equally clear that, when that trade comes to the limit of these Provinces, they should all stand on the same footing, and the Canadian Pacific Railway should not be in a position to do injustice to anyone of them or to any portion of these Provinces The right hon. gentleman said that the Canadian Pacific Railway objected to this clause, and therefore this clause was not to be inserted. I have supported the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think that the policy was a good one is best proved by its success, but now that it is built, I think we are entitled to see that that railway, with its enormous powers and its enormous influence, is not permitted to use those powers or that influence to the disadvantage of any portion of the Dominion, especially that which contributed the most largely to its construction. If that is a fair ground, we have a good reason for the proposal before the House. If it can be shown, as I think it has been shown, that unless some such provision as that now proposed is made, that portion of Ontario which is affected by this resolution will stand in a very unfavorable position as compared with the rest of the Dominion, then the resolution now before the House ought to be adopted. Now, the argument of the right hon. gentleman, with reference to the Northern Railway, I think is hardly fair. I do not think it is in the power of the Northern Railway Company to establish a monopoly. The Government have all the power they need to have to regulate rates and traffic upon the Northern Pacific Junction, so that they can prevent Mr. Barker from establishing a monopoly. They can prevent him from using any privilege he has from the geographical position of that line, to the detriment of other lines. I understand that in the charter, and the various arrangements with regard to the Northern Pacific Junction, which was built by this country as a link connecting the Canadian Pacific Railway with the Ontario system of railways, it was provided that ample security shall exist for preventing that which is, to all intents and purposes, regarded as a neutral link between the two points, from being used by Mr. Barker or anybody else for the purpose of injuring the traffic of any other railways. If such a provision is not made, it certainly ought to be made; but I believe the Government have ample power to deal with the question. I do not think there is anything in the conduct, either of Mr. Barker or the Northern Railway Company, to justify the idea that they are acting in such a purely selfish spirit as the hon. gentleman would lead us to believe. I think that, whether the motion before the House, or a similar one, is adopted or not, the interest of the Province of Ontario requires that something should be done in this House to bring about the result which is desired.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think it would be right to take the question without someone from the Maritime Provinces explaining the attitude which they occupy. But before doing so I may say that I listened with a great deal of attention to the very verbose circumlocution contained in the resolution of the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment to the Bill. Now, that gentleman put his case very plausibly indeed. He gave us the history of the transactions connected with the building of that link, with the legislation which had taken place, and with the conditions of that legislation, and he went on to explain the attitude which would be assumed by the Canadian Pacific Railway if they were allowed to have this legislation now before us, which is the last opportunity, as he says, when we can check the power of the Canadian Pacific Railway by parliamentary action. Sir, the question before the House has been well explained by the First Minister. It is not a question with which this amendment of my hon. friend has fairly any right to be considered, nor is it one to which his amendment should be attached. What are the facts of this matter? Is it not known to every one that the General Railway Act gives to the Committee of the Privy Council the power to regulate the terms upon which railways shall interchange traffic? Is not that the rule that guides the whole railway system of to-day? Yet my hon. friend wishes to tack on a compromising resolution which I venture to say not ten men in this House understand.

An hon. MEMBER. Not one man.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, I think perhaps the hon. gentleman himself who read it understands it, but I question whether almost anybody else does understand it, for I listened to it with a good deal of attention, and I must confess that it is difficult to conclude, with the most careful reading of that document, what the practical legal effect of it will be upon these railways. Now, Sir, to bring down the point free from all this verbiage, the object of my hon. friend is this: He has stated to the House that the Parliament of Canada, by the condition which was attached to the charter, wished to protect the trade of the city of Toronto, and the western and eastern portions of the Province of Ontario. Sir, I think that position is perfectly correct; but he says that the Canadian Pacific Railway has to carry by Smith's Falls, a distance of 447 miles from Toronto, to Callander, or Thorncliffe, or wherever the point of junction is, against a distance which, if carried over the Pacific Junction Railway, would be only 227 miles; that is to say, the railway which my hon. friend represents has only to go from Toronto, 227 miles, while the Canadian Pacific Railway, to compete with them for the Toronto peninsula, and the traffic of the peninsula east and west, would have to carry 447 miles, a distance of 217 miles against the Canadian Pacific Railway. The contention of my hon. friend was, the other day, that if the Canadian Pacific Railway carry freight from Toronto, 447 miles, to Thorncliffe, and thence on to Winnipeg, as against the 227 miles from Toronto to Thorncliffe by the Northern Pacific Junction, they would have to reduce their rates on the whole distance from Thorncliffe to Winnipeg in favor of the Pacific Junction Railway as against their own road. Now, I ask any man whether that is fair or not. The distance from Carleton Place to Thorncliffe is about the distance from Toronto to Thorncliffe, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway are willing to carry over their road freight from Toronto to Winnipeg the same as they are willing to carry it the same distance from Carleton Place to Winnipeg, I want to know what unfairness there is in that, or what there is that militates against the Province of Ontario. But the point my hon. friend wants to accomplish is to keep the Canadian Pacific Railway out of the city of Toronto and out of the trade east and west of Toronto; and when he talks about monopoly, the object is not to prevent a monopoly being effected by this arrangement, but to create a monopoly for his own road by preventing the Canadian Pacific Railway carrying 447 miles as cheaply as his line carries 227 miles. There is the whole thing in a nutshell, so far as Ontario is concerned. The object of my hon. friend is not to promote the interests of the Province of Ontario so much as the interests of his own road—that is what it is, wiping away all the verbiage and coming down to hard pan. Now, Sir, we have got something to say about the road from a maritime standpoint, and I would invite the attention of gentlemen who represent that section of the country, including those from the Province of Quebec. We have spent a great deal of money. It is not Ontario alone, assuming that the argument of my hon. friend is correct, that is to be considered in the proposition which the hon. gentleman has submitted, but we have got to consider the interests of the eastern portion of the Dominion as well. We have all contributed to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we have contributed very handsomely to the construction of my hon. friend's road, when we gave $12,000 a mile, with a prospect of $20,000 more if the Government took it over and his views had been carried out. These Provinces which have contributed that money, have some right to be considered in a measure of that kind; have some right to demand that some condition shall be put in that Bill which will not militate in the future and for all time, against the interests of the eastern Provinces which will be affected by the operation of that traffic. Sir, what is the object of it? The object of Mr. Barker, when he prepared his resolution, was to wipe out the traffic of the eastern portion of this Dominion, and if we, a thousand miles from this to the sea, desired to send a train load of frozen fish, or preserved fish, or any other commodity which we produce down there, to Winnipeg, if the same thing has got to be carried from Toronto, we have an additional haul of a thousand odd miles, and we are prevented from getting the benefit of that long haul as against their 227 miles of a short haul, which, by this resolution, he demands that the Canadian Pacific Railway shall reduce to the average rate over the whole haul. That is a true statement of the position and the effect the resolution would have, and the motion is therefore one to which the House should not assent or entertain.

Mr. COOK. I regret the hon. leader of the Government should have characterised the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) as the representative of Mr. Barker. I am sure the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is moved by the very best motives in the interests of Ontario in this matter. Speaking for the western portion of Ontario I know that Toronto and the west desire there should be a competing railway with the Canadian Pacific Railway in that regard. They do not wish to have their traffic by way of Smith's Falls to the North-West. They also desire that any freight coming from the North-West shall find a short route and be delivered in Toronto and the western portion of Ontario at as cheap a rate as possible. The Ontario railway system it is thought in that part of the country should have an inlet and outlet to the North-West by the most expeditious route possible. I desire to draw the attention of the member for North Simcoe to the condition of the Northern Railway. That railway, I must say, is in a very disgraceful condition; one can scarcely travel upon it. I know the hon. gentleman has no pecuniary interest in that railway, but now that he has become interested in the Northern Pacific Junction from Gravenhurst to Callander and that it is to be leased by the Northern and North-Western Railway, I hope he will endeavor to use some influence with the Northern Railway to keep it in better running condition. There has been some talk that the Canadian Pacific Railway Com-

pany propose to monopolise or at least to buy the Northern Railway. If the two great systems, the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific, propose to gobble up all the side lines of railway, I should prefer that the Northern fall into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from the fact that it would be a competing line from Georgian Bay. The Grand Trunk owns the Midland at the present time. The Northern is a competitor with that line from Orillia and points north; but I hope, if the Canadian Pacific Railway does purchase the Northern, it will not do as the Grand Trunk has done with the Midland. The Grand Trunk has made the Midland a side line, and carries but very little freight over it; so much is this the case that the people are not properly served by the railway owing to the monopoly that exists. I trust this resolution will pass, because it is of vast interest to that section of the country. If this resolution tends to create a monopoly—which I do not understand it does—I hope hon. members will accept the suggestion made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar); and if the hon. member for North Simcoe will not adopt that resolution, let him frame one himself, so that the House will not imagine that he proposes to make a monopoly of the line in question. I am sure all the hon. gentleman desires is to have a competing line for the people of western Ontario. I am glad to be in accord with the hon. gentleman on this occasion, because it is the only time I have had the pleasure of acknowledging that he was right.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I do not think the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is treating the House with fairness on the present occasion. The hon. gentleman has brought forward what is admittedly a most complicated resolution, on the motion for the third reading, a resolution dealing with a difficult and abstruse subject, with which few hon. members are familiarly acquainted; and, in fact, I think the observation of the hon. member for Northumberland, that only ten members understood it, might be reduced to a much smaller number, because no one member could listen to the resolution moved by the hon. gentleman, and thoroughly understand in a moment its effect. It undoubtedly needs a railway expert, and that one of very great ability, to listen to a long resolution of that kind, and immediately grasp the full effect of it. Is it fair or right for the hon. gentleman, on the third reading of the Bill, to call upon the House suddenly to pronounce an opinion upon this complicated question? If the hon. gentleman had desired to bring this matter before the House on this Bill, he could have done it at an earlier stage. He could have given notice that he intended to make this motion, and it could have been placed on the Order paper, and we would have known what was coming up and could have read the proposed resolution. Not having done that, I confess that so far as I am concerned, although I am not altogether unfamiliar with legislation of this kind, I cannot at the moment take in the full effect of the hon. gentleman's amendment. But the hon. gentleman has argued that it should be adopted on the ground that this is the last opportunity we shall have of dealing with or controlling the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I do not think that argument is correct. If we pass this Bill without amendments the company is still subjected to the control of Parliament. The Act incorporating it is a public Act. There is the clause to which the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has referred, contained in that public Act, and we can legislate next Session or at any future Session just as well as we can at present and exercise as complete control over the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at that time as on the present occasion, when we are asked all in a hurry, without understanding the subject, to adopt the clause which the hon. member for Simcoe has suggested. There is also, as the hon. the First Minister has said, the provisions and powers of the General Railway Act, and also the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to deal with unjust discriminations, to say nothing of the Railway Commission, if it is ever created. However, there is no doubt that the matter remains within the jurisdiction of Parliament, and if next Session it is found necessary to legislate so as to protect the interests of any section of the country, be it Toronto or Ontario, or Montreal or the eastern Provinces, it is within our power to do so and we are not debarred from doing so by passing this Bill. The House is asked to add this clause hurriedly, without due consideration and without understanding the effect and scope of it. I have looked at the clause that my hon. friend from West Ontario referred to, with a view of seeing whether his suggestion to substitute the name of the Northern Pacific Junction for the Ontario Pacific Junction would ensure complete justice being done in the matter, and I do not think it would. Clause 24, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, was framed at a time when the Canada Central was an independent road, and was not part of the Canadian Pacific Railway any more than the Ontario Pacific Junction; and the whole of that clause speaks of the three roads—the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Ontario and Pacific Junction, and the Canada Central—as free and independent roads, and provides that no one of them shall discriminate against another. But, of course, as soon as the Canada Central became part and parcel of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as it did some years ago, this clause became inapplicable, and a more extensive alteration of it will be necessary than that which my hon. friend from West Ontario suggests. But I say that the re-framing of it should be made next Session, after we have had sufficient time to consider it thoroughly, after members of this House thoroughly understand what they are about. There is another reason why I think we ought not hurriedly, on the present occasion, to adopt the proposal of my hon. friend, and that is because I am disposed to look with some suspicion upon it, and to think that while he says that, if it be not passed, the Canadian Pacific Railway will be able to monopolise the trade so as to completely control it between Toronto, Hamilton and other western points, and Thorncliffe and the Canadian Pacific Railway generally. I am inclined to think that the object of the clause, as originally drawn, was rather to enable the Pacific Junction to monopolise the trade. In fact, the hon. gentleman practically admits that, because he says that the clause as handed to him—I presume by the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway—was such that it would not have had the desired result; that it would have discriminated in favor of the Northern Pacific Railway. He admits that, on the face of it, that clause was so unjust that he would not bring it forward, and so he altered it. But it may turn out that the sting of the clause has not yet been removed, and that it is still open to the objection that it is a clause introduced in favor of a particular road, rather than in the general interests of the public. The effect of that clause, as altered by the hon. gentleman, would be to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway from competing for the trade of Toronto, Hamilton, and other western points in Canada, against the Northern Pacific Junction. Now, we do not want that. We do not want to create a monopoly in favor of the Northern Pacific Junction any more than a monopoly in favor of the Canadian Pacific Railway. What we want is that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be able to come to Toronto and compete with the Northern Pacific Junction, so as to provide the lowest possible freights for those having goods to ship; and while my hon. friend says that the result of leaving matters as they are will be that the Canadian Pacific Railway will be able to starve out the Pacific Junction, I confess that, to my mind, it is incomprehensible how a road which has 447 miles to carry its traffic can starve out a road which has only 217. That is contrary to common sense. If a road with a mileage of over 400 miles is anxious to come and compete with a road of less than half that mileage, the

public will be benefited and cannot suffer. I think, therefore, the hon. gentleman should not, at this late period of the Session, and at this late stage of the Bill, ask the House to adopt such a radical resolution as he proposes, and about which we have had no opportunity to inform ourselves.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I have no wish to prolong the discussion, but this is a matter which, while of great importance to the Province with which I am connected, is of more especial importance to the locality that I more particularly represent. Of so much much importance was it felt to be, that a number of ridings in my own immediate vicinity, after privately talking over the matter, charged me with a resolution in amendment, similar in purport to that which has been moved by my hon. friend from Simcoe. Now I confess, without professing to be an expert in drawing Parliamentary resolutions, or in railway matters, I think the argument of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), if it proves anything, proves too much to be satisfactory to a representative from Ontario. The House to-day has already declared that we shall only have access to the North-West through connections with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I need not remind those in this House who are familiar with business that it is not many months ago that the Canadian Pacific Railway deemed it in their interest as a corporation—and I have no fault to find with them for taking that view—to readjust the rates upon which they carry passengers and traffic upon that short line of railway which connects Winnipeg with the American system to the south, and by means of that system and the Grand Trunk, with the cities of Toronto and Hamilton; and every business man knows the position of affairs in so far as the business of that road was concerned. They managed so to adjust their trains and local rates upon that road as practically to force traffic over their own road by other directions. Now, we have practically no access into the North-West except by that connection. If the argument of the hon. member for Northumberland proves anything, it proves that he wants to leave in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway the power so to adjust local rates between Winnipeg and Callander as to enable them to carry freight from Hamilton and Toronto, around 444 miles and charge them a rate for that distance, compel them to pay what will be a fair haulage rate over those 444 miles, that, under other more reasonable circumstances they would only have to pay for half that distance.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to explain. I can scarcely imagine how he could draw such a conclusion from anything I said, when we bear in mind that, under the General Railway Act, the Government have power to regulate rates; and, therefore, the Canadian Pacific Railway could not put an improper rate between Winnipeg and Callander.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I think I heard the First Minister say to-night that the ways of railway managers were something remarkable, and I know that shippers have reason to realise the truth of that statement. But, Sir, if this is simply a provision to make sure that they shall not discriminate unfairly between Callander and Winnipeg, why should there be any difficulty about that?

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not that; it is more than that.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). What I want on behalf of the business men of my section is that we have a fair and equitable arrangement. We contributed largely to the construction of this original Canadian Pacific Railway, in common with the Maritime Provinces and other sections of the Dominion. We were interested in getting fair and equitable connection with that country. But if that railway expects to compete with 220 miles by carrying freight around 440 miles. I fear that, unless there is a very strong and plain statement in the Act somewhere, it will be found that rates will be adjusted unfairly for that purpose. I think it is of prime importance that we should have such an amendment as the one before us, and the proof of such a necessity, is the fact that, when this grant was made to the junction railway connecting the Northern and North-Western Railways and the Canadian system generally with the Canadian Pacific Railway, so much pains were taken to make provision for the proper and equitable carriage of freight over that line, showing that where one party had control of the business connection of the country it was felt desirable it should not be handled to the detriment of any other party. I need not tell you that the Canadian Pacific Railway is an immense corporation. When that company was chartered, it was not expected that they were going to extend their lines all over the country as they have done. It was only a short time after the charter was granted that we found them competing with the Grand Trunk system in the western part of Ontario; and we know how keen competition is between railway companies for traffic. Therefore I feel, so far as the interests of Ontario are concerned, that something in the direction of the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) or the more simple one referred to by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), is essential before we pass this Bill. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that the Maritime Provinces have also contributed to the construction of this railway and have an interest in seeing that no Province gets an undue advantage. I agree with him; but I contend that Ontario, as a part of this Dominion, is bearing a very large proportion of the annual interest charged to the country for the construction of the long railway system known as the Intercolonial, by which the Maritime Provinces are able to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway system. For that reason alone I think no discrimination should be established against the Province of Ontario. If it had been open to us to reach the North-West by another system, then we would have a fair guarantee that business principles would control the operation of this company; but the House has decided to-day that we are to be placed at the mercy of this company, and I do not think it wise to leave ourselves in that position, judging from their operations in the past.

Mr. EVERETT. I trust that the members of this House will be exceedingly careful before they decide to tie the hands of the railway company, and cause the people in the eastern Provinces to suffer in the future by any arrangement which they may now make. It is well understood by all engaged in railway operations that the longer the distance over which a railway carries freight, the smaller is the cost per mile of carrying it; and it must always be so. I hope hon. members will remember that the day is not far distant when St. John and Halifax and other maritime ports will receive for shipment a considerable quantity of freight passing over the Canadian Pacific Railway; and if anything is unwisely done, the whole of that business may be blocked. If the principle advocated by some hon. gentlemen that the same rate per mile should be charged for carrying freight from some point in the west to Callander, or to the city of Montreal, is adopted, the principle might be extended to carrying freight from some point in the west to Winnipeg as to Callander. But that is not a sound principle, and I hope it will not be acted upon by this House. I trust that this House will remember that the people of the Maritime Provinces, although few in number as compared with other portions of the Dominion, pay their share for building the railways which have been built throughout the country by means of public subsidies; and I trust they will also bear in mind that the direct advantages accruing from the construction of the railways

already built by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, accrues more largely to the people of the west, particularly to the Province of Ontario. They derive benefits such as we cannot derive, because those railways are constructed in their midst. Some hon. gentlemen have referred to the advantage we of the Lower Provinces derive from the Intercolonial Railway. A great many members of this House, and a great many people throughout the country seem to think that the Intercolonial Railway was built simply for the use of the people of the Maritime Provinces. Why, Sir, that railway has opened facilities for the carrying on of business operations to the great advantage of the people of Ontario and Quebec; they have enjoyed as great benefits from that railway as we have; and some in the Maritime Provinces feel that by the competition which it has brought to bear upon us we have rather suffered. I trust that hon. members will bear in mind that we have some rights in this matter as well as the people of Ontario. Let us not tie the hands of the railway company; let us leave this matter in the hands of the Government and their Railway Committee, so that fair rates will be secured for the future.

Mr. FAIRBANK. It has been repeated several times during this discussion that this proposition is so involved, so intricate, and so verbose that not ten men in the House can understand it. I do not think it is open to that charge. I think some of the remarks recently made clearly show that it is not. As I understand it, it proposes that the rate from the North-West per mile shall be the same to the junction as it is to Montreal. It seems to me that there is nothing very intricate or involved in that. Now, if the rate per mile to that point, at which it connects with the Ontario system, was to be very different from the rate to Montreal, I would ask, for what object did we grant $1,300,000 to tap the Canadian Pacific Railway there. Hon. members must understand that members coming from the western part of Ontario feel a special interest in this question. Regarding Toronto as the commercial metropolis of that Province, we want to look at its position in relation to this railway. The three points, Callander, Toronto and Smith's Falls, form the three angles, very nearly of an equilateral triangle. If the Canadian Pacific Railway were not to be tapped at Callander, the business of Ontario would be forced to pay the cost of carrying freight around the two sides of the triangle instead of across it, which certainly would not be in the interest of Ontario. The difficulty of reaching the Canadian Pacific Railway from western Ontario is very obvious to any person who will but cast a glance at the map. I have seen car loads of wheat standing at the mills in the town where I live, which were brought to the county of Lambton by way of Smith's Falls. Now, this resolution simply proposes, as I understand it, that the railway may be tapped at a point 220 miles farther west. Take the reverse proposition, and what does it amount to? It amounts practically to this—moving Ontario 220 miles eastward. Hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces must bear in mind that we from Ontario have supported the proposition to grant money for a short line for them; and if they ask for a short line for themselves, is it proper that they should force a long line upon us? Ontario has been a pretty large contributor to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Why should she be deprived of her geographical position? If she is nearer that market, why should legislation force freight 200 miles out of its way? I think the proposition is not a fair one. If it be claimed that it is creating a monopoly in any other direction, let us deal with that monopoly. When it was proposed to grant this bonus to the Junction Railway, I suggested, although quite young in the House, that the proper course would be for the Government to maintain their control of that railway. I think so now. Had the Government maintained perfect control of that, extending the system down to the vicinity of Lake Simcoe, where it really strikes the Ontario system of railways, no possible monopoly could be created. If the danger rests in that direction, let us remedy it from that point, and not actually force the business over 200 miles out of its way.

Mr. McCARTHY. With the indulgence of the House, I would like to say a word or two in reply to what has fallen from some hon. gentlemen opposite. Having made this proposition and occupying the unfortunate position as it appears to be, of president of the road which comes under circumstances of suspicion, all I can say is I moved it, not in the interest of the road of which I happen to be president, but in the interest of the Province to which I belong, and it is a matter in which I take great interest. The House must look at the resolution, and see whether it is so worded as to create monopoly or create special advantages for that line of railway, or whether, on the whole, it does not give, as I have endeavored, in recasting the resolution, to make it give, fair-play to the Province of Ontario as distinguished from and as a part of the whole Dominion. I will say one word more, and that is with respect to what is called the verbose and indirect form of the resolution, and some other adjective was used, which, perhaps, very fairly expresses what it appears to be the lay mind. But it is necessary, if this clause 24 is to be amended, that it should be amended in some such form of words as that which is to be found in the resolution. Only a moment ago, the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) moved a resolution laying down a proposition; but when he was asked for the clause, he was obliged to admit he had not based his resolution on the clause, and it had to be framed over again at the Table to suit the clause. I have given the clause, but if the House thinks that is too involved, uncertain, verbose, or indirect, let me put the resolution in a simple form. Let me substitute this resolution, and let the committee deal with the clause. I will just say, in answer to the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), that the mere substitution in the 24th clause of "Northern Pacific Junction" for "the Ontario and Pacific Junction" would be quite ineffective, as the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) has made quite plain. The circumstances have wholly changed since that clause was drawn. The Canada Central, which was then an independent line, having become part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, clause 24 is wholly inoperative as it stands. What I desire is not that clause 24 should be embodied, but that the resolution, which the Toronto Board of Trade adopted, and which was drawn up with great care by Mr. Justice Ferguson at their request, which was assented to by the Government of that day, according to the statement made by the then Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, and which was assented to by the Railway Committee, should be now placed in the Bill. With the permission of the House, I will move my amendment:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the committee, with instructions that they be at liberty to amend the said Act by embodying therein the provisions of the resolution prepared by the Board of Trade, at the city of Toronto, at the request of the then Minister of Railways, and which was referred to by him in his place in Parliament on the 7th February, 1881, providing for equal mileage rates, going from or to Toronto by Ontario railways.

That is the resolution which Sir Charles Tupper stated in his place in the House, that the Government had accepted, and that the railway company had agreed to. I do not see, under the circumstances, how the Premier can go back on it. If that was the promise then made, at the instance of the Board of Trade, by the then Minister of Railways, and assented to by the company, and which we find embodied in a resolution—a resolution not merely to be found in the Northern Pacific Junction Railway Act, but in the Votes and Proceedings No. 23—I really cannot understand what possible objection there can now be to carrying it out. I desire to say one word in defence of Mr. Barker, who, I think, has been rather unfairly dealt with. It is true that

since that time the Board of Trade have not stirred in the matter. And why not? Why the Board of Trade at Toronto had the assurance of a Minister of the Crown, given in his place in Parliament, that the resolution they had prepared at his request had been agreed to by the railway company and accepted by the Government; and the Board of Trade, under such circumstances, could not do anything more than rest satisfied with such a statement. But when this railway was about being built, when the manager, Mr. Barker, as he was in duty bound to do by the contract made with the Government—the contract which has been referred to by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) and which is to be found in the contract made between the Government and the company,—and which contained as a condition of the company accepting the bonus that they would make an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway—approached the Canadian Pacific Railway, he was told that no agreement could be made, that the company were not bound by Sir Charles Tupper's statement or by the resolution centered in the Act, that the Act had never been carried out, that circumstances had so changed, that that section was practically a dead letter; the Canadian Pacific Railway practically said: We will make no bargain with you, one way or the other. In defence of the company of which Mr. Barker is manager, Mr. Barker did seek to get a change, which, perhaps, from his point of view was not unfair, but which from my point of view, standing here as a representative, I did think was going too far in preventing competition.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. But my hon. friend who cheers that statement is willing to give the absolute monopoly of the trade to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MITCHELL. I contradict that.

Mr. McCARTHY. What is his object then when he gets up in his place and speaks against putting in the amendment? What possible competition can there be if the amendment is not put in?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will tell you directly.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will be glad to hear from the hon. gentleman. There cannot be any competition between the Canadian Pacific Railway who will control the traffic and any other railway, if this amendment be not inserted. I can give you an illustration to prove this: A man wants to send goods to Toronto to the West. The Canadian Pacific Railway say: We will carry your goods to Winnipeg at exactly the same rate as by the Pacific Junction. Will any man send his goods by the latter road, knowing that when the goods reach the junction, the Canadian Pacific Railway will say: We have our own goods to attend to first, and will look after yours in a day or so, when convenient. The traffic will inevitably go around by their own road, and the result will be there will be practically no competition. The resolution I have proposed, and which is the resolution agreed to, as I have already stated, by the Government, through Sir Charles Tupper, is one by which I desire simply to get rid of a clause that is unfair. I admit I am to blame for not bringing this matter forward earlier. My simple excuse is that I have been endeavoring to arrange with the railway company. It is no surprise to them. I think it is no surprise to some of my hon. friends here. I think they have known something about this before. They are well prepared to speak on behalf of that particular part of the Dominion from which they come, and in the interests which they here uphold. It is no surprise to them. I have been endeavoring to arrange with the railway company a fair agreement which would have prevented a resolution of this kind, and would have saved the time of the House. The company, however, say: There is our charter, we decline to alter a word of it. I have nothing therefore to do, but, even at this late hour, on the third reading, to bring forward this resolution, which I do. It is not yet too late. It is a matter of such importance that even if we do delay the Session for twenty-four hours, even if we sit here for another day, I think none of us would suffer very much. I want it distinctly understood that I am not proposing anything new, that I am willing to take the resolution which the Minister of Railways told us in his place in Parliament, the Government had agreed to and the Canadian Pacific Railway had accepted. If the House will allow me, I will substitute the amendment I have made, in order to meet the views of some of my hon. friends around me, for the one which has been read, or, if that one is voted down, this can be moved afterwards.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think, after the allusions the hon. gentleman has made to the views I have expressed here, I should be allowed to say one or two words in explanation. The hon. gentleman has made a personal allusion to the knowledge I have had of this matter. I can say to the hon. gentleman that until the beginning of this week I had not the slightest knowledge that any difficulty had arisen or that any correspondence was going on in relation to this question between the two railroads. I heard of it purely by accident, and when I heard of it, happening to be in company where the conversation was going on, I felt, from the slight knowledge I had of railway working, that it was likely to interfere with the interests of the section of the country from which I came. When I heard what it was, I took some trouble to learn what were the demands made by Mr. Barker, and if the demands made by him, upon the basis of which he was negotiating with the general manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to whom I went for information, had been carried out, if the general manager had agreed to them, I have no hesitation in saying that it would have irreparably injured the traffic and the trade of Quebec and the eastern Provinces of the Dominion; more, it would have injured the trade of the Province of Ontario. Another point to which the hon. gentleman has referred is this: he says it is trying to exclude the Northern Railway from an existence in the trade between Toronto and the West. What is it doing? It is simply giving Toronto a competing line on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, as stated at an earlier stage of this debate, if the Ontario Pacific cannot live by carrying for one mile as cheaply as the other road carries for two, the Ontario Pacific has no need for existence. The other point, and the only one to which I wish to refer, is where my hon. friend spoke of the non-existence of any remedy provided this addition is not made to the Bill. As stated before, no man knows better than the hon. gentleman, under the provisions of the General Railway Act, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council have full powers to regulate rates, to control tariffs and to arrange difficulties between railways. What better arrangement do we want? Has there ever been a practical difficulty as to the arrangements between railways that has not been provided for and dealt with by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council? That power still exists, and that power can remedy the very difficulties to which my hon. friend refers. I will not repeat the arguments of the hon. gentleman from South Victoria, but his arguments against any amendment at all of that character, which we have not time to consider at this late hour, is one that I think will recommend itself to the consideration of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to the hon. gentleman substituting his other amendment now.

Mr. McCARTHY withdrew the amendment which had been put.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is moved by Mr. McCarthy:

That this Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend section 24 of Canadian Pacific Railway charter by providing that equal mileage rates must be given by that company to any railway running southward from Callander station on the line of said railway, and that Callander station should continue to be a neutral and distributing point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not the amendment the hon. gentleman read.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I think so.

Mr. SPEAKER. Call in the members.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Although the members are called in, it appears that the wrong amendment was put in your hands.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is the amendment which the hon. gentleman intended to substitute:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend said Act by embodying therein the provisions of the resolution prepared by the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto, at the request of the then Minister of Railways, and which was referred to by him in his place in Parliament, on the 7th February, 1881, provided for equal mileage rates going from or to Toronto by Ontario railways.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Now that this resolution is read, it is a striking instance of the inconsistency of this whole proceeding. Here we have a specific Bill with a specific object. It has been through all its stages but the last, and now the hon. gentleman proposes to refer it back again to committee to make this important amendment. We cannot go into this until the Canadian Pacific Railway has the opportunity of being heard. It was no fault of the House and no fault of the Canadian Pacific Railway that the hon. gentleman did not bring this matter before the House two months ago, and the reason why it was not brought down before, I have no hesitation in saying, is that it is for the purpose of putting the screw to the railway, because they happened to come and make a reasonable proposition to this House. They say: You shall not have what by resolution we declared the other day was right. This Bill is founded on certain resolutions. Those resolutions were considered in committee in full. They were discussed upon their merits, and upon their merits it was decided that a Bill should be founded upon them, and at the last moment the hon. gentleman says: I know we have no right to do it, but we will force the Canadian Pacific Railway by putting the screw to them. I think it is unfair. I have no hesitation in saying it is unfair. It is done in a sort of blackmailing system by the Northern Railway in a way I do not like, and there is no necessity for it in the world, because the Railway Committee of the Privy Council have full control, and can have their full control over tariffs and can prevent the possibility of one railway overriding another and treating it wrongly in the way of tariffs. There is no doubt about that. If the Railway Committee of the Privy Council do not act according to the approbation of this House, this House will very shortly show the committee, and the Government of the day of which the committee is a portion, that they do not consider that the Railway Committee has done its duty.

House divided on amendment of Mr. McCarthy.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),	Hilliard,	Platt,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cartwright (Sir Richard)	Jackson,	Somerville (Brant),
Casey,	Landerkin,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casgrain,	Lister,	Springer,
Cook,	Livingston,	Sproule,
Davies,	McCarthy,	Trow,
Edgar,	McCraney,	Tyrwhitt,
Fairbank,	McIntyre,	Vail,
Glen,	Mills,	Wallace (York),
Gunn,	O'Brien,	Watson,
Harley,	Paterson (Brant),	Woodworth.—37.
Hay,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Dugas,	McCallum,
Auger,	Dundas,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Everett,	McGreevy,
Baker (Victoria),	Farrow,	McLelan,
Barker,	Fisher,	McNeill,
Béchard,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bell,	Foster,	Mitchell,
Benoit,	Gagné,	Moffat,
Bergeron,	Gault,	Montplaisir,
Bergin,	Geoffrion,	Orton,
Bernier,	Gigault,	Paint,
Billy,	Gillmor,	Patterson (Essex),
Blondeau,	Gordon,	Reid,
Bossé,	Grandbois,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Guay,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Guilbaut,	Royal,
Bryson,	Haggart,	Rykert,
Burnham,	Hesson,	Scott,
Burpee,	Hickey,	Scriver,
Cameron (Victoria),	Holton,	Shakespeare,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Homer,	Shanly,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Small,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Taschereau,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jenkins,	Tassé,
Chapleau,	Kilvert,	Taylor,
Cimon,	King,	Temple,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Thompson,
Colby,	Kranz,	Townshend,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Tupper,
Coursol,	Landry (Montmagny),	Valin,
Curran,	Langelier,	Vanasse,
Cuthbert,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wallace (Albert),
Daly,	Lesage,	Ward,
Dawson,	Macdonald (King's),	Weldon,
De St Georges,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Maskin'gé),	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. Maurice)	Macmaster,	Wigle,
Dickinson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wilson,
Dodd,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Brockv'le).—120.

Mr. PLATT. Notwithstanding that I understood the First Minister to say that this House cannot pass important amendments to this measure without consulting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or in other words, that this House cannot legislate without consulting that authority, I venture to make a proposition which I think will not be considered either verbose or difficult to understand; it is provoked by the fact that this Bill proposes to lay violent hands upon what has generally been considered a very important safeguard in the original contract for the construction of this road. As the point has been d scussed largely at a previous stage of this Bill, I shall simply move the following amendment:—

That the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same by striking out the provision for a release of the security of five millions for the operation of the line.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—CUSTOMS SEIZURE AT MONTREAL.

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

Mr. GAULT. Before you go into Supply, I wish to bring before this House some circumstances connected with a seizure which took place in the city of Montreal recently, and which has caused a great deal of excitement in the mercantile community there. We first heard of this matter through the public press, where it was stated that the firm of Patterson, Kissock & Co. had been seized, and that the Government had sent officers into the establishment and demanded their books, that the firm had refused to exhibit

their books, and that then the officers had been sent to their warehouse, slept there all night, and the next morning an attempt was made to turn these officers out of the establishment, when one of them drew a revolver and presented it at one of the clerks, the result being that the officers held possession of the establishment. After that we heard of the police being called in. The street was crowded with people, and nothing was seen but policemen, bailifs and legal gentlemen, tramping up and down, and a great crowd of people gathered in the street. I may say that this matter was said to be three times worse than another seizure which had already taken place in Montreal, in which the parties had paid to the Government the sum of $36,000. It is said that the second seizure was much worse, and the proof obtainable against them was clearer than against the first case. To-day we see by the press that the Government has compromised the matter on the payment of $2,000, at the suggestion of the English creditors. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to know if the Government have compromised that matter, and if their officers are authorised to compromise cases of that kind without consulting the Minister of Customs. The merchants of Montreal feel very strongly about this. They think that they have been selling goods at no profit; when their travellers went west they found other travellers able to sell goods 10 and 12 per cent. cheaper than they. The very oldest houses in Montreal have made no money for three years, and the reason is now evident why they have made no money. On behalf of the honest merchants I ask the Minister of Customs to say whether this matter has been compromised, because it is felt in Montreal that no compromise whatever should be made in a case of this kind, and that the Department should do their duty and the firm made to do theirs, so that justice may be done to all.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has based all his statements upon newspaper reports and, although an old newspaper man myself, I do not propose to hold either myself or the Government responsible for the version given by the press of what has taken place in the city of Montreal with reference to seizures there. In regard to the seizure to which my hon. friend has called attention, I have simply to say that I am not in a position to give that information to the House which I trust I may be able to give in a few days. The frauds were discovered by some of the special agents connected with the Customs Department. They went to the establishment and, with the knowledge they had of what had taken place, demanded, under a certain section of the Customs Act, an examination of the books; and the firm, whether by their own mere motion, or by advice, refused to surrender the books. They were then threatened with seizure, and the difficulties to which my hon. friend has referred, to a certain extent did occur. It became a question whether the authority which is vested in the officers under the Customs Act, should be exercised without interference of the civil authorities, or whether the civil authorities should issue a certain process, and prevent them from carrying out what they believed to be their duty. I believe a difficulty did occur between some of the officers of the court and the officers of the Customs, who then proceeded to seize the goods which were in the establishment. Another question arose as to whether they had a right to seize any goods that had not actually been improperly entered, or which had not been smuggled into the country. While negotiations were going on, two representatives of the English creditors called upon me and desired to know if an arrangement could not be made by which the business would not be closed. I replied, that the only arrangement that could possibly be made would be, that the parties, Messrs. Patterson & Kissock, should acknowledge the Customs authority, that they should submit to an examination of their books, whatever they might have, and surrender all the invoices which were in their possession, in order that a thorough and full investigation of the frauds which are supposed to have been committed could be arrived at. It transpired, I believe, although I am speaking now under correction, that some of the invoices had been destroyed. I then suggested that they should make a full statement of all their affairs, and if that could not be done in any other way we should send to England and their creditors should furnish a statement of the business transactions with this firm in order that we could compare that statement with the entries which had been made at the Customs, and then ascertain the extent to which frauds had been committed, and that upon no other consideration would I listen to any proposition which would lead to a compromise. I may say that so far as regards the statement made that a compromise has been effected, I have no knowledge of any compromise having been made. I state on behalf of the Government that no instructions were given by me to make any compromise in this matter. When the officer left the city in the company of the gentlemen to whom I have referred, he was informed to act strictly under the instructions of counsel, Messrs. Church and Hall, and that nothing should be done that would compromise the Customs or by which any authority which we had claimed should be conceded. What has been done since that time I am not prepared to say. If the frauds committed only amount to $2,000—of which I have no knowledge—that is all we could collect with the penalties. But I have no knowledge as to any settlement having been effected, nor have I had any report from the officer since the conversation to which I have alluded, and consequently am not in a position to give as full information as I would like to furnish. I trust I will be able to answer more fully in a few days.

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

Subsidy to line of steamers between France and Quebec..... $56,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think only $2,000 were paid last year.

Mr. LANGELIER. I observe there is a change in this item from that of the previous year. Two years ago and last year there was a condition affixed to that grant, namely, that the French Government should give an equal sum, this being done in order to secure that service. It is within my own experience that only one steamer of that line came to Quebec last year.

Mr. BOWELL. That accounts for the sum of only $2,000 being paid.

Mr. LANGELIER. I am quite in favor of this grant if we can secure a French line to Quebec. I understand that some other steamers of that line came to the Dominion, but did not reach Quebec, only Halifax. I think $2,000 is too large a subsidy for only one steamer. I would like to ask the Government if they have ascertained that, with that subsidy, without any subsidy from the French Government, those steamers would be able to keep up a fortnightly service between France and Quebec?

Mr. BOWELL. The contract to which the hon. gentleman refers has been cancelled from the fact that they were unable to carry it out, and I think the sum of $2,000—though I wish to speak under correction—is the sum which was equitably due the company for the service which they performed. The hon. gentleman is quite right in stating that the former grant was given conditional on the French Government granting an equal sum. The Government failed to make any arrangement with the French Government by which a joint subsidy could be granted in order to

secure this service. Propositions have been made, I believe, to the Government for the establishment of a service between the St. Lawrence and France, and the Government are so anxious to establish that line, if it is possible to do so, that they thought it better to place a sum in the Estimates granting a bonus in order to secure the service, if necessary, independently of the French Government. If the object which we all desire, can be obtained by this means no doubt we will be able to open up a considerable trade with France which does not now exist. One very important industry in this country to which I might call the attention of the House would be developed if we should succeed in establishing that line. As the hon. gentleman knows, there is a surtax charged on our phosphates now taken to France which passed through an English port. An extensive market for phosphates would be opened if we could get into the country without the payment of that surtax. It is now charged upon every ton of phosphates which goes into France by way of England, and if by the establishment of this line we could get them directly into France, they would go free into that country, and that particular branch of industry alone would be greatly benefited, especially in the Provinces in which this valuable mineral is found.

Mr. LANGELIER. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman as to the importance of maintaining this line. I understand from him that no arrangement has yet been made, and that the amount will be put at the disposal of the Government to be granted to any company which the Government consider to be able to undertake the service. There is no particular contract I understand.

Mr. BOWELL. No, but negotiations are going on which we think will end successfully.

Subsidy to line of steamers between Liverpool or London, or both, and St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S., a port in the Dominion to be the terminal port..... .....$25,000 00

Mr. WELDON. With what line is the contract continued?

Mr. BOWELL. It is the Furness Line.

Mr. WELDON. Is the contract still continuing?

Mr. BOWELL. I think so, but I will make a note of it.

Steam communication from Port Mulgrave to East Bay, C.B.....$6,000 00

Mr. PAINT. When this subsidy was agreed upon between Cape Breton members, it was understood that these steamers should call at Hay Cove, county of Richmond. There is ample time for the boat to call, and I would desire the Postmaster General to see that this service is performed, as it is of great importance to this port and to the 5,000 people in the district contiguous to it.

Steam communication between Canada and Antwerp or Germany.....$24,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this contract being carried out or has it lapsed? Apparently only a portion of the subsidy was paid.

Mr. BOWELL. There were two lines that were proposed to be subsidised, one running from Hamburg and the other running from Antwerp. One of them, I think, has failed, and it is only proposed to vote half the former amount this year, and this will be given to one of the lines.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know whether any considerable additional trade has been developed in that direction?

Mr. BOWELL. With some of the steamers there has, but with others there has not. I might state that we made it a condition this year that the manifests of every trip outward and inward should be sent to the Finance Minister, and he has all the information which will show to the House the nature and quantity of the goods which were carried.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My chief reason for putting the question was that as we have recently paid a large sum for the exhibition held at Antwerp, I was anxious to know whether any development of trade has resulted from it.

Mr. BOWELL. I have not noticed that it has as yet.

Mr. GAULT. The agent expects a very large increase of trade this season. A large amount of window glass came out by one vessel, and I think 45,000 bushels of rye was shipped home by one vessel.

For steam communication between Canso and Port Hood, daily, touching at railway terminus, Port Mulgrave, and such other places within above limits as may be agreed upon, to provide for continuance of service during winter, on the Port Mulgrave and Canso section $5,000 00

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). This resolution, as it is worded, does not fully express the service. A person would infer that it was a daily service, which it is not; it is rather a triangular service; it touches at Port Mulgrave, the eastern terminus of the railway, the extreme southern limit is Canso, and the extreme northern limit is Mabou. I propose to change the wording so as to make it read:

For steam communication between Canso, Port Hood and Mabou, and such other places between above limits as may be agreed upon, touching daily at railway terminus at Port Mulgrave, and also to provide for continuance of service during winter on the Port Mulgrave and Canso section.

Mr. PAINT. That should contain the word Arichat.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Arichat, Guysboro', Port Mulgrave and Port Hood, are intermediate points, all of which the service will take in just as if they were named.

Mr. KIRK. Except that it is necessary for the Government to obtain an agreement from the company or the individual performing the service that the steamers must touch at Arichat and Guysboro'. But I think the resolution as proposed by my hon. friend from Inverness is quite sufficient, and it is necessary, because there is really no sense in the resolution as it stands. This amount of $5,000 is not half enough to do justice to the service. It ought to be $15,000 at least.

Mr. BOWELL. There can be no ojection to changing the wording to meet the object the Government have in view of granting the subsidy; and if my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Paint) thinks the steamers will pass Arichat unless it is named in the resolution, I have no objection to adding it.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I have no objection to inserting Arichat.

Mr. PAINT. The hon. member for Inverness has nothing to say about that. The steamers call at Arichat by way of compliment, and they are paid for doing it; but if it is named in the resolution, there will be no question about it, and they will be obliged to call there. As Guysboro' is some twenty miles out of the way, it is necessary that it should be inserted.

Mr. KIRK. If it is intended to serve those towns, they should all be inserted.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). This vote has been in the Estimates for the past five years, and during that time, the service has been faithfully performed, the steamers always touching at both Arichat and Guysboro'. But I have no objection to inserting them.

Mr. KIRK. What about increasing the vote?

Mr. BOWELL. That is a matter we will take into very serious consideration.

Mr. KIRK. This vote is intended to give those towns which have no railway facilities the advantage of communication with the railways that have been built at an enormous expense to the country. Although I know it is invidious to draw comparisons, and I do not wish to do so, with any injurious effect, at any rate, I notice that there is one item, at least here for service, which is not any more important, or perhaps not as important, as the one we are discussing, and for which there is $12,500 voted, namely, the subsidy between Campbellton and Gaspé and intermediate ports. Yet only $5,000 is given for this service for three counties that have no railway communication whatever. I maintain we should have a better service than simply a steamer calling twice a week at those ports. If we had the sum doubled we would have a steamer calling four times a week, and that is as little as might be expected by people who have paid their share towards building railways in the North-West and throughout the Dominion, and have no railways of their own.

Mr. PAINT. I am able to speak from experience of the steamer *Admiral*, which runs from Dalhousie to Gaspé and touches at twenty places on the way. It is a very exposed and risky service and not over-paid at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before leaving this subject, I would ask in what position we stand with regard to the Montreal Ocean Steamship Company. Last year the Postmaster General brought down a contract which was objected to and was withdrawn by order of the Government. Can the hon. gentleman state exactly how the negotiations stand, and what is proposed to be done touching the renewal of the subsidy?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract has not been changed, but has been allowed to continue until now. The Government have taken the matter into consideration, and it is likely that tenders will be called for, for the new service. They have not been called for yet. We intend asking for better and swifter steamers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman know on concurrence what terms the Government propose to insist on. This is a matter of very great importance, because the speed of the Atlantic steamers has been increasing so rapidly that our St. Lawrence route will be put at a great disadvantage, unless stringent measures are taken to ensure an equally good service.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will let the hon. gentleman know on concurrence what the Government intend doing.

Maintenance and repairs of Government steamers...$130,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Last year we required apparently $177,000 on this. I have no desire that the hon. gentleman should spend any more than he asks, but I would like to know whether this is a mere guess vote or whether he really thinks we can keep the expenditure down to $130,000.

Mr. FOSTER. *La Canadienne* and the *Lansdowne* will be used, the latter for the most of the summer and the former for a portion of the time, as fishery and police protection vessels, and their maintenance will be charged to the fishery and police protection vote. The *Napoléon III* and *La Canadienne* are still at Quebec, the *Sir James Douglas* is at British Columbia, and the *Newfield* is at Halifax and the *Druid* at Quebec.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We usually receive some receipts from these steamers. What did they consist of this year?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

Mr. FOSTER. We received some receipts. For instance cables are laid, in the laying of which the *Newfield* was employed last year and the cost charged to Public Works Department. When vessels are towed off or otherwise helped by these steamers, a certain amount comes in from that source.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to the Minister of Customs who is acting for the Minister of Finance that we should have a more detailed account of the receipts for these several services. With a correct system of book-keeping, there ought to be no difficulty about this. That is a matter which I had intended to call the attention of the Public Accounts Committee to, and probably will do so, but I mention it now for the information of the Minister, that he may confer with the Minister of Finance about it.

Mr. BOWELL. I understand that you want a more detailed statement of the receipts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes. They are generally put down in lump. I dare say that has been the practice but I think we ought to get a little fuller account.

Mr. VAIL. Is it intended to keep the *Lansdowne* the whole year in the service she is in now?

Mr. FOSTER. It is intended to keep her in that service for the whole season or nearly all. There may be a few days in which she may have to do some busy work in the Bay of Fundy. As there is very little cable laying to be done, it is thought that the other boats will be able to overtake the rest of the service.

Mr. VAIL. Is the *Lansdowne* doing her work satisfactorily?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe so.

Mr. VAIL. I saw in one of the papers that she started to go from St. John for Digby with this American schooner, and the schooner ran away from her. Her speed does not appear to be what we expected.

Mr. FOSTER. She got her at last.

Mr. PAINT. Were there any repairs on the steamer *Newfield* last year?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe there were.

Mr. PAINT. Do you know the amount?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I have not got it now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At least $11,732 was entered for last year. If the hon. gentleman thinks it desirable, we can get the details, I dare say, in the Public Accounts.

Mr. PAINT. No, I do not want them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The sum was nearly $12,000.

Mr. PAINT. Yes, but the repairs were new boilers and were extensive, and I do not wonder at the amount.

Rewards for saving life and life-boat service..... $8,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have any new life-boat stations been instituted, or does the hon. Minister propose to institute any?

Mr. FOSTER. A certain number of new life stations were instituted last year. We got, I think, twelve new boats of the best pattern, and they have been distributed to different stations, some of them, of course, going to the stations formerly established, where old and less serviceable boats were, and others going to new stations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have any been put on Prince Edward county, in Ontario? That is a portion of the coast of Lake Ontario, on which every year there are two or three wrecks, sometimes more, and they have been

generally attended with considerable loss of life. This matter has been pressed upon the attention of the hon. gentleman's predecessors. There is one station there, I think, or perhaps two stations.

Mr. FOSTER. Two new life-boats have been placed in Prince Edward County, one at Poplar Point and the other at Wellington.

Mr. PLATT. Is it the intention to order the construction of any new life-boats during the current year?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not yet decided. We ordered some last year. Of course, the service is still in its infancy, and, although we like to extend it as much as possible, we have to take consideration of the funds at our disposal. There are some places which especially require life stations, and it may be quite possible that some half dozen will be established for this year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you compute is the cost of each station?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not very heavy. After the equipment is placed there, we have a captain who is paid $75 for the season, and he and the crew receive something for each drill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About how much would each station be supposed to represent?

Mr. FOSTER. The captain gets $75 per annum and $1.50 for fourteen half days' drill, and the crew receive $1.50 for fourteen half days' drill. If these were added together a simple computation would tell the cost.

Mr. PLATT. How many men constitute the crew?

Mr. FOSTER. Twelve, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose $400 or $500 would cover it.

Mr. DAWSON. Last year something was said about putting some of these boats on the upper lakes, but I do not think anything has been done so far. I would be very glad if the Minister would keep it in mind for the future.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one at Goderich. That is the furthest on the lakes.

Mr. WILSON. Has the Minister established any life-boat station on Lake Erie?

Mr. FOSTER. There is a life-boat station at Port Rowan.

Mr. WILSON. Is there any other?

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is one at Port Stanley.

Mr. WILSON. Has the crew there been fully completed?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McCRANEY. I desire to call the Minister's attention to the lake to the west of Toronto. There is no life-saving station at all between Toronto and Hamilton, and of late years a number of very sad accidents have taken place there. I hope that, at any rate, as soon as the Government are in a position they will take this matter into consideration and do something in that way. There are several ports between Toronto and Hamilton, and so far none of them has been supplied, nor is any provision made at all for the saving of life.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt that is true, but we must remember that the inside and outside coast line of Canada is a great many thousand miles in extent, and it would require a very large expense, and a great deal of time, to overtake all the work which is necessary to be done.

Mr. PLATT. The question I asked in regard to the construction of additional life-boats, does not mean that I desire that any more should be constructed, or any more stations established, until those which are now established are made much more efficient than they now are. I see the same amount is asked this year as was voted last year. Last year several new life-boats were procured. If none are to be obtained this year, in what way is it intended to expend the $8,000? It will be more than the captains and the crews will require.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think I stated that no more would be purchased or that no new stations would be established. I think I said that it was probable that there would. Another question which will receive consideration is whether these crews would not be made more efficient by making them paid crews, not simply paid for days' drill, but under a salary sufficiently large to make them feel that their services could be properly called upon.

Mr. PLATT. I hope the Minister will give that his very favorable consideration. I have urged every Session that something more should be done to perfect these establishments than has been done. The Minister says there are twelve men to a crew. I think the regulations provides that the captain and six men shall constitute a crew.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably I was mistaken then.

Mr. PLATT. But I wish to draw special attention to the fact that the names of the crew do not seem to be known to the Department, although the names of the captains are known. The captains have been in the habit of calling the men out for drill, and selecting anyone they can pick up. Under these circumstances, the system of instruction amounts to nothing. In the Wellington station, I find by the Public Accounts that eleven men were paid instead of six, and the eleven men who were paid were men whom the captain happened to find upon the street upon the day when he wished to go out to drill. The captains have no control over the crews, who are simply volunteers, and drill once or twice, or three times a year, perhaps. The instruction, consequently, is worthless, and the captains admit such to be the case. Again, complaints have been made to me from captains of life-boats, that the instructions they have received are not such as will enable them to render assistance to vessels in distress, unless it appears to them plainly evident that life is in danger. I understand that instructions have been issued that they are not to take out the life-boat to save property. Now, when property is in danger it is very likely that life is in danger, and I think the instructions should be changed, and that the saving of property as well as the saving of life, should be made one of its duties. Now, Sir, I have contended every Session that the service will be as good as worthless, and the money as good as thrown away, until those stations are made more efficient, until there is something like a system of instruction. I advocate the establishment somewhere on the coast of our lakes, of a central station to serve as a sort a school of instruction, under some responsible officer who will train, at least, one crew that may be depended upon, that there may be some system so that these men will be under the obligation to obey the captain, and will turn out whenever he sees fit to call them. I am told by one of the captains in my county that in fair weather he may possibly get a crew, but in bad weather it is impossible for him to do so; that on two or three occasions when he thought there was danger of his being called upon, he had not the men he could rely upon. I hope the Minister will give more attention to perfecting this branch of the service, rather than extending it. I think the suggestion I have made time and again for the establishment of a central station, will aid in securing a service approaching near to what a life-saving service is supposed to be, and I think such a one ought to be established, so

that we may have at least one crew who will be efficiently drilled, and who can furnish instructors to other stations throughout the country. I know, from communication and association with members of life-saving crews on the other side of the water, that they look upon ours as a complete sham. Why, there is not a sailor on our lake who knows where the stations are located. The sailors do not put any confidence whatever upon our life-saving service. On the other side of the lake, every man is supplied with a list showing exactly where the stations are, and the masters know where they can expect relief in case of disaster. Here there is nothing of that kind, and instead of spending money for the extension of the number of these stations, it would be far better to spend it in perfecting those we have in existence.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has given so poor an account of the life-boat service, and the enterprise of the sailors in his county. Although this may be true of the hon. gentleman's own county, there are amongst those companies, even though they are volunteers, some very efficient ones.

Mr. PLATT. I grant that.

Mr. FOSTER. In the first place, they have a good boat, and that is important when danger is liable to be incurred. They have a captain in charge who is responsible, and it is not impossible to get even volunteers who, when life is in danger, will be on hand. I know it is difficult to get men to attend to this for $1.50 a day for drill. However the system is not by any means worthless, and it is doing much as we hope to make it do.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the life-boat service is so inefficient in Prince Edward, I think it is time that the Department should see that a crew is furnished who will do their duty, and in whom the mariners may have some confidence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Last year the total sum expended for five crews was barely $913; it is utterly impossible to expect an efficient service for an average of $180 per crew, including captain and men. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has ever inspected any English or Irish life-saving stations.

Mr. FOSTER. I have never seen either.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There, the crews are regularly trained, and such a thing would not be thought of, except in case of accident, as going out to sea on a dangerous night with a mere scratch crew. If they are to do good service they must be accustomed to work together. The sum is altogether inadequate to obtain good service, and it would be by the merest chance that you could succeed in obtaining a good crew where all that is allowed for six or seven men is about $100, after deducting the $75 which is paid to the captain.

Mr. GUILLET. In the Cobourg station I can report that the captain has made no complaints to me of any difficulty in keeping a volunteer crew together. He has the same crew this year he had last; the men drill regularly, and they have made no complaints. The service appears to be in a very satisfactory condition, and the crew is most efficient. I know that the life-saving service at Cobourg is known to many sailors on the lake.

Mr. PLATT. The hon. gentleman must be aware that the town of Cobourg is a different place from Poplar Point, situated on the south side of what is called Long Point in the county of Prince Edward, and a sparsely settled neighborhood. A station is situated in the small village of Wellington, and, so far as location is concerned, the Minister will not have to go as far away as Presqu'Isle, or even Prince Edward Island, to find a better place for the location of a life-saving station, than Wellington. I have always contended that on account of its location the station there was useless. The point where a life-saving station should be is at Salmon Point. The station at Poplar Point is in a sparsely settled neighborhood, the people being chiefly fishermen, amongst whom there are as good boatmen as can be found in Canada, and who are willing to lend a helping hand in case of danger. Cases of danger have arisen, and the life-boat has been at their command, but so little were they accustomed to its use that when life was to be saved a few years ago, the fishermen preferred to go out in their own boat to risk taking the life-boat, because they did not know how to manage it. In the village of Wellington there is a life-boat well provided, but the boat at Poplar Point has been lying in an ice-house, a damp place, filled with snow in the winter. I think the boats, generally, are described as being valuable; those who are able to judge say they are valuable. They have two first-class life-boats and two efficient captains. Beyond that they say there is nothing that can be called a life-saving service. I do not ask now a change in the location of the life-boats, but that the captains should be given crews to command, and know, when danger arises, where to call on crews to assist them. We cannot expect to have crews unless we pay them. We should have one or two stations properly conducted, and with efficient crews, so that they could give instructions, and the stations should be supplied with every appliance known for the rescue of the imperilled mariner, and thus encouragement should be given. I admit that in case of danger many men in Wellington will be found prepared to face danger. The captains have no regular crews, and although names have been given to the Department, instead of six names eleven names were given. The boats sometimes went out with full crews and sometimes with half-crews. I hope some change will be made in some of the stations so that we may be able to say in the future that we have a life-saving service in Canada.

Investigation into Wrecks and Casualties..... $1,500 00

Mr. VAIL. For what purpose is this expenditure asked?

Mr. FOSTER. Wrecks take place and they are reported to the Department, and the Department pays a small fee for the information, I think $2 for each wreck reported.

Montreal and Quebec Water and River Police ... $40,000 00

Mr. PAINT. I should like to see a similar expenditure for St. John, Halifax and Sydney, especially for Sydney, where there are 300 steamers a year.

Removal of obstructions in navigable rivers..... $14,000 00

Mr. FOSTER. There is a large increase in this item over last year. It is due to the sinking of the steamship *Ottawa*, a large vessel which sank in the River St. Lawrence. We had a man working on the vessel part of last year, and it was found impossible to raise her. Tenders were asked for and a contract has been entered into for $12,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman expect to receive any amount to recoup the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. No, we have no reasonable expectation of getting anything in return. The man in charge last year was to recoup himself by what he brought up from the vessel. He obtained a quantity of iron, but it did not pay him I think, for his work.

Mr. PAINT. I call the attention of the Minister to the fact that there is a wreck in Wren River, which has been in the channel two years, although it could be removed for a small sum, about $1,000.

Winter Mail Service, Prince Edward Island.....$5,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this a new vote?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a new vote, but an amount of $4,000 has been transferred from the Post Office Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is the money to be expended?

Mr. FOSTER. It is for the winter ice-boat service between the capes. Formerly it was done by contract, but last year it was taken over as a Government work. Boat-houses have been erected and boats provided, and those items account for the large increase for the present year. Probably the service can be done for $4,000 next year, now that boats have been built and boathouses provided.

Salaries, &c., of Lighthouse Keepers..... $175,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is an increase of about $2,000 for Ontario. What is that caused by?

Mr. FOSTER. There are each year new lighthouses being erected, and consequently new keepers have to be employed. There is a yearly increase in the salaries corresponding with the yearly increase in the service. If the hon. gentleman will look at the statistics he will find the amount is very large.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many new lighthouses does the Department expect to place in Ontario?

Mr. FOSTER. There are two new ones being built for the upper lakes, and three or four others will be placed in Ontario. The list has not yet been made up; it will be brought down and laid before the House before concurrence.

Mr. DAWSON. The expenditure on lighthouses for the upper lakes will have to be a great deal larger than it has been hitherto, both in the number of the lights and in their maintenance, because the shipping is increasing very rapidly in the upper lakes. In order to give an idea how shipping is increasing, I may say that, at Owen Sound, where the tonnage a few years ago was very limited, now amounts to nearly half a million tons yearly. Take again Port Arthur which has over half a million of tons yearly now, and so on with other ports. To give a still further idea of how the shipping on these lakes is increasing, I may mention that at the port of Duluth the shipping last year amounted to 900,000 tons. Now, as these lakes become covered with fleets, further provision will have to be made in the way of additional lighthouses as well as for beacons and buoys. There were appropriations made for beacons on the St. Mary's River some years ago, but they have not been put there yet. In fact, I do not know that they would be of much use. What we want is light-houses and range-lights, which will enable vessels to pass up and down at night. With the increasing trade of the upper lakes, the Government will have to look forward in the future to a very considerably increased expenditure in the way of keeeping up lighthouses, life-saving apparatus, and in other ways. I had to draw attention, last year, to the loss, within a few years, of no less than twelve vessels with a large loss of life, and, last year, we had the lamentable loss of the *Algoma*, wrecked not in Canadian territory, but on the boundary line near Passage Island. No doubt, the wreck arose from a mistake on the part of the officers navigating the vessel, so that the fault was not in the lights.

Maintenance and repairs to lights, for whistles, buoys and beacons, to humane establishments, and provision depots..... $323,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a considerable increase here.

Mr. FOSTER. Arising from the same cause as exists in the case of salaries and allowances.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to enquire of the Minister if it is proposed to establish fog whistles at the various light-houses in the Gulf of Georgia, during the coming year. It will be remembered that a serious accident occurred there last season, by which a very valuable ship became a total wreck, the ship and cargo being valued at something like $130,000, and during one period last summer there was great inconvenience to the steamships frequenting the Port Nanaimo, owing to the dense fog in the gulf during a portion of the summer. The steamships which frequent that port are very valuable, and the trade is very important. No less than 357,000 tons of coal were shipped from that port last year, and that will convey to the House the importance of maintaining a perfect system of lights and fog whistles up and down the gulf, more especially so, now that we are going to have a line of large steamships running from Vancouver to China and Japan. I think every precaution should be taken, and, if I mistake not, the pilotage authorities of Burrard Inlet, Nanaimo and Victoria, have memorialised the Department to have those fog whistles and also a number of buoys, in order to mark the dangerous points that protrude in the gulf. I cannot press upon the Government too strongly the importance of this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. The representations which my hon. friend has made are fresh in memory. They have arrived within the last month or two, and I have had reports and am having reports made upon them; and I have no doubt that in the course of time these improvements will gradually be made. There is no doubt that more money will have to be expended in these works on the British Columbia coast than has been spent in years past, owing to the large development which has taken place and will take place there. I will bear his representations in mind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there should be some further explanation on this vote, as a sum of $31,000 is asked additional to what was granted in 1885. Now, the sum for Cape Race light and fog whistle may be fairly deducted, as we receive compensation for a large part of that; but even then, an increase of $27,000 over and above the sum sufficient for the purpose of 1885 seems to me a good deal more than has been sufficiently accounted for. A great many of these items which we are asked to vote in very large sums, are susceptible of being carelessly used; and I do not think so large a vote should be given without some fuller explanation of the cause of this addition of $27,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very difficult to give all the items; they are so various. I have no doubt the deputy has made a careful computation of what is required. The increases for lamps, lanterns, oil, &c., are due to the fact that the more lighthouses we have the more lamps are used, and the more oil is consumed. Many of these increases are owing to the increased number of lighthouses we have to supply. In repairs to lighthouses there is an increase of $5,500, which I must say is a large item. In buoys and beacons there is an increase of $2,000, which is due, I think, to the importation of a number of gas buoys of a new and improved pattern. The system was entered on a year or two ago; and as the buoys do very good and economical work, the system is to be completed this year. I cannot give any fuller explanation of the increases.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that last year $292,000 was expended, and $308,900 was voted; the increase would be something like $31,000 in two years. I think it is high time the Government should improve the lighthouse service along the north shore of Lake Superior and in the Georgian Bay; and if the hon. Minister had been able to announce that he was going to make some decided improvements there, I

could understand this increase; but as he has made no such announcement, I do not see why so large an amount is required. The shores in that district are very rocky and dangerous, and the Government should certainly make some provision to prevent such serious disasters, with loss of life, as have occurred there during the last few years. Any person who has travelled along those shores, as I have done, will easily realise how easy it is for a boat on a dark night to meet with a serious accident.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has not read the report, or he would have seen that a very large expenditure was made last year and the year before in those upper lakes. In last year's report I find that a light was placed at the entrance to Tobermory Harbor, Georgian Bay, and lights at Manitowaning, Cape Robert, North Sister Rock, Wilson's Channel, and Shoal Point, as well as a fog horn at Cove Island, in Georgian Bay, and a temporary light at Spanish River. A lighthouse has also been placed at Rainy River, a lighthouse and fog trumpet are in course of construction at Caribou Island, in Lake Superior, and tenders have been invited for the erection of a lighthouse at Victoria Island, in Lake Superior.

Mr. McMULLEN. I quite agree that considerable improvements have been made, but there is very great length of cost.

Mr. PAINT. One lighthouse in Lake Erie cost $25,000. We, in Nova Scotia erect about thirty with that amount.

Mr. DAWSON. Great progress has been made during the last few years in the erection of lighthouses in that part of the country. Last year we had five new lights. But I would correct my hon. friend from Centre Wellington in one thing. The north coast of Lake Huron is an exceedingly dangerous coast, but the north coast of Lake Superior is a very safe coast. A vessel need never be more than two hours run from a good safe harbor on that coast, and all that is wanted is a few additional lights to make its navigation the safest on Canadian waters. The north coast of Lake Huron, on the contrary, is exceedingly dangerous, and there is no more dangerous place than the Georgian Bay. I might point out that a very important life-saving station would be on the Great Duck Island, for there have been wrecks in that direction. As new lights are placed year after year, the navigation of these lakes will become safer.

Completion and construction of lighthouses and fog alarms $40,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We ought to have a list of the various works on which the hon. gentleman proposes to expend this amount.

Mr. FOSTER. I mentioned a few moments ago that there should be such a list before the House. It is being prepared and will be laid on the Table before concurrence. I am sorry it could not be ready in time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman can state generally the number of lighthouses, and the places where they are to be constructed, that would awswer. Otherwise the item ought to stand.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be far more satisfactory to have the list. This is the usual vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the usual custom is to lay on the Table, at the time this vote is asked for, a detailed statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I will have to ask the indulgence of the House this time.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Cannot the hon. gentleman give a general idea where the chief expenditure in the country will take place? Will it take place in the upper lakes or in the Lower Provinces?

Mr. FOSTER. I would rather not give an incomplete statement. I am going through the Provinces one by one, making a list of all the lighthouses.

Mr. WELDON. My hon. friend has invited tenders for a fog alarm to be placed at the west Quaco Head. At what particular spot do they propose to place it there? Formerly the lighthouse was on the ledge, the raceway running between that and the main land. Some years ago the lighthouse was burnt down, and a new lighthouse erected on the bluff on the mainland; but since the alteration there have been several wrecks, whereas none had occurred for years previous. One vessel went to pieces, and the men escaped by getting on the foundation of the old lighthouse, only to become frozen to death, with one exception, before assistance could reach them. Had there been a lighthouse on that spot, these men's lives would have been saved. The matter underwent legal investigation, and a large number of facts came out, to which I will not now allow allude; but I wish to ask whether the fog alarm could not be placed on the ledge, because, in case of danger, there is a chance of saving life there. If a vessel strikes the ledge, when the raceway is full, it is impossible to send out assistance to it in a storm. Had the new lighthouse been on the site of the old one, those men would have been alive to-day. This is such a serious matter that a fog horn should be placed, if possible, on the ledge so that it would become a place of refuge in case of disaster. There have been several instances of vessels being wrecked at the same place, but fortunately without loss of life.

Mr. KIRK. I am sorry the hon. the Minister had not the list prepared and submitted to the House so that we might know where the lighthouses were intended to be built. The hon. gentleman has said it is only the usual vote, but it is usual for the Government sometimes not to build lighthouses where they proposed to build them. Previous to the Session of 1882, a petition was presented to the Minister from the county of Guysboro' asking that a lighthouse be built on Goose Island, an island opposite the harbor of Isaacs and Country Harbor. The petition was submitted to the agent at Halifax, who reported favorably. The lists presented to Parliament showed that a lighthouse was to be built at a cost of $2,000 on that island. It was not built in 1882 or 1883. I asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries why, and he said it was the intention of the Government to build the lighthouse; but it was not built when the House met in 1884. Again, in the Session of 1884, I asked the question, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries explained the reason. He said the owners of the soil refused to sell at a reasonable rate, but it was the intention of the Government to expropriate as much as was necessary. The lighthouse, however, has not been built yet, and I would like to know whether the Government will again submit to Parliament a sum to build it. It is due to the people that it should be built; it is necessary, according to the report of the Government's own engineer, and it is due to the Government to carry out the promise they made in 1882.

Mr. VAIL. I want to bring a matter up in connection with the petition I represented to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is merely for a harbor light for the inhabitants of a cove in Digby. It is a long reef that puts out from the mouth of the harbor that vessels are liable to get upon, and it is simply a small affair, merely a lantern erected on the end of the wharf to guide vessels in. I hope the Minister will take that into consideration.

Maintaining buoys and beacons in the St. Lawrence River, below Montreal..... $7,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How comes this ? This appears to be an entirely new vote, and to be practically saddling the Dominion with a new charge of a considerable amount *in præsenti*, which may rise to larger proportions hereafter.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is mistaken. It is not a new vote. It has been voted every year since 1880 or 1881, being granted at that time for reasons which I have no doubt were good, and it has been the usual vote since that time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is it charged in 1885-86 ?

Mr. FOSTER. In that year I think it was not voted, and the item will appear in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who paid it ?

Mr. FOSTER. It was omitted by some mistake or error, and it will be remedied in the Supplementary Estimates this year.

Mr. GAULT. Who paid that sum last year ?

Mr. BOWELL. This is an item that has been assumed for some years.

Mr. VAIL. I should like to know, if this amount is paid for buoys in the River St. Lawrence, why an appropriation is not made for the Maritime Provinces. I know a number of rivers there where parties have been applying for buoys, and the answer has been that it is not the business of the Department to provide buoys.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must know that buoys are placed all over the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. VAIL. I am speaking of buoys in rivers, to assist vessels in going through drawbridges.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course it depends on the nature of the river.

Mr. VAIL. If the nature of the river is such as to require a drawbridge, it is the duty of the Government to furnish buoys.

Mr. BOWELL. There are no drawbridges in this.

Mr. VAIL. There are in the Maritime Provinces, in the cases I refer to. If buoys are furnished in the St. Lawrence River, I do not see why they are not in the rivers of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must know that they are.

Mr. VAIL. I am glad to hear the Minister say so, because probably the same answer will not be returned to such applications in future.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not follow that every river should be buoyed, any more than that every place can have a lighthouse where one would be advantageous.

Mr. WELDON. How is it that the cost of the Montreal harbor is placed on the Dominion ? Every other harbor has to provide its own buoys.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not simply the port of Montreal, but the district of Montreal, which extends from the boundary of Quebec and Ontario down to Portneuf, nearly to Quebec, it is the whole of that river. When the change was made from the old Trinity House, and the Harbor Commissioners took over that service, a steamer was given them, and, on condition of that, they were to have charge of the buoys; but the steamer wore out or went to pieces, and representation was made that the Harbor Commissioners should not have the labor of buoying the whole River St. Lawrence from the Ontario boundary down to Quebec. That representation was favorably heard, I think in 1880, and since that time the Dominion Government has paid for the placing of buoys there, as they do in the St. John River and other rivers, at their own expense.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There appears to be some error about this $7,000. Not only does it not appear to have been voted in 1885-86, but it does not appear to have been paid in 1884-85.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is right. It was not paid in 1884-85, and was not voted in 1885-86, but it was not forgotten, and the demand, though delayed, has been made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it is quite a new departure, if for two years it was omitted from the Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. No; it was omitted from the Estimates only one year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand that it was placed in the Estimates in 1884-85, and not applied for ?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe it was—a most wonderful thing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the member for Montreal (Mr. Gault) can explain.

Mr. GAULT. I cannot. I am surprised that the Harbor Commissioners were so slack in applying for this, because I presume it goes through their hands.

Observatories, Toronto, Kingston and Montreal.. $6,250 00

Mr. GAULT. The amount of $500 for the Montreal Observatory ought to be increased.

Mr. LANGELIER. I do not see anything for the observatory at Quebec.

Meteorological observatories, including instruments and cost of telegraphing weather warnings..... $50,000 00

Mr. WELDON. Are there any observations taken at Sackville now ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think so.

Mr. WELDON. Because two years ago there was a change made, by which a very efficient officer was removed from the position in St. John, and I doubt if a man equally efficient was put in his stead. The statement made by the Minister was that it was to save expense, but I see that the expense now is larger than it was in 1882. I see there is nothing for Sackville. It was stated that the observatory was taken from Fredericton to Sackville.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. WELDON. Is it still at Fredericton ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Committee rose and reported,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1:35 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 19th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 8) respecting the Lennox Passage Bridge Company.

DUNNVILLE DAM AND BRIDGE TOLLS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 139) respecting tolls over the Dunnville Dam and Bridge connecting works constructed over the Grand River. He said: This work gives an annual revenue of $320. The Government think that the bridge might be made a free bridge without detriment to the public service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

EXPLORATION OF HUDSON'S BAY AND STRAITS.

Mr. ROYAL asked, In sending the *Alert* to visit the Hudson's Straits last year, was it intended by the Government that the navigability of these waters should be tested by the said vessel, or was the *Alert* sent for the sole purpose of visiting the posts established along the coast of the Straits by the Government in 1884?

Mr. FOSTER. In sending the *Alert* to visit the Hudson's Straits last year it was intended by the Government that the navigability of these waters should be tested by that vessel, as that was the primary object of fitting out the expedition to the Hudson's Bay and Straits in 1884-85. The visiting of the posts established along the coasts of the straits by the expedition was a secondary matter altogether, and was not supposed to interfere with the primary object of the expedition in any way beyond a few days delay. A very important element of these expeditions was obtaining information relative to the temperature both in Hudson's Bay and Straits at certain seasons of the year, as this information has an essential bearing on the question as to whether the route could be utilised for commercial purposes, and the commander of the expedition considered it advisable to visit the stations of observation on his way into the bay, in case relief might have been required by any of the observers, who had been stationed there during the previous eleven months.

WORKS ON THE INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. LESAGE asked, Under the order of what superintendent or employee of the Intercolonial Railway did Mr. James McGuire, of Quebec, construct a reservoir and lay pipes in the Intercolonial Railway station at Lévis? Who took over and inspected those works, and what was the cost?

Mr. THOMPSON. The reservoir and laying of pipes in the Intercolonial Railway station at Lévis were works done under the orders and superintendence of W. B. Mackenzie, assistant engineer. Mr. Mackenzie inspected and took over those works; the cost was $106.21.

Mr. LESAGE asked, On whose order did Mr. F. B. Atkinson repair the Intercolonial Railway wharf at Lévis? How many toise of stone were paid for, and at what rate per toise? Who inspected the work, and upon whose order was payment directed to be made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. THOMPSON. The contract was awarded to Atkinson, the lowest tenderer. Four hundred and thirty-six toise of stone were paid for, at the rate of $3.20 per toise. The work was inspected by Piton & Ritchie. The payment was made by order of Mr. Ritchie.

ADVANCES TO PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. DAVIES asked, Whether any application has been made by the Government of Prince Edward Island for any advance to that Province out of the capital amount standing to its credit, and upon which interest is now being paid? 2. Whether any application has been made by or on behalf of the Government of Prince Edward Island for any payment to that Province of the sum of $125,000 or any other sum beyond those already paid to that Province? 3. If any such application has been made, what is the nature of the claim, and is it the intention of the Government to accede to it in whole or in part? 4. Has the claim of the Island Government in respect to a refund for moneys expended on wharves and piers been finally settled, or is the same still standing open and unsettled?

Mr. McLELAN. To the first, second and third questions the answer is, no such applications have been made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will answer the last question, although I answered it the other day. The Island Government made a claim, and in the first instance we admitted a portion of that claim to the amount of $54,000. Later on a second claim was made, of which we admitted $24,000 or $25,000.

APPEALS AGAINST FRENCH CANADIANS.

Mr. TASSE asked, *La Patrie*, of Montreal, having asserted, in its issue of 11th May, that the head of the Government, not long since, wrote a letter which was published in the Winnipeg *Siftings*, in which Sir John Macdonald made a contingent appeal to the faithful battalions of Winnipeg against the French Canadians, what is to be thought of that accusation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say what is to be thought of such an accusation.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think the question is not in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. That part of it beginning "what is to be thought," &c.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Besides that, it contains assertions which require to be proved.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know whether *La Patrie* of Montreal has asserted anything, because I have not seen *La Patrie*.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You do not study it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I am not in the line of *La Patrie*. I do not know what is to be thought of this statement by other people, but I know it to be a falsehood.

COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF REGISTERED LETTERS, &c.

Mr. EVERETT asked, Is it the intention of the Government to take into consideration the propriety of adopting for Canada an arrangement similar to that made by the British Post Office Department for granting "compensation for loss or damage of registered letters and packages?"

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter is receiving the consideration of the Government.

BADDECK, N.S., CUSTOM HOUSE.

Mr. KIRK asked, Who is the contractor for work being done in connection with Baddeck, N.S., custom house? Was the contract let by public or private tender, and what is the amount? How much did the site cost, and of whom was it purchased? How much has the work already cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contractor's name is R. H. Hill. The contract was let by public tender, and the amount of the contract is $7,500. The site cost $1,133.35, including legal expenses, and it was purchased from Mr. A. T. Macdonald. The contract is being executed.

ESTUARY OF THE NATASKOWAN.

Mr. BÉCHARD (for Mr. LANGELIER) asked, What is the yearly rent paid to Government by the tenant of the estuary of the River Nataskowan? For what number of years does his lease run, and has he paid his rent regularly in advance each year?

Mr. FOSTER. The yearly rent is $650. The lease has yet four years to run. The rent has been regularly paid, with the exception of 1885.

JOHN MOODY.

Mr. LISTER asked, Whether John Moody, formerly an officer of the Government in the Fishery Department, is now in the employ of the Government, in that or any other Department? If so, what is the name of the office held by him? When was he appointed? What salary does he receive? How much has he been paid in each year since his first employment, in the way of salary or otherwise? If not now employed by the Government, when and why were his services dispensed with?

Mr. FOSTER. John Moody is now in the employ of the Government as Fishery Overseer, at a salary of $50 per year. His other disbursements, from 1880 to 1884, inclusive, have been, respectively, per annum, $4, $9, $15.50, $12 and $13.50.

MUTUAL LIFE ASSOCIATION OF CANADA.

Mr. HOLTON asked, Has the position of the cash deposit of the "Mutual Life Association of Canada" been changed by the Government? If so, in what sense?

Mr. McLELAN. It has been changed from municipal debenture bonds to a bank cash deposit.

EUGÈNE HAMOND.

Mr. BÉCHARD (for Mr. LANGELIER) asked, Whether Eugène Hamond, of St. Thomas, county of Montmagny, has been appointed to any Government office or employment? If so, to what office has he been appointed, when, and at what salary?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Eugène Hamond has been appointed to the office of Harbor Master at St. Thomas, at a salary not to exceed $200 per year of the fees collected. He was appointed by Order in Council, September 21st, 1885.

RELATIONS OF CATHOLICS TO POLITICAL PARTIES.

Mr. TASSÉ asked, Whether the Government has cognisance of a document addressed to the electors of Ontario, under date of 26th October, 1882, the which document, signed "Frank Smith and John O'Donohoe," contained, amongst other things, the following declaration:—

"There are two political parties in this country, one calling itself the Conservative or Liberal-Conservative, the other the Liberal or Reform party; each claiming the confidence of the country, each having a certain following among the people, each having certain traditions and a certain measure of support among the Catholic people.

"The undersigned, in common with large numbers of their Catholic fellow-countrymen, are in alliance with the Conservative or Liberal-Conservative party. They recognise in that party and in its policy the strongest claim on their support as citizens; and as Catholics, they declare that the history of the country will show that it is from this party only that the Catholic people have received fair representation in the Cabinet and in the Senate, a fair distribution of the public patronage, and a fair support at all times for Catholic candidates at the polls.

"On the other hand, they assert with confidence that the relations between the Liberal or Reform party and the Catholic people, have been most unsatisfactory to the latter. When the Reform party had power to use, and patronage to bestow, the Catholic people, even that portion of the Catholic people in direct alliance with them remained without representation of a proper character in the Government and the Senate; Catholic candidates were openly abandoned by the Liberals at the polls; and the public patronage was distributed without regard to their interests under a system of administration which practically recognised such interests as regarded the rest of the population. And for several years at an earlier period than this, the Catholic Church, its doctrines, ceremonies, religious orders, bishops, priests, and people, were the victims of the incessant and blasphemous vituperation of the recognised organs of the Liberal party; while in the press, in the Legislature and at the polls, the Conservative party acted in friendly accord with the support of the Catholic Church and people.

"The alliance between the two parties in Dominion and Provincial affairs is now complete; the Conservatives and Reformers of Ontario, are now in alliance with the Conservatives and Reformers of the Dominion. Each has made public profession of this union. And as Catholics the undersigned, in common with thousands of their fellow-Catholics, are desirous of legitimately giving their aid to their political friends in this Province, in the fullest confidence that their policy will be as just and their acts as generous as in Dominion affairs. Though the Conservative party in Ontario affairs have been for years in Opposition, there is nothing in the published speeches of their leaders or in their published resolutions adopted in convention with which as citizens they do not heartily concur, and nothing that as Catholics they are called on to disagree with. Our Separate School system owes much to the wisdom of the Conservative party. That party are supported in the Legislature by some of our fellow-Catholics. They have nominated several of our fellow-Catholics as their candidates, and when in power, they will be as faithful to their Catholic friends as the Catholic Conservatives have been to them." Is Mr. John O'Donohoe who signed the said document the gentleman who was made a member of the Senate?

Mr. MILLS. I object to this question. Here is a long statement of facts, on which the question is based, and of which we have no knowledge. We have no such document before us, and we do not know whether any such document was ever published or written or not; we cannot know in this House, under the circumstances, whether it is in existence or not; and I maintain that it is not in order for the hon. gentleman to base a question on a disputable statement of fact.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is:

"In both Houses questions are constantly put to Ministers of the Crown concerning measures pending in Parliament, or public affairs and matters of administration; and to particular members who have

charge of a Bill, or who have given notices of motions, or are otherwise concerned in some business before the House. A question may be asked concerning the intentions of the Government, in any matters of legislation or administration, but not as to their abstract opinions upon general questions of policy."

I must say this is not a question affecting any Bill or matter before the House, nor does it refer to public affairs or matters of administration. I think it is not a question that should be asked—not unless the Government choose to answer it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can say I do not know whether the Government has cognisance or not——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—of the document referred to, but I do know that the Mr. John O'Donohoe who signed that document is the gentleman who is now a member of the Senate.

TIMBER DUES OF MR. HERMAN COOK.

Mr. TAYLOR asked, Was any sum, and if so, how much, due to the Government or the Indian Department by Mr. Herman Cook, as dues for timber cut on Indian lands in the Georgian Bay, during the years 1872-73? Did Mr. Cook pay such indebtedness? and if so, in what sums and at what dates? If Mr. Cook has not paid these dues, why not? Whether the said claim still remains unpaid or unsettled, and if not, when, and under what circumstances was any settlement thereof made, and what were the terms and conditions of any such settlement?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the answer furnished by the Department:

"Mr. H. H. Cook, in 1870, acquired a timber license to cut pine and oak trees on the following islands in Georgian Bay: Christian, Hope, Beckwith, Giant's Tomb, and Beausoliel. In the season of 1872-73 he cut a quantity of pine on these islands, the dues on which amounted to $3,879.95; on October 1, 1873, he paid cash $2,079.95, and gave a bond for the balance, $1,800.00, bearing interest at 6 per cent. He was called upon several times to pay the bond and interest thereon, but failed to do so. In July, 1875, he wrote to the Superintendent General (Mr. Laird), asking for a renewal of the bond, owing to the dulness of the lumber trade. On the 7th July the order to renew the bond was given by Mr. Laird. On February 3rd, 1877, Mr. Cook wrote to the Department enclosing a statement showing that the men employed by him to measure the pine timber in 1872-73, had made an over-return of 927,017 feet, the dues on which amounted to $1,486.24. Nothing appears to have been done in the matter until 1st October, 1878, when the remission was made by Mr. Mills, of the above sum $1,486.24, and interest thereon, from the date of the bond, 1st October, 1873, five years, in accordance with a declaration of William Telfer, Mr. Cook's bookkeeper at Toronto. On the 2nd October, Mr. Cook paid to Mr. Mills the sum of $313.76, and interest, which, together with the amount remitted, made up the amount of bond $1,800."

THE HOME RULE RESOLUTION.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex) asked, On what day and at what hour was the resolution of this House on the Home Rule question communicated to Sir Charles Tupper, as the First Minister stated in the House it had been? Did the communication forwarded to Sir Charles Tupper contain the resolution of this House only, or did it contain any or all, and if any other than the resolution, which of the motions submitted on the question? Were the division lists or the votes in any or all of the divisions on the question forwarded, and if any were communicated, which?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I stated the circumstances before. On the adjournment of the debate on the Home Rule resolution, I asked Mr. Johnson, who is Reuter's correspondent, to send the resolution at once to Reuter, so that it might be communicated to the press and otherwise. In the morning, I sent for Mr. Johnson, and found that he had not sent the whole resolution *verbatim et literatim*. Thereupon I made my secretary telegraph the whole resolution to Sir Charles Tupper, and instructed him to print it at once and send a copy of it to every member of the House of Commons. Besides sending the resolution itself under the Order of this House, I telegraphed to Sir Charles Tupper, for his own information, the whole of the proceedings.

IMPERFECT RETURN.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to one or two returns and the absence of several others. In the first place, I moved:

"For a return of all horses, ponies, cattle, furs, waggons, carts and other property seized by the mounted police or expeditionary force while on service in the North-West between March 27th and August 1st, with the disposition made of the same, the names of persons from whom such seizures were made, and the amounts (if any) paid, received, or now payable or receivable on account of such property."

This is all the return contained:

"To Officer Commanding N. W. M. P., Battleford.

"CAMP FORT PITT, June 30th, 1885.

"It would be advisable to take in charge all the property of all those half-breeds now at Battleford who lately delivered themselves up from rebel camp until their innocence is proved, there being strong doubts on the loyalty of the whole of them.

(Signed) "FRED. MIDDLETON,
"M. General."

That is the only return I got to that Order, and I submit it is treating the House with disrespect to bring down a return of this kind in answer to the Ordor. This is not, and does not pretend to be, a return. My reason for asking the return was evident on the face of the Order. It has been constantly charged in the press and in private conversation that property was improperly seized by men of the force, and I hoped to be able to clear them of such a charge; but if the Minister of Militia will afford no means of clearing them, the fact will lie with him. Again, there were two or three returns moved for which are not brought down, and some of which are comparatively brief. I asked for a statement in gross, under certain heads, of the total expenditure, somewhat differently arranged from the way in which it is to be found in the Public Accounts. We have not had that return yet. Ten months after the close of the campaign, it ought to be possible to make up the accounts, and the obvious way of making them up would be the way I suggested.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman in his expression of opinion that the obvious way of making up the account was exactly the way he thinks is the proper one. I told the hon. gentleman, when he moved for the return, that the information he required it would take considerable time to prepare, and that I did not expect he would get it this Session.

Mr. CASEY. Oh, no.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I say, oh, yes.

Mr. CASEY. I appeal to *Hansard*.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I told the hon. gentleman we would have to go through every account so as to put the different items under the headings he required. I told him I would bring the return down as soon as possible, and I did not refuse to bring down any return. It simply could not be brought down in time; the officers of the Department said it would take a long time to prepare it, because every account handed over to the Auditor General would have to be gone through again, and every item placed under the heading required by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman speaks of disrespect to the House. I brought

down the return which was handed to me by the officers of the Department, and that return evidently indicates that no such seizure as the hon. gentleman referred to in his motion has been made. That is all. The General, as a precautionary measure, indicated it would be prudent to take charge of the property, as reported in that return, but it is quite evident no seizure was made.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. Minister told me what he now says he did, I certainly did not hear him. My recollection still is that he told me he would be able to bring it down in a short time. I do not doubt his word, but his memory.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman told me, moreover, that if I brought down what I could he would be perfectly satisfied.

HOME RULE RESOLUTION.

Mr. MILLS. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the House to a telegram sent to the London *Times*, at the instance of the First Minister, which, the House will see, does not fairly represent the proceedings of this House, which the telegram purports to represent. After the Order of the House that you, Sir, should be the medium of communication, it was scarcely respectful to the House, on the part of the First Minister, to give instructions to an outsider to send news of our proceedings to the English people, and that gentleman certainly sent a telegram which gave an erroneous impression of the facts, and his telegram was before the English public at least twenty-four hours before the actual facts were disclosed. The telegram purports to come from Philadelphia, and is in these words:

"In the Dominion House of Commons yesterday Mr. Blake's resolution in favor of Home Rule for Ireland was discussed. The debate resulted in the adoption, by 117 to 61 votes, of an amendment moved by Mr. Costigan, Minister of Inland Revenue declaring:

"That in view of the fact that Parliament addressed Her Majesty on this subject in 1882, receiving from the Earl of Kimberley a not altogether satisfactory response, this House earnestly hopes that such measures will be adopted by the Imperial Parliament as will, while preserving the integrity and well-being of the Empire and the rights and *status* of the minority, be satisfactory to the people of Ireland, and as will permanently remove the discontent so long unhappily prevailing in that country."

The word "status" is underlined, and underlined no doubt to show that the principal object of this Parliament, in passing the resolution, was to suggest a plan for the protection of the minority, and not with the view of urging the Imperial Government to grant Home Rule to Ireland.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Where is that dated?

Mr. MILLS. Philadelphia, 7th April.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of the First Minister, I may say that the House remembers well what the First Minister said when the question was put to him. He said that, immediately after the sitting of the House that night, he saw Reuter's agent, and asked him to telegraph the whole proceedings.

Mr. MILLS. This is the telegram.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The next morning, having ascertained that, instead of telegraphing the resolutions, he had only sent a synopsis of or *resumé*, the First Minister took care that all the resolutions before the House and the divisions should be cabled to the High Commissioner for Canada, with instructions to have them published immediately, and they were published in the *Times*. The High Commissioner was instructed also to have the resolution of the House printed and distributed to every member of the House of Commons.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may state that I conceived it to be my duty to communicate an attested copy of the resolution to the High Commissioner, with the request he would carry out the desire of the House as contained in that resolution.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did you feel it incumbent on you to send the resolution passed by the House, or to send all the resolutions?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, I sent an attested copy of the resolution adopted by the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Which you understood was the wish of the House, and nothing more?

Mr. SPEAKER. I simply communicated that, and nothing more—an attested copy.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY.

Mr. THOMPSON moved concurrence in the amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 105) to amend the Act to provide for the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company. He said: It is simply a clause ratifying the contract which was made.

Mr. DAVIES. I could not hear a word of the hon. gentleman's explanation.

Mr. THOMPSON. The object of the Act was, as my hon. friend knows, to validate a contract which had been made by the Minister of Railways, in October last, with the company in charge of this work, and the clause does that explicitly.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman have the goodness to speak louder.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Senate has simply added a section declaring that that contract is confirmed, as the Act did in effect before.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Speaker order the amendment to be read, for I cannot catch, from what my hon. friend says, what the meaning of it is.

Mr. SPEAKER read the amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must again protest against the passage of a measure of this kind, which involves this country to the extent of over $3,000,000. I am not going to take up the time of the House by discussing it again, but I protest against fixing upon this country, in order to give the promoters of this company facilities for inducing English capitalists or others to go into this enterprise, an amount of liability for which the country will get no benefit at all.

Motion agreed to, on a division, and amendments concurred in.

HALIFAX REFORMATORY FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 134) to amend an Act respecting a reformatory for certain juvenile offenders in the county of Halifax, in the Province of Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. WELDON. Is this a Dominion or a Provincial institution?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is a Dominion institution, that is, the powers are conferred by the Dominion authority. In Halifax, there are two industrial schools or reformatories,

one for Protestant boys and the other for Roman Catholic boys. This is the latter, and the hon. Senator who introduced the Bill is, I think, himself one of the managers, or, at any rate, is largely interested in the management, and he informs me that since the establishment of this institution a considerable number of boys have been sent there who can safely be allowed, after a short time of instruction and confinement, to go at large, that depending upon good behavior, and he has suggested this method of applying what is known as the ticket-of-leave system to this institution. I have no personal acquaintance with the matter, but have been willing to give my consent to its being tried, especially as it is the strong wish of those who are concerned in the institution.

Mr. WELDON. It is not supported by Dominion funds?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 135) to amend an Act respecting offences against the person.—(Mr. Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is a good sign of the times to find that, as the Session grows older, my hon. friend grows wiser. I introduced a Bill in the earlier part of the Session, making every accused person competent to give evidence in his own behalf. The hon. gentleman strongly opposed that Bill. He called upon his followers to vote it down, and they voted it down accordingly. Now he fathers a Bill which goes a great deal further than mine. He proposes to make the wife a competent witness, not for, but against, her husband. I have no objection to that proposal. It is necessary, if the law is to be carried out, under the decision in the case of the Queen *vs.* Bissell, in which it was held by the Superior Courts of Ontario that the wife was not a competent witness. That is practically doing away with the Statute altogether, and I am in favor of this Bill in that respect. But if the wife is made a competent witness against the husband, upon what principle can the hon. gentleman refuse to allow the husband to give evidence in his own behalf? To make the Bill perfect and just to both parties, the wife ought to be a competent witness against the husband, but the husband ought not to be excluded from giving evidence in his own behalf. If his mouth is closed, as it is under this law, his wife can enter the witness-box and tell her own story and get a conviction against her husband on one point. To make the Bill perfect, if the wife is a competent witness, the husband should be a competent witness. I suggest to the hon. Minister that he should add a provision that such accused person shall be a competent witness in his own behalf.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no objection to the amendment, but I do not see that the hon. gentleman should object to my growing wiser as I grow older.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not object; I am glad of it.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman seems to have a singular notion, however, that, ever since the defeat of that Bill to allow criminals to give evidence in their own behalf, every Bill is one like that. Now, this is a Bill of a very different character. It is simply to render competent the wife to give evidence against the husband on a charge of desertion. In some of the Provinces it has been held that she is competent, but by a decision in an Ontario court, the one, I presume, to which the hon. gentleman referred, it has been decided that she was not competent in consequence of an old English decision based on the principle that she had an interest. However, I have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The court in this case were divided in opinion.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE LAW RESPECTING THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 133) further to amend the law respecting the North-West Territories.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Mr. THOMPSON. Those were the laws that were in force there at the time the territories were acquired by England.

Mr. MILLS. I do not know as to the exact position of these territories. Of course, the Hudson Bay Company claimed to have jurisdiction over them, and did, as a matter of fact, exercise a kind of jurisdiction in the territories from 1820 to 1870, but whether the English law could be in force in the territories at that particular time, or whether it would be any other law, it would be difficult to say. In 1763, those territories were conquered by Canada, and were surrendered to the Crown of Great Britain by the Treaty of Paris. The French reserved all the territory that was west of the Mississippi as far north as the source of the river, but all the territories that were further north than the source of the Mississippi River and that were embraced in the Province of Canada, were ceded, and they are so marked on the map by the English and French commissioners in 1773, at the time the cession took place, as French territory. Now, while the English law, in so far as it is applicable to a new country, becomes the law of that country when it is acquired by discovery and is colonised by settlers from the Mother Country, that is not the rule where the territory is acquired by conquest, as this was. Besides, that rule only applies up to the time the territories were actually taken possession of, which would not be until 1870, and unless the law is brought into force by this Statute, it would not be in force of its own vigor in consequence of the occupation of settlers.

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot agree with that view. I think the law was in force.

Mr. MILLS. Now?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the English law does apply in case of conquest. The law of the conquering country prevails. That is of no consequence here, however. The intention is to bring in force the civil and criminal laws of England in respect to those matters on which the Parliament of Canada has not legislated, so as to bring in force there the common law, at any rate. I think that is the meaning and the interpretation.

Mr. MILLS. With respect to the introduction of the English law, it is laid down by the authorities, that in the

ase of a conquered country, the law remains in force until it is superseded by the King. The King has power in himself for purposes of legislation as regards a conquered country; but his legislation and power of dealing with the country is superseded by the action of Parliament. If the Legislature should make concessions, then the King's power is gone altogether. The difficulty in dealing with this country arises as to whether the French law was in force in that country at the time the territory was acquired in 1766. There can be no doubt that the Governors of Canada from 1729 till 1759 exercised jurisdiction over the country. They issued licenses to various parties to trade there; they established a number of trading posts, and at the time Quebec was taken there were over fifty French soldiers in that country.

On section 14,

Mr. WELDON. I think it would be a great deal better to adopt the practice which is now in force in Ontario, or some of the other Provinces, instead of that which is in force in England, under wholly different circumstances.

Mr. THOMPSON. The object of this is not at all to introduce the English practice, but to provide for the powers of the court, and I thought it better to assimilate it in this respect to the sister court of Manitoba. However, the clause may stand.

Mr. MILLS. There is another matter which I think ought to be considered in connection with this question, and that is as to how far you will allow the court to exercise jurisdiction in cases of contempt out of court. There is no doubt the law on that subject is now obsolete, or should be so regarded, and, while it is necessary that a court should have power to punish for contempt committed in the court, I think it is wholly inconsistent with our modern notions to allow the court to exercise jurisdiction in cases of contempt out of court, where the party is practically deprived of the right of trial under the laws. In many of the American States that power has been greatly abridged. For instance, a member of the court may be severely criticised, and it may be the party has done a great injustice to the court, but, after all, why not let the court be vindicated the same as any other party, in accordance with the law of the land, instead of taking the law into its own hands?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think that in that respect this court should be put on the same footing as the courts of the other Provinces, as in course of time it will no doubt be fully as important as the other courts in respect of the volume of business, &c. I think, therefore, it should have as full powers to protect itself as the courts of the other Provinces.

On section 18,

Mr. MILLS. Is it intended to give the court jurisdiction to amend its own procedure and to make rules and regulations?

Mr. THOMPSON. The North-West Council at present have power to deal with that subject.

Mr. MILLS. The judges would be better qualified to deal with it.

Mr. THOMPSON. They practically do now. The North-West Council prescribe the procedure, and the judges sitting at that council are really left to deal with the matter. I do not see any objection to giving them power directly to do it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think it is an objectionable thing to allow judges to be members of the North-West Council.

On section 20,

Mr. MILLS. Is it intended to continue the appointment of sheriffs and clerks by the Governor in Council when the Territories have full representation?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is intended that the appointments shall be from here.

On section 22,

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the sheriff should be required to give security before entering upon his duties, and I move the following in place of this clause:—

Before entering on the duties of his office each of the sheriffs to be appointed under this Act shall give security by bond or by guarantee in some guarantee company, approved of by the Governor in Council, in the sum of $2,000, and the clerks shall each give like security in the sum of $1,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would it not be better to limit it to a guarantee?

Mr. THOMPSON. It might be difficult in that country to get a guarantee, and I thought I had better allow the option.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 35,

Mr. DAVIES. Are the powers of the deputies defined, or is it necessary to define them?

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think it is necessary to define them. The Interpretation Act says that whatever may be done by an officer may be done by his deputy.

Committee rose and reported progress.

QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (page 1342) respecting the improvements of the harbor of Quebec.—(Mr. McLelan.)

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter was explained the other day, but I will repeat the explanation. This work was undertaken, I think, in 1875, and the works were authorised by Order in Council at that period. The works have progressed since, and, as they progressed, the Government, with the sanction of Parliament, advanced the sums required to continue them. Last year I promised that I would have an examination made during the recess to see which would be the best mode of completing the docks and making the city side of the dock water tight, as required. This has been examined by Mr. Perley, the Chief Engineer of the Department, and Mr. Sandford Fleming. They have reported three schemes for the completion of that work on the city side. The first scheme would be to build a water-tight wall from the gas works, or the portion of the dock which is next to the gas works, by a street which is reserved in the concessions to the proprietors there, and to carry at the same time the sewer of the city, which empties into the harbor there, along the wall to the St. Lawrence. The objection to that scheme is that we would thus have to purchase property of large value where the small vessels, schooners and so on, come every season, and this would increase largely the expenditure that would be required for this work. We have, therefore, thought it would be better not to go in for that expense, because if we adopted this first scheme, as there would

be only one entrance to the one dock, the small craft would have to be admitted at the same time and would be interfering constantly with the large vessels admitted to the dock. The Government have, therefore, thought that that plan should not be adopted. The second plan is to start from the same point near the gas works, and follow what is called the commissioners' line, which was fixed years ago, and come to what is called the cross-wall, where the lock is being built. By this means, we would still have to purchase property to a very great extent, because we would be interfering with the access to a number of these wharves, and therefore have to pay an indemnity to these parties. Thus the second scheme has also been put aside. The third scheme, which has been adopted and for which we ask money now, is that instead of following the commissioners' line, a wall should be built north of that line, in order to leave access to the wharves between the wall and the end of those wharves. Thus we would bring that wall from the gas works down to the cross-wall, but a portion of the cross-wall would remain open, for the purpose of giving a separate access to these wharves, without going through the lock, which will be the lock of the dock. Thus we would have hardly any property to purchase, we would have no damage to pay, and we would not have to interfere with the sewage of the city, which we would not divert at all, and thus we would be quite independent of those proprietors. Another reason is, that by building this wall, by the third scheme, we would have not only on the Louise Embankment side large berths for the ships that would visit the wet dock, but would also have alongside the other wall that we are now asking money for a large number of berths for vessels, thus doubling the capacity for wharfage purpose of the dock, without increasing the expense of the building of the work. These are about the works that have been decided upon in order to complete the dock.

Mr. LANGELIER. If I understand the explanations of the hon. Minister, the plan adopted by the Government consists in building the cross-wall which is now being built——

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is now under contract.

Mr. LANGELIER. Not up to Dalhousie street, but to stop at what is called the commissioners' line.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. LANGELIER. But what would be done with the portion of the cross-wall which is commenced? I understand that it has been commenced in a portion that is not now to be built.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That portion is not built, so there will be no work lost.

Mr. GAULT. I have no objection whatever to this money being voted for the harbor of Quebec, but, at the same time, I think it is about time the Government took into consideration the necessity of assuming the Lake St. Peter debt. The Lake St. Peter channel is as much a canal as any other canal in Canada, and I think the Government should take that into consideration.

Mr. CURRAN. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has referred to a subject which has been a burning question for a considerable length of time. The people, not only of Montreal, but in various sections of the country, have taken it into consideration and have spoken favorably of the assumption by the Government of that particular debt. No doubt this is not a gift to the harbor of Quebec; it is a loan upon interest, but while we may expect, perhaps, at some future day, that the Government will take into their favorable consideration the application that has been made to them, and which has been supported by various Ministers, and successive Administrations, I think I may also ask the Government, now that the port of Quebec is being attended to, to take into their favorable consideration the city of Montreal, and the absolute necessity that exists for the construction of a bridge across the Lachine Canal, which will not involve a very great outlay. I have laid before the Government facts and figures which must convince any body of gentlemen who are desirous of doing fair play, of the absolute necessity of a bridge being constructed for the protection of life and property near the present Wellington Bridge over the Lachine Canal. I hope we will have some assurance from the Government that they will consider this matter, and that a sum will be put into the Supplementary Estimates to accomplish this work.

Mr. MITCHELL. I like the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), but he would be much more practical if he would propound a resolution, upon which a vote could be taken, than he is by making vague statements as to what he would desire if the Government would be pleased to do it. It is useless to talk about what we would desire; what we want is a proposition asking the Government to do what is right for the city of Montreal, and, if my hon. friend will make a motion embodying what he has said, I will be very happy to vote for it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to my hon. friend for Montreal Centre, I may say that to day I saw the Minister of Railways and Canals on the subject of the bridge in question, and he told me that he had given orders to study that subject in order to see how the complaints could be met. He has every desire, and there is every desire on the part of the Government, to do what we can in order to remedy the evil complained of. I know that bridge is frequented by a very large portion of the inhabitants of Montreal, by a large number of vehicles, along with foot passengers, and the surprise is that we have not to deplore loss of life every day at that point. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the Minister of Railways is desirous of coming to the relief of Montreal in that respect. I may say to the hon. gentleman who spoke last, that, if he continues to have the same confidence in us that he recently had, he will rely upon what we say when we tell him that our intention is to meet the wishes of Montreal as far as possible. We have never refused to any portion of the country, and especially to Montreal, any reasonable demand that was made. I may say that this is one of those reasonable demands that will be taken up by the Government with the intention of remedying the evil complained of.

Mr. MACKENZIE. As this matter is before the House, I would like to know the financial position of the Quebec Harbor Trust.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Trust, after paying the ordinary expenses of every kind for salaries, repairs to their property, &c., have left a sum sufficient to enable them to pay 4 per cent. interest and 1 per cent. of a sinking fund on about $750,000. That covers their debt, except the debt on these docks. Of course, we are hastening the completion of the docks in order that they may be ready to give a return, for we expect that the interest and sinking fund will be obtained, and more than that. We expect that these docks will be a paying work, and that as soon as they are completed we will have a revenue sufficient not only to pay the interest on the sinking fund, but to leave a surplus to the commission. Of course that depends altogether on the trade.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Do I understand that the interest is only paid on the old issue of bonds and not on the new?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, not on the new.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total debt at present, exclusive of this three-quarters of a million, without this present loan which you propose to give?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Including this present loan, it would be about $2,875,000.

Mr. DAVIES. That is $2,120,000 altogether, at the present time, is the existing debt?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am speaking of those works. The first amount that was advanced to the board was $1,200,000, and out of that they paid the debt of the commission at the time, of about $750,000. They pay interest on that and the sinking fund. Then other sums have been advanced to the commission since for these docks.

Mr. MITCHELL. How much?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About a million dollars.

Mr. MITCHELL. I can only say that if the district of Montreal had so able a representative in the Cabinet as my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, I am sure the request would have been granted that has come so frequently from the city of Montreal, from the Harbor Trust, from the Board of Trade, from the Corn Exchange, and from public meetings, and their demands would not have been in vain, as they have been to a very large extent. I am not a representative of the city of Montreal, but I am a citizen of Montreal, and in that capacity I state here that the port of Montreal has not received that attention from the Government which its great importance demands, and if she only had a representative in the Cabinet who would do for her what the Minister of Public Works does for the district of Quebec, she would get what she is fairly entitled to.

Mr. GAULT. I am very much pleased that the Minister has taken up that question with regard to the bridge over the Lachine Canal. A great many people are constantly crossing that bridge.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think I have allowed that subject to be discussed as far as it ought to be.

Resolutions concurred in.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 140) respecting improvements of the harbor of Quebec.

Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 141) further to amend the law of evidence in certain cases (from the Senate).—(Mr. Thompson.)

INSURANCE.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 111) respecting insurance.—(Mr. Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Mr. THOMPSON. A question has been suggested since the Committee on Banking and Commerce passed the Bill, which may be worthy of some consideration. The clause provides, among other things, that, excepting on conditions named, no company shall transact any business of life, fire or inland marine insurance in Canada. It has been suggested that the words are more stringent than they were intended to be, and that the prohibition of transacting any business of insurance might apply to a person such, for instance, as an inspector of a foreign company here for the purpose of making an inspection. Before the committee it was understood that no prohibition would be enacted against the Manufacturers' Insurance Company, on account of the particular circumstances of that company. It has been said that a prohibition against transacting any business of insurance might apply against an officer of that company who came here to make an inspection of property. That, of course, was not intended; I do not think it is the effect of the clause; but if it is thought to be the effect of the clause, I suggest that the words "carry on" be substituted for "transact."

Mr. MULOCK. I quite agree with the tenor of the remarks made by the Minister of Justice, but I am afraid he is going to defeat the object by adopting the words suggested. What is necessary to guard against is the transaction of insurance business as between the company and third parties. I am afraid if we use the words "carry on," more than merely taking risks would be necessary in order that this section should apply, as it was desired to apply to the case of receiving applications.

Mr. THOMPSON. This clause will certainly cover the case of brokers canvassing for applications in Canada.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Immigration Expenses $279,925

Mr. McMULLEN. What are supposed to be the duties of the agent at Ottawa? It appears to me singular that there should be an agent here at $1,300 a year.

Mr. CARLING. The agent at Ottawa is a most efficient man. A very large number of immigrants come here, just as they do to other agencies, and the Ottawa agent has the distribution of them throughout the whole Ottawa valley.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can easily understand the necessity of having agents and complete staffs at such points as Montreal and Quebec; but I think to pay $1,300 for an agent at Ottawa is extravagant. I do not think it is ever the case that a lot of immigrants come straight through to Ottawa, and seek to get the information here as to where they can get lands and where it is most desirable to settle. We might as well have an agent in the city of Hull. I admit that it might be well to have some person to give directions to parties who might enquire; but I would like to know how many immigrants this agent received last year, where they were distributed, and generally what amount of work he has done?

Mr. CARLING. It is impossible for me to give that information just now. This gentleman has been an agent here for a great many years; he was here when the hon. gentleman's friends were in power; and he is considered one of the most efficient agents in the service of the Government. A large number of immigrants do come straight through to Ottawa; I think it was only yesterday that a large number came here. I shall be glad to furnish the hon. gentleman with information as to the number of immigrants who came last year, and how they were distributed.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no desire to express want of confidence in the efficiency of the agent. I have no doubt he is an efficient man.

Mr. CARLING. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the annual report, he will find the number of immigrants who came here, and how they were distributed.

Mr. McMULLEN. No doubt the report contains that information, but I think the Minister should be prepared to give it to us here. It is pretty difficult to read all those

reports. I think we have had this Session quite enough answers of that kind. If we can do without this agent, I think we should cut him off.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whatever may be the merits of the Ottawa agent, one thing is tolerably certain, that an enormous number of the immigrants who have been reported as having settled in Canada, have disappeared in a most unaccountable fashion. Year after year for the last nineteen years—I am bound to say under the Administration of which I was a member, as well as under this Administration—we have had statements that 20,000, 30,000, 50,000, 113,000, 120,000 immigrants have come to this country. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that our census returns show conclusively that of the immigrants reported by our officers and agents as having settled in Canada, not 25 per cent. can by any possibility have remained. That is perfectly clear, at any rate, as regards the two censuses of 1871 and 1881, and something must be very much amiss in the mode in which those returns are made. Looking back to 1867, and taking up the returns of the hon. gentleman's Department, we find that about 900,000 immigrants—I think the exact figures are 875,000—are stated to have settled in Canada during the last eighteen or nineteen years. I am not censuring the hon. gentleman's individual management, I am speaking of the whole subject of immigration; and it is perfectly absurd to suppose that any such number of immigrants have remained in Canada. It is a matter of grave doubt whether the total increase of our population during the nineteen years since Confederation has amounted to 900,000. It is undoubted that one of two things have occurred. Either these immigrants have merely passed through Canada, or they have displaced other people here. It is quite clear that these returns, setting forth that so many people have settled here, are entirely unreliable. It may be—I do not pretend to say it is not—the case that these immigrants have declared to the hon. gentleman's officers they intend to stop here, but we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that a vast proportion of them have not stayed here. That is quite demonstrable from the census returns as late as 1881, and the other returns, the various municipal returns, especially for Ontario, all go to show, in the strongest possible fashion, that the immigrants either do not stay in the country or thrust out Canadians to make place for them. Under either of these conditions it cannot be said we are doing a very sensible thing in spending the money we spend for the purpose of bringing immigrants to the country. The hon. gentleman, if he has studied the question, must be aware that, according to our municipal returns, the total increase in Ontario for the last four or five years renders it impossible to suppose that anything like the number of immigrants reported to have come in, can have settled here.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. White, Hastings.)

Bill (No. 119) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company.—(Mr. Royal.)

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Columbia Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Tupper.)—[Title changed to "The Kootenay and Athabasca Railway Company."]

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. McMULLEN.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. I was remarking just before six o'clock, that I thought there was little or nothing to do in this office at Ottawa. I see that $3,217.08 was spent in the Ottawa immigration office last year for salaries and contingencies. I notice that all the agent has reported is some 1,200 that arrived here in that time. That is about $3 a head. I cannot see the necessity of continuing that office with the immense expense attached to it. Of course, the Minister of Agriculture is perhaps in a better position to judge what is necessary than any member of the House, but it appears to me quite absurd. Kingston, where there is an amount of $1,300 to be voted for the agent, is another point where there is considerable expense, $3,056.25 having been spent there last year for salaries and contingencies.

Mr. CARLING. There is no additional charge. It is the same as it was last year, and these agencies have to be kept up. The number of immigrants last year may have been less than in the previous year, but there is every probability that it will be larger this year.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that last year $2,956.25 was spent for salaries and contingencies in the Hamilton office, for which a vote of $1,250 is now asked for the agent. I really cannot see that much immigration business can be done in Hamilton. I can understand that in Toronto it is absolutely necessary that you should have an efficient staff, but I cannot understand why at Hamilton, which is so very close to Toronto, only 39 miles, we should have the additional expense of an agency. I admit that it is pretty hard to cut these things down, and that it would not be a very popular thing for any Minister of Agriculture to undertake, but it should be inaugurated, and I believe that anyone who would enter upon that matter would receive the thanks of this entire Dominion. There is a large amount of money spent in connection with immigration that is not at all necessary. We ought to reorganise the whole system, and we should begin by cutting off these useless agencies. Of course the agents all try to show that there is business done, because they expect, if they did not, they would lose their position. Even in Ottawa I notice there is an extended report. I dare say the agent has plenty of time to prepare it, probably half a year, for I do not think he works half a year. I do not see the necessity for an agent at Hamilton.

Mr. CARLING. A very large number of immigrants come by way of Suspension Bridge, and Hamilton is looked upon as a distributing station for western Ontario. We have immigration buildings there and a very good officer, and every attention is paid to immigrants who come by that particular route,

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to ask——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, carried.

Mr. McMULLEN. We will get through all the sooner if you will keep quiet. You are not going to scare me—not a bit. I want to know if there is any assistance given to immigrants coming by way of New York? Do we get immigrants by way of New York, or is our assistance confined to those who come by the Atlantic to Quebec?

Mr. CARLING. No assistance whatever is given to immigrants coming by way of New York.

Mr. McMULLEN. How is it, then, that immigrants come in by way of Suspension Bridge?

Mr. CARLING. Immigrants that come by the Cunard and White Star lines to Canada come by way of Suspension Bridge. All the immigrants that come to the country are not assisted. Out of the 80,000 that came to this country last year, only 7,000 or 8,000 were assisted.

Mr. WILSON. On this item of $1,000 for London, I would ask what number of immigrants arrived there, and where are they distributed?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The CHAIRMAN. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If order cannot be maintained, we will have to move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Hon. gentlemen are interrupting the business by their disorder.

Mr. WILSON. I desire to get some information as to the services this man in London performs during the year. I do not object to his being paid a reasonable amount, but I want to know whether he is doing enough for the amount he receives.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again. Unless hon. gentlemen can keep their own supporters in order while these Estimates are discussed, it is idle to go on.

Mr. MULOCK. I think that is a most proper motion to make; we are now granting supplies to Her Majesty, and there is no matter more important to the people than a proper disposition of the taxes they pay. We are bound to give the most serious consideration to every proposition involving the creation of taxes, and if this committee is not prepared to-night to give that consideration to these matters which they demand, then it is quite clear that we cannot go on.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no doubt that the committee wishes to get on with the business, and proceed with the voting of supplies to Her Majesty, and, therefore, being convinced of that, as I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is, who has made the motion, I hope he will withdraw his motion and let us proceed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman will use his influence with his supporters to allow these items to be fairly discussed, I certainly will withdraw it; but it is absurd to suppose that we can go on with the discussion in the midst of cat-calls and all kinds of noises.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN. I declare the motion lost.

Mr. WILSON. I think this motion should be put to the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is lost.

Mr. WILSON. I was on my feet before the motion was put. I desire to express my sentiments upon the motion, and I think I am in my right. We are perfectly prepared to go on with the Estimates, but I shall expect that the Minister leading the House will do his utmost to keep his supporters in order. I desire to ask the Minister where the immigrants arriving in London are distributed?

Mr. CARLING. I find by the report that 1,160 arrived at London, and they were distributed in the western part of Ontario. Mr. Smythe, the agent, gives great attention to strangers. When they arrive he takes care of them, and they are well pleased.

Mr. WILSON. Does the agent devote his whole attention to this part of the business?

Mr. CARLING. I believe he does.

Mr. WILSON. The Minister is not aware that he has any other business at all?

Mr. CARLING. No, I am not.

Mr. McMULLEN. Suppose these immigrants come in at Montreal, are they again reported when they get to London? Are they reported at any other point before they reach London?

Mr. CARLING. I think they are reported either at Hamilton or at Quebec, when they arrive. They are sent from Quebec. The agent at Quebec has information from different agents where immigrants are required, and he sends them to the different points.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It was stated last year in reference to some of these local agents, that they acted as agents for the disposal of farms, and in that capacity they were making a good deal of money, and, in some cases, rather acting to the prejudice of those who were coming to the country. I have never heard this alleged with reference to the agent at London, but this is the only opportunity I have had, on account of the disorder of the committee, of calling the Minister's attention to the subject.

Mr. CARLING. I am not aware that any such charge was made against any particular agent, but there is no doubt that farmers, or parties who have land or farms for sale, give the number of the lots, and probably the price, to the agent, so that he can give the information to the immigrants who may desire to purchase. But I am not aware at the present moment of any charge having been made against an agent of receiving commissions, and I am not aware that any investigation has been made into any such case.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have known a case where an immigration agent has cut advertisements out of a paper of farms for sale and sent them to the parties who advertised, saying that if they chose to give him the sale of the farm he would undertake to sell it for a certain percentage, or for $25 or $50, so much being paid down. I know there has been such a case, but I do not know that the Government were aware of it. I saw one case myself where an agent had cut out an advertisement and sent it to the party who advertised the sale, saying he had opportunities of making sales, and for a certain sum he would try and procure a purchaser. It is desirable that immigration agents should give all the directions possible to immigrants or parties seeking to buy farms; but where an immigration agent uses his position to improve his own personal circumstances it is not well that the practice should be encouraged.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman should give the name of the agent. It is scarcely fair for the hon. member not to submit the name to the Minister in order that he may bring the agent to answer the charge. I can quite understand that any agent acting in that manner would not be doing what it is his duty to do and what he is paid for doing. If an agent is giving voluntary information to parties, it is all right; but if the hon. gentleman says that he has seen advertisements by immigration agents of farms to sell, then he ought to be candid enough to give the committee the names so that the Minister can make enquiries.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for Perth misunderstood me. What I said was, that an immigration agent had cut an advertisement out of a paper and sent it to the party advertising a farm, stating that, if a commission was given, he might possibly find a purchaser at a certain figure. He did not advertise himself as agent; but he cut out an advertisement and sent it to the party saying that he had good opportunities of selling property.

Mr. TROW. In regard to this question, it is an easy matter to name the agent. It is Mr. Donaldson of Toronto. We are aware that he does advertise very extensively. I do not know that he does very material injury either to the immigration Department or to immigrants. Men of limited means are thus informed where they can obtain homesteads in the older Provinces, particularly in Ontario.

The commission if he receives any, and I presume he does, is paid by the party who employs him. It is no particular injury to the immigrant, but is if anything a benefit because he gets information from Mr. Donaldson for which he does not pay, and the commission comes out of the pockets of the persons who sell the property.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It may be true in this particular case, but I doubt that it is a wise policy to allow an immigration agent to make profits from selling farms. It may be and very likely is the case in the instance of the particular agent alluded to by the hon. gentleman, that good rather than harm results; but the Minister will see that it is a practice very liable to abuse.

Mr. CARLING. I am informed that it is contrary to the instructions of the Department and is not done with their knowledge. It is not done by all or any of the agents with the approval or consent of the Government. The Government's attention having been called to it they will put a stop to it.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad to hear the Minister so express himself. While in many instances it may be advantageous to the immigrant to get honest information from anyone, yet the Government runs the danger of compromising itself if its immigration agents are in a position where they can injure those whom they should protect. If an immigration agent is acting for the vendor of property, he, of course, has the interest of the vendor at heart, for it must be remembered that one party cannot be both buyer and seller. Immigrants who arrive here are unacquainted with the value of property; they are not in a position to decide for themselves; they cannot rely on their own judgment, and therefore they must rely on the agent who gives him advice. If in such a case as has been referred to the agent should make a mistake, either unintentionally or from corrupt motives, and the immigrant should be deceived, it would operate against the Government, which would be more or less compromised by that Act, although it was done without the Government's sanction or approval. I am therefore glad that the Minister has intimated that the Government oppose agents acting as middlemen, and I hope that if any practice of the kind referred to has sprung up the Department will take immediate steps to intimate to the agents that the practice must be for the future discontinued.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman give the committee any information of the state of immigration into the North-West up to the present time?

Mr. CARLING. I have no report, but the information we have shows that immigrants have gone in in large numbers, which is very gratifying indeed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman mean by large numbers?

Mr. CARLING. Five car loads of immigrants have gone up in one train, and other trains have been in the same way filled, so that we have reason to believe that a very large number of immigrants have settled in the North-West this season. I know of fifty German immigrants who have gone to Regina and become settlers in that immediate neighborhood. From the reports we have of the agents of the steamship and railway companies we have reason to believe there will be a large immigration into the North-West this season.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would have supposed that the hon. gentleman would have received returns from that agency ere this.

Mr. CARLING. It is rather soon yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I saw a statement made recently that valuable immigrants from Hungary are expected. What information has the hon. gentleman on this subject. They have come in under the auspices of Count d'Esterhazy, a well-known family.

Mr. CARLING. I believe the Count has gone up to the North-West within the last few days and that he has fifty Hungarian families with him, and others are expected to follow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What arrangements have been made with him? He has received, I think, a special grant of land.

Mr. CARLING. There is no special grant, but they will be placed on lands as contiguous as possible.

Mr. GAULT. I know the steamship agents expect a very large immigration. The steamship *Parisian* brought 600 steerage passengers on her last voyage. There must have been at least 2,500 passengers arrived this spring from Liverpool at the port of Montreal.

Mr. TROW. Is there any necessity for an agent at these various points in the North-West, Brandon, Qu'Appelle, Medicine Hat and so on. They are all on the line of railway, and, as a matter of necessity, all those who pass Brandon will have to proceed westward to Qu'Appelle and thence to Medicine Hat.

Mr. CARLING. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that the distances are great, and that we have now an application for an immigration agency at Regina, as a large number of German immigrants have arrived there and others are following. It is the policy of the Government to erect buildings at these different points for immigrants, so as to be able to give them proper attention, and of course we must supply officers to look after the buildings, to take care of the immigrants, to supply information and to see that they are placed on the land they are looking for.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see there are assistants and caretakers employed at Emerson, Winnipeg and Qu'Appelle. Are they employed all the year round?

Mr. CARLING. As we are trying to practice economy in the Department, we have appointed the assistant at Qu'Appelle as immigration agent at Calgary.

Mr. WATSON. Does the hon. gentleman intend to establish an agency on the Manitoba and North-Western? I believe a petition has been sent in asking for such an agency, and there is a large section of fine agricultural country there.

Mr. CARLING. The Government have decided to put up two buildings, one at Minnedosa and one at Birtle, and they are now under construction. The people of the municipalities have undertaken to take charge of the buildings and furnish the fuel, so that the Government are at no expense whatever beyond that incurred in erecting the building.

Mr. TROW. Would it not be a saving if efficient interpreters were made agents at these different points? If an interpreter is a man of business, why should he not also act as agent?

Mr. CARLING. At Winnipeg we have assistant interpreters and we have also had one at Qu'Appelle. If it is found necessary to have interpreters at these other points no doubt we will supply them, but we must be guided by circumstances. Immigrants come from different countries, Germans, Hungarians, Icelanders and so on, and every precaution is taken to have parties there who understand these various languages to give them necessary information.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I desire to take this opportunity of again impressing on the Minister of Agriculture the desirability and the justice of increasing the salary of the immigration agent at Victoria, B.C., to at least $1,200. Although comparisons are odious, I notice that the agents at

Brandon and Qu'Appelle get $1,400. Now, of my own knowledge, I am perfectly sure that the work performed in British Columbia by the Dominion immigration agent is equal to, if it does not exceed, that of either of those persons. I know that last year some slight increase was made for extra services performed in connection with the Colonial and Indian Exhibition. That, however, has now ceased, and the agent will get only $1,000 a year, the amount which he had previous to that addition. I have no doubt that the Minister is aware that the cost of living in British Columbia is far in excess of the eastern Provinces at least; and, inasmuch as in fixing the salaries for Emerson, Brandon, &c., the increased cost of living has been taken into consideration, I would impress on him the desirability of taking also into consideration the increased cost of living in British Columbia, and placing the agent there on the same footing as other agents in regard to salary. The sum of $1,200 would be the least salary which would be commensurate with the services rendered by that agent to the Department.

Mr. CARLING. The agent at Victoria is looked upon as a very good and a very deserving man. During the past year he has been employed collecting exhibits for the Colonial Exhibition, and the amount paid him for that extra work will bring his salary up to $1,200, not only for this year, but for next year. If we find that immigration increases, as we expect it will, I can only promise that Mr. Jessop's salary shall be favorably considered.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). The hon. gentleman promises consideration, but he does not promise increase. Consideration sometimes goes a long way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What languages do the interpreters at Winnipeg, Brandon, Qu'Appelle and the North-West Territories speak? Do they all speak the same language, or do any of them speak more than one language?

Mr. CARLING. The interpreter at Winnipeg, I think, speaks three different languages—German, Scandinavian and Norwegian, in addition, of course, to English.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What of the other interpreters?

Mr. CARLING. There are none at Qu'Appelle or Brandon, but if it is necessary to have assistance there we will take care to have men who understand the languages required.

Mr. TROW. Does this item for salaries in the London, Eng., office include rent or books and periodicals?

Mr. CARLING. No, this is for the salaries for the staff only at the London office.

Mr. TROW. How many officials are there on the staff?

Mr. CARLING. There is Mr. Chipman, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Just, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Howard, Mr. Welland, Mr. Colmer, and Mr. Wilkinson, eight in all. They are all in the London office in Victoria street.

Mr. WILSON. What does Mr. Dixon do?

Mr. CARLING. He is one of the clerks of the office, and is a valuable clerk, I believe.

Mr. WILSON. I see that he is spoken of as the librarian. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can explain why a man at nearly $1,000 salary is required there as librarian?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Dixon has charge of the papers and the archives, and does general work in the office.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that the expenses of the London office last year amounted to $12,767.12. The first item is for decorating, $2,593.93. I would like to know what that is for.

Mr. CARLING. I am unable to give an answer to the hon. gentleman, but I will enquire and give it on concurrence.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There are a number of men who seem to be acting in some capacity, in addition to those the Minister mentioned in connection with the London office.

Mr. CARLING. All the agents in Great Britain and Europe are paid through the London office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In connection with the salaries of agents in Europe, I see that the Rev. A. Labelle was employed for five months and received $1,500. I thought that gentleman's services were rather in requisition here.

Mr. CARLING. Father Labelle was not an agent, but went on a special mission to France, and brought out a number of immigrants who were located in this section of the country. He is not now in the employment of the Government, but his visit is still having the effect of bringing a number of immigrants to settle in Lower Canada.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Where were they settled, and how many were they?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot give the hon. gentleman that information. I believe part of them settled in this section, and part of them in the North-West.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was the Rev. Father Labelle acting in connection with the French delegation who were here last year?

Mr. CARLING. Yes. I think that was one of the results of his mission, to bring a number of influential men from France to visit this country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is Mr. Lukes an agent yet?

Mr. CARLING. No, he is not now in the employment of the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are Mr. Gaunce and Mr. Beaton still in the service of the Department?

Mr. CARLING. They are not now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What were they doing?

Mr. CARLING. I understand that Mr. Gaunce was an agent from New Brunswick who acted specially for six months.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The expenditure for salaries of agents in Europe was over $10,000 last year, and the hon. gentleman asks $7,300 for next year. In what way does he expect to achieve the reduction? What agents have we in Europe now?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Dyke at Liverpool, Mr. Foy at Belfast, Mr. Grahame at Glasgow, Mr. Connolly at Dublin, Mr. Down at Bristol, and Mr. Hahn.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to the item of travelling expenses of agents in Europe, $7,300, the Minister's agents apparently act wholly in disregard of the direction to rest every seventh day, for they charge invariably for travelling on Sundays. Mr. Dyke charges $4 per day for 365 days, and Mr. Graham and Mr. Connolly and the others charge the same.

Mr. CARLING. He must live on Sundays as well as Saturdays.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He gets a salary for that. I do not understand how they can be travelling 365 days in the year. This is practically giving them salaries of $3,400 or $2,400, as the case may be. How do they come to occupy all these days in travelling? They must remain

at headquarters a great portion of the time, particularly Mr. Dyke.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Dublin agent only gets $2 per day, and the agent at Belfast gets $4.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Home Rule will rectify that, I suppose.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It costs less apparently to stop at Dublin than at any other point.

Mr. CARLING. It is not confined to travelling expenses; it is an allowance made, and regular vouchers are rendered to the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Department have put it in a lump sum for the whole 365 days. That is not at all a good plan. The hon. gentleman allows $1,460 in the Liverpool agency and in the others except Dublin. Out of that the agent will be probably disposed to save all he can, and not indulge in travelling to any extent. These gentlemen do not travel to any extent, particularly at the Liverpool agency. If this is only a way of increasing the salaries, the Department ought to demand from the House the salaries requisite and not increase them in this fashion. If this has any result, it will be to induce the agents to neglect their duty in travelling and stay at home.

Mr. CARLING. I understand this has to be accounted for and vouchers given for every item. It is limited to a certain amount of expenditure, and the agents have to give to the Department and the chief in London full particulars and vouchers before it is paid. It is not confined to travelling expenses, but also includes incidentals and office expenses. It is not an allowance making any addition to the salary of the agent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They were paid the exact full sum for every day. It must have been exceedingly excellent book-keeping on their part, if they spent exactly the $1,460. The hon. gentleman will find that this is practically an increase in salary. Mr. Dyke, for instance, I believe is an excellent officer, and I dare say so are some of the others, but this is not the way to remunerate them, and it is open to the serious objection that if it is in the interests of the service to travel, they are under the temptation to stay at home.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Dyke is an excellent officer, and his charges have been found reasonable and moderate.

Mr. TROW. I am very well acquainted with Mr. Dyke, have met him frequently at his office, and have a very high opinion of him; but some of the articles paid for rather astonish me. There are "mounting heads of deer and bullocks." I wonder what advantage these are to immigration; I suppose they ornament the Department.

Mr. CARLING. I think it is for purchases made for the exhibition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, it is put down under the head of travelling expenses. How does that come under the head of traveling expenses?

Mr. TROW. There is an item for a veterinary surgeon of $51.10. What did they require a veterinary surgeon for?

Mr. CARLING. I cannot give the full particulars at present, but shall be very glad to ascertain and give the information.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Dyke has been successful in the way of securing travelling expenses on Sunday and every other day, but you have a man in Glasgow who beats him. He charges $4 travelling expenses every day in the year, and in addition he charges travelling expenses attending shows $84.80.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend is not just to Mr Dyke, because he charges $206.22 for travelling expenses in addition to his travelling allowance.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It seems to me these travelling expenses have the appearance of being supplements to salaries. The Minister says the Department have the details, but I think he will find they are details respecting other matters. In almost all the accounts, travelling expenses are charged in addition to this allowance of $4 a day. As my hon. friend has said, Mr. Dyke has charged, in addition to his allowance of $4 per day for travelling, $206.22 for travelling expenses. Mr. Grahame charges $84.80 additional. Take the Dublin agency also, there the allowance for travelling is $2 a day, which makes it significant as being a supplementary salary more than anything else, because it is just half the amount allowed to other agents, and that same gentleman has besides a bill for travelling expenses of $332.23. The allowance must be, therefore, a supplementary salary. It would be better if this be the case, that the salaries should be put down in full. Mr. Lukes has a travelling allowance for 10 weeks at $9.75 a week, which is a long way short of $4 a day or even $2 a day, that would seem to indicate he was able to travel 10 weeks at $1.50 a day; perhaps he was not travelling all the time. The next special agent, Mr. Gaunce, has a travelling allowance of 212 days at $1 a day, his ocean passage besides is accounted for at $80, and there is $250 not accounted for. We ought to know something of the value we receive at the hands of this gentleman for this expense. Mr. Lukes, the Rev. Mr. Labelle and Mr. Beaton, who are all special agents, have cost us a large sum of money.

Mr. CARLING. I think this item, as entered in the book, is misleading, and that the amount is not for travelling expenses, but for office expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to Mr. Dyke?

Mr. CARLING. I am speaking of the Dublin office just mentioned. It is really an expenditure in connection with the office.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, the Minister is wrong. Take the case of Mr. Grahame, you find rent of office, $316.33; taxes, $47.79; office cleaning, $44.90; coal, $7.02; and a lot of other matters outside, so that it cannot be that.

Mr. CARLING. I was speaking about the Dublin office.

Mr. TROW. Why is the discrepancy between the various agents so large in the cost of distributing pamphlets? Mr. Dyke, who has probably the most successful agency in Europe, has $2.43 for distributing pamphlets, and Mr. Grahame, in Glasgow, $4.87, while the Dublin agency has $123 for the same purpose.

Mr. CARLING. There is no allowance for this work, and I suppose the payment will be for the service, whatever it was.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think my hon. friend means to point out that these expenditures are covered up under different headings. You have $4.87 for distributing pamphlets in Glasgow and $123 in another agency. I presume my friend does not think there would be that much difference in the work, but the expenditure must be put down under different heads. The explanation of the Minister with reference to travelling allowances does not hold good, that it includes office rent and other matters in these different agencies. If he will look through the account, he will see that at Belfast, for instance, there is $211.70 for office rent; taxes, $31.63; cleaning office, $58.40; gas, $27.75; coal, $24.33. And so in the Glasgow agency and the Liverpool agency. I think he ought to be able to say what this travelling allowance at $4 a day is expended on, what it is for, for it appears to be nothing more or less than a supplement to the salary of the official, because all other

items are entered besides. If it be really a fact that it is merely a supplement to salary so fixed, and it bears that impression, being $4 a day for the whole 365 days, the contention is that it would be better to increase the salary by that amount.

Mr. CARLING. I understand that this money is for office expenses, and in some places for office rent. It is not at all given as an additional salary in any way whatever. All the accounts are rendered to the chief office in London and sent to the office here with vouchers. It is not allowed at all for travelling expenses but for expenses in regard to which full information is given.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How could the Auditor General put in the matter of rent under the head of travelling allowance? He could not do that. Take the case of Mr. Dyke. Here is an item of $909.18 for rent. That shows that the Auditor General recognised the fact that rent was paid, and he puts it under its proper head. If there was any additional rent, he would put it under the same head, and not as a travelling allowance at $4 a day.

Mr. CARLING. I do not know how the report of the Auditor General is made up, but, as far as the Department is concerned, it is as I have said, and every voucher for everything that is expended is given. The agent gets no allowance whatever in addition to salary.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does not this strike the Minister—here are five or six agencies with travelling allowances at $4 a day for 365 days; if that be for contingencies of different amounts, is it not a remarkable thing that in each case they have spent to the very cent, neither more nor less, exactly $4 for each of 365 days? And yet, it is made up of a whole lot of different items. How that can be brought about is a remarkable coincidence.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I have no doubt the money has been expended, but it seems to me that the process of entering it is misleading, so far as we are concerned. We find that the agent at Bristol is not down for any travelling expenses, but he has a most extraordinary bill for postage, amounting last year to $1,753, while the postage bill at the main agency at Liverpool, where all parties agree that one of our most active and energetic agents is placed, is only $684. I think it is plain on the face of it that there is something here that requires explanation. Judging by the statement of the Minister, these expenditures must have been made in every possible way, except in the way they appear upon the face of this page.

Mr. CARLING. Bristol was specially made a distributing point, and a large amount of printed matter was specially sent to that branch for distribution.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). To what point?

Mr. CARLING. To all points in the different counties surrounding that particular locality. I cannot give the different counties. Printed matter to a very great extent, farmers' reports, immigration pamphlets, and documents of all kinds, were sent there to be distributed in that particular section.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). What made me notice the postage account at Liverpool as compared with Bristol is that I find Mr. Dyke, of Liverpool, mentions in his report the large amount of business that has to be done there in the way of supplying information to parties, that being not only the chief point of departure for immigrants from Great Britain, but from other connections. In one respect this seems to fail to give us information on a side very interesting to this House to know about, that is, in what respect and upon what side the expenditure is reached, or where it is accounted for in these reports, that is spent on the continent of Europe for the purpose of reaching a very desirable class of immigrants from the central Provinces of Germany and Austria. We have been laboring for years to establish a nucleus from these countries with the hope that those parties would draw additional immigrants to us, but, when we turn to the reports of the immigration from Germany for instance, which has been the large recruiting ground of the American States for many years and produces a very desirable class of immigrants, we find that year by year the number of our immigrants from that country is steadily shrinking. Last year it seems to have been about half what it was the year before, and that is only an example of the progress backwards which has been going on for several years. In looking down the travelling expenses and other working expenditures of our agents, I look in vain for anything which indicates an expenditure in any way to reach those classes. Now I am aware that there is a difficulty in reaching them by sending agents to spread information, because I remember at an early day the Government arrested our agents and put them in prison. But at the same time we are charged in the lump with considerable expense for this purpose. There are one or two agents who figure upon our permanent list, and I think it would be interesting to this House to know where the expenditure goes that is charged to us and that we are laying out to get immigrants from central Europe and Scandinavia. So far as Great Britain and Ireland are concerned, I think, from the amount of immigration literature that we have paid for for many years past, surely that portion of the country must be pretty well supplied with immigration literature. The amount we have paid for year after year for that purpose, it seems to me, must have brought information to the reach of nearly everybody that was at all accessible. I do think that unless our immigration expenditure is going to be simply a waste of money, our reports of expenditure ought to be in some way re-organised so as to show where the money has gone, instead of having them blanketed under travelling allowance, and postage accounts, and these various statements which, to say the least, seem to have an extraordinary similarity to each other, and do not indicate an ordinary expenditure.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister asks for $7,300 to cover this item, and he asked for the same amount last year. Now, the expenditure was $17,565. It is true he told us that he had no special agents just then, but that he might have during the year. But if I take out the special agents—he had then Mr. Beaton, Rev. A. Labelle and Mr. Lukes—to whom he paid about $2,000, it would still leave the travelling expenses of the agents representing the Dominion at Liverpool, Glasgow, Dublin, Belfast and Bristol, and there would be over $15,000 then expended. Now we have all these agents; these amounts were expended before, and now the Minister asks for only $7,300. There is no use asking for a smaller amount when we expended this large amount last year. This discrepancy would seem to point in the direction that there has been an over expenditure; that there has been—I will not say a waste of money, but we will be forced to say that money is wasted unless the Minister can point to some results. Then I call attention to this fact, that while we have these travelling expenses of agents in Europe, we have items covered up in one way or another so that it is impossible to distinguish them. We have an expense made by the London immigration office; and there again comes in a confusion of accounts with this same Mr. Dyke, who is down here for a travelling allowance of $4 per day for every day in the year, including Sundays, with travelling expenses of $206, besides all the other items. He figures through the London agency also; he figures there for the Royal Show of Shrewsbury for $889.15. He figures in another place under the head of travelling expenses, and is paid through the London agency $315.07. These items I have found, others may have escaped my eye. But the Minister will see that the expenditure of money is made through so many different channels, and is entered up in

such a way, that it seems difficult to track up the expenditure. There is an actual expenditure among our permanent agents there of double the amount of the estimate the Minister asked for last year, which would seem to confirm the idea that there must be a waste of our money in some regard.

Mr. CARLING. The chief cause of that expenditure to Mr. Dyke was for fitting up the show of the Royal Society at Shrewsbury.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why was it paid through the London agency, and does not appear in his own Department?

Mr. CARLING. I suppose because it was ordered by the High Commissioner and paid through his office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. However, that does not answer the point as to the apparent inadequacy of the provision made. Now there is no use in bringing down haphazard estimates to the House. Here we find $7,300 are asked for travelling expenses of agents in Europe. We find that Mr. Dyke, the most of whose expenses appear to be of a permanent character, spent $5,600; that Mr. Grahame spent $3,000; Mr. Connolly spent $2,497; Mr. Foy $2,298. All these appear to be of a class which will be permanent, if this travelling allowance continues. Now, how can the hon. gentleman expect to meet those expenditures out of $7,300? Why, the travelling allowances alone nearly equal the $7,000.

Mr. CARLING. The expenditures I have given are in the Auditor's report as actual travelling and medical expenses.

Contingencies of Canadian and other agencies (not European)..... $30,000 00

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice these contingencies are distributed through several offices. In Quebec, last year, there was $4,499; in Montreal, $2,485; in Ottawa, $1,365; in Toronto, $2,352. Is there any detailed account at all, or what system of checking over those expenses is adopted?

Mr. CARLING. I can only say that these agents render detailed accounts to the Department, with vouchers for every cent that is expended.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This item is a very close approximate to the expenditure. The Minister asks for $30,000, and there was expended last year $29,800. That is in marked contrast with the discrepancy in the last item we discussed. It does appear competent for him to approximate his expenses.

Mr. CARLING. I will give the hon. gentleman the item. This vote comprises fuel, light, labor, general office expenses, telegrams, aid to immigrants, postage, stationery, travelling, agency business, and ordinary wear and tear.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is a great pity some system of checking those expenses could not be found. We may have honest men in some places, but where men are disposed to take advantage of their position to improve their own means to the detriment of the public, it is well to have some system adopted by which we could thoroughly check these expenses. When so large an amount of money is expended, it is desirable we should know that it goes to a proper purpose.

Mr. CARLING. We trust them as honest men, and tell them to give us a return of every item of expenditure, with vouchers. We cannot do any more.

Mr. McMULLEN. What about this item of $1,000 for the Montreal Women's Protection Immigration Society?

Mr. CARLING. That is a grant which has been given for a number of years to the Ladies' Protective Society of Montreal, which renders valuable service to women who come out to this country. It takes charge of women who arrive in the country and keeps them until they get situations and then places them in such positions. There is a large, expenditure by those ladies in addition to this grant.

Mr. BAIN. Do they report to the Department from year to year?

Mr. CARLING. Yes; they send reports of the expenditure.

Mr. GAULT. I know all about this association. It is composed of the very first ladies in Montreal. There are about twenty ladies who find out places for women who come into the country. The ladies endeavor to protect the women as far as possible. They have a Home in Montreal, for which they pay $500 a year, and they have a man at the railway station constantly to meet immigrants and invite the women to the Home. No less than 290 passed through the Home last year. If all the money of the Government is spent as advantageously as is this annual grant, it will indeed be advantageously spent. The ladies have taken a very deep interest in the work, and labor night and day in connection with it. I wish similar institutions were formed in Toronto and other places, and they would be found productive of much good.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a very excellent grant. There is no objection to it. With respect to the general item of $200,000 for immigration expenses, I should like to ask the Minister some questions. In the first place, a very large expenditure has taken place in connection with various newspapers, for instance the London *Free Press*, the *Mail* job office and the Montreal *Gazette*. Were tenders invited for the work given to those offices?

Mr. CARLING. The work done in those offices was done according to a tariff prepared by the Queen's Printer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But was there any tender asked?

Mr. CARLING. No; but a price is fixed by the Queen's Printer for all this kind of printing—a fair, commercial price, which is considered so low that some of the printers, who desired to obtain work, refused to accept those prices. I am told by persons of experience that offices could not take printing at those prices, were it not for the purpose of keeping their men employed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is very philanthropical for those various newspapers, especially the *Free Press* and Montreal *Gazette* to take printing at a bare living price, or at a loss, as the hon. gentleman would give us to understand.

Mr. CARLING. With respect to the *Free Press*, nearly all the money was for lithographing, not for printing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am strongly of the opinion that the great bulk of this grant is utterly wasted. I am strongly of the opinion that the time has long passed during which we were rendering any service to the country by paying large sums for assisted passages; and I am still more strongly of the opinion that we are not only doing no good to the country, but we are doing positive mischief by subsidising the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite, the *Free Press*, the *Mail* job office, the Montreal *Gazette* and all those worthies out of the sum granted for Dominion immigration. Every year for the last three or four years very large sums ranging from $60,000 to $100,000 have been divided among some half dozen of those newspapers, and I am inclined to think that if the work could be tested it would be found that for 100,000 copies of those articles circulated we do not get one valuable immigrant. We have been examining those publications, and I am bound to say with respect to some of these productions that more utterly trashy articles I never saw. I do not see any charge here

or such productions as that of the Rev. Mr. Bray, and I think that probably the discussion in the Public Accounts Committee has rendered the Government indisposed to circulate photographs of themselves, with their biographies, at a cost of $5,000 or $10,000 under the head of immigration literature. In the case of the Minister of Agriculture, I am bound to say that I think he would have personal grounds for objecting if no better photograph of himself was circulated than those which were circulated of his colleagues. With respect to some of those other productions. Here we have 69,000 pamphlets on the North-West, for which we have to pay $3,450. Then we have 100,000, for which we have to pay $5,500; and we have 20,000 "Homes in Canada," at $1,000. The time has come when these productions might, to a very great extent, be discontinued. I doubt exceedingly whether the hon. gentleman is going to render any service whatever by circulating a vast quantity of this description of literature. It appears to me the thing has become simply and solely a means of subsidising certain organs. If the hon. gentleman was giving all this work out by tender, we would have some reasonable guarantee that the work, if it must be done, would be done on reasonable terms; but we all know what it means when certain rates are fixed, when what is called a fair commercial profit is allowed. We all know that half a dozen firms get the work. The Montreal *Gazette* printed 200,000 British Columbia pamphlets. I doubt exceedingly, unless they were published in Chinese, whether the people of British Columbia have derived any real benefit from the distribution of those 200,000 pamphlets. I should like very much to know where they were sent, or what was done with them. We find that $5,446 was paid for British Columbia pamphlets, and immediately afterwards there is an item of $862 for 40,000 more. It is absurd to say, that by giving all those sums to newspapers for printing, we are going to bring in valuable immigrants. The hon. gentleman has not been long at the head of the Department, but he must know that we get nothing from them. In our various towns and cities complaints are rife, and they come to the knowledge of every one of us who pay any attention to the movements of immigrants, that immigrants are being lured here by rose-colored statements, intimating that all an emigrant has to do is to come to Canada, and there will be competition to employ him at $2, $3 or $4 per day. If we were wise we would put a stop to three-fourths if not nine-tenths of all the expenditure for which the hon. gentleman is now asking a vote.

Mr. CARLING. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will mention one particular pamphlet of that kind. I am not aware of any such documents having been printed by the Department, and, in fact, I am very particular, as my predecessor was, that no publications should go out by the authority of the Department without reliable and truthful information. I think it is hardly fair to charge the papers with jobbery in receiving contracts for printing——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They do not receive contracts; they get jobs.

Mr. MILLS. They are subsidised.

Mr. CARLING. I do not think so, because the same course was pursued when hon. gentlemen were in power. Any printing that was given was given to their friends; and if friends of the Government do the printing at low prices, at fair commercial prices, they cannot be charged with jobbery, nor can the Government be charged with doing what is unfair or unreasonable. I must say to the hon. gentlemen that the printed matter we prepare is distributed all over Europe, as well as in the United States, and we find from steamboat agents and immigration agents that there is a great demand for information with regard to the Dominion of Canada, and more especially since we have built a railway across the continent and have a vast belt of fertile country opened up for settlement. The people who read of what we have done in that way are anxious to know what inducements are offered to immigrants, and we are careful in preparing such information with regard to the North-West and the resources of Canada as can be relied upon as truthful and accurate. If the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to point out any particular pamphlet which gives inaccurate information with regard to the inducements offered to immigrants and the resources of the country, I shall be glad to receive that information, and no one will be more anxious than I am to put down anything of the kind. I differ from the hon. gentleman as to the large expenditure of money for immigration. We have a large country, as large as that of the United States; our country has been opened up by railways, and we do not want to stand still and leave the land lying there waste without offering some inducements to people to settle upon it. I think that this House and the country will justify the Government in doing everything that is in their power to show to people intending to settle in some new country the great advantages that are to be found in Canada. I do not think the people of this country will grudge any expenditure made in that direction, as long as that expenditure is honestly made; and I believe it is honestly made. So far as I am aware, and so far as the Government are aware of this expenditure, I am sure it is made properly, honestly, and to the best advantage. If it is not so made, we are only too glad to have our attention called to any mistake, or to anything that is improperly done.

Mr. MILLS. I am rather astonished at the observations made by the hon. gentleman who tries to defend this large expenditure on the newspapers of the Government—because after all there is no attempt by the Government to get this printing done in a business kind of way; there is no attempt to get the pamphlets and other work printed at the Government printing office. It is distributed amongst the organs of the Government in the various parts of the country, and it is well for the House to carefully consider what the Government have been doing in this matter. Sir, this expenditure is not an expenditure for the purpose of promoting immigration; but immigration is made a pretext for distributing a certain portion of the public funds amongst certain organs which are supporting the Administration. That is the position of things. The hon. gentleman speaks about the large extent of territory there is in the North-West. There is a large extent of territory there. There is a territory fit for settlement, but has the hon. gentleman or his predecessor in office succeeded in securing the settlement of that country? Why, Sir, according to the reports they have brought down there should have been 150,000 people beyond the limits of Manitoba in the North-West Territory; while, Sir, the returns show that there are only 23,000. The hon. gentleman in securing 23,000 people during the past eight years makes that result a justification for this extraordinary expenditure upon the organs of the Government in every part of this Dominion. Where are those people who are anxious to know about the North-West Territory? Where are those people in Europe, the British Islands and the United States, who are anxious to know about the North-West Territory? If they are so anxious, how is it that the hon. gentleman, notwithstanding this distribution of pamphlets, notwithstanding that he has printed 200,000 pamphlets relating to British Columbia alone, in the *Gazette* office, has not secured any portion of those people. Sir, the hon. gentleman knows he has not secured them. He knows that the Allan Line carried back from the North-West to Liverpool, last year, a larger number than they carried out from Liverpool for the North-West; and the hon. gentleman was told by an official that the statements made by these people on their return to England, their complaints against the Government and the

treatment they received, was doing infinite damage to the cause of immigration to Canada and the North-West Territory. Sir, it is not long since that there was a pamphlet prepared by a gentleman who, I believe, was some time on the Winnipeg *Free Press*. He has been occasionally employed by the Departments here; he is, I think, at the present time in Toronto—a Mr. Allen. Now, Mr. Allen, published a hand-book relating to the North-West, giving a description of the country—a sort of guide to the North-West. Well, Sir, Mr. Allen has been attempting to establish a newspaper in the interests of hon. gentlemen lately; he has been around seeking subscriptions at the hands of hon. gentlemen. He did not raise the amount required for this enterprise and what does he do? The Minister of Interior, perhaps, can tell what negotiations have been carried on at his instance to know how much Mr. Allen would take for that pamphlet, in order that the Government may obtain the right of publication from him. What is the object of that? Is that for the purpose of promoting immigration? Is it for the purpose of furnishing the people with a guide to enable them to know what is best to do in going to the North-West. No, Sir, it is on a piece with everything else done lately connected with the administration of public affairs. It is an attempt to fly a kite in the interests of the Government; to get up an illustrated paper that Mr. Allen proposes to publish. His friends did not find that they were altogether able to put the scheme afloat, so it is proposed to buy Mr. Allen's interest in this particular publication and to pay Mr. Allen for it, in order that he may obtain in this roundabout way the funds from the public Treasury which the party did not feel itself able to give him for this purpose just now. It is in that way that the Montreal *Gazette*, the Hamilton *Spectator* and the London *Free Press* have been supported for some time back. Now, I have no objection to hon. gentlemen putting their hands in their own pockets if they wish to promote the interests of their own party and sustain themselves in the places they now occupy; but I decline altogether that they shall put their hands into the public Treasury and take money out of it to distribute among their friends to maintain these organs in their own interest. Here is the London *Free Press*, which is published for $6 a year, but when an election is at hand the agent is sent out and the paper is offered for $3 a year, less than the cost of publication. How, is that done? Because hon. gentlemen have taken $10,000 out of the public Treasury and given it to the publisher of that paper for pamphlets to promote immigration to the North-West which it never received. I think it is time that this system should come to an end. I think it is time that the people of this country should know how they are being fleeced for the purpose of sustaining hon. gentlemen opposite in their present positions. It is time that this system of jobbery and robbery should come to an end, and the people of Canada should not be burdened with an expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, as they are burdened, for the purpose of maintaining those hon. gentlemen in power. Immigration to the North West! Why, nearly all the immigration that went to the North-West has been driven out of the country and across the border.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS. Yes. I have a statement here from the Rev. Mr. Turner, who went to the North-West, and tried in vain to settle there, and afterwards crossed to Dakota. He was employed for the purpose of procuring an enumeration of the county in which he resides, and he found out of 1,235 settlers 1,223 were Canadians who were driven across the border by the system of hon. gentlemen opposite. You tax the people of the North-West for their agricultural implements and for everything they consume, and for what purpose? Why, to find money for the purpose of subsidising these organs of the Government, which profess to be organs of public opinion, but which are the organs of a venal system such as is to be found in no other country in the world where representative government prevails.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I should imagine that the hon. gentleman would have been a little more modest in his attacks on this Government for what he calls corruption, after the statement of the hon. First Minister, in answer to a question this afternoon, in relation to a case in which the hon. gentleman deliberately gave $1,400 of the public funds to a friend of his after the Government of which he is a member had been defeated at the polls, and he had no longer any right to deal with the public funds.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is that statement correct?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The fact is that this Government have paid an average of 33 per cent. less for printing outside of the regular contract than the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite. That matter has been discussed several times, and there is no necessity of further discussing it. I rise for the purpose of pointing out what seems to me to be important. The hon. gentleman says the policy of this Government has been to drive settlers from Manitoba into Dakota. Now, I have in my hand an article from the Winnipeg *Free Press*, which can hardly be said to be prejudiced against hon. gentlemen opposite, dated the 7th of May, and I will read it to hon. gentlemen in order that they may see what is going on in the North-West at present:

"A young man named Arthur Walker, whose father has a 250-acre farm six miles from Fergus, in the county of Wellington, Ontario, passed through the city three weeks ago to look for land for himself and his brother in Dakota, and has been travelling ever since in that State, but returned here last night to make his future home in Manitoba. He was not very favorably impressed with Dakota as a farming country, and says that the most of the settlers in the new districts there have not made very much progress for the past two years, owing to the failure of the crops by frost and other causes. The want of timber is another drawback, and mud shacks are the rule, with an odd frame house here and there, in many of the largest settlements. He intends to locate near Burnside and go into mixed farming on a large scale. Mr. Anton Frost, an old Dakota settler, arrived by the same train, with his family, for the purpose of going into market gardening and butter making near the city, and two other parties from Texas have been here for some days looking for farm lands. There seems to be a considerable number coming over this year from across the line."

Now, everybody knows that long before we had railway communication into the North-West, and long before it was open for reasonable settlement, large numbers of Canadians went, just as eastern Americans went, to the great west and settled; and the presence of those people has attracted large numbers of others there as well. In that way settlement for a while tended towards Dakota and Minnesota. But a change is taking place to-day, and this spring we find a large number of people coming from Dakota and other western States into our North-West and settling there. I do not know whether it is because of this tendency that we find increased energy on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite to warn people that the condition of things in our own territory is so bad that they ought not to go there. They have posed as patriots, but they have acted as immigration agents for American companies in the western States. They have done everything they possibly could to discredit our own country, and to promote immigration to the western States. In spite of all they have done, the practical logical facts are teaching the people of Dakota and Minnesota, that our own territory is the better territory to settle in, and they are now coming across; but lest that tendency should increase, we find hon. gentlemen now getting up and warning those people that the position of things and the policy of the Government are so bad that they ought not to venture into that country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have always maintained that our territory was the best, and I have always maintained that nothing but the extreme misgovernment and mismanagement on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite could have ever induced our intelligent Ontario settlers in

particular to go from Manitoba into Dakota. I believe it is quite true that Manitoba, and southern Manitoba especially, affords better opportunities for profitable settlement than a very large part of Dakota and Minnesota; and I repeat, that had the Government of Canada left the people alone, had they not interposed in every imaginable way, by the creation of a most odious railway monopoly, by imposing a most arbitrary and absurd tariff upon the people of a new country, and by establishing a system of jobbery and robbery, as my hon. friend truly called it, particularly in connection with the management of the lands of the North-West, to-day, instead of having a miserable 120,000 or 130,000, we would have had at least 500,000 Canadian settlers in Manitoba and the North West. But the effect of the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite has been to drive away Canadians who desired to go there, some of whom went there and were found afterwards settling by hundreds and tens of hundreds in the adjacent territory of Dakota. I would be very glad indeed to believe that some of those men are going to come back; I hope and trust they will come back; I have always pressed, as this House knows, for the construction of lines of railway in southern Manitoba, because I knew that that was the only means by which those people could be brought back. And I trust that as southern Manitoba is well provided with railways, we may succeed in diverting the stream of immigration from Dakota to that section. If that can be done, even at this late day, much as we have lost, a great deal may be done for the purpose of reviving the immigration which we desire to settle there. I would ask again why the Government, having to spend $60,000 or $70,000 a year for printing purposes, did not get their printing done under their contract here, where it would have been done a great deal cheaper than it has been, as the Auditor General's accounts show, or why, if they did not choose to have it done here, they did not honestly advertise for tenders before giving it out. If they had done that, and the Montreal *Gazette* or any other paper, by fair tendering in a fair field, had obtained the contract, nobody would have had anything to say. What we complain of is that the Government have been giving these large sums of public money to their own special friends in the press; we complain that for three or four years, at least, very large sums have been paid to certain subsidised organs, and the one to which the most has been paid, by far, is the organ of which the hon. gentleman who spoke last is, or was, until very lately, the principal proprietor. The Public Accounts show that, mainly through the immigration Department, sums ranging as high as $18,000 or $19,000 a year have been paid to the Montreal *Gazette*. If the hon. gentleman, who has better means of information, I admit, than I have on that point, will state the exact sum, I will accept his statement.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The $19,000 which have been so much referred to, include the amount of $5,000 granted by Parliament for the printing of the proceedings of the Royal Society. These proceedings, as has been proved by a letter from Dawson Brothers, read some time ago, were given to that firm to be published. The mere type-setting and press work were done by the *Gazette*, after tenders had been asked for the work by Dawson Brothers; the binding and paper were furnished by Dawson Brothers, and the Government had nothing to do with the matter except to hand over the grant to that firm. I think the hon. gentleman will admit that the Royal Society's proceedings would not have looked as well printed in the form of our blue books, as they do in that issued by Dawson Brothers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, we will call it $14,000 to the Montreal *Gazette*. With respect to this question of immigration, the hon. Minister stated, I believe, there was no one expenditure which the people of Canada bore more cheerfully than the expenditure for immigration. I will say this, that if the expenditure of several million dollars which has been going on during the last three or four years, had contributed, as it might have, to bringing a class of desirable settlers to Canada, the people would not have grumbled; but the hon. gentleman is much mistaken if he believes the proceedings of the immigration Department and the class of immigrants they have brought out, notably from the great cities, have been such as to give satisfaction to the people of Canada. I can tell the hon. gentleman, that there is no one thing of which a great many people in our large cities complain more justly, than the fact that while employers of labor are protected by the Government at the expense of the public, in a very high degree, the Canadian laborer and artisan, or the man who, in by-gone times, made Canada his home, is subjected to a most unfair competition on the part of many laborers and artisans who were assisted out. That is the daily and hourly complaint which has been voiced again and again by the trades councils and labors unions of all the great cities. It is a most just complaint, seeing that, if you are going to protect the employers of labor, the man who is employed has as great, if not a greater, right to claim at the hands of this House protection. If there is one thing we ought to avoid more than another, it is the importing labor to lower the fair remuneration which the Canadian artisan receives. A great deal of the money which the hon. gentleman or his predecessors have been spending has gone for no other purpose than to bring a very poor class of people to many of our great cities, who, by competition, very seriously reduce the rates of labor in many employments. That is a mistake in every sense of the word. I believe the whole system of immigration for many years back, has been a gigantic failure; our returns show that we have brought in 875,000 people, while, on the other hand, as the hon. gentleman knows, our census returns show that not one in four of these people remain. That is indisputable up to 1881, and all the information we have since been able to gather from our municipal statistics, from the hon. gentleman's own census returns from the North-West, from the statements made in the Manitoba Legislature, and made outside by persons well acquainted with the state of things there, goes to show that since 1881 the hon. gentleman and his predecessor have been quite unsuccessful in retaining the immigrants who have come to Canada. The fact is we have come to a point in Canada when we do not want that class of people whom we have to assist to bring out here. There was a time in our history when those persons might have been desirable immigrants, but that time has passed, and it is cruel to lure out these poor immigrants by extravagant promises. When I speak of extravagant promises to these people, I had reference more particularly to those made to them by some of our immigration agents, whom I cannot particularise. But I can tell the hon. gentleman that I have, again and again, in the streets of our towns and cities, met these people, and they have stated to me—and I do not think there was any reason to suppose they were stating falsely—that they were assured before they left England and Ireland they would get here very high wages in their respective occupations. I have seen them in our streets willing to work but utterly unable to obtain work. I have seen, not once or twice, but scores, I may say hundreds of times, letters from these poor people in the English, Scotch and Irish papers, all making the same complaint that they had been induced to come to Canada on the representation that they would find here abundant employment at high wages, and all repeating the same story that they came out and found employment very difficult to obtain. Now the hon. gentleman knows quite well, or ought to know, as Minister of Agriculture, that even in the Department in which a

few years ago we could absorb most of the laborers who came out, namely that of agricultural employment, there is now, except at certain seasons, comparatively little demand for labor in most parts of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The enormous improvement in agricultural implements enable farmers to carry on their work with much less assistance than formerly. It is quite clear, if the hon. gentleman and his agents persist in bringing out paupers or immigrants who depend wholly on their own hands for subsistence, the effect will be that these people will not find work or will have to displace our own people. My own impression is, that in the majority of cases, they do not stay here but make their way to the United States, and for that reason I say that, whatever may have been the case in former years, we have now arrived at the point in which very little service is going to be rendered the public by our continuing to pay assisted passages. I take issue distinctly with my hon. friend on the question of fact, as to whether there is any use in our bringing these people here; and I take issue with him still more strongly on the question, that the people of Canada, as a whole, desire these large charges should be made for the purpose of bringing immigrants here, who, in nine cases out of ten, only serve to reduce the wages of the people employed in Canada.

Mr. CARLING. It is very unfair on the part of the hon. gentleman to state, over and over again, that the Government are encouraging the bringing out of pauper immigration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have seen it.

Mr. CARLING. I can only say that such is not the case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can say it is the case.

Mr. CARLING. If the hon. gentleman knows more about the immigration Department than I do, of course I must give way to him. I stated in the House and produced the figures a month ago to show that, out of 79,000 immigrants that came to this country in 1885, only about 7,000 or 8,000 were in any way assisted by the Government. They were agriculturists, agricultural laborers and domestic servants. Out of the 7,000 or 8,000, not more than 3,000 were fit to work, the remainder being their wives and families. It is most unfair for the hon. gentleman to say over and over again, and for his friends behind him to say over and over again, that the Government are paying hundreds of thousands of dollars in bringing pauper immigration to Canada, when it is not the case. Now, with regard to the statement which the hon. gentleman has made with respect to deceiving immigrants, I ask the hon. gentleman to produce the printed literature, the documents, pamphlets or posters, or anything of the kind, to show that the Government are making any statements to the people who are wishing to emigrate that are not strictly true. No inducements are held out to them to come out here that cannot be realised when they arrive. I say it is most unfair for a gentleman holding the high position he does in this House to invariably charge the Government with doing what is not the fact. The hon. gentleman has asked why the Government give this printing to their particular friends, the London *Free Press*, the Hamilton *Spectator*, the Montreal *Gazette* and other papers friendly to the Government. I ask why did he as Finance Minister, or the immigration Minister who was in the Government with him, not put this up to tender? Why did they not offer some different means of contracting than we are doing?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much did we spend?

Mr. CARLING. I do not know how much they spent, but the principle is the same. If you spent $10,000 in giving it to your newspaper friends, the principle is the same as if you spent $50,000, and it ill becomes the hon. gentleman to charge us with giving favors to our friends of the press when his Government did the same. Besides, the hon. gentleman's Government paid 33 per cent. more than we are paying. Then, with regard to immigration, the cost of those who settled in the country in 1875 was $10.83 per head; in 1876, $11.12 per head; in 1877, $6.78 per head; in 1878, $6.23 per head; in 1879, $4.35 per head; in 1880, $4.71 per head; in 1881, $4.30 per head; in 1882, $3.08 per head; in 1883, $3.15 per head; in 1884, $4.15 per head, and in 1885, $3.92 per head.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who compiled those figures?

Mr. CARLING. These are taken from the public documents, and I vouch for their correctness.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who compiled them, though?

Mr. CARLING. I vouch for their correctness.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then the hon. Minister will vouch for all the immigrants being here that the author of that paper says are here, of course?

Mr. CARLING. I see that these returns show that the number of immigrants who settled in Canada in 1874 was 39,373; that it was 27,382 in 1875, 25,633 in 1876, 27,082 in 1877, 29,807 in 1878, 40,492 in 1879, 38,505 in 1880, 47,991 in 1881, 112,458 in 1882, 133,624 in 1883——

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Hear, hear.

Mr. CARLING. Hear, hear. 103,824 in 1884, and 79,169 in 1885. I have endeavored to show that the number of immigrants that have settled in Canada during the years that the present Government have been in power has been much larger than during the years that the hon. gentlemen were in power, and that the immigrants have not cost more than half per head what they cost while those hon. gentlemen were in power. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has made a charge against the press of the country, or that portion of it which is friendly to the Government, and I think it is very unfair of the hon. member to do so, considering that he is connected with the press himself. It appears more like envy or jealousy on the part of the hon. gentleman than for the interest of the country. As I have said before, if the printing that is done for the Government at these offices is done at a fair commercial price, no one has any right to complain, more than that it has been given to a supporter of the Government instead of to an opponent of the Government. With regard to the number of immigrants that settled in this country, I noticed that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), when I said 133,000 had settled, said "Hear, hear." I suppose he thought that was a bad thing for the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, no; I only want to know where they are?

Mr. CARLING. The census has not been taken since 1881, five or six years since, and I am sure we have no reliable information as to the population of the country since the census was taken.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, we have.

Mr. CARLING. No, there is no reliable information as to the population of this country at the present time since the census was taken. The statement of the population as given by assessors in Ontario and in different parts of the country, although, perhaps, taken with considerable care, is not information that can be thoroughly relied upon. We have a population coming into the country, and there is no doubt that people are coming and going not only in this country but in other countries. I find that, in the United States, the immigration to that country in 1882 was 788,992, and

in 1885 it fell off to 395,346, because the number of people had not been emigrating the last year or two that did emigrate some years ago; but I believe now, with the inducements we have to offer immigrants in this country, the opening up of our great North-West and the suppression of the insurrection which took place last year, that there is a feeling of satisfaction and safety, and that we may expect this year, and perhaps next year, a much larger immigration than we have had before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has no right whatever to accuse hon. gentlemen on this side of being unfair to him. We do not condemn him except as being a member of the Government, and so responsible for the proceedings of his predecessors for the existing condition of things, but I do not hesitate to tell him here in my place that I attach no sort of value whatever to any statement made by his Department as to the number of immigrants that have settled in this country. I say further that the statements made by the Department he presides over are utterly false and misleading, in my judgment. There is no sort of ground or justification for the allegation that 103,000 immigrants, or anything like that number, settled in Canada within the last year or two.

Mr. CARLING. The statements were correct when the hon. gentlemen were in power, and the same system is carried out now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think these statements were particularly correct, but I know that no attempt whatever was made to exaggerate them.

Mr. CARLING. They are not exaggerated now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say they are, and I shall prove it. If immigrants come to any part of Canada at all, everybody knows that they would go to Manitoba or the North-West, or else to Ontario. You have your own census returns in the North-West, showing a most scandalous failure in the settlement of that part of the country. You have the evidence of everybody in Manitoba, from the legislators down, who have any interest in Manitoba, to show that immigrants have not gone there, and that the statements made from year to year on the authority of that Department, as to the number of immigrants who went into Manitoba, were one of two things—either grossly exaggerated or that immigrants went there but did not stay there. Now, as to the Province of Ontario; we have got sufficient evidence as to what has been going on there. Hon. gentlemen ought to know that our assessors returned pretty accurately the annual increase. We have the returns made by the assessors for the ten years from 1871 to 1881, showing a total increase in that Province very nearly equal to the nominal increase as reported by the census, an increase in that time of nearly 300,000 souls which was very nearly what the census gave; and everybody who knows how that census was taken, knows that it was as at least as likely that the assessor's returns of the increase was correct, as that of the census commissioners, because it was taken on an entirely faulty system, the system known as *de jure* in opposition to that of *de facto*. I know myself that men who have been absent from this country ten or twelve years were put down under that system as residents here. Now, we turn to these assessors' returns for the Province of Ontario, which hon. gentlemen must know absorbs much the largest proportion of all the immigrants who come to this country, the North-West alone excepted. We find, Sir, that from 1879 to 1880 the assessors returned an increase of 10,000; from 1880 to 1881, 10,000; from 1881 to 1882, 2,000; from 1882 to 1883, 14,000. We find then a large increase, I am happy to say, in the next year of some 40,000 odd. Now, my opinion is that the enormous exodus, which I know to have been going on from Ontario, and which every hon. gentleman who paid any attention to the subject, knows to have gone on in Ontario, went, not to the North-West, I am sorry to say, but to various States in the American union.

Mr. CARLING. What authority have you for that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have the authority that the people are not here; we have the authority that in hundreds of towns and villages in Ontario the population has remained stationary; we have the authority that from 1870 to 1884 there was no increase at all in the rural population of Ontario according to the assessors. Now, Sir, unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to say that the assessors throughout Ontario have deliberately made false returns, which I do not think he will insist upon, he is shut up to this, that all over Ontario the rural population has remained stationary during the last six or seven years; that in the towns and villages there has been a small increase, in the cities a considerable increase, but the total increase has been vastly below the natural increase of the population. If it be correct that any of these immigrants the hon. gentleman speaks of, have been brought in and have stayed here, they have stayed here only by displacing the existing population, by sending our own people adrift and taking their places. It is the very acme of absurdity, when we know that our people have been going from us in such numbers, to tax the people more heavily by paying large sums of money to bring other people here. Sir, there is no getting away from the assessors' returns, and I tell the hon. gentleman that they are the only returns that approach to accuracy. Since attention has been called to this subject they have been unusually careful in reckoning the population, they have, relatively speaking, increased the number they have put down. Now, if the hon. gentleman, who is a western man, chooses to go through any of the great and fertile counties adjacent to London, he can scarcely go into a township in which he will not find a large number of people all of whom have near kinsmen or kinswomen in the United States. I have over and over again made minute enquiries, taking sections at haphazard, and asking every man who attended my meeting there, what the facts were, and it was the exception and not the rule to find persons who had not near relatives in the United States, from that part of western Canada which the hon. gentleman knows is an exceeding fertile and attractive region, and what is true there is true, though perhaps in a less degree, in other parts of the country. The hon. gentleman must see that if we had kept these 875,000 people who are alleged by his Department to have been settled in Canada within the last nineteen years, our population must have been larger than even he estimates it, or than the Finance Minister estimates it, by 1,100,000 or 1,200,000. Had we added that to our natural increase, and had we obtained these 875,000 people who are said to have settled here, the population of Canada, on the ordinary rules of increase, which anybody can compute, ought to be to-day nearer 7,000,000 than 6,000,000. Now, if the hon. gentleman wants to know where our people have gone he can find out by referring to the United States census, which contains some very curious items of information on this point, because they show not merely that there were 717,000 of Canadian birth in the United States five years ago, but there were 900,000 odd born of Canadian parents on both sides. One reason why our population has been increasing much less rapidly than it ought, has been, as I have more than once pointed out to his predecessors, because the class of emigrants who leave Canada have been the very flower and pick of our population; have been men and women in the prime of life, and I have no doubt whatever that the rate of natural increase in this country has perceptibly diminished from that cause. Now, Sir, those are some of the reasons which induced me utterly to dispute the accuracy of the

statements made for the last 18 or 19 years by the Department of Immigration, as to the number of people who are settling here. The hon. member is not going to tell us that they have settled in Prince Edward Island, nor is he going to tell us that they have settled in Nova Scotia, nor that they have settled in New Brunswick. I do not think he will say that they have settled in the French portions of Quebec to any appreciable extent. Have they settled in the Eastern Townships? I think the hon. gentleman will not maintain that. You are shut down to the fact that they have gone either to Manitoba and the North-West or to Ontario.

An hon. MEMBER. To British Columbia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Some to British Columbia. They have had a Chinese immigration to a considerable amount, I am willing to allow, of ten or twelve thousand. I dare say that there has been a considerable immigration there; but there has not been, unhappily, to the North-West and there has not been, unhappily, to Ontario. It is no use for hon. gentlemen to shut their eyes to the plain fact that all over Ontario to-day, in the rural districts, the population is very nearly stationary in a great number of constituencies, and that in a great number of the smaller towns the population is almost stationary. Now, there may be difficulties about ascertaining the exact population in some of the outlying districts, but there is very little difficulty in ascertaining accurately the population in the numerous towns and cities which dot Ontario; and these, without exception, show that the population has either been stationary, or that it has failed to keep up the natural increase, and consequently there has been no room for these immigrants, unless, as I say, by the process of displacement. It is not to be supposed that our condition differs very greatly from that of other countries. I am quite aware, I have said it over and over again that much the same condition of things has taken place in the States of the Union under similar conditions. Let us not make the mistake of boasting that we have a larger population than we possess. This process has been going on for many years. Our one chance, in my opinion, of adding largely to our population was the adoption of a wise policy in the North-West, and the reason, as I have told the hon. gentleman, why I object so much to his policy is, because I think that between the heavy tariff of the Government, the railway monopoly, and the impolitic land regulations the Government have utterly failed to avail themselves of innumerable opportunities given to them of stopping the exodus from Canada, and particularly from the North-West.

Mr. FOSTER. This question of immigration is, of course, an interesting one, and we shall not help it in this country by endeavoring to prove that our policy has been of a very useless character. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, in his last remark, that we will not help things by endeavoring to show that our population has increased more than it has increased. That is true. But, on the other hand, it is equally true that we will not help things by endeavoring, in Parliament or in public, to prove that the population of this country has, in an immense number of constituencies, become diminished, and that the whole immigration effort which has been made in this country for the last ten years, has proved of no benefit. That alternative, when compared with the first mentioned alternative, is not the one to be preferred in this country. The first point that comes up for discussion is, whether it is a good principle to make public the resources of the country, or not. Some say that all this publishing of our resources is a thing of no use and of immense cost. I do not believe it. I think we have to act in this matter in the light of similar efforts after immigrants made in other countries and in the United States, and although the Government itself may not have gone into the business of immigration attractions as has the Dominion Government, this work has been equally as well done and as widely done by the immense railway companies and land companies which have flooded not only Europe and Great Britain and the eastern States of the Union but also this Dominion with accounts of their advantages, put forward in the most attractive style, by maps and pamphlets, delineations of the features and resources of the country. And this literature having been spread everywhere has had its effect in drawing attention of emigration centres to the advantages offered by the United States. Now I think there is more need of Canada attempting to carry out this course than for the United States because the Dominion came later into prominence as offering an attractive field for immigrants. It comes into the field in competition specially with the United States, which had its advantages portrayed in those ways that I have spoken of, and widely circulated in the centres of emigration movement. If Canada were to make itself known at all, if it was to attract the attention of those people, we must do it by this same system of circulating pamphlets and books and maps, showing in a popular manner what this country is, what advantages it offers, and so make it attractive to immigrants. I do not think there can be any exception taken to this proposition, that fairly judicious advertising of the resources of the country is a necessary and judicious act on the part of the Government. The next proposition that comes up is one of cost. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated boldly, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) also stated very strongly, that this was a giving of money, that the amount which was paid for instance to the *Free Press* of London and the *Gazette* of Montreal and to those other papers for pamphlets and maps was money given to those papers. The hon. gentlemen do not seem to take into account, and he would lead the country not to take into account, the fact that a *quid pro quo* was obtained in connection with those printing contracts.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman ignores the fact that the printing was done, that the composition took place and that the work was struck off, and before the hon. gentleman can make a single effective point he has got to show that an extravagant price was paid for having those documents published. I leave it to this House to say whether the hon. gentleman attempted to show there were extravagant prices paid. He did not. He simply held up the items, mentioned the amounts paid and the newspapers to which they were paid, and he did not take into account what any fair-minded man would have done, that work was given for the payment made. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) made some very strong statements, being spurred up by the almost fierce speech of the hon. member for Bothwell, and he made some very strong statements which I do not think he substantiated before this House. He declared, and he ought to explain that to this House in view of the position in which he stands and the weight which his speeches carry—he made the statement broadly here and persisted in it, that the pamphlets issued by the Department of Agriculture were misleading, that they made certain promises which had no foundation in fact, that they promised that certain wages would be given which were not given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, no; I spoke of promises made by agents of the Department to immigrants who have come out here, and I have been informed as to that fact by immigrants themselves, and I have seen, as I have stated over and over again, their communications in English papers.

Mr. FOSTER. If that was what the hon. gentleman said, I am glad to have the correction, but I certainly understood him, in the course of the debate—either the hon. member for Huron or the hon. member for Bothwell—to declare that the pamphlets themselves were misleading. That was the impression I gathered; if it is not what the hon. gentleman meant to state, I am glad to find out such is not the fact. I know there has been much said in the House and the country, and those broad statements have been made that the pamphlets issued and the representations made by our responsible agents have been misleading, and that people were deluded by them and brought to this country under false pretences. Another statement the hon. gentleman did make, and as regards that I am certain I am not mistaken, was, that the people were going out of the North-West by tens and by tens of hundreds. If that is the truth he should certainly give some grounds for the statement and bring forward some proof. Did the hon. gentleman give a single proof of the bald assertion he made, that people were going out of the Canadian North-West by tens of hundreds, which means by the thousand? I do not think he did; I do not think he can do so. As a general assertion, it may do very well for an irresponsible man, but as an assertion to be made from the seat occupied by my hon. friend, in his responsible position, I think he should have thought before he made it, or else he should have proved the assertion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can do it.

Mr. FOSTER. He should have proved it to the satisfaction of this House. He does not believe—it would not do—it is not part of his creed at all to believe in statistics which emanate from Canadian authorities. He does not believe that the statistics and statements which have been gathered by our own painstaking officers, by our own Departments, and in our own country, are true. Afterwards, when cornered by the statement of the Minister of Agriculture that these were now gotten up on the very same basis that they were during the *régime* of my hon. friend, he turned around and said he never had much faith in them; and, towards the close of his speech, he said he believed they had been wrong for the last nineteen years. Now, my hon. friend did himself great injustice; he did the party to which he belongs great injustice, and he did the country of which he is a citizen still greater injustice when he sat still and quiet for nineteen years, and never thought to open his mouth until within the last two or three years. Why, Sir, by so doing he was guilty of complicity in the arrangement of the basis which has become stated and settled, and which it seems has put our country on the wrong line entirely in this respect. He was just as wrong there as he showed himself to be in a remark which slipped out very quietly—but still slipped out—that there was not so much difference if only a little wrong was committed as if a great wrong was committed, that is, that the principle did not amount to anything. But the hon. gentleman believes in something. If he does not believe in the trustworthiness of Canadian officials and Canadian statistics, he has every faith in the statements and statistics of the officers of the United States. My hon. friend beside him will probably get up before the debate closes, and will cite the wonderful revelations made by these wonderful statisticians along the line of the Grand Trunk Railway, which have been floating around through this country for so many years, showing the great efflux of people from this country to the United States. There is no limit to the extent to which my hon. friend's credulity will stretch itself, when he has to swallow the statements of American officials, and there is no limit to the amount of his incredulity, when he is asked to take a single statement made by the painstaking officials of our own Canadian Department. Now I can show that my hon. friend rather let himself into a trap. How does he show, when he was talking about the efflux of immigrants from our own North-West into the American North-West, how did he undertake—if he made any proof at all—to prove that they did go out? In this way: by taking the Canadian statistics as to how many went in and as to how many are in. It suits him to take Canadian statistics as true, both for the number going in and the number who are in, when he wants to prove that a great many have gone over into the north west States. But when he has to prove that people come and stay in our own country, he does not think Canadian statistics are worth anything in that point of view. Well, but why have they gone? If they have gone out of our own North-West Territory into the territories to the south of us, why have they gone? The hon. gentleman has told us why. He says: It is your high-handed, your iniquitous, your oppressive tariff that drives them out. Whither did they go, and to what country are they driven? To a country in which the tariff is higher, and, according to my hon. friend's logic, more oppressive. Now that is not consequential reasoning. If people are driven out by a certain evil, they are not likely to go to a country where the evil is tenfold greater, or threefold greater, or any greater. They go to a country where there is relief from that evil. According to my hon. friend a protective tariff drives them out of our country and drives them into the arms of a country having a protective tariff far higher than ours. Again, he says railroad monopolies drive them out. Our North-West has a railway through it, and that monopoly is so great and so grinding that the people are led to flee from that country, and to go to the north western States. Yet the hon. gentleman knows that a comparison was read in this House no longer ago than yesterday—a comparison of the railway rates in our own North-West and those in the north-west States of the Union—in which our rates stood far better in comparison with them, both for freight and for passenger traffic. Now, if the hon. gentleman says they are driven out, let him prove it, but let him give some more sensible reason than that they are driven out from our country by the tariff and the railway into a country where both the tariff and the railway rates are a great deal higher than they are in our own. The hon. gentleman says he travelled around amongst a number of constituencies, and especially around London, and that he met with people and talked with them, and when he talked with them he found that they had relations in the United States of America. Now, Sir, that is the very strongest reason why the policy pursued by this Government, and the policy of this country which supports the Government, for these years that have been past is proved to be a wise policy. Why have they relatives in the United States? Those relatives went there years ago, before our own North-West was opened at all; and I venture to state this, without fear of contradiction, that if our own North-West had been opened as early for this country as the North-West of the United States was opened for the United States, these relatives of our people would have gone to our own country, and the sources which draw people to that country would have been planted there as they were planted in the United States, because our North-West was not opened at all. That is a disadvantage we had to start with. We are later in the field. Our North-West was opened later, and we have that disadvantage to contend against, that certain of our own people in the earlier days have gone to the American North-West. Their relatives are there, and they draw their own kind; and it is better for us, instead of magnifying that, to magnify the resources and capabilities of our own North-West, so that we may plant a nucleus of our own people there, who will, in future years, continue to draw around it relatives and friends from this distant part of the country. The hon. gentleman says then that immigrants do not go to Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. That may be true to a

certain extent, but my hon. friend should not make that a complaint against the immigration policy of this country. It is not so. Geographical difficulties surely cannot be said to be the result of a policy, and national difficulties or national considerations cannot be said to be the result of a tariff policy or the like of that. Why, Sir, the very same thing takes places in other countries beside our own. If the hon. gentleman was a citizen of the State of Maine, or the State of Vermont, or the State of New York—if he was a citizen of almost anyone of the New England States and was disposed to decry that country, as he is disposed to decry this country, he could stand up in his place and make the same statement, that these populations are practically stationary; that some of them are even going backward in population. These are not the results of policy but of something deeper than any policy. They are what take place in every country which has different sections, older and newer, when the new are opened up and the populations of the old run out towards them. So, I think the policy of this Government, in stretching every nerve to make the people of other countries acquainted with the resources of Canada, and to place those resources before them in an attractive light, is a policy that this country will uphold, a policy which in the end will be proven even more wise than we think it at the present time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to call attention to two or three material facts which hon. gentlemen have not thought it convenient to pay any attention to. With reference to the relative expenditure of the two Governments on pamphlets and such objects, I find that in 1878 the total amount paid by the late Administration for pamphlets and advertising for immigration purposes was $4,193, against $80,000 paid for paper and printing alone during the past year, and $100,000 during the year before. That shows what the relative economy of the two Governments was in that respect. As for the other statement, that we have no evidence of the utter and disastrous failure of this miserable policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, why, Sir, the very Customs returns published by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, as far back as 1884, claim 248,000 people in the North-West Territories; and when we come to sift those figures, what do we find? That there are not 140,000 white people in the whole North-West and Manitoba put together. Is that proof enough for the Minister of Marine? The hon. gentleman, I suppose, in the toils incident to the position of a newly-fledged Minister, has not had time to read the reports, or he would see that year after year 30,000, 40,000, 50,000 people were stated to have gone into the North-West since 1881 by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Where are those people? We know they are not there; they have not come back to Ontario, because there is nothing in the assessors' returns that we possess to show any additional population to equal their number. The inference is perfectly clear that they have gone outside of this Dominion, and, if so, where could they go except to the United States? Now, Sir, it is not true that in the last 14 or 15 years Dakota and the north-western States have had a better chance than our North-West. In 1871 the population of Dakota was 12,000; in 1885 it was 420,000.

Mr. McLELAN. How many in the first 10 years?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Between 1871 and 1878 the total population of Dakota was reported at about 80,000 to 90,000, and in the United States census at 130,000. The greatest increase has taken place in the last four or five years. Since 1878 we have had every access to our own Territories, and I am speaking of what I have seen when I say that our own people were pouring into that territory, that they would have been delighted to settle in that country, and nothing but the impolicy of the Government drove them away; and when hon. gentlemen tell us that they go from a slightly protected country to a more highly protected country, they only show that they have not mastered the A, B, C of the protective system. Everybody knows that a protective system is infinitely less injurious when applied on a large scale in a gigantic country like the United States than in a small country like Canada. In fact, a very moderate system works very much greater harm in a small country, with very limited markets, like Canada, than a high protective system does in a large country like the United States. I have always pointed out that a country like the United States could adopt a protective system with a minimum of injury to the people, but that in a small country like Canada, with our Provinces separated as they are, it works infinite mischief; and people go from Canada to the United States, because they find the protective system infinitely less mischievous there than they do here.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). The hon. gentleman has made two or three statements which I think it would be unwise to let go to the old country uncontradicted. He said that farm laborers were poorly paid. Now, every gentleman in this House or in the country who has paid the slightest attention to that subject must know that at no period in the history of this country for thirty-five years has manual labor of all kinds, agricultural as well as mechanical, been as well paid as it is to-day; and the very reverse of the hon. gentleman's statement with regard to the effect on the use of agricultural implements on the wages of agricultural laborers is the case. So scarce and so dear is agricultural labor to-day that if it were not for the use of machinery, the farmers would be at a loss to carry on their business. As for the mechanics, such as bricklayers, carpenters, and men of that stamp, the wages they are receiving to-day are almost fabulous as compared with those they received fifteen or twenty years ago It is no wonder we cannot get immigrants. It is not four weeks since I heard it stated in this House that mechanics should not be brought to this country, because they would starve in the public streets. There is no healthy, able-bodied man who cannot procure any kind of manual labor in this country that he wants, and at remunerative wages. I know that in large towns and cities there are large numbers of people who are in a chronic state of distress, and nothing will drive them out of that; no government policy will ever prevent that, it is the evil of human nature. With regard to people being driven out of Manitoba by the tariff—and agricultural implements were specially referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell—I have no hesitation in saying that prices on every line of agricultural implements are from 15 to 25 per cent. cheaper to-day than they were five years ago; and I think I am correct in saying that nine-tenths of all the implements put into the market to-day are of Canadian manufacture. Hon. gentlemen have called for specific items, and I will mention one—the breaking plough, which has been the subject of so much debate in this House. Four years ago the John Deer plough was put in the market at $28 retail all along the railway line, and a Canadian plough manufactured by Frost & Wood, not many miles from this city, was put in for $24. The Deer plough came down $2 and the Canadian plough came down $2. Last summer, the John Deer plough was sold for $21 or $22, and to-day it is put on the market at $18. I have letters here from people in the country in which they say that the preference for the Deer plough over the Canadian was a mere matter of sentiment. At first, people preferred the article which had been made by men long accustomed to manufacturing for prairie work; but they find that our own people are quite as competent to manufacture a useful and durable article as the Americans. I can say that the Canadian plough, which was sold there

four years ago for $24, was, during this Session, offered by tender to the Interior Department for $14, exactly one-half the price of similar ploughs five years ago.

Mr. WATSON. This immigration question is one that interests Manitoba deeply, and one in which I have always felt a great interest since I have had the honor of occupying a seat in the House. I have always been under the impression that false reports of the number of immigrants who went to the North-West, are not calculated to advance the interests of immigration to that country. That has not been the opinion held by hon. gentlemen opposite, I know from experience, the Government apparently want to blind people to the facts of the case by stating that a certain number went in each year and that the country is prosperous. But what are the facts? We find that the population of Manitoba, according to the census of 4th April, 1881, was 59,189 and that of the North-West Territories 6,974. According to the immigration report of the Department of Agriculture, we find that in 1881 the Department claims 22,000 immigrants went into Manitoba and the North-West; in 1882 they claimed 58,751; in 1883, 42,792; in 1884, 24,440, and in 1885, 7,000. In 1885, the year of the rebellion, of course, there are reasons why immigration was less than usual. This makes a total of 221,146 people who ought to be there to-day. The census has been taken for the Territories, and I find there are little over 23,000 whites in the Territories. This is allowing nothing for the natural increase, which is pretty large in Manitoba and the Territories. I find a discrepancy in the figures, apparently, when contrasted with the estimate of the population of Manitoba to-day. As was stated in the House a few days ago, the population of Manitoba to-day is placed at 110,000, which would make, with Territories, a total population with whites of 133,000; deducting this from the 221,146, we find about 88,146 of a discrepancy. I maintain that giving figures which are not correct and leading this House to believe that the course of immigratien was being directed into that country has had an injurious effect. The first Session I had the honor of a seat in this House, I acted on the Standing Committee dealing with Immigration, and when the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, at one of our meetings, made the statement that 13,000 Americans had emigrated from the American side into Manitoba during that year, 1883, I ventured to contradict his statement. I stated it was false. What was the reply? It was: "For God's sake, if we get a good report, let us have it." That was the reply made by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson). But I maintain that false statements are not in the best interests of the country; I ventured to correct the statement, because I was not aware it was the duty of a representative of a constituency in Manitoba, when he knew a statement was not correct, to remain silent. Now, I think there is no doubt but that there is a discrepancy. What are the reasons the people did not think fit to stay in that country? They did not leave because they thought the soil is not better than it is in Dakota. The Minister of the Interior read from the *Free Press* of Winnipeg—and he might read from it at any time, because that paper has always stood by Manitoba, because it has always advocated our interests and claimed that we had better soil than can be found in Dakota—but that paper has stated the reasons why the people do not stop in Manitoba. It said the land through southern Manitoba was locked up, the land in the west was locked up for colonisation purposes.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No land was locked up for colonisation purposes.

Mr. WATSON. There was; and at one time a large portion of southern Manitoba was withdrawn from homestead, as well as large tracts in other portions of Manitoba and the North West. A mile belt was reserved along the railway. The land policy was frequently changed.

Mr. BOWELL. Every change has been to make it more liberal. Has it not?

Mr. WATSON. Not in the first place.

Mr. BOWELL. When is the first place.

Mr. WATSON. In 1879, you could get 160 acres homestead free; in 1880-81 you got only 80 acres, and 80 acres at $2 per acre as pre-emption. The changes in the regulations went on so rapidly that people going into the country could not feel a certainty as to what the land regulations might be. With reference to the agricultural implements, the tariff drove people out of the country. The hon. gentleman talks of ploughs. Why the Copp Brothers, of Hamilton, shipped a cargo of ploughs to the North-West, not one of which was fit to plough with.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is the case now?

Mr. WATSON. Where are your settlers? Many of them have left on this account. But I admit that now Canadian agricultural implements are almost equal to the American.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, and cheaper.

Mr. WATSON. This protective system built up the manufactures at the cost of immigration to the North-West. People, if they could not secure agricultural implements at reasonable prices, would not stop in the country. I know of men who left the Province because they could not secure proper implements. Self-binders, for instance, in 1880, cost $340 in Manitoba, while you could buy them at $200 in Dakota, and that was your grand system of protection. That policy has been a curse to the North-West.

Mr. FERGUSON. What can you buy them for now?

Mr. WATSON. For $250, and in Dakota for $190. Another reason which kept our immigration back is the railway monopoly. It was stated, a couple of years ago, by the First Minister, that he would not allow the Manitoba and South-Western Railway to be built through one of the finest sections in Manitoba, because American capitalists were interested in the road, but we find he is prepared to ask this House to vote millions of dollars to build a line through the State of Maine. Hundreds of men left the country because they had not railway communication, and because the Manitoba and South-Western, which was to have been built four or five years ago, has not yet been extended so as to reach the settlers, who went in with the prospect of having a railway years ago. We have a better soil and country in the North-West and Manitoba for general agricultural farming than they have in the western States. We have larger yields of wheat, and we enjoy better climate. And with all these advantages we have not got the immigration, and I am sorry to say I know of settlements in Dakota that are entirely built up of Canadian people. I was also sorry to see in the Toronto *Mail*, a paper which hon. gentlemen almost swear by, when it was apologising for having only 23,000 whites in the North-West Territories, the statement that it was a fact, and the sooner they realised it the better, that the North-West could not be settled up until Dakota was settled up, and that they could not expect many people to go into the North-West until Dakota was settled. I was sorry to see such a statement. I believe that we have such inducements in Manitoba that people would come into that country in preference to going to Dakota, with equal advantages. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that members on this side of the House are trying to decry the country because they state that the country has grievances. If it has grievances, this is the place to ventilate them and to right them. Do not say that it is all right because the Minister of Agriculture comes forward and says there are 60,000 or 70,000 immigrants gone into the North-West, when it is not the case.

In that way you are deceived, you are only putting off the evil day. You take the census and you find out what your population is. I contend that, if that North-West country had been properly governed, instead of 133,000 people in Manitoba and the North-West, we ought to have had half a million people there, and, if the immigration had continued according to what it was in 1879–80, with the natural growth we would have had 400,000 or 500,000 people there. The country was progressing rapidly, but the progress was interfered with by the changes in the land policy, by the monopoly given to the railway and by locking up lands for colonisation purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. They were not locked up for colonisation purposes.

Mr. WATSON. I tell the hon. gentleman they were. He for one is interested in colonisation lands. He is interested in getting hold of the few immigrants who do go to the North-West. He has got men along the line who get $10 a piece to rope them on to his land, and for what purpose? For the purpose of getting a quarter section for each settler for half price. That is the way the lands in the North-West are disposed of. I hope in the future we may have correct returns made of the immigration into the North-West. I hope we may know the exact amount of immigration that go each year to that country, and the number of settlers who remain in the country, and then we shall know the reasons why some do not. As to that young man whom the *Free Press* speaks of, and the Minister of Interior spoke of to-night, who came from Fergus, were the member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) resides, I do not see why he should go in search of land in Dakota before he went to Manitoba. Surely the member for Centre Wellington should have induced him to go to Manitoba before he went to Dakota, but still, after going to Dakota and hunting all through it for land, he has come back to settle in Manitoba because he finds the land is better there. I believe he is right, but why should he go to Dakota?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). He went to see Mr. Pardee.

Mr. BOWELL. He went to go on Mr. Pardee's land.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). He might go to Florida to see Mr. Chapleau's land.

Mr. WATSON. There is no better immigration agent in the world than a contented settler, and, if you make the people in that country contented, they will induce others to go and reside there. I hope the Government will pursue such a policy that, in five years, instead of coming down here and finding the population 80,000 or 90,000 short, they will find the population that they expect in the Territories. If these people go there, they should remain there. There is nothing to induce them to go out of that country. There are no natural disadvantages to make them leave Manitoba and go to Dakota, and I hope such means will be used by the Minister of Agriculture as will induce immigration of the right class to settle in Manitoba.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I desire to call attention to one point in the remarks of the hon. gentleman. He talks about the reservations made by this Government and the injury which resulted to the North-West from these reservations. I shall simply state the facts, without any comment, as to what was the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. I am not saying it was a bad policy, I am not condemning it, I am simply stating what it was and what the motive was which prompted it when they were in office. On the 24th December, 1874, an Order in Council was passed—and I cannot do better than read it in full—as to reservations, and you will see the object that they had was that, having regard to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they were anxious to reserve the lands from settlement in order that they might have them to do as they pleased with them for the construction of that railway:

Mr. WATSON.

"On a memorandum dated 24th December, 1874, from the hon. the Minister of the Interior, stating that, in view of the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway line westerly from the present limits of the Province of Ontario, he submits that in all probability during the coming season there will be a disposition manifested on the part of settlers going into the Province of Manitoba to squat upon lands along the route, thus possibly embarrassing the Government in carrying out the provisions of the Railway Act of last Session, and under these circumstances he recommends that he be authorised to give public notice to the effect that all lands within twenty miles on each side of the line surveyed, and upon which the telegraph is now under construction, are for the present withdrawn from sale or settlement under the Dominion Lands Act, and that no rights of entry upon the said lands by parties who may have entered thereon after the issue of this notice will be recognised by the Government until further notice.

"The lands so withdrawn to include also a district twenty miles to the westward of Fort Pelly.

"The committee advise that the requisite authority be granted.

That only went a certain way westward. I will give you another Order in Council passed on the 28th February, 1876.

"On a memorandum, dated 21st February, 1876, from the hon. the Minister of Interior, reporting that public considerations make it expedient to select the site for the proposed seat of the Government of the North-West Territories at a point westerly of Livingstone.

"That the late surveys for the Canadian Pacific Railway and the construction of the telegraph line have developed the fact that the crossing of the Battle River, some 250 miles west of Fort Pelly, possesses special advantages as a site for the proposed city.

"That the Battle River is said to be 175 feet across, in low water, with a depth of twelve feet, and is believed to be navigable for many miles towards its source.

"That the soil in the vicinity is excellent, and the country generally eligible for settlement, and the general position is central and convenient for the Territories.

"That in view of the above he recommends that a block four miles square, making in all a block of sixteen square miles, be reserved at such a point in the vicinity of the junction of the Battle and Saskatchewan Rivers, as may be found most convenient for a town site, which may be constituted the future seat of the Government of the North-West Territories."

There was a reservation of sixteen square miles for a possible town site in the future, upon which no one was to be permitted to settle, although the very reason given for the reservation was that it was admirably adapted for settlement. The Order in Council then proceeded to make a much larger reservation, as follows:—

"He further recommends that the lands for twenty miles on both sides of the telegraph line as laid out, extending from a point twenty miles westerly of Fort Pelly to a point twenty miles westerly of the mouth of the Battle River, be withdrawn for the present from sale or settlement, as an extension of the reserve already set apart in connection with the construction of the Pacific Railway.

"The committee submit the above recommendations for Your Excellency's approval.

Then, on the 22nd April, 1876, there was a further Order in Council on the subject of these reservations, as follows:—

"On a memorandum, dated 21st April, 1878, from the hon. the Minister of the Interior, stating, with reference to the question of withdrawal of lands in the vicinity of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway from ordinary sale and settlement, to be disposed of at a future period in connection with the construction of the railway, that in view of avoiding possible difficulties with persons taking up land upon or in the vicinity of the line, as surveyed, to the westward of Battle River, it is, in his opinion, expedient to extend the reserve authorised by the Order in Council in that behalf, dated the 28th February last, and recommending, therefore, that the lands for 20 miles on each side of the line of the railway, from a point 20 miles westerly of the Battle River to Jasper House, in the Yellow Head Pass, through the Rocky Mountains, be withdrawn accordingly.

"The committee submit the above recommendations for Your Excellency's approval."

There were three Orders in Council passed from 1874 to 1876, two of them in 1876, one in February and one in April, reserving a forty-mile belt through what everybody admits is an excellent part of that country, because the Government might require it hereafter for the building of the railway.

Mr. WATSON. Hon. gentlemen on that side of the House claimed that about twenty miles each side of that track is of no use, that it was nothing but a muskeg swamp.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). All I can say to the hon. gentleman is that the reservation by the first Order in Council was not at that point at all, it was on the ordinary Prince Albert trail, west of Portage la Prairie where the hon. gentleman lives. It reserved the Prince Albert district, the Battleford

district and the Edmonton district, all admittedly good lands, and it reserved them up to Jasper House. The hon. gentleman surely does not pretend to say that the whole of the country for twenty miles on each side of the railway was unfit for settlement, that the Government seriously contemplated building a railway from Selkirk to Jasper House through a country that was not fit for settlement. On the contrary, the Order in Council which I have read states that the reason for the reservation was that the country was so attractive for settlers that they would probably go in there and squat. Then, Sir, on the 9th November, 1877, there was this report:

"On a report dated 30th October, 1877, from the hon. the Minister of the Interior, stating that in consequence of the rapidly increasing demand for lands for settlement in Manitoba, and also of the continued dissatisfaction at the locking up of the lands withdrawn for twenty miles on each side of the line surveyed for the Canadian Pacific Railway by the Order in Council of the 26th December, 1874, he is of opinion —

Here is a modification—

"that it is expedient to effect some amelioration of the conditions of the said Order in Council so far as relates to the lands within the Province."

Only the land within the Province, nothing beyond—

"He, therefore, recommends that the lands in Manitoba withdrawn as above be thrown open to actual settlement, but not for homestead or pre-emption entry, or for entry by military bounty or police warrants, or for ordinary sale; no person to be allowed to acquire more than one-half section, or 320 acres, and such land to be paid for by the occupant at whatever rate and upon such terms as may be fixed therefor by the Government when the remainder of the lands in the Province of this class are disposed of.

"He further recommends that persons desiring to acquire such lands shall, previous to settlement thereon, be required to be entered therefor at the nearest Dominion Lands office; and in order to prove their good faith, the applicants shall be obliged in each case to make a payment in advance, at the time of entry, of $1 per acre in cash on account of the purchase, and further be required to settle on and commence to cultivate the land within one year from the date of entry, or in default thereof the payment so made to be forfeited.

"No scrip of any kind, or military bounty, or police warrants, to be receivable in payment of the lands above described.

"The Minister observes that the withdrawal of the lands in question was effected under section 105 of the Dominion Lands Act, circumstances not permitting the application thereto of the Act 37 Vic., cap. 14, which provides for the construction of the railway, and as no statute exists authorising the special mode above suggested of disposing of the lands withdrawn, it will be advisable to confirm the action proposed to be taken as above in that respect, by legislation during the ensuing Session of Parliament.

"The committee concur in the foregoing report, and recommend that the same be approved and acted on."

Then came the first Order in Council passed after the present Government came in, on the 24th October, 1879:

"On a report, dated 22nd October, 1879, from the hon. the Minister of the Interior, stating that the provisions recently made for the disposal of certain public lands set apart for the purposes of the Canadian Pacific Railway have rendered it expedient that the Order in Council of the 9th November, 1877, respecting the lands reserved for twenty miles on each side of the then surveyed line of the Canadian Pacific Railway through the Province of Manitoba, should be cancelled, and he recommends that the same be cancelled accordingly.

"The committee submit the above reccommendation for Your Excellency's approval."

Thus one of the very first things this Government did was to cancel this Order in Council under which settlers coming in had to pay $1 down in cash at the time of entry, and were to commence their settlement duties and perform them as they are required to do now, when they get the land for nothing, and if they failed to perform them they were to forfeit the payment they had made, and in addition to this they were subject to any other payment Government might exact from them after the railway was built. And hon. gentlemen who adopted that principle in the North-West actually talk about the illiberality of the policy of the present Government, under which, with railway facilities furnished, within the 20-mile belt—or within the one-mile belt, after the time had passed when it was necessary to make the reservation to prevent speculative settlement—even within the mile belt, people can settle on their homestead and get 160 acres of land for nothing, by the simple performance of the ordinary duties under which they were able to get it for $1 down, and such further sum as the Government might impose on them, under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, I think I may fairly say, under these circumstances, that it does not lie in the mouth of hon. gentlemen opposite to talk about the land policy of the Government as being illiberal, or to refer to the reservations made from time to time by this Government—reservations which may have been wise or not, but which at that time were pressed upon the Government upon the ground that the lands were going to be so valuable that it would be a pity to allow them to go, because the Government might through them largely recoup the country for the expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Looked at now after the event, with the experience of the last three or four years, with the bursting of the boom then upon us, and which dazzled the minds of the best business men in Canada, it may be all right to turn around and say we ought not to have done so. Personally I wish it had not been done, I think it was a mistake to do it—I have no hesitation in saying that—but that is a piece of wisdom after the event, which is a very cheap commodity. It was done in accordance with the best business sentiment of this country and of Manitoba. But it did not last long and that land was open for settlement. I think the reservation only lasted about a year, if I remember rightly. Then, Sir, as to the reservation of the mile belt. Why, everyone knows that at that time there was a boom with regard to town lots, and a disposition to squat in the hope of getting a town lot, and it was desirable to reserve the mile belt on each side until the railway was built and the stations were fixed. The mile belt was then thrown open, and settlers can go in there now and settle. Then the hon. gentleman states that the land was locked up from settlement by colonisation companies. Nothing of the kind. No colonisation tract interfered in the slightest degree with the even sections. Every even section is open to homestead and pre-emption, the same as lands in any other part of the North-West and anybody can go in there and settle upon them. I believe one of the things which has caused the absence of so large an influx of population into the North-West as many believed would have taken place, and as we regret has not taken place, has been the persistent efforts of the hon. gentlemen opposite to decry our land policy, to impress upon people going in there that there was something very bad in our land laws, something which prevented their getting as good a chance as they would find in Dakota and Minnesota, and in addition to that was the fact there was already a large Canadian population in those States, attracting their neighbors to go there instead of going into our own territory. It ought, however, to be remembered when hon. gentlemen tell us that the population of the North-West to-day has not much increased—and I have heard persons say that the population has not increased—that when the census was taken in 1881 all that part of Manitoba which is west of the old western boundary was in the North-West; and when I tell hon. gentlemen that in one constituency, Selkirk, represented by Mr. Sutherland, which is largely within that new Territory, there are 15,000 voters on the list, it cannot be contended that there has not been a considerable influx of population into that country.

Mr. WATSON. When the hon. Minister talks about 15,000 voters being on the list, perhaps he will tell us how many are resident voters?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is a conundrum. Probably the member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) is on the list; I do not know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt I am.

Mr. WATSON. That list may embrace almost everyone n this House. No doubt, the Minister of the Interior

himself is on the list. I am glad to know that the Minister has come to the conclusion that the railway route laid down by the late Administration ran through a good tract of country. When the hon. gentleman talks about the reservation on the Portage plains, it must be remembered that they did not come into that reservation, because it was more than twenty miles from the proposed railway tract. The hon. gentleman got away back to 1876, to find out that the Mackenzie Government reserved a block of four miles square for a town site at Battleford. That is a small thing to bring up. The hon. gentleman has, however, seen fit to justify the reservation of a mile belt the full length of the railway. I am not here to justify any wrong-doing that might have occurred during the late Administration. If I see any wrongs committed in the administration of affairs in the North-West it is my duty to point them out, and two wrongs do not make one right. The old reply is made, and steps are at once taken to hunt up an old Order in Council of the Mackenzie Administration. In regard to the North-West, which is a new country, we ought to learn from experience. That being the case, the hon. gentleman should not use those arguments in replying to statements made from this side of the House.

Mr. WALLACE (York). The hon. gentleman who has just sat down was a little inconsistent in his remarks. He told us that he believed in that country; and yet on every occasion he decries that country.

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. WALLACE (York). The hon. gentleman never rises to his feet but he takes occasion during the greater portion of his remarks to run down the North-West——

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. WALLACE (York)—to run down that country which gives him a living and which sends him here as a representative. The hon. gentleman says the objection to the North-West is the iniquitous land laws. I remember when the land laws were being discussed here four years ago. That hon. gentleman took an active part in amending the Act; he came down to the front seat and criticised almost every clause. He was satisfied with the Bill.

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. WALLACE (York). That was his course. *Hansard* will show how he has decried the country, and also how he was satisfied with the Land Bill.

Mr. WATSON. The *Hansard* will show that I proposed amendments which were voted down.

Mr. WALLACE (York). The hon. gentleman said the amendments then made were almost identical with his views as to what they should be. The *Hansard* will also show the hon. gentleman's inconsistency. He states that the lands were locked up by being placed in the hands of colonisation companies. The Minister of the Interior has shown that such is not the fact, that there is not a particle of truth in that assertion, that every even numbered section in those tracts is open for settlement as is any other portion of the North-West, and those even sections have always been so. The hon. gentleman, however, says they are locked up by colonisation companies, and yet he tells us in the same breath that those same colonisation companies who were locking up the land are so exceedingly anxious to get settlers that they are willing to give $10 each to get them from the railway lands. I do not know what logic there is in such remarks. We have a large colonisation tract many miles from the railway; we have put there 231 homesteaders during the last four years, drawn from England, Ireland and Scotland. We have sent out agents there this year and we are getting a large number to come out from the old country to settle on our tract in the North-West. We went to the United States, to the State of Illinois, and got fifteen homesteaders who had gone from the county of York in 1876-77 when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. They went to the North-West and settled in York colony, and are well satisfied to-day. The hon. gentleman has also spoken about railway monopoly. We have a great railway in the North-West and we are rapidly getting more railways. It cannot be contradicted that we have lower rates for freight and for passengers than any American railway in the American North-West. We have greater facilities. We know that last year thousands of bushels of wheat were sent from the American side and brought into the Dominion and sent over our railways, paying the duty, and they were sent by our route because the rates were much cheaper than the American lines. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite take occasion every time they speak here, and still more in their campaign speeches, to decry the North-West and make statements which are utterly devoid of fact. I hope hon. gentlemen will learn, if they learn nothing else, to have a little patriotism in their remarks.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is scarcely necessary to allude to anything said by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, in regard to the hon. member for Marquette running down the North-West. I think no one in the House will be prepared to receive that statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think not. Unfortunately for the hon. gentleman who made that statement, we have had an instance of the length to which he is prepared to make statements under the excitement of debate, when he sought to lead the country to understand that certain telegrams, known to be forgeries and fabrications, were genuine documents. The House will not be prepared to receive with any degree of marked confidence any statement the hon. gentleman may make, and members of the House know that the member behind me (Mr. Watson) stands to-day the only recognised true representative of Manitoba and the North-West Territories.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh! as a Grit?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And the people of Manitoba and the North-West recognise him as such a representative and openly declare it, and the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) cannot hope to damage the reputation of the hon. gentleman in the eyes of members of this House and in the eyes of the people whose interests he represents. The charge that gentlemen on this side go about decrying their country is one which hon. gentlemen opposite have so often made that possibly they may actually believe it themselves. The hon. member for South Huron told them, as he always told them, that we have there a country which was superior in many respects to the western States; and that has been the unvarying sentiment of gentlemen on this side. We have pointed out that the climate is equally as good, that the soil is, if anything, more fertile, and that, while we may deplore the visitations of storms and tornadoes among the people of the western States, we could rejoice in the marked advantage we possessed over them in that respect. That is what we have said, and it gives additional force to the statements made by the Opposition, who do not decry the country, but decry the Government whose energies seem to be bent upon doing what in them lies to retard its progress, instead of aiding in its development. They must not make the mistake that they are continually making, of thinking that they and the country are synonymous terms. The country is all right; it is the Government we complain of. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. White) went as far back as the land regulations of 1874, and, while I shall not follow him in all he said, there is a point I shall mention incidentally, that as far back even as 1874 there were a great many people in that country; and in 1880 when the census was taken, under the Administration of that

country by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, we had, at any rate, 122,000 souls in that country. Now, under the administration of these hon. gentlemen, after tens of millions of dollars have been expended to build a railway, with a railway completed there, with an expenditure of millions upon millions of the people's money in order to promote immigration, what is the record of hon. gentlemen in that land of ours, that is a better home for settlers than is offered to them in the western States? What have they accomplished? Why, Sir, they have put in less that 51,000 in those five years, with the expenditure of all that money. We maintain that the expenditure of that money, which is being spent to promote immigration, has failed in its object, and if, for a moment, the attention of the committee was diverted from that question, it was to point out, by the fact of the small increase in the population there, that the vote of that money, which if wisely applied would have had a beneficial influence, has been thwarted by other influences which have been sinister in their nature. The Minister found fault with the hon. member for Huron for stating that he did not accept the figures of his Department, and I must say here, as the hon. member for South Huron said, that in making these statements the Minister of Agriculture must not understand them as personal attacks upon himself. He has done what is a manly thing on his part. He has assumed to answer for, and to be responsible for, his Department, and in that respect he deserves credit over and above his illustrious immediate predecessor, inasmuch as he does rise to defend his Department and does not sit dumb, as that gentleman did, not answering a question or defending his administration. But let us take the Minister on his own basis. He says: I assume the correctness of these figures; I stand by the figures which have been compiled by my Department. Then, when I made an interjection, he seemed to think that I was glad that there were not so many immigrants as the figures show; and I said no; that I would rejoice if it were so, but that I could not take his own figures as proving such a result. Another hon. gentleman objects because the hon. member for South Huron said that a great many people have gone out of the country, and they say they have not. Their proposition is then that all the figures given us by the Department of Agriculture, with reference to immigrants coming into this country, are correct, and their other statement is that people have not left the country to go to the United States. The Minister of Agriculture has given to this House, year after year, the following statements, as he can find out for himself; that, between 1880 and 1885, 154,403 souls went into Manitoba and the North-West Territories. The Minister says these figures are correct; I stand by them. Very well. We had according to the census—we are not taking American figures but the census compiled by that gentleman's own Department, and he says I stand by those figures—we had according to the census in 1880, 122,400 souls there. Therefore, according to the hon. gentleman's own figures, we had in 1885, 276,803 in that country. Now, Sir, we have the gentleman's own figures of the estimates of the population of the Province of Manitoba in the year 1885, because they made a settlement with that Province upon it, and, according to those figures, the population of Manitoba was 125,000. Then, Sir, we have the figures furnished by that hon. gentleman's Department, in 1885, of the number of souls by actual count in the three districts of the North-West Territories in that year, and the number was 48,363 souls, Indians and all included. Therefore, according to the hon. gentleman's own set of figures, there were in 1885 actually 173,363 souls in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and, according to another set of the hon. gentleman's own figures, which he will stand by, there should be there 276,803 souls. These are all his own figures, and he says he will abide by them. I have not used any figures but those from his own Department, and, therefore, there is a discrepancy of 103,410 souls, or that number less than he says went into that country. Now, if that be so, how will the other hon. gentleman maintain his proposition that none have gone out? Will the Minister of Marine rise and state again, with such a jaunty air, that the hon. member for South Huron made a statement, but that he did not prove it? There are 103,410 people that, according to the Minister, went into that country, who are not there now; and therefore, if not there, they must have gone away. I am bound to say that my own opinion is not that those 103,410 went into the country and left it; but I do believe, from a number of circumstances, that many more did leave it than we could have desired. But while I do not believe that number have gone, yet I am of necessity impelled to take the position that the figures which have been furnished by the Department to this House and to the country are not correct, and cannot be correct. If the one set is right the other is wrong, and if one is wrong we have no reliance upon any of them. The hon. gentleman says the same system is pursued now as was pursued under the Mackenzie Administration. Then that hon. gentleman found fault with the figures taken at Port Huron when they said that the United States officials there gave us crooked reports. We had the officer from that place, and we had his testimony that precisely the same rule was followed in counting the immigrants from Canada to the United States at that port during the time they said the figures were false, that the same system exactly prevailed that prevailed at the time of the Mackenzie Administration, and, therefore, the same result would follow. Take the American statistics and compare the number that left during the time of the Mackenzie *régime* with the number that left during the *régime* of the present Administration, and you will see how greatly augmented has been the exodus of our people. Now, Sir, these are facts; these are arguments based on positions hon. gentlemen opposite themselves have taken; and all their airy speeches and denunciations of gentlemen on this side of the House for lack of patriotism go for nothing at all. These statements must be met. I wish the Minister of Marine had been in his place, he would have seen that there is a way of proving the statement made be the hon. member for South Huron that the people ary leaving the country. There are the figures, and either he must admit that 103,000 have gone out, or that the figures the Minister of Agriculture gave are not correct. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Ferguson), speaking of the charge that the system of the Government had made living in the North-West very dear, stated that a Canadian plough could be bought there as cheaply as an American plough, and it was as good a plough—that it was nothing but sentiment against the Canadian plough that existed in the mind of the people. I am glad to know that; but I will ask the hon. gentleman how he will justify the Government in stipulating, in their advertisements for Indian supplies year after year, that the plough to be given to the Indians should be the John Deer plough. The Indian Department would not have a Canadian plough, and the reason the First Minister gave and brought down in a report of the Department, was that the Canadian plough was unfit for the work. How will the hon. gentleman justify such statements made by the First Minister and his Department?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). How long ago was it that he made that declaration?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to go up to the Routine and Records Office and ask for a return I obtained of tenders for supplies to the Indian Department he will see that that is reported.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). In what year?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think it was under discussion last year or the year before; and the hon. gentleman said that these Canadian ploughs have been as good for years.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Two or three years.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That has been done for three years. Whether the John Deer plough was specified in the tenders of this year, I do not know, but it was last year, because when I asked the First Minister, he said the form of tender was the same as it had been the year before. The line of argument adopted by the Minister of Marine was like the line we are told the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), adopted in another place, when testimony was being given regarding the immigration into the North-West. A glowing account was being given of the thousands of Americans who were going into our territory; and one gentleman who knew that country well felt that that statement was not correct, that it was impossible that such a number could go in; and he felt compelled, from his own knowledge, to contradict the statement. Then the hon. member for North Perth begged for pity's sake that he should not say it is so, whether it is true or not, so as to boom the country. In the same way the Minister of Marine regrets the statements made; if things are not as good as they are set forth by the Department, it is not well to point that out; it is not well to let the people know these things, because if you adopt the plan of telling them that these statements are not true, that there are not so many people in the country as there were said to have been, the tendency will be to dampen the ardor of those intending to go into the country. Is that the policy to be deliberately adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite? Is it an honest policy? If it be not an honest policy it cannot succeed. Does the hon. member for North Perth not know that the line he takes, that in advertising our country we are to deliberately misrepresent it, and paint in glowing colors that which it does not possess, is like the policy of a merchant who advertises great bargains which he does not give, and is declared by his disappointed customers to be a deceiver, and the consequence is that his business is ruined? Does he not know that if we spread abroad reports which are not founded in fact, and bring people into the country who might have been satisfied with it if the truth had been told without exaggeration, people will find their glowing anticipations disappointed, and what will be the result? Why, Sir, letters of disappointment will go to warn the friends left behind not to come to the country; and I venture to say, without fear of contradiction from hon. gentlemen opposite, that a letter from a *bonâ fide* settler expressing disappointment and regret at what he found in this country, going back to his native land and among his own people, will have a greater deterrent effect on those who intended to come than even 10,000 of the hon. gentleman's pamphlets can overcome. This whole system of assisted immigration in the hands of the present Government has been a great, an utter failure. The hon. gentleman wants proof. I will give him another proof. I have proven from their own figures that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has been a lamentable failure in Manitoba and the North-West; but what has been its effects in the rest of the Dominion? There is a simple way of working it out. The estimated population of the Dominion of Canada this year, as given by the Minister of Finance—and I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will accept his authority—is 4,700,000.

Mr. McLELAN. I claimed 4,800,000; but I took off 100,000 to accommodate hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, take 4,800,000. When the census was taken in 1881 the population was 4,324,810. Now, I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will agree with me that 2 per cent. per annum is a very low rate to take for the natural increase of a country, especially a country like Canada. That we know is below the natural increase. But if I estimate the natural increase on 4,324,810 for five years at that rate, making the simple calculation without compounding it, without a single immigrant coming in during the five years, we should have had this year 4,750,290, or 57,290 souls more than the Minister of Finance claimed we had. There is another proof taken from the hon. gentleman's own figures; and in face of all this hon. gentlemen opposite rise and say that gentlemen making these statements are making statements without foundation. I have given the figures on which we have based our conclusions, and I have some more remarks to make, but will take my seat to give the Minister an opportunity of explaining these figures.

Mr. HESSON. I suppose, as long as we have an immigration policy, we will have these debates from time to time. No doubt it will never be possible to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite that we are likely to get value for our money, or that our expenditure on immigration is at all a wise outlay, but when they were in office, they did everything possible also to encourage immigration. They did not succeed to the extent they desired, or to any extent which their expenditure might justify, but we are not disposed to find fault with them for that. What we found fault with them for, at the time, was that they took no means to procure employment for the immigrants after bringing them out. Whether their expenditure on immigration was wise or unwise, their treatment of their immigrants was most unwise. Whether the immigrant happened to be a mechanic or a laboring man, he found on his arrival that there was no employment to be obtained by him. On the other hand, if there is one thing that marks the conduct of this Government more than another, it is their anxiety to find employment for the class of people who come to our shores. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said, over and over again, that it is no part of the duty of the Government to bring out people who are not able to take care of themselves. But we do not assist that class.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You do.

Mr. HESSON. Not to anything like the extent the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite did. We are not doing it at all. Distinct instructions are given to our agents everywhere, and I can appeal to the report of the Commissioner of Immigration for Ontario, Mr. Hardy, to prove it has not been done, and that there is no desire to do so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Commission on children at $2 each, $2,450, and on children under 12 years at $2.00¾ each, $4,071.21.

Mr. HESSON. I had no idea the hon. gentleman was so rude. He will have his opportunity to speak by-and-bye, and should not interrupt me; I did not interfere with him when he was speaking.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I beg your pardon.

Mr. HESSON. I was referring to the fact the report of the Ontario Commissioner of Immigration does not bear out the statements made to-night with regard to the expenditure of this Government or that of the Ontario Government, being in the direction of bringing out people unable to take care of themselves. The hon. member for Brant contends that we ought to have 276,000 souls in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, but I desire to point out the fact that the hon. gentleman, however anxious he may be to be accurate in his statements, still requires to be watched, as he has omitted altogether from his reckoning the fact that a large territory has been added to Manitoba, which was not counted in at the time the census was taken.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What has that to do with it. I took both Manitoba and the North-West Territories.

Mr. HESSON. You took the census of 1881.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Which included the Territories.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You do not understand the thing.

Mr. HESSON. You omitted the whole settlement from the original boundary of Manitoba to Alberta.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to state?

Mr. HESSON. You will have your opportunity just now. The hon. gentleman has also omitted, in his anxiety to be honest, to refer to the fact that a very large number of people have left Manitoba and the North-West to go to British Columbia. That was pointed out to him by one of the hon. gentlemen who represent British Columbia, but he omits it altogether. This only shows how anxious the hon. gentleman is to belittle the efforts made to induce people to come into the country. If the hon. gentleman had his ears open when the Minister of the Interior read the Orders in Council which were passed when the Mackenzie Government were in power, and heard described the course they pursued with reference to their Orders in Council, he would have been able to find a sufficient reason for our not having as many settlers in the North West as would otherwise have been there. What was the conduct of the hon. gentlemen opposite when in office? They shut out settlement along the line of railway by hindering squatters and settlers taking up lands, and compelling them if they wanted to settle, to purchase the land at any price the Government might choose to name. Was that such an inducement as the hon. gentleman would suppose would lead to settlers coming into the country? If hon. gentlemen opposite had then pursued a liberal policy; if they had given homesteads to the settlers, we would have no talk about an exodus to the States, but would have kept all our settlers in the country. We are of course, I presume, in this House all actuated by the same desire to see our country prosper, but it is lamentable to find on every occasion, when the North-West question is brought up, men in this House, who profess to represent Manitoba, always willing to look on the dark side and present that Province in a very gloomy light. Referring to the select committee which was held some years ago, to which the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has alluded, a statement was made by a witness before the committee who had lived in southern Manitoba on the borders of the United States, and therefore knew what he was talking about, the correctness of which the hon. gentleman denied, although he admitted he had not travelled very far in Manitoba, having scarcely gone west of Portage la Prairie. When he challenged the statement I said: For heaven's sake do not try again to damage your own country, when there are gentlemen here who are trying to give evidence as to its prospects and probabilities of settlement. You should rather be glad to hear his statement instead of trying to throw doubt on them. I say it is these things that we have reason to find fault with, that the hon. gentleman should stand by or sit in the presence of anyone who will try to decry and injure the reputation of his own country. We have great reason to be proud of the progress that country is making, and, when we consider the difficulties that farmers have had everywhere to surmount, not only there but in all parts of Canada, the wonder is that they have succeeded so well. Hon. gentlemen have no right to stand up here and continually charge the Government with damaging that country by their policy. The land policy of the Government is the most liberal that the hon. gentleman can point to on this continent. There never was a more liberal policy. The whole object of the Government has been to make those people content and happy and prosperous, to give them railway accommodation at the earliest possible moment, and that has been accomplished to an amazing extent, beyond the most sanguine hopes of the friends of the North-West; but with all that, with a free grant of land and a most liberal policy for the improvement of that land, giving them the opportunity to go away for six months in the year and make a living, which they, perhaps, could not make on the new place, and helping them to put up their buildings and make their improvements and get their implements and put in their crops, gentlemen on the other side denounce the policy of the Government and say it is illiberal, and that it is the fault of that policy that the country is not being settled. I say it is shameful to make such statements.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. HESSON. I state it, and I am not out of order; and no gentleman who has the success of that country truly at heart would deliberately make such statements or say that we have not given a liberal policy to the people of the North-West. They ought to know better, and they do know better in their hearts, but, in order to make some attack upon the Government, to damage them, if possible, in the estimation of the public who may not have the advantage of knowing all the ins and outs of the Government policy in the treatment of the North-West, in the hope of damaging the Government somewhere where the public cannot hear all these things, they make the statements they do and give them to the press of their side to scatter through the country. The hon. gentlemen know perfectly well that the Government have done all they could to give those people not only liberal land laws, but every other advantage, and to enable them to have free homes and to be contented and happy and prosperous. It remains for hon. gentlemen opposite to talk about the early frosts in that country. I said I would give a few items from the report of the Hon. Mr. Hardy, Commissioner of Immigration in Ontario, and the reason is that the hon. gentleman said we were filling the country with paupers, that the Government were bringing out pauper immigration. I deny that, and will quote the words of Mr. Hardy and his agents, and I think we can prove that that is not the policy of the Government.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is all Hardy says correct?

Mr. MACKINTOSH. You think so.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do, a great part of it. I am glad the hon. gentleman accepts it.

Mr. HESSON. We have here the report of Peter Byrne, Esq., Ontario Immigration Agent, Liverpool, England, he says:

"I have the honor to report that the work of disseminating information regarding the Province of Ontario throughout the United Kingdom has been carried on by this agency during the past year by the same methods as heretofore, though on a more restricted scale, namely, by advertising in the public press, distribution of pamphlets, maps and other printed matter at agricultural shows, &c., by conferences with intending emigrants, correspondence, &c. These various means have not been called into requisition to the same extent as in previous years owing to the very decided falling off in the demand for information on the part of the emigrating parties. In fact the tide of emigration so far as concerns the British Isles has touched the lowest ebb during the past season that it has reached for several years."

Hon. gentlemen think that, in the face of a report like that, showing the difficulties which the agents have to encounter, this Government should have accomplished a great amount of work, and they would have all the agents withdrawn because we have not accomplished all we desired; but I think the Minister made it very clear that we brought out our immigrants at a much less cost——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Only they did not stay.

Mr. HESSON. That was accomplished by the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not one in ten stayed.

Mr. HESSON. I thought I had pointed out that the Government did endeavor to give them employment when they came here.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, they do not.

Mr. HESSON. Well, they do, to a very great extent. They have given every opportunity to these people to get employment by encouraging the industries of the country. The hon. gentlemen know that. I do not want to debate that part of it. The Government took that course in order to give employment to those who came so that they might have a good report to send back to their friends. So much for that. You see the tide of emigration was not large, to start with. Now, what further do they say? This is from another immigrant agent:

"The health of the immigrants during the past season has been remarkably good. In fact there has not been a single case requiring medical aid brought to my notice during the year, something that has not previously happened in all of my sixteen years' service. It has been impossible for me to supply the demand in my district for farm laborers and female servants, and I trust more of these classes will be sent to me next season.

"R. MACPHERSON,
"Government Immigration Agent."

Now we will hear what another gentleman says in his report:

"The numbers this year remaining in Ontario fall short of those of 1881 by some 2,063, but the class of immigrants was, however, superior to those of former years, and with very few exceptions were able to pay their way to their destination or to where work was to be obtained. The demand for farm laborers during the past year has not been quite so brisk as formerly, owing to the introduction of machinery, but we have always had applications in excess of the number arriving. The principal demand at present is for skilled farm hands and domestic servants."

Just the very people we are endeavoring to bring out. The Minister has repeated it in this House and elsewhere, but hon. gentlemen still endeavor to make it appear that the Government are bringing out all sorts of people, whether they are able to paddle their own canoe or not:

"The principal demand at present is for skilled farm hands and domestic servants, the applications for the latter class, especially in the country parts, being far in excess of the supply."

What do hon. gentlemen say to that? Then there is another very interesting item here. The hon. gentleman referred to the publication of pamphlets and their distribution in the old country. They happen to refer to that here:

"I have much pleasure in alluding to a pamphlet published during the course of the year by H. B. Small, Esq., of the Bureau of Agriculture, Ottawa, on the industries and manufactures of Canada, in which the fullest information is given in a condensed form which cannot help attracting the intending immigrant with capital to our shores. Time, patience, and a vast amount of labor has been expended in compiling this valuable work which cannot be too largely circulated throughout Europe and elsewhere. Of the rapid growth of our city, I can only repeat what appears in the columns of our newspapers from day to day, that it is simply marvellous. New houses and manufactories are going up in every direction. The value of buildings erected in the city during the past year has been estimated at over $3,000,000. This alone will show the rapid strides this city is taking. Its growth in the past has been without a parallel in Canadian history, and its position is such as to make it the distributing point for manufactured and other goods for the whole Province. The great inducement held out to farmers by the demand in England for Canadian cattle and sheep has been the means of introducing a far superior stock in the market, and farmers and breeders are now turning their attention more to the improvement both in their stock and lands."

Now that is from Donaldson, the Toronto agent. I suppose, if that report is unreliable, the Minister would not accept it. He has been there for many years.

"There is also a decrease of 2,449 passing through Manitoba and the North-West Territories from the United States owing to the late unsettled state of the Territories caused by the North-West rebellion, and the unfounded and injurious reports put into circulation by interested parties in Canada."

I would like the committee to observe that. I hope the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) will pay some attention to that instead of whispering to his friends round him.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Speak a little louder, please.

Mr. HESSON. Let the hon. gentleman wake up; then he can hear me.

"There is also a decrease of 2,449 passing through to Manitoba and the North-West Territories from the United States, owing to the late unsettled state of the Territories, caused by the North-West rebellion, and the unfounded and injurious reports put into circulation by interested parties in Canada, and by real estate agents, land companies and railway companies owning land in Dakota and other States and Territories of the American Union."

He states the reason exactly: There are parties in this country who are interested in reporting in favor of another land than ours.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who wrote that?

Mr. HESSON. Mr. John Smith, Dominion Immigration Agent at Hamilton. He goes on to say:

"There is also a decrease of 35,929 immigrants reported as passing through this agency to the western States. The decrease may be attributed to the falling off of immigration to New York, and the cut rate of $1 fare made by the Pennsylvania Railway Company over their system from Philadelphia and New York to Chicago and intermediate points. The immigrants arriving at this agency and settling in the Dominion during the past season have been of a superior class, and with very few exceptions did not require any assistance.

"There has been an active demand for all kinds of agricultural and general laborers, which it was impossible to supply, and the demand for female domestic servants, both for the city and country, was largely in excess of the arrivals, and a large number of the applicants had to return without obtaining the desired help.

"*Mechanics.*—The demands still continue light, the number of arrivals being in proportion to the demand, the number as already stated only amounting to thirty-six hands, including the St. Lawrence and United States route.

"*Mill Operatives.*—The reported arrivals this year being less than any other previous season, have readily found employment, the demand being in excess of the supply. At present the mills are badly in want of weavers, some of the managers being compelled to advertise in the States for operatives to keep pace with the growing demands for fabrics, several of the mills being running entirely on orders."

Now we have something further. I told the hon. gentleman that I would prove by their own friends that there had been no immigration to Dakota, or, at least, it has been much less than they stated.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do you call John Smith one of our friends?

Mr. HESSON. He is reporting to one of your commissioners?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He is a Dominion agent.

Mr. HESSON. If the report had not been correct they would not have received it:

"There has also been a large falling off in Canadians leaving for the north-west States, and the movement to Dakota may be said to have entirely ceased, the railway land companies and real estate agents having withdrawn their agent from Canada. Their field of operations is broken so far as relates to this Province, the advantages offered by the Dominion Government in Manitoba and the North-West Territories being of a more liberal character, the land and climate being better, and the country free from cyclones and floods."

Here is another item:

"Referring to the low price of coals, the American coal companies have deducted the whole of the Canadian duties on large contracts in addition to the regular discount allowed to the Canadian dealers."

Then, I find in the report of Mr. Smyth, of London, that he says:

"The demand for farm laborers was good during the whole of the spring and summer months; in fact, as usual, in excess of our supplies, and at fair wages.

"The demand for female servants during the whole season was large for cooks, housemaids, general servants, laundresses, &c., and at good wages, but they could not be supplied, as so few of that class can get so far west as London.

"The general health of the immigrants arriving this season was excellent; they were, also, of a very good class.

"We shall, to all appearance, have the usual demand for farm and ordinary laborers for country work the coming season."

So much for that report. I hope hon. gentlemen are satisfied that the Government have been endeavoring not only to spend money wisely, but to bring out a class of immigrants who would be useful to the country. There can be no desire on the part of the Government to bring out any other kind. I must say, however, that some of the most valuable and successful of our citizens came here, perhaps, on assisted passages, unable to pay their own way; so it is not well always to measure results by the amount of money an individual may have in his pocket; very often he may dissipate the money he brings over with him, and is left helpless and stranded. I have here a report of the Hon. Mr. Hardy, of the Province of Ontario, for the year 1885, printed by order of the Legislative Assembly, so I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will accept it as reliable:

"From the beginnig of August to the end of October there was a steady demand for farm laborers, especially for single men. More than double the amount that arrived could have found employment by the year at fair wages. Of one large lot of practical and experienced farm hands, thirty reached Toronto at 5 a.m, their expected arrival having been published in the morning papers, and before noon all had been engaged at wages ranging from $144 to $150 per annum with maintenance. It must, however, be understood that only experienced men are wanted by the year."

Well, we say so. We don't say anything else.

"A single man who can plough well, and who has had some experience in taking care of stock, can readily obtain employment at $150 per annum with maintenance, with a prospect of considerable increase if he should be found to be a good trustworthy man. Should thirty or forty come together, and advise the Department on their arrival at Quebec, farmers would certainly be in waiting in Toronto to employ them. Farmers have so often been disappointed in coming for men that they do not now feel disposed to come to meet immigrants unless they have some assurance of success."

I hope the hon. gentleman is satisfied that there has not been an over immigration in that Department. I have felt called upon to make these remarks as a member of a committee working in the interest of immigration, and I hope that all the members of that committee desire with me that we may have a good class of immigrants and plenty of them, because we have abundant room, a fine climate, and the best of land, everything, in fact, that settlers could desire. If they have only muscle and energy, they ought to succeed. Hon. gentlemen opposite must know that the Government have been endeavoring to have the land laws of the North-West so satisfactory that no man would have a right to complain, or to leave his land on account of the conditions. The Minister of the Interior has pointed out what circumstances would compel them to leave our country and go to another where the conditions are worse. Hon. gentlemen will admit that south of the line they have frost, perhaps, more severe than we have, and cyclones, storms and floods, with damage to crops, life and property, to an extent that we never have in our own North-West. They have worse land laws. There, a man has to live five years on a place, and make more improvements than is required here, before he can get his patent. Then, if they go over the line, they go to the country that has a much heavier taxation than we have.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not at all.

Mr. HESSON. I venture to say there is not one single individual in Canada to-day who will make that statement but yourself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will most assuredly.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of the Interior made it during the Budget debate.

Mr. HESSON. Will the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) have patience. He occupies about half the time of the House, and to-night he was obliged to speak on the items for all the different agencies. There was no one from any of the Provinces that could take charge of the items specially affecting them, and that hon. gentleman had to wander from one end of the country to the other finding fault with the expenditure of the Government. I say the condition of things in our North-West is infinitely superior to that of the country where emigrants are going. Our railways are better and cheaper, our land laws are better, in fact our whole system is very much better than that in Dakota, and the chances of the settlers are better; and why then should people leave our country and go to the United States?

An hon. MEMBER. Why?

Mr. HESSON. It is only because hon. gentlemen here are not sufficiently resolute in placing the claims of our North-West before the people of Canada. Some are unwise enough to make statements in regard to the American North-West which are not true and which are not capable of being proved, and our people taking those gentlemen at their word believe those statements and go to the American North-West, where nine out of ten of them regret they are a few years afterwards.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I only rise for the purpose of replying to the hon. gentleman who attacked my figures and gave what I conceive to be a misstatement with respect to them. He has not attempted to answer them, but has simply chosen to make a statement which I do not understand to be correct. He said that when I have the figures I gave them incorrect and withheld something in regard to them. I give that an emphatic denial. I read from *Hansard:*

"Mr. CHARLTON asked, What was the estimated population of Keewatin, Manitoba and the North-West Territories at the close of the year 1885 and upon what data is the estimate given?

Mr. CARLING. The estimated population of Manitoba was 125,000, arrived at for the purpose of the recent financial arrangements with that Province."

Those are the figures I gave, and they apply to enlarged Manitoba.

Mr. HESSON. You were dealing with an estimate instead of the census.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am dealing with the whole Province in regard to which the arrangement was made.

Mr. HESSON. An estimate, not a census.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is not the point on which the hon. gentleman attacked me. He said some territory of the North-West had been added to Manitoba and I left that out. I have given the hon. gentleman, in answer, the whole population of enlarged Manitoba up to the close of the year 1885. Will the hon. gentleman pretend to say that there was some new territory taken into Manitoba after the close of that year? That is virtually what he did.

Mr. HESSON. I did not say so. I said, you are dealing with an estimate in the one case and with figures taken from the departmental returns in the other case; and that was not fair. If you take the census returns for 1881 you will find a different statement.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I took the census returns for 1881 and I gave the figures of that census; the hon. gentleman has not examined them and does not know the difference. The hon. gentleman chose to say that I made a statement entirely without foundation. I have read from the official documents showing that the population of enlarged Manitoba at the close of 1885 was 125,000. The hon. gentleman knows, or if he did not know he ought to have known, that we had laid on the Table of the House a statement of the population of those Territories, which

was 48,363 including Indians, half-breeds and whites. But the hon gentleman says I gave a wrong statement, because there was part of the North-West added to Manitoba and it had not been counted into Manitoba. So the whole argument of the hon. member is utterly without sense, because I have given the population for enlarged Manitoba up to 1885, and it was enlarged some years ago. Therefore the figures I gave were correct and I withheld nothing. If the Department of Agriculture has given us the correct figures the people who went in and were not there when the census was taken in 1881 number 103,410, and we want to know where they have gone. A few words with respect to the so-called liberal land policy of the Government. Is the hon. gentleman sure he is not confusing the Government's timber limit policy with their land policy? No doubt he thinks the timber policy a very liberal one, and it is a very liberal one to members on that side of the House. I am afraid the timber limit policy and the land policy have become confused in the hon. gentleman's mind. In like manner with the enlargement of the boundaries of Manitoba. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hesson) complained that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) spoke too much and did not give him an opportunity. The hon. gentleman takes an opportunity however. Scarcely an hon. member addresses the House but the hon. member for Perth is speaking at the same time. He is keeping up a running speech all the time, and I venture to say that the House generally derives about as much information from that speech, in which a sensible man is talking to a sensible man, as the hon. gentleman is talking to himself, as it does from the hon. gentleman's remarks to-night. What did the hon. gentleman mean by reading the report by Mr. Hardy? He also gave the House a report of John Smith. But I would as soon take the testimony of himself as that of John Smith, for he probably knows as much about the people of Dakota as does John Smith. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that we are dealing with figures and with figures furnished by the Department. I want to point out how utterly the Department has failed in this matter. From their own figures they have placed 51,000 extra souls in the North-West and Manitoba in five years, leaving out the natural increase. What did the western States do? When I use these figures which I am about to use, it must be remembered that they were given by the First Minister a few years ago, and therefore I shall be relieved from the charge of want of patriotism in quoting them. The right hon. gentleman told us at that time the population of the western States. He enumerated among others Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, Missouri and Kansas. The area of those combined States was about that of Manitoba and our North-West Territory, and the population that entered those States in ten years was 2,555,000, while we have in five years obtained 51,000 for a similar area of territory. Hon. gentlemen will say: You take the United States, but you must look at the facilities they possess, for it is an old settled country. The Finance Minister said go further back when the hon. member for Huron was speaking of Dakota. Now, this increase of 2,555,000 in those States took place between 1850 and 1860, thirty-five years ago. And who will say that there were greater facilities for settling that territory thirty-five years ago than we possess in Manitoba to-day? and that under circumstances such as they existed, as far back as 35 years and from that to 25 years, they were able in the same area of territory, to place 2,555,000 in ten years, while in five years we have placed barely 51,000. Look at the question any way you will, and the answer that is arrived at—and we arrive at it with feelings of the greatest regret—is that the immigrants alleged to have come into this country with a vast expenditure of money, if they are here, have displaced an equal number of our own sons. If it be true that there are places to be found on our own farms here, is not the answer to be found in the statement of another hon. gentleman when it was pointed out that the population was stationary, and the hon. gentleman claimed that they were not going to the States but were going to Manitoba and the North-West. That would leave a vacancy here; but if a number like that went to Manitoba and the North-West that would account for the 51,000 additional population, as being all members of the older Provinces, and therefore that your whole immigration expenditure is an utter waste, because you do not expend any of it in sending the sons of Ontario or Nova Scotia farmers to the North-West. Therefore if they have gone in such numbers to the North-West that would account very soon for 51,000; but we find from that, if that be the net result, that there have been no immigrants at all from the older countries of the world to the North-West, or we must adopt the other alternative that, having gone there, they have been forced to leave the country after settling in it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to call the attention of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson), to a fact which I think he will not dispute, being, I know, familiar with the details of our municipal affairs. He has just been quoting the returns of the Province of Ontario. These returns, of course, are entitled to all possible weight; I am not disposed to dispute them, although it is true that reports from joint officers are a very different thing from those of officers of the Ontario Government alone. But the hon. gentleman implied that the population did not increase as fast under the Mackenzie Government as under the present Government. Now, Sir, it is quite clear that from 1873 to 1879 the population of Ontario alone increased 225,000 souls. During the time when Mr. Mackenzie's policy was in force up to April, 1879, before the National Policy was introduced, there was an increase of 225,000, by the assessor's count, in the Province of Ontario. After 1879, and down to the present time, there has been an increase of just 80,000 souls. Those are the facts as stated by the assessors, who are not partisans of ours, but who are, probably in greater number, partisans of hon. gentlemen. Now I do not assert that the assessors' returns are *verbatim et literatim* accurate returns, but what I do assert is that, from 1871 to 1881, they showed a total increase of population in Ontario quite equal to that of the census returns, and that they are relatively accurate.

Mr. HESSON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to point out to him that the report shows an excess of 300,000 in the addition, in the figures for 1878.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I corrected that error where a nine was placed in room of a six. As the hon. gentleman knows, those reports come on the average to April of 1879, which was a period before the National Policy came into effect. Now, I always maintained that when hon. gentlemen on that side were decrying the position of the country during Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, as they did decry it in every shape and form, that they were drawing the most unjust comparisons between the position of Canada and the United States. I said then, and I repeat it now, that during those five years the position of Canada was very much better than the position of the United States; that it was in almost every possible shape and way in a better position; that whole sections of the most important States were overrun by armies of tramps; that life and property over a large portion of these States was very insecure, and that there was greater distress altogether than there was in Canada. The point to which I wish to call attention is this, that the increase in that period in Ontario, which, as the hon. gentleman knows, is the Province which absorbs the greatest number of immigrants, is nearly triple what has taken place since; and I call his attention further to the fact that the recorded increase

from 1879 to the present time is, by at least 120,000, less than the natural increase of Ontario should be, without a single immigrant; Ontario's natural increase should have shown 120,000 more than the assessors' return does. Those are the only statistics for Ontario we can get. I have pointed out again and again to hon. gentlemen opposite that, if they want to find out the truth as to the Province of Quebec, it is easy to obtain it by applying to the clerical authorities there, who keep very accurate records of the vast bulk of the population; and if hon. gentlemen do not choose to obtain that information, there can be but one inference, and that is that they do not want to obtain it, because it would prove conclusively that there also a very large movement of the population has been going on in the wrong direction, and that a great number of people have left this country. I stated that I paid no regard whatever to the statements made, even during the time of the late Administration, as to the immigration into this country. The reason I made that statement is that, since that time, we obtained the census of 1881 which showed beyond the possibility of a doubt—unless you dispute the census of 1871, which was made under hon. gentlemen, as well as the census of 1881 - that of the immigrants whom our returns alleged to have settled in this country, only a small proportion could have stayed there. It was not until that census appeared, and until we had the opportunity of examining and dissecting it, that I came reluctantly and unwillingly to the conclusion that our agricultural and immigration returns were in that respect, wholly untrustworthy and unreliable. It may have been—I do not say it was not the case—that these people did state to our authorities that they meant to settle here, but it is quite clear that they did not stay here, and that is the whole gist of the position I take.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. As the hon. gentleman places such confidence in the municipal returns, I may state to him that I find by the Sessional Papers, No. 55, of the Province of Ontario, for 1884, that the population given for 1881, according to the municipal return, was 1,691,070. I find by the official returns of the Federal census that the population of Ontario for 1881 was 1,920,460.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will explain. The hon. gentleman is perfectly correct in pointing out that the municipal assessors' returns are largely below, even at this moment, what I believe myself the population to be. But the point is this, that this reduction bears a fair proportion in each year. There was a similar diminution in 1871, when the assessors' returns bore precisely the same proportion to our census returns that they did in 1881, and what I say is that these returns are relatively accurate Between 1871 and 1881 the assessors' returns show an increase of population in Ontario of about 290,000. Now, if the hon. gentleman looks back to the census returns of 1871 and 1881, he will see that they show an increase of a little over 300,000. That is a very fair proof, I think that the assessors have fairly computed the annual increase; though they are a little under the mark, I think, in each case.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I fully comprehend the meaning of what the hon. gentleman wishes to convey. The population of the city of Ottawa in 1883, as given in the Ontario Government returns, was 25,583, while the Assessment Commissioner gives me the figures as 27,583, and he also gives me figures up to 1885 showing an increase of 3,000 a year. I find that the hon. gentleman bases his conclusion as to the shrinkage of the population of Canada on the fact that the school population had decreased.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not as returned by the assessors, but simply by the registered list of pupils.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. It would be, of course, registered with the Provincial Government?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. That is what I have used. Then, an increase in the school population, according to the hon. gentleman's argument, means an increase in the general population. By the report of the Ontario Industrial Bureau, the school population of 1861 is placed at 384,960, and that of 1871 at 495,756, an increase of 104,776; and yet the hon. gentleman, in speeches of his that I have read, has argued that there was a decrease in the school population of some 8,000 from 1879 to 1884, and that that proved conclusively that there was a decrease in the general population of the country. Now, I take the increase in the school population between 1861 and 1871, when the hon. gentleman said the great exodus took place in this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, the great exodus took place after 1871.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I will quote the hon. gentleman's own words at Simcoe in 1877, according to the *Globe's* report. He said:

"The census returns of the United States as well as reports made to Sir John's own Government by their own officials show that during the ten years from 1861 to 1871—during which Sir John was absolute master of Canada—we lost 400,000 people emigrating from Canada to the United States."

Then, basing my argument upon the very returns used by him, to prove an exodus taking the figures he quotes to prove that Canada is becoming rapidly depopulated, I find that there was an increase in the school population between 1861 to 1871 of 104,776.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is in Ontario; we are speaking of the population of the whole Dominion.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The rule applies to Ontario as an important portion of the Dominion; and Ontario and Quebec were important portions of the Dominion at that time. The hon. member for Brant said in this House, on the 24th of March, 1884:

"I suppose one child should represent about five inhabitants."

Consequently according to the arguments of the opposition statistics, Ontario, instead of decreasing between 1861 and 1871, increased her population by 523,880; and yet the hon. member for South Huron claimed that during that time there had been a startling exodus. I desire to show that the municipal returns to the Ontario Government are lamentably inaccurate in various particulars. I have looked through them, and I find that it is utterly impossible to place any reliance upon them. In giving the population of various cities, they omit 2,000 or 3,000; and yet hon. gentlemen use these figures, I think unfairly, to show that there is a great exodus fron Canada in progress. The hon. member for South Huron cannot forget that while he was in power he admitted that an exodus from this country was then going on. In his speech, in 1876, he stated:

"On the accession of this Ministry (that of the hon. member for East York) to power, a most extraordinary panic took place in the United States, and the result was widespread distress, affecting in the most serious manner emigration from Europe to this continent. For the first time in history, a steady stream of artisans, and even agricultural laborers, had been seen returning to the British Isles. In every steamship that had crossed the Atlantic during the past two years and a half numbers of these persons—of all classes and creeds—unable to find employment in the United States had forsaken the shores of this continent."

The hon. gentleman from his place in Parliament, and speaking with all the responsibility of a Minister of the Crown, proclaimed that thousands were leaving the American continent to return to Europe, and yet he would endeavor to prove that only since he went out of office have thousands left Canada to go to the United States. Now, I think I could show the hon. gentleman, if it were not so late, that the greater number of native Canadians went to the United States during the time he administered the financial affairs of this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I will take the case of the French Canadians of Massachusetts. The hon. gentleman will remember that the leader of the Opposition, in 1884, was arguing this very question, laying down the rule that because the French Canadians had asked for a committee to investigate and report as to their position in Massachusetts, and to be allowed to give evidence before that committee, therefore their statements showed that they had left Canada during the *régime* of the right hon. the leader of the Government. The hon. member for West Durham then said :

"It is proved, by a very thorough examination that took place in the year 1882, under the instruction of the Legislature of Massachusetts, into the question, that it has only been within the last ten or fifteen years that this immigration has assumed such large proportion in that part of the country. It is only within a much shorter period, five or six years before 1882, that it began to assume the character of a permanent settlement in the country to which these people went."

The following is the resolution which was passed by the French Canadians, at Lowell :—

"Whereas, since the French Canadian have come to this section, they have reached a population of 400,000 in New England ; whereas a large number have become proprietors, paying large taxes, and whereas, for the most part, the young men propose to make their homes here,—Resolved, that we protest against the portion of the report which says we are a horde of industrial invaders ; whereas we have to live five years in this country before we can become citizens of this glorious Republic, and the French Canadians have been here in large numbers only for five or six years."

This report was ordered by the Legislature of Massachusetts, in 1882. Six years had elapsed since the French Canadians had arrived in the States in large numbers ; and subtracting that six years from 1882, the hon. gentleman will find that those French Canadians must have gone to the States between 1876 and 1877. This is proof conclusive with regard to that fact. I wish also to call the hon. gentleman's attention to a statement dealing with the question of agency and information expenditure, in his treatment of which the hon. gentleman was unfair to this Government and to the hon gentleman who formerly administered the Department of Immigration and Agriculture. He called attention to the fact that in 1877 the Department of Agriculture only expended $4,180 for printing pamphlets.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In 1878.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. In 1878 it was $9,000, and in 1877 it was $4,180. I will give the figures every year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have them here, taken from the Public Accounts.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. The hon. gentleman will find I am correct. I will give the figures for the following years, being desirous of showing the House that the question of agency and information expense was not fairly treated by the hon. gentleman. In 1874, the policy of the gentlemen opposite was to expend a large amount for agency fees and less money for printing. The reverse has been the policy of the Department of Agriculture at present, taking into consideration the enlarged business and constantly developing resources of the country. The following is a statement of the expenditure :

—	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.
Number of immigrants.....	39,373	27,382	25,633	27,082	29,807
	$	$	$	$	$
Agents including expenses.	148,558	117,437	108,937	78,042	66,232
Printing and pamphlets	20,062	9,140	7,087	4,180	9,086
Total	168,620	126,579	116,024	82,222	75,318
Ratio *per capita*....	4·28	4·62	4·52	3·04	2·53

—	1879.	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.
Number of immigrants.	40,492	38,505	47,981	112,458	133,624	103,824
	$	$	$	$	$	$
Agents including expenses.	60,334	62,283	75,212	56,385	71,430	660,153
Printing and pamphlets	7,514	24,382	22,772	39,353	58,693	116,408
To al	67,848	86,664	97,984	95,738	130,123	216,561
Ratio *per capita*....	1.67	2·22	2·04	0·85	0·97	2·08

To'al immigrants reported 626,161
Total cost for agency and information expenditure, 1874 to 1884 ..... $1,263,681

The hon. gentleman will remember that a large number of Delegates came to this country between 1879 and 1884, the total cost for agency and information expenditure, from 1874 to 1884, being $1,263,681 ; he will also find, by making the calculation, that the average paid for information and agency fees between 1874 and 1878 was $3.81 per head. From 1879 to 1884, average paid per head of the immigrants reported was $1.45 ; or, in fact, hon. gentlemen opposite paid more for printing and agency fees than the per head expenditure of this Government for the entire cost of the Department. In 1878, the hon. member for South Perth contended that if we paid $50 a head, as Australia did, we would not be paying too much to get people into the West. He said it was the best investment the Government could make. Hon. gentlemen opposite surely do not mean to say it was not their intention, if they had remained in power, to encourage immigration. They cannot, from the knowledge we have of their public utterances, assert that they did not intend, so soon as business revived, inviting immigration to the country. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) found fault with the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) because he did not held out sufficient inducement to immigrants of a class which came under the head of laborers to come into the country, and he must remember that the reply of the hon. gentleman was that he was not going to induce men to come into this country who would be in a position to compete with the labor of the country. Look at the illogical position in which hon. gentlemen opposite have placed themselves. They say : Keep out the artisan and laborer who competes with the laboring classes here, and, in the next breath, exclaim : Break down the wall of protection, and allow foreign industries to compete with our own industries to the detriment of the labor market of Canada They profess to be the friends of the working classes. They ask that we should have a low duty and make Canada a cheap country to live in, but as a working man in this city once said to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), "it is a splendid idea to make Canada a cheap country to live in, but what is the use of giving us cheap goods, if we have no money to buy them with."

Mr. MILLS. And so you propose to make money out of the public Treasury.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. So far as the artisans are concerned, the hon. member for Bothwell must know that the hon. member for East York promised, before appealing to the country, that so soon as there was a revival of trade, he would do all in his power to open the gates into Canada for all classes of people. The first utterance made in public by the then hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) when Premier, in 1874, was that he would allow the Chinese to come in to compete with Canadian workingmen. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) found fault with the hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) because in 1879, he asserted that he did not

believe the Chinese could mix with our more civilised population to the benefit of such civilisation. Hon. gentlemen opposite profess to be friends of the artisan and the workingman. Take their whole record, which is the best proof. They know that at the very time Mr. Jenkins, commonly known as the Hash-of-all-the-Talents, was agent general, he wrote to this country in 1875, that he had advised artisans not to come to Canada; it afterwards transpired that in 1876 the Government of the Dominion was paying $120 and $150 per night for public halls in Birmingham and Manchester, where lectures were delivered by his officials, inviting the artisan population of those industrial cities to seek a home in Canada, thus competing with the very class who were suffering deprivation consequent upon the policy, or want of policy, of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for South Huron must be aware that even when they got the immigrants here, his political friends then in power paid to send them back again. I find in the official *Debates* that Mr. Masson asked on the 27th February, 1877:

"Notwithstanding the continual reduction in the number of immigrants coming to the country, the expenses remained the same. This was more striking when it was considered that last summer an extraordinary event occurred. Those immigrants whom we had taken so much trouble and spent so much money to bring to Canada were sent back to the country from whence they came by the Government. * * * Under the circumstances, he would like to know how the Government had decided upon giving such a blow to our whole system of immigration as to pay the money to send 230 persons back to the country from whence the came?

"Mr. CARTWRIGHT. The French who had come from France, and over whom the difficulty occurred, were not as desirable a class as possible. A considerable number had to be sent back to Paris.

"Mr. POPE. How many were sent back?

"Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I believe 230 were sent back, the expense being $22 per head, or $5,000 in all. I entirely agree with the hon. member for Terrebonne in what he said, that it was not the business of the Government of Canada to pay for the people coming out here, and then to pay their expenses back if they did not like the country."

I maintain then, that hon. gentlemen opposite are not dealing fairly with the present Administration and are not acting in the interests of Canada by discussing this question in so prejudiced a manner. It is a question in which every Canadian is interested, a question fraught with grave import to the Canadian taxpayers and producers, and should be approached in a less partisan spirit. At this late hour of the morning, I do not desire to lengthen the debate, but, as my hon. friends opposite admit, it is a vital and national question, and one which must be debated not only here but in public; and I shall take the earliest opportunity to make some further statements with reference to it should the opportunity present itself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman who spoke last, and who, I am sorry—because he treated the matter very fairly—did not speak earlier, makes this mistake with regard to the school population, and that is the only matter I am going to allude to. He says that the school population had increased very considerably between 1861 and 1871, but he must remember that, up to that time, a very large proportion of our people had not been able to avail themselves, particularly in Ontario, of the advantages of our school system. Between 1861 and 1871, as I have no doubt those who recollect the country at that time will bear me out in saying, an immense development of our school system took place, so that the nominal increase in the number of children bore no fair proportion to the increase in the population. That is why I pay and paid no attention to the increase between 1861 and 1871. After 1871, the number of schools throughout the country was very nearly as great in proportion to the population as it is now, and from that time out the school statistics, and particularly the registered school statistics, afford a very valuable check on the movement of population.

Mr. KING. The discussion up to the present time has been largely confined to hon. members from Ontario and the North-West, and, lest the hon. Minister should think this is a question in which the people outside of Ontario and the North-West were not concerned, I would claim the indulgence of the House for a few moments. It is not my intention to criticise the policy of the present Government specially with regard to this immigration business, but I desire to point out to you how in my opinion it affects the interests of the Maritime Provinces. It is true that we were not always members of this Confederacy, and it is equally true that prior to our coming into the Union we had, at all events in the Province of New Brunswick, an Immigration Department, and I think I may fairly claim that those who were entrusted with the business of promoting the settlement of the Province of New Brunswick at that time were eminently successful, because, on a reference to the journals of our Local Legislature, we find, in ten consecutive years prior to the Union, we succeeded in inducing 51,000 immigrants to settle in that Province. It is also true that at that period we had not—I believe I am safe in saying—a mile of railway in New Brunswick. Our position was very different from the position which the settler enjoys in the North-West to-day. We had no inducements to offer such as are offered to immigrants going to the North-West. But there is another feature of this business to which I desire to call attention, and that is the small cost as compared with the cost incurred at the present time. I find, on referring to the same journals of the Local Legistature of New Brunswick, that our Immigration Department in New Brunswick was run at a cost, in some years, of about $400 per annum, and further that the item which would be similar in every respect to the item which has been discussed so freely here to-night, that is, the amount expended in the getting up of literature to induce immigration to the country, such as pamphlets, maps, and so forth, is represented in the accounts of that day by the small sum of $30 for advertising, stationery and postage. I have not gone into the calculations very carefully, but I think I am safe in stating that during the past seven years a sum in round numbers approaching to $3,000,000 has been spent in promoting immigration to Canada. The Maritime Provinces contain about one-fifth of the population of Canada, if that be true, our proportion of that $3,000,000 would be about $600,000. I think it would be only fair to ask the question, whose lands are we to-day trying to settle in the North-West? Are we trying to settle the lands which belong to the whole people of Canada? To a certain extent I admit we are, but in a greater measure I believe I may fairly claim that from this time forward our efforts will be in the direction of settling the lands belonging to the railway companies, the colonisation companies, the Hudson's Bay lands, and the lands of speculators in the North-West.

Mr. SPROULE. Such as the member for Huron, with his 13,000 acres.

Mr. KING. I think I am not mistaken in saying that, in promoting lines of railway in that country, we have adopted a system of granting from 10 to 15 square miles of land for every mile of road we build. I do not believe that, in a country where railways are so absolutely essential as they are in the North-West, a mile of railway will do very much more than develop ten or fifteen square miles of land. I do not object to that. I hope we may succeed in developing that North-West country by giving lands to aid in the construction of railways, but I take it for granted that we will have very little land in the North-West to dispose of for cash. It is true that we propose to induce settlers in that country to settle upon the land of the North-West, but I think that largely the class of people we will induce to go into that country will settle upon the free grants. If that be the case, very little money will be returned to the Treasury of the Dominion for lands given

to actual settlers. Then, unless we can dispose of land in the North-West for cash, I fail to see where any greater advantage accrues to the Dominion of Canada by settling an immigrant in the North-West than would accrue by settling the same immigrant in the Province of New Brunswick. We have spent over $100,000,000 already in developing that country, and we had it from the mouth of the hon. the First Minister yesterday in his place in the House that that was a charge against the old Provinces of Canada. Such being the case, I think the Maritime Provinces, containing about one-fifth the population of the Dominion, might fairly claim that they are chargeable with $20,000,000 of that $100,000,000. It is true that we have got some land in the North-West which we did not own until yesterday; we bought yesterday, I believe, 10,000,000 dollars worth of land in the North-West. Now, Sir, I think that is quite enough to expect from the people of the Maritime Provinces for all the direct interest they have in that country. They have contributed their share, something like $2,000,000 of the purchase money of that land which we took back from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I think that is enough, without asking us to contribute our share of the $300,000 or $400,000 expended annually for the purpose of getting settlers into the North-West to settle upon lands belonging to the railway company, and on colonisation land and Hudson Bay lands. It has not been claimed, at all events this Session, that up to the present time the Dominion has received any considerable amount from the sale of lands in the North-West over and above the cost of surveys and management; if that be true, I think our chances for receiving much in the future are very doubtful. I was glad to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries speak on this question to-night, but I regretted that he could not speak as freely, perhaps, as he would have done had he not filled the honorable position he occupies. Of course I understand that in speaking on this question he would not come down to what might be termed parish politics; he speaks, of course, for the whole country. But I think he was unfair in a comparison which he made. He spoke of the Maritime Provinces and particularly New Brunswick, and he said that what was going on there was going on in the States of Maine and Vermont, that there was a large exodus from those States to the western States. Now, I deny that there is any similarity in the two cases.

Mr. FOSTER. I never said so.

Mr. KING. What did the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for South Huron was talking about so few of the immigrants coming to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and I said that if the hon. gentleman was a citizen of either of the New England States, and was talking in the same manner there, he might found a very good text upon which to preach a sermon about the exodus from those States. I made no statement as to whether the population was decreasing or not in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. KING. I am dealing now with the immigration to the Maritime Provinces. I think the hon. member for South Huron pointed out that it would hardly be claimed that there was any considerable number of immigrants coming to the Maritime Provinces, and in answer to that statement I think the Minister made the statement I have just recited, and that it could not be expected that immigration would come into those Provinces any more than into the States of Maine and Vermont.

Mr. FOSTER. Even if I had said so, that is a very different thing from saying that the population was decreasing.

Mr. KING. I think I can prove that the population is decreasing. Now, Sir, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not contend that there is any similarity between the Province of New Brunswick and the States of Vermont and Maine, because he must know that in those States to-day there is not one acre of public land; all the land has passed out of the ownership of the State into the hands of private individuals. In fact, there is but little land fit for agricultural purposes in those States, that is not occupied by settlers. But that state of affairs does not exist in New Brunswick; in that Province there is more good agricultural land waiting for settlers than has been already settled, and the hon. gentleman must know that. Therefore, I say the argument made use of by him will not apply to New Brunswick. As I already stated, at a time when we were able to induce 51,000 settlers to come into New Brunswick in ten years, at a small cost compared with the cost of immigration in Canada to-day, we had not one mile of railway, and to-day we have 1,000 miles of railway. The Province has contributed largely of its resources; in fact we have given away over a million acres of our best land to construct a railway in that Province, yet we have failed to secure immigrants there. There must be a cause for this. Our climate is just as good as it was before Confederation, the portion of our soil that remains unsettled is as good to-day as it was then. Why, then, do we not receive immigrants as we did formerly? I believe that one great cause is that the efforts of this Parliament have been wholly directed towards the settlement of the North-West instead of treating our Provinces fairly. Of course, I am free to admit that some efforts have been made since Confederation, and some assistance was given by this Parliament to the Province of New Brunswick to promote immigration. The effort was partially successful, and in one year we had a good number of immigrants, and many of those who came into that Province have succeeded in making themselves comfortable. But, Sir, it is lamentable to have to admit that the policy of the Government has been the means, even, of taking away a large number of the immigrants whom we induced to settle there. What else could be expected when over the whole Province of New Brunswick, the people are flooded with this very same literature which Canada is paying for to the extent of $100,000 a year? I do not think this country has much to gain by transferring the population from one Province to another. Now, Sir, I have a word to say with regard to this report, and if it be on the whole as incorrect as that part of it with reference to my own Province, I must conclude that it is not very reliable. I am not going to dispute the figures as to the number of immigrants that have arrived in New Brunswick this year. The report gives the number who have settled in each county, but I challenge any member from New Brunswick, outside of one or two counties, to give the names of anything like the number of persons, or to show where the immigrants are in that Province, which are said by this report to have settled there. Of course, I admit there are a few in one or two counties. But there is another feature in this report to which I would call attention. We are told by the immigration agent at St. John, a gentleman who receives $1,000 a year:

"All the manufacturing industries have been visited in the past year, and have done a greater amount of work than they had reason to expect in the beginning of the year. Some are working double time, especially the rope-making industries."

Again he says:

"As for the agricultural interest, the crops being very large, and the prices being maintained, they have reaped a glorious harvest indeed."

Proceeding he says:

"Owing to the continued dulness in the lumber business, as well as in almost all other trades in the Province, we have not done so large and profitable a year's business as in former years."

That is said in the face of other statements I have just read, about the prosperity of the manufacturing industries and the glorious harvest. If there is any sense in a report

of that kind, or if anybody can understand it or know what is meant by it, I fail to be able to do so. It has been said on this side of the House, that there has been a large exodus during the last few years, and the declaration of this opinion has been declared to be unpatriotic and to be decrying the country. If I was to state anything else than the statement I now make, I would make a statement that would not be believed in the Province from which I come. It is well known that a large number of people are leaving our Provinces every year for other parts. It is true that notwithstanding the great efforts made, very few have gone to the North-West. According to the census reports, I find only 245 New Brunswickers there. I regret that, if they are to leave our Province and go out of New Brunswick, they do not go to our North-West, because they would contribute something to the revenue and would benefit the older Provinces in that way. But we are told in this report, that 147 Americans have settled in New Brunswick during the past year. I would like some one to tell me where they are to be found. I have never heard of any such immigration during 1885. In the interest of the Maritime Provinces at all events it is time that this immigration policy was abandoned and all the Provinces placed on a fair footing and allowed to do what they wish in their own way to attract immigrants within their own borders. Let the Canadian Pacific Railway look after their interests in the North-West; let New Brunswick look after its own interest. But do not tax the Maritime Provinces to the extent they have been taxed ever since Confederation to bring in immigrants which the Government have wholly failed to retain. I need not repeat what has been said to night, and yet I may fairly say that so far as regards the settlement of the North-West the Government's policy has been an utter failure. That has not been denied; in fact it has been admitted by hon. gentleman opposite that up to the present time the policy has failed to secure the settlement of that territory. If so, what have the Maritime Provinces to show for their proportion of the expenditure? Nothing. It has been said that 23,000 have settled in the North-West, outside of Manitoba. Hon. gentlemen are mistaken who attribute that meagre result wholly to the immigration policy of the Government, because the census shows that 50 per cent. of these people have been drawn from the older Provinces. In the interest of the Maritime Provinces this policy of taxing the people for immigration to the North-West should be abandoned.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the reason why we are not receiving that fair share of immigrants to which we are entitled is due to the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite make statements in this House and outside of this House, and the press representing them give those statements publicity, which have been used to the detriment of the interests of Canada. I observe by the Brockville *Recorder* that the member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) made this statement in a speech delivered at Brockville on Monday night. He said:

"We got the National Policy and we challenge any man to point out one single industry in Canada that did not exist before the National Policy."

What inference can be drawn from such a statement? The American immigration agents will say: That is a statement made by a member of Parliament. The statement of that hon. gentleman is endorsed by no less a personage than the Hon. C. F. Fraser, who in winding up the meeting said he had listened to two of the most effective political speeches he had ever listened to. The American immigration agents would refer to the fact that the hon. member for Brant made that statement and was cheered in the statement, that we had had the National Policy for eight years and the industries of Canada are in just the same position as they were eight years ago; and the agent would say: What is the use of sending emigrants there, they had better go to the United States. That is the only deduction that can be drawn, and that is the principal reason why we are not receiving more immigrants into this country.

Mr. FAIRBANK. While not holding the Minister of Agriculture responsible for all the main errors of the past and wishing him success in the new department which has fallen into his hands, I have a suggestion or two to make. I will not for a moment either now or at any time deign to answer the constantly repeated allegations from the other side of the House by which they are claiming all the loyalty, all the interest in this country, all the patriotism and everything of that kind, claiming to be the owners of this country and the rest of us tenants at will. But there is one point to which I wish to call the attention of the Minister, and that is to this so-called immigration literature. I believe that not only is it not being beneficial but that it is painfully injurious to all the older Provinces at least. The hon. member for King's N.B. (Mr. King) has referred to the flooding of his Province with this literature. I will not just now trouble the Minister with the question as to what proportion is sent to foreign countries and what distributed at home, but the older Provinces have been and are being constantly flooded with this immigration literature, the effect of which is not to produce immigration but to some extent migration. I believe it works largely in this way: we all know that literature which does not speak highly of the western country will not be entertained by the Department. Every country has its advantages and its drawbacks, and when you have pictured only the bright side of a country the effect is to create a state of unrest. When this idea has taken hold of the people the first result is to decide to go. The next question is where to go. In too many instances the people do not go to our own Territory. I believe this literature being distributed throughout the older Provinces has been one of the most productive sources of sending Canadian people to the United States, and I hope the Minister will consider this matter of sufficient importance to investigate its effects in that direction, and if this literature is to be continued to any extent it should be sent to foreign countries instead of being distributed at home. I have myself seen cart loads, I think car-loads distributed in Ontario alone, and this distribution is not confined to party by any means. When you consider the number who were interested in colonisation schemes, when you consider the number who are interested in the colonisation companies, in railway schemes and the efforts they make, not to bring population not from the Old Country or from the United States, but from the older Provinces, we need not wonder that in many sections of Ontario the result of this has been to depreciate the value of real estate 25 per cent.

An hon. MEMBER. It is not true.

Mr. FAIRBANK. It certainly is. I grant hon. gentlemen that real estate is now recovering, but at the time it did depreciate to that extent, and some portions of the very garden of Ontario were retarded to a very great extent. Now, Sir, I am not speaking of anything that hon. gentlemen do not know. They know perfectly well the extent to which the exodus from Ontario prevailed some time ago. They know the nature and character of that exodus. I maintain that on the continent of America, or upon any other continent, you could not find a finer class of men, or even as fine a class of men, as those who were taken from Ontario, ostensibly to the North-West, although I believe the majority of them were lost to us. The wheel was set in motion largely by this literature, and it continued to roll, and it did not land in our own country but in another nation. I am glad to hear from the Minister that assisted immigration is almost discontinued, and that probably it will be discontinued altogether. It is of the highest importance what kind of seed you seed down a new country with, and

we do not want the sweepings of other lands. Too much attention cannot be paid to the character of the immigrants who are induced to come to this new land. There is, however, a branch of assisted immigration which I think might be instituted with beneficial results. A gentleman connected with one of the churches in the west assured me some time ago that, in connection with that church alone, there were at least 3,000 wives wanted in the North-West. You will remember that in the early settlement of the old Dominion of Virginia there was felt that same want—the want of wives. So keenly was this felt that they offered inducements to supply this want. The current price for a wife at that time was, in the first place fifty pounds of tobacco; subsequently they were in such demand that the price rose to 100 pounds, and to-day many of those proud F.F.V's. can trace their origin to a wife purchased for from fifty to 100 pounds of tobacco. I think if we could introduce that kind of immigration we should assist it. As we are not raising tobacco, I would suggest that we should take wheat; say 100 bushels, for each immigrant of that kind. I think it would largely increase the production of wheat, as well as increase the population of the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have waited for some time for an opportunity to address the House. I am sorry the debate has taken so wide a range. We expected that we would have an opportunity of dealing with the money granted to the different printing and publishing companies for the last year through the Immigration Department. I believe myself that the statement furnished by the Immigration Department is largely overdrawn, in order, if possible, to cover up their sins in the way of dividing up printing which passed through that Department to the different printing journals and companies throughout the Dominion. Now when the Minister of the Interior arose to reply to some remarks from this side, he stated that the Government who were once in power, under the *régime* of Mr. Mackenzie, had given to a member of this House the sum of $1,400 of money belonging to this Dominion. Now, I am sorry that the gentleman to whom the Minister referred is not here, if he was the hon. gentleman would not have ventured to make that statement. I am sorry that the Minister should not guard his words more carefully than to make a statement of this kind, which, if he does not know it is untrue, he ought to know is untrue. The facts are these, that the money owed by the gentleman referred to was owed for dues upon timber which was cut. The hon. gentleman who spoke referred to the statement of the First Minister. Now if he will take the trouble to enquire of Mr. Vankoughnet, who is in charge of that Department, and is a political friend of his own, he would tell him that there is not a single farthing due that he was not paid.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am making an explanation with regard to what the Minister of Interior said.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The CHAIRMAN. You have no right whatever. Confine yourself to the question.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, if you so rule, I have no right to refer to it, but I will take another opportunity to do so.

An hon. MEMBER. Take a rest.

Mr. McMULLEN. Some three years ago I moved in this House for a return showing the amount which had been paid to the different printing and publishing companies of this Dominion through the Agricultural Department since 1880. The Minister of Public Works amended my motion by making it from 1874. And, though I have asked for it a dozen times, that report has not been brought down, and consequently that information has not been furnished. Now, I say that this system of dividing up amongst the different printing and publishing companies the money which is divided amongst them, is a gross wrong and a gross fraud on the people of this Dominion; and I say that Parliament has no right to consent to it, and that it is done for political purposes undoubtedly. When we had the question of timber limits before the House the other night, we found the Minister of the Interior getting up and defending the unprotected heads of hon. gentlemen opposite, and no doubt he is well paid for it, he having no doubt an interest in the Montreal *Gazette*, as he admitted in reply to the hon. gentleman in front of me. The hon. member for South Huron said that the Montreal *Gazette* got $19,000. The Minister of the Interior said that there was $5,000 included in that sum for some other work leaving $14,000 which he admits the *Gazette* got from the funds of this Dominion for which no tender was put in, and for simply supplying the ink and the men to set the type. He did not even supply the paper. In addition to that, he gets his allowance as a Minister of the Crown and sessional allowances, $8,000, make $22,000, which he draws of the money of this country. He can well afford to stand up and defend hon. gentlemen around him, and I admit that he is an able advocate. I admit that he is a desirable man for hon. gentlemen opposite to have in this House, because, when we find hon. gentlemen from the beginning to the end, from the top to bottom, from the First Minister down to the last joint in the tail of the whole party, are implicated in the same way in timber limits and political plunder, it is an advantage to have a man of his stamp to defend them. Now, I say it is a gross wrong on the people of this Dominion to take the money that is collected from them, and divide it up among the different printing companies composed of friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. This is an important question, and we have not had half enough of time to consider it. We simply wish to wake the country up to the way the people's money is being thrown away; we want to show them into whose pockets it is going; we want to show them that members on the other side of the House are largely responsible for the increase in the annual expenditure, and that the moneys levied on the working classes of this country, on the goods they consume, are divided amongst the followers of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. HESSON. As the hon. gentleman is in trade, I would ask him a fair question. Does he say that the people are paying more for their goods now than they were seven or eight years ago?

Mr. McMULLEN. The best evidence we have whether the people are paying more for their goods or not is that to-day all the smuggling that is done is done from the American side into Canada, whereas seven years ago the smuggling was out of Canada to the United States. It was stated to-night that the taxes *per capita* are not as great in Canada as they are in the United States. I was surprised to hear an hon. gentleman make that statement after the statement of the Minister of the Interior in the debate on the Budget, in which he admitted that the *per capita* tax of the people of this Dominion was a little in excess of the *per capita* tax of the people of the United States, and the *per capita* debt of Canada was a little in excess of the *per capita* debt of the United States. I am sorry we are so far advanced in the night, because I would like to have offered some lengthened remarks on this subject. I know that in a short time hon. gentlemen are going to the country, and we cannot do better than show them their corruption before they go, and how public money is being handed from pocket to pocket; but when a charge is made against a member of Parliament we find that every gentleman on that side of the House gets up to defend him. I want to prevent expenditures of this

kind, because our people cannot afford them. Some remarks were made with regard to agricultural implements being cheaper in the North-West than they were during the time of the Mackenzie Administration. I am sorry to say there have been a large number of agricultural implements sent up there by different manufacturing companies, and they have been sacrificed. I know some who have sent up implements and suffered serious loss by doing so; implements which they have been compelled to sell for less than they were worth.

Mr. COCHRANE. How many bunches of pamphlets did you send to your constituency?

Mr. McMULLEN. I have tried to make the best use of anything I could get around. Anything I have found that would be of interest to them I have sent. I believe our whole immigration policy has been wrong. I believe we should cut down this item more than one-half.

Quarantine expenses..... $77,966 00

Mr. LANGELIER. I wish to call attention to a very important matter. I received a letter to-day of a very serious character as to something which took place a short time ago. A steamer was allowed to pass through Quebec to Montreal, which had had a case of small-pox on board, without disinfection having taken place. I do not know whether it was due to oversight or to a defect in the system adopted, but it is a very serious matter. After the experience we have had in Montreal, most severe precautions should be taken to prevent the re-introduction of small-pox.

Mr. CARLING. Every precaution is taken. A medical gentleman at Rimouski is ordered to inspect the ship before she goes to Quebec, and the medical officer at Quebec also inspects and reports. My attention has been called to the matter, and every precaution will be taken to prevent anything of the kind occurring again.

Mr. LANGELIER. Has any explanation been given of the fact that she was allowed to go to Montreal without being disinfected.

Mr. CARLING. Every precaution is taken, but naturally some oversight has taken place on the part of one of the Government officers, either through mistake as to the nature of the disease or from want of paying sufficient attention, but the matter is being looked into.

Mr. BAIN. Will the hon. gentleman specify what is to be done with the vote to meet expenses for precautionary measures for public health?

Mr. CARLING. It is to take precautionary measures whenever the Government thinks necessary. I cannot say anything more without going into particulars. They consist to a large extent in inspecting vessels at the different ports, and last year there was an expenditure in connection with the outbreak of disease in the Eastern Townships.

Mr. BAIN. There is a special vote afterwards of $12,000 for cattle disease.

Mr. CARLING. That is for cattle quarantine at Halifax, Quebec and Sarnia.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I notice an item for 5,000 copies of Couture's pamphlets, $2,500, on which $1,000 has been paid on account. What is that for?

Mr. CARLING. That was paid for a pamphlet on the diseases of animals.

Mr. WILSON. There are $400 paid Mr. Playter for pamphlets. What is done with these pamphlets?

Mr. CARLING. They are distributed to the medical profession all over the country, and to the sanitary officers.

Mr. WILSON. There are travelling expenses for Dr. Covernton, $122.25 and $104 for services. What were these?

Mr. CARLING. Dr. Covernton was sent to the United States to a health convention held at St. Louis. He was sent by the Government, as it was necessary Canada should be represented at the convention, and his visit will be productive of much benefit.

Mr. WILSON. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken in reference to that, because the wages and time occupied in attending the convention could hardly have anything to do with the matter he referred to. It was in 1884-85. That was not last summer.

Mr. CARLING. I am only referring to last summer. I am not in a position to explain just now what that was for in 1884.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). It appears as if there was a number of rather miscellaneous items congregated under this head. For instance there is J. Fletcher, Library of Parliament, on account of travelling expenses to British Columbia, $300.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How is that a precautionary measure for the public health?

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Then there is J. L. R. Archambault, aid to a French sanitary journal, $400. I understand that, as far as the Minister is personally concerned, these are items not within his personal knowledge, but I think it will strike him and every other member of the committee that these are peculiar items, to say the least, to be passed under the head of precautionary measures for public health. They require some explanation. I think there is a large field for improvement in adjusting our accounts. For instance, there is Dr. Coleman, for services in investigating cattle disease, when we have a separate vote for that purpose. I think this wants readjustment in some form.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It will be apparent that the purpose for which this vote is given is comparatively a small amount of the entire sum. The statistical officers who are paid out of this vote, and for the organisation of whom the vote was originally placed in the Estimates, only received $2,366 out of the entire sum of $9,412 spent last year. The rest has been largely spent in travelling expenses and such other items as these. It does not appear to me how the public health has been served by many of the items which appear here, and, while the Department very justly pay a very fair amount of attention to this and benefit the public proportionately, yet these items do not disclose any satisfactory reason to account for the expenditure as it has been made. I would be glad to see the Department give every attention possible to health statistics. They are attaining an added value every year, but it is only a small proportion of the entire vote expended, and, while we may be very glad to see 400 copies of the *Sanitary Journal* bought, we may still think that a large sum to pay, and that, while we pay only $116 as twelve months' salary of a statistical officer, we pay another officer $228 for attending a health convention for eight days.

Mr. FISHER. A moment ago, in explaining the expenses of last year, the Minister spoke about an outbreak of some cattle disease in the Eastern Townships. What did he mean by that?

Mr. CARLING. I think the chief expense was caused by the breaking out of a swine disease in the county of Huntingdon.

Cattle quarantine, Province of Quebec..... $5,000 00

Mr. FISHER. I would call the Minister's attention to the hardship under which a large portion of the Province

of Quebec labors in regard to this question of cattle quarantine. I dare say that the Minister is aware that we are frequently desirous of buying thoroughbred stock in the United States for the purpose of improving our own stock; and that such stock has to come through the port of Sarnia where the cattle undergo quarantine. Now, I know of cases where farmers in the Eastern Townships have desired to buy cattle, the owners of which lived within 30 miles of their homesteads, but on the other side of the line, and they were prevented from doing so because they would have had to send these cattle to Sarnia to be quarantined, and bring them back again. In consequence of this expense the people are either debarred from improving their stock by the importation of cattle, or they will smuggle these cattle in. Now, the result of smuggling cattle may be very serious. Our cattle quarantine here enables us to send our cattle to England under favorable conditions, but if there is any danger of diseased cattle being imported into our country it would seriously affect our cattle trade in England. In point of fact, there is a danger that large numbers of cattle may now be smuggled into the country, and consequently there is a danger of introducing diseased cattle. In the New England States there is a large number of thoroughbred cattle, and the interchange between those States and the Eastern Provinces would be of great advantage to the people on both sides of the line. Therefore, I draw the attention of the Minister to the desirability of making some arrangement by which cattle might be brought across from the New England States without having to go so far west to be quarantined. Last winter I was informed at the office of the medical inspector at Montreal, Dr. McEachran, that it was thought possible to make some arrangement by which cattle would be taken in bond to the station in Quebec, and there go through quarantine. I asked him to enquire if that could be accomplished, and I understood there was no means by which it could be done. I think some such arrangement could be made, and I have good grounds for saying that it would be easy and cheap to establish a small quarantine station on the New England border, by which cattle could be brought in at small expense. It could be entirely managed from the head office in Montreal, and would be a great advantage to the people of the Eastern Townships.

Mr. CARLING. The advantage we have in shipping cattle to England at the present time is very great, and if the present arrangement was interfered with, our trade would suffer. The arrangement with the Imperial Government is that all cattle brought into the country for breeding purposes shall be quarantined at Sarnia, giving us the privilege of sending our cattle to England without being slaughtered on their arrival. Of course, if any such arrangement could be made as suggested, I should be very glad to carry it out, if it did not interfere with the arrangement we have with the Imperial Government.

Mr. FISHER. Is there an arrangement between our Government and the Imperial Government that all cattle brought from the United States must be quarantined at Sarnia, and at no other place?

Mr. CARLING. Yes; so far as the older Provinces are concerned.

Mr. FISHER. I think it is an extraordinary thing that the Imperial Government should dictate to our Government where we shall place our quarantine stations. Do I understand the Minister that the Imperial Government has distinctly ordered that the Canadian Government shall have no quarantine stations between this country and the United States, except at Sarnia?

Mr. CARLING. Yes, in the older Provinces. They have prohibited us from importing from the United States unless quarantined at Sarnia.

Mr. FISHER. I must say I think that is a very unreasonable proposition on the part of the Imperial Government, and I think it is an undue interference with the internal economy of this country. What does it matter to the Imperial Government whether we have a quarantine station in one place or another, so long as our cattle are quarantined, and that no diseased cattle are allowed to come across the border? It does not matter one whit to the Imperial Government whether we string stations all along our border, provided that American cattle coming into this country are properly quarantined. I have been informed by Dr. McEachran's staff that cattle can now be brought in from the United States to the port of Quebec, and be quarantined there, only that would be a very inconvenient way to bring them in. I believe also that cattle are also brought into this country west of Sarnia. I think in Manitoba there is a quarantine station where cattle are brought in from the United States to this country, and I think there is a regulation by which cattle have been allowed to come in west of Emerson.

Mr. CARLING. Not for shipping purposes.

Mr. FISHER. At no time?

Mr. CARLING. Not since this arrangement was made with the Imperial Government.

Mr. FISHER. When was that arrangement made with the Imperial Government?

Mr. CARLING. Some five or six years ago.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the Minister whether there was not an Order in Council issued a year or two ago by which cattle might be brought from the United States into the western ranching country?

Mr. CARLING. I think there was.

Mr. FISHER. Did not that interfere with the Imperial edict that no cattle should be brought in except at Sarnia?

Mr. CARLING. That was a special arrangement for ranching purposes.

Mr. FISHER. Was that arrangement made with the Imperial Government?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. BOWELL. They are not allowed to come east.

Mr. FISHER. How can they be prevented from coming east? Is there any cordon drawn between the western ranching country and the east?

Mr. CARLING. The arrangement was that cattle should not be brought into the older Provinces. If we were willing to have our cattle scheduled, as the American cattle are, we could bring them in at any point.

Mr. FISHER. No one suggests that.

Mr. BOWELL. You are.

Mr. CARLING. The arrangement for the older Provinces was that they should only come in at that one point, and that for breeding purposes only, and should be quarantined at Sarnia. The regulations with regard to the North-West, made by an Order in Council, had special reference to ranching purposes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend's position is clear enough. He says there is danger to our cattle trade from cattle crossing in the Eastern Townships, where, as everyone knows, the boundary line is only an imaginary

one. It would be a very grave thing if any disease should be introduced into the country in that way, and, if that is the case, I think a report should be made to the Imperial Government representing that in their interests and our own, a quarantine station should be established there between Canada and the United States.

Mr. BOWELL. No cattle are allowed to come in there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend says you cannot prevent it.

Mr. BOWELL. No quarantining will stop that. If a man owns a farm on the border, with one-half in Canada and the other half in the United States, no regulations establishing quarantine stations would prevent the cattle from grazing across the line. Every precaution is taken that is possible, by every custom house officer along the eastern frontier, to prevent cattle coming from any portion of the United States and across the line. If they do cross, they are seized for smuggling; and, if they are imported and it is discovered, they are seized and the owners compelled to take them back, or have them slaughtered. The tendency of the arguments advanced by the hon. gentleman from Brome (Mr. Fisher) would be very much to alarm the Imperial authorities and the parties who are interested in England in preventing the spread of cattle disease. I do not say the hon. gentleman does it with that intention, but, when he reflects upon the sensitiveness with which this subject is treated in England, and reflects on the great difficulty which we had, and that it was only by the exertion and determination and push which have always characterised our High Commissioner, that Canadian cattle were prevented from being scheduled, by which we should have lost millions of dollars a year, I think he will come to the conclusion that we should deal with this subject as gingerly and as tenderly as possible; for those who have paid any attention to it know that the agriculturists of England are very sensitive on this point, that in every single instance, not only in their agricultural societies, in their boards of trade, but in the Imperial Parliament, the special representatives of that class of the community have not only taken every precaution, but have advocated the schedule of Canadian cattle and placing them in the same position as those of the United States, and those that are brought from the steppes of Russia, where the cattle disease exists to a very great extent. I do not take the same view, nor do I believe do those interested in this very important trade to Canada, as does the hon. member for Brome. If the Imperial Government say to us: If you adopt such and such regulations in Canada to prevent the spread of disease, which is supposed to exist and does exist in some parts of the United States, we will not place you in the same disadvantageous position as that in which we place the people of the United States and other countries in which the disease exists. I think the least we can do is to acquiesce in the request made by that Government, particularly when our pecuniary interests are so great as they are at present. I know the Minister of Agriculture, the predecessor of my hon. colleague who now occupies that important position, when urged to establish a quarantine station at Halifax for the Maritime Provinces, so that the people could import the same class of cattle as are imported by way of Quebec, that right was refused to those Provinces, and refused for no other reason than because to reverse what the Government had done would be to interfere with the advantages we now possess as an integral part of the British Empire. When we export large numbers of cattle it is with the belief and knowledge in England that disease does not exist in Canada. But so cautious must we be in acting upon their suggestion so as to prevent the introduction of cattle from countries where disease is supposed to exist, that every precaution is to be taken, and the people of the Maritime Provinces have been put to some disadvantage, as have the people of Ontario, by not being able to import American cattle without sending them to Sarnia or Quebec; and I am glad to know that when the reason was given to the people of the Maritime Provinces, that it was in consequence of the regulations entered into with the English Government, they not only gracefully but gladly acquiesced in the policy adopted and carried out by the Dominion Government.

Mr. FISHER. No one is more anxious than I am to see our cattle healthy and free from disease. No one understands the importance of this more than I do, and what I have said to-night has been entirely and wholly for the purpose of trying to perfect arrangements which will tend to prevent disease coming in from the United States. The reason I wish some such arrangements as I have suggested made is because, in consequence of the absence of some such arrangement, cattle may come from a country where there is danger of disease. The Minister of Customs has said that if such an arrangement were made, it would still not prevent cattle strolling across the line. I know people can go over the line and bring back cattle, and those individuals would be perfectly willing to quarantine them if it could be done within a reasonable distance and at a moderate expense, but it is too costly to send cattle round by Sarnia. The result of the absence of such an arrangement is that there is danger of our cattle becoming diseased. I am not aware that any disease has been introduced; but there is danger, and I desire to ascertain if the Government are taking steps to make arrangements by which our people will be able to bring in and quarantine cattle without going such a long distance. I do not believe the British Government is so unreasonable as to prevent cattle being brought in by any other station except the one station, provided they are properly quarantined. The English Government is right in providing that cattle shall not be brought in here without being quarantined and passing through a probationary period of three months; but it does not matter whether they are quarantined in Sarnia or Quebec or the Maritime Provinces or anywhere else. I am very much surprised to learn that it is in the agreement with the English Government that cattle coming into this country from the United States must be quarantined at Sarnia and nowhere else, and I hope the Minister will take steps to have some change made.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). In looking up last year's reports of the expenditure under this head it appears there is a quarantine station at Emerson, which I presume applies to Manitoba. In addition, we paid Dr. McEachran fifty-one days attendance inspecting cattle entered for the North-West Territories. So I presume there is some other process west of Emerson by which stock gets across the border. I am not finding fault with the arrangement, but it is patent such an arrangement exists.

Mr. WATSON. I understand the quarantine is principally for shippers by the Canadian Pacific Railway through Montana to Chicago.

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. WATSON. Are those cattle quarantined?

Mr. CARLING. They are inspected.

Mr. WATSON. Are they allowed to be unloaded off the cars before they cross the boundary line at Emerson?

Mr. CARLING. No, I believe not.

Mr. BOWELL. There is an arrangement with the cognisance of the Imperial Government by which western

cattle are allowed to pass from Sarnia to Portland under certain regulations, and the same applies to the western States.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With respect to the item of $10,000 to meet possible expenses for sheep-scab and cattle disease, perhaps the Minister will say if this is to be used in payment of some just claims that are presented for cattle slaughtered under the provisions of the Act. I mentioned the case of some hogs that were slaughtered, and I believe there was a considerable number in the county of Essex. Will this apply to such cases?

Mr. CARLING. It will apply to such cases, and the Department are now enquiring into them.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). This item for immigrant patients in Winnipeg and St. Boniface hospitals is new. We should have some explanation.

Mr. CARLING. It is the same as last year, only it was then down in the Supplementary Estimates. We thought it better to put it in the main Estimates.

Committee rose and reported.

RETURN ORDERED.

Correspondence and statement showing what is the sum claimed by each of the counsel employed by the Crown in the trials resulting from the North-West troubles in 1885, and the amount paid to each of them —(Mr. Langelier.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 3 o'clock, a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 20th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

TIMBER DUES OF MR. HERMAN H. COOK.

Mr. TAYLOR. In answer to a question which I asked yesterday, the right hon. the First Minister made a statement which I think reflects seriously against two hon. members of this House. One, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), ex-Minister of the Interior, in his dealings with the revenues of this country; and the other, the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook), in his dealings with the Department of the Interior. The question I asked was as follows:—

"Was any sum, and if so, how much, due to the Government or the Indian Department by Mr. Herman Cook, as dues for timber cut on Indian lands in the Georgian Bay, during the years 1872-73? Did Mr. Cook pay such indebtedness? and if so, in what sums and at what dates? If Mr Cook has not paid these dues, why not? Whether the said claim still remains unpaid or unsettled, and if not, when, and under what circumstances was any settlement thereof made, and what were the terms and conditions of any such settlement?"

To which Sir John A. Macdonald replied:

"This is the answer furnished by the Department:

"Mr. H. H. Cook, in 1870, acquired a timber license to cut pine and oak trees on the following islands in Georgian Bay: Christian, Hope, Beckwith, Giant's Tomb and Beausoliel. In the season of 1872-73 he cut a quantity of pine on these islands, the dues on which amounted to $3,879.95; on October 1, 1873, he paid cash $2,079.95, and gave a bond for the balance, $1,800.00, bearing interest at 6 per cent. He was called upon several times to pay the bond and interest thereon, but failed to do so. In July, 1875, he wrote to the Superintendent General (Mr. Laird), asking for a renewal of the bond, owing to the dulness of the lumber trade. On the 7th July the order to renew the bond was given by Mr. Laird. On February 3rd, 1877, Mr. Cook wrote to the Department, enclosing a statement showing that the men employed by him to measure the pine timber in 1872-73, had made an over-return of 927,017 feet, the dues on which amounted to $1,486.24. Nothing appears to have been done in the matter until 1st October, 1878, when the remission was made by Mr. Mills of the above sum, $1,486.24, and interest thereon, from the date of the bond, 1st October, 1873, five years, in accordance with a declaration of William Telfer, Mr. Cook's bookkeeper at Toronto. On the 2nd October, Mr. Cook paid to Mr. Mills the sum of $313.76, and interest, which, together with the amount remitted, made up the amount of bond $1,800."

I may say that, in justice to these hon. gentlemen, I think the matter should be investigated, and as the Session is so near its close I ask the permission of the House to move the following resolution:—

That the matter of the indebtedness of Mr. Herman H. Cook as dues for timber cut on Indian Reserves on a certain island in Georgian Bay in 1872 and 1873, and the remission of $1,486.24, together with interest thereon, be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me, although there can be no objection, if the hon. gentleman has any charge to make against my hon. friend that it should be investigated in a proper shape, that we have never referred to the Committee on Public Accounts anything which does not appear in some volume or other of the Public Accounts. I do not understand that this item did appear in any item of the Public Accounts that I know of.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an item in the Public Accounts referring to the matter, but I will ask to refer it to a special committee if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know whether the matter appears in the Public Accounts or not. I did not speak when the motion was being put, as I thought the hon. gentleman to whom it refers might wish to say something, but it occurs to me that there is a statement of the facts as furnished to me by the Department when I sent the question for an answer. There is the whole thing, and I do not know that we have anything to enquire about. There are the facts. I think, on the point that has been taken, in the first place, that it does not appear in the Public Accounts, and, in the second place, that the whole facts are there, and there is really nothing for the committee to enquire about. My hon. friend should withdraw his motion.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). This is rather a nice way to get along I must say. When a charge was made against me, when I put money into the public treasury instead of taking it out, no person asked that it should be withdrawn. There is just that difference: that I put money into the public treasury and the hon. gentleman took money out of the public treasury. I brought money into the public treasury with the consent of the Minister, and this money has been taken out with the consent of the Minister. Is that not to be investigated? Let us have fair play on both sides. There is a matter of about $2,000, and while I have not an unkind word to say against the hon. gentleman, against whom the charge is made, I say we should have fair play on both sides. Why is it that day after day I should be racked before the people of this country in the newspapers of hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially by the editor of the *Globe* newspaper, if a matter such as this before us should not be investigated? Now, I say this is a matter which a committee should investigate. Let it go before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and let us have these matters all cleaned up. I hope the hon. gentleman will not withdraw this motion.

Motion agreed to.

LAND GRANTS TO MILITIA.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the militia force on active service in the North-West. He said: I may say that the object of this Bill is to extend somewhat the privileges with respect to scrip and land warrants to persons who were engaged in the service in the suppression of the outbreak last year. It proposes to enlarge the class to whom grants of land are to

be made, so as to include certain of the irregulars who were actually engaged—to scouts who were actually engaged, to men engaged on the *Northcote* or other steamers which were actually in action, to persons regularly appointed to the medical staff, to nurses in the hospitals, where they have been recommended by the Major General commanding the forces for special services. It also proposes to extend these privileges to members of the force who left home but were invalided before reaching Port Arthur, and were compelled to return. It also proposes to allow volunteers who are now homesteaded in the North-West to apply their land warrants on their homesteads. It also proposes, in the case of certain members of the permanent force, such as "A" and "B" batteries and the military schools, for themselves, but not for substitutes, to extend the time in which they may enter for their land to six months after their term of service expires.

Mr. GAULT. I should like to ask the Minister of the Interior if the telegraph operators are included. Many of them went up to the North-West at the risk of their lives, as well as the volunteers.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). They are not included.

Mr. BLAKE. It appears, from the explanation of the hon. gentleman, that provision is being made for the alienation of a large additional portion of the public domain; large numbers of persons are to receive grants who are not now entitled to receive them. Therefore, I would ask whether the Bill should not be preceded by a resolution in committee?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will consent that I should now move that the House resolve itself into committee on the resolution to-morrow.

Motion for leave to introduce Bill withdrawn, and motion for the House to go into committee, to-morrow, agreed to.

SIXTH REPORT OF PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. BERGIN moved:

That the sixth report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament be adopted.

He said: Mr. Mortimer, the contractor for the binding, asked the committee for an increase in consequence of the increased size of the volumes. At first each volume was about 600 pages, and last year it was over 1,000 pages. The committee, after investigating the matter, came to the conclusion that an addition of 5 cents per volume should be allowed to Mr. Mortimer, and it was understood that that should be in full of all claims for the past, and from this period until the expiration of the contract.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to refer to a matter which indirectly brings my own veracity into question. In the debate on the timber limit question on the 4th of the present month, the hon. member from Montreal West (Mr. Gault) denied having made any application. In the *Hansard* report I find the following:—

"Mr. GAULT. No, Sir, my name is found nowhere on the books.

"Mr. CHARLTON. This is taken from the Sessional Papers of 1883, Volume 16, No. 12, Return No. 84.

"Mr. GAULT. I never spent one cent, and had nothing to do with any territory in the North-West."

In addition to the application for colonisation lands referred to then, the hon. gentleman's general denial of having anything to do with applications, covered my statement that he had applied for friends for coal limits. I have looked over the returns, and I find the following:—

"OTTAWA, September 19th, 1882.

"SIR,—I have the honor, by direction of the Minister of the Interior, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 7th instant, the application of Mr. G. W. Smett for the west half of section 16, township 3, range 8; and beg to reply that it will be submitted to the Minister.

"I have, &c.,
"A. RUSSELL,
"For Surveyor General.

"M. H. GAULT, Esq., Montreal."

I also find the following:—

"MONTREAL, Sept., 1882.

"Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,
"Minister of the Interior, Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—Some friends of mine here, Messrs. Kane, Scott, Iles, have applied to the Department for leases of land in township 3, range 8, west of 2nd C. M., and the favorable consideration of their application would very much oblige,

"Yours faithfully,
"M. H. GAULT."

Mr. GAULT. I think I should reply that I myself personally never applied for any. I have lots of favors to ask for my constituents, but not one for myself. I never asked a favor from any man living for myself, and never will.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman was not charged in my statement with having made application for himself, but he denied having had anything to do with lands in the North-West, or having made any application.

NORTH-WEST CLAIMS COMMISSION.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask when we are likely to have laid on the Table the report of the board appointed to enquire into the North-West land claims?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). One return on that subject has gone down to the Senate to-day. The investigation is still going on. I believe to-day or to-morrow the commission leave Prince Albert, where they have been engaged in settling claims, and they are now going westward to Battleford and Edmonton to continue their investigation.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire to enquire when we will have the report of the War Claims Commission. The Minister of Militia last Friday promised it in a day or two. The question has been asked once or twice this week, and the last time the Minister of Militia was out of the House, but the Minister of Public Works promised to see that the Minister answered it or asked to have the question renewed, I am not sure which.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understood from my colleague, the Minister of Militia, that he expected the report either last night or this morning. I have not seen him since.

FISHING BY FOREIGN VESSELS IN CANADIAN WATERS.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 136) further to amend the Act respecting fishing by foreign vessels. He said: I have no further explanations to offer than those I gave the other day. The Bill is to amend the third section of our present law. The present law provides, with reference to any ship, vessel or boat, within any harbor of Canada, or hovering, in British waters, within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors of Canada, that:

"If such ship, vessel or boat be foreign, or not navigated according to the laws of the United Kingdom or of Canada, and has been found fishing, or preparing to fish, or to have been fishing (in British waters), within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors of Canada not included within the above-mentioned limits, without a license, or after the expiration of the period named in the last license granted to such ship, vessel or boat under the first section of this Act, such ship, vessel or boat, and the tackle, rigging, apparel, furniture, stores and cargo thereof, shall be forfeited."

By the convention of 1818 United States fishermen were prevented entering our ports, harbors, creeks, &c., for any

but the four purposes of shelter, repairs, obtaining wood, and obtaining water, and the Imperial Act of 1819 was based upon that treaty, as will be seen by section 3 of that Act, which provides that United States fishermen can enter only for these four purposes I have mentioned, and for none others. In the Dominion Fisheries Act the penalty of forfeiture is inflicted only in cases where vessels are found fishing, or preparing to fish, or having fished, and there is no penalty provided to cover other infractions of the treaty which would come under the term "and for no other purposes." It is proposed, therefore, after the word "Act" in the thirty-first line of the third section of this amending Bill, to add the following words:—

"Or has entered such waters for any purpose not permitted by the law of nations, or by treaty or convention, or by any law of the United Kingdom or Canada in force at the time being, or, having entered such waters, has failed to comply with any such law of the United Kingdom or Canada."

The penalty of forfeiture therefore will be provided in the case of United States fishing vessels which come into Canadian waters for any other purpose than for shelter, repairs, wood and water. It is thought necessary, to complete the protection of our fisheries and carry out the express terms of the convention of 1818, that this be added.

Mr. WELDON. The first portion of the section is simply the same provision as is contained in the Act of George III, and also in the Statutes of the different Provinces, which it is proposed to repeal, but a difficulty has been suggested, and which the hon. gentleman proposes to remedy by sub-section (*b*). My hon. friend wishes to obtain power to enforce, under penalties of forfeiture, the provisions of the treaty of 1818, and of the Act 9 George III and of the Customs Act; but there may be a difficulty as regards forfeiture in the latter case. That penalty might apply, under his amendment, to a vessel which had committed a breach of customs regulations, an offence which was not contemplated in the Act or the treaty. I would suggest to the Minister to leave that out entirely. In the Act regulating customs, ample provisions are made for breaches of the customs regulations, and it would not be advisable to provide, as the hon. gentleman would, for the forfeiture of a foreign vessel in case of a slight breach of a customs regulation. Under this proposed provision a very slight breach of customs regulations by a foreign vessel might involve her forfeiture, when our Act regulating customs would only subject her to a small penalty. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman would eliminate that clause.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite appreciate the objection raised by my hon. friend, and have no objection to eliminate that portion, when in committee.

Mr. DAVIES. I am glad the hon. gentleman has accepted the suggestion of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon). It would raise unpleasant complications if we were to seize a vessel for some infringement of the customs law. I would like to have some information of the real object of the Bill and the policy which is sought to be enforced. The convention of 1818 provides distinctly that American fishermen shall not be allowed to enter our territorial waters except for the purpose of shelter, repair and procuring wood or water, and for no other purpose whatsoever. The Imperial Act of 1819, 59 George III, provided expressly for the forfeiture of American fishermen entering our waters who were found fishing, or preparing to fish, or who had been fishing. That Act went a little further, and provided that any American vessels might, pursuant to the privileges accorded to them by the convention, enter our waters for the special purposes I have named, subject to such restrictions as might be enacted by any Imperial Order in Council to prevent their abusing that privilege. I would like to ascertain in the first place whether any Orders in Council were passed pursuant to the powers contained in that section of the 59 George III; if those Orders in Council were passed, what they amounted to, what punishment was imposed upon a vessel which entered irregularly under the provision of that convention, ratified by the Imperial Act. Then we find that, following the course of legislation which the Imperial Parliament had set as a precedent, in 1870 we provided that American fishermen entering our waters should render themselves liable to forfeiture if they were caught in the act of fishing, or preparing to fish, or found to have been fishing. I should like to ascertain from the hon. gentleman whether he has come to the conclusion, or has been so advised, that the purchasing of bait is covered by the words "preparing to fish, or fishing, or having been fishing," or either of them; whether it is necessary to make further provisions in that respect, or whether he thinks the Act in that respect is sufficiently extensive; and, if he thinks so, I should like him to tell the House a little more fully and accurately what other acts on the part of the American fishermen he intends by this legislation to prohibit, or to render them liable to forfeiture in case they commit. Of course we find ourselves somewhat at a loss, in the absence of information which the Government refuses to give—and the loss is so great in my individual case that I do not pretend to attempt to overcome it—to discuss the policy of the Government in carrying that Act out. I first want to know what that policy is, what objects the hon. gentleman seeks to attain, whether he finds the Act deficient in the respect which I have mentioned, in regard to the punishment of vessels purchasing bait, and I suppose transhipping cargoes, whether it is intended to punish those acts or the shipping of crews, whether it is part of their policy to prevent American fishermen, as fishermen, from shipping crews in our harbors and along our shores, and whether this Act is for the purpose of enabling them to carry out that policy? The policy may or may not be a good one; it may or may not be one required; it may or may not be one which the Imperial Government, whose consent and assent and assistance is required, would give that assistance and co-operation to. The hon. gentleman, acting in the public interest, as he said the other day, thought it was not prudent to give the House the information in that regard which I thought the House should have, but whether he thinks it prudent to give himself greater latitude on this occasion or not, I certainly think he should define a little more clearly and accurately what his policy is, and what are the particular objects which he seeks to reach by these new provisions. I think it is desirable to have this general statement before we go into committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. I quite agree with everything the hon. gentleman from Queen's county (Mr. Davies) has said with regard to the desirability of information, but on this matter it is rather a delicate point, I take it, and I think my hon. friend will see that, under the circumstances, perhaps it would be just as well not to be too definite in the explanations in relation to this Bill. My hon. friend knows as well as I do what the point in the Bill is, and I think we ought to exercise some degree of patriotic spirit in this matter; and I am sure, when I appeal to my hon. friend, who knows well the point in the Bill, he will exercise that patriotic feeling, and allow the Government to pass the Bill. I think it is not a question upon which we ought to raise any discussion, and I am sure my hon. friend will see the propriety, from a national spirit, from a patriotic spirit, of not raising a discussion at this time on this Bill.

Mr. DAVIES. When my hon. friend imagines that I know the intention and policy of the Government in introducing this Bill, I may say that I am not thoroughly conversant with that policy, nor do I know what their intentions are. My patriotism is quite extensive enough, I think, to meet the requirements of the case, but I think, before we

take a new departure upon this very important question, we should be informed whether this is in consonance with the views of the Imperial Government or not, and the exact extent to which the measure proposes to go.

Mr. MITCHELL. It was not the hon. gentleman's political knowledge, but his legal knowledge that I referred to, and I am sure he knows what the object of the Bill is, and I think it would be well to allow the Bill to pass.

Mr. BLAKE. At the earliest stage at which it was possible to do so this Session, I adverted to this very important subject in words which I wish to repeat, because they express my present views:

"I regard, I confess, with some degree of apprehension, the situation. I agree that some steps have to be taken, and I do not condemn what is announced rather guardedly in the Speech; but what our relations with our neighbors are to be in the new situation in which we are placed, what is to be the solution of the headland question, which was unhappily left unadjusted in the former negotiations, and what complications may occur, are questions which must press themselves on our minds, but which I do not now refer to further, not knowing the precise state of the situation, and in the absence of the papers, which I hope to be brought down, showing what the position of the Imperial authorities is."

I think it is absolutely impossible to enter into a profitable discussion of this question in the state of want of information in which we are to-day. I suppose that condition of things, in the view of the Government, continues which they stated existed the other day, as to the expediency of affording us that light. In the absence of that light, it is impossible for us to judge, I think, of the propriety of any precise measure which they may propose to us, and it is rather in furtherance of an executive policy which they declare to us we have to take upon trust, in truth which they do not disclose to us, that we are now asked to legislate than in any other way. On former occasions, we know —those of us who recollect the circumstances, or those who have refreshed their memory by reference to the documents —what the attitude of the several parties to this question was, the attitude of several of the Provinces of the Dominion which were not then part of the Dominion, the attitude of Newfoundland on a later occasion, the attitude of the Imperial authorities, and the attitude of the United States. Upon these questions, so far as they concern the separate Provinces, omitting the case of Newfoundland, we are at this time entirely in the dark, and therefore it is practically a step in the dark that we are asked to take.

Mr. THOMPSON. In answer to the hon. member for Queen's county (Mr. Davies), I may be allowed to say that at the present juncture it seems necessary to refer back to the Imperial Statute. The Imperial Statute, as he is aware, while clearly defining what is prohibited in respect of foreign fishing vessels, does not in precise terms, in such a way I may say as to avoid question, provide the penalty which is to attach to a violation of some of its terms. The Parliament of Canada has already legislated in reference to that defect, in relation to two or three specified instances. The hon. member has enquired whether my hon. colleague is advised that the legislation is necessary to meet the offence of purchasing bait in the bays and harbors of Canada. I think he will see the propriety of not pressing the question, inasmuch as the contention on both sides is now submitted to a Canadian court for adjudication. However, referring again to the question of the Imperial Statute, the hon. gentleman asked whether any regulation had been made by the Imperial Government under that Statute. I think I am correct in stating that no regulations have been made. The penalty which is prescribed in the last clause of the Imperial Statute, is a penalty of £200 upon any person offending, and that penalty is only pronounced in respect of those who, having come into the waters of Canada, fail to depart when they are ordered so to do, and against those who violate any of the regulations. The regulations not having been made, that class of offences is out of the question, and then we have simply that penalty pronounced in respect to those persons who, having come improperly into the bays and harbors of Canada, do not depart therefrom when ordered so to do. Now, it is obvious that the evils which the enactment was to prevent may be completed before the proper officer in our large ports on the Atlantic seaboard can give the order to the offending vessel. If the object of the vessel has been to prepare to fish, or to violate any of the provisions of the treaty, that object, to a large extent, may be accomplished before the order can be given, and therefore the penalty, although a very heavy one, is not effectual for the reason I have stated. I think it would not be at all expedient, as was stated by the hon. member for Northumberland, to undertake to state categorically now the offences in respect of which it is proposed to enforce this Act, if it should receive the sanction of Parliament. That, of course, must depend on a great many circumstances, as the hon. gentleman is aware, which it is impossible to forsee at the present moment. But we are asking for this legislation now simply on the ground that it is desirable to make effectual the clear provisions of the Imperial Statutes, and those of our own country, and to remove any controversy as to the penalty that should be attached to the violation of the law.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to amend by striking out the word "by," in the 32nd line, and insert the words "contrary to" in lieu thereof. Also to strike out the word "by," in the 33rd line, and substitute the word "to" in lieu thereof. Also to strike out all the words after the word "force," in the 34th line, and substitute these words: "or having entered such waters, has failed to comply with any such law of the United Kingdom or of Canada."

Mr. DAVIES. I beg to ask the hon. gentleman what he means by the expression in the Act "has entered such waters for any purposes not permitted by the law of nations." What law of nations does he refer to?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a general expression, and serves to introduce what follows.

Mr. DAVIES. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman would explain to us what the law of nations is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are many offences against the law of nations that may be committed by ships.

Amendments concurred in.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman desire to have the full penalty exacted necessarily in every case, where there has been even a slight breach of the law? As the Act is worded now, the slightest breach in the world on the part of any ship, would subject her necessarily to absolute forfeiture; the court would have no power to inflict any lesser penalty.

Mr. THOMPSON. Of course there is a discretion in the Crown. It is not desirable to invest that discretion in the court.

Mr. DAVIES. The law at present subjects a vessel to a penalty of £200 if she does not depart from the waters after having been notified to depart by the collector. The difficulty there was that after she had been notified there was such a length of time allowed her (twenty-four hours), that she might then commit a breach.

Mr. MITCHELL. As I understand the objection of the hon. gentleman, it is with regard to the extreme penalty. The Act 31 Victoria, chapter 61, gives the Governor in Council power to relieve from the penalty in case of seizure.

Mr. DAVIES. Not a forfeiture.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Act says:

"In cases of seizure under this Act the Governor in Council may by order direct a stay of proceedings; and in cases of condemnation may relieve from the penalty in whole or in part, and on such terms as may be deemed right."

That would cover the objection.

Mr. DAVIES. That relates to a penalty. I only suggested this point; I am not going to press it.

Mr. MITCHELL. This section covers any seizure under the Act.

Mr. DAVIES. What I suggested was that possibly some small breach might be committed which could be atoned for by payment of a penalty in the court in which the vessel is libelled. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to another point, that he may consider whether there is force in it or not. The new offence which is created by this Statute is entering the water for a wrongful purpose—the offence is "entering." The animus must exist at the time of the entry. The Act of buying bait, transhipping cargo, shipping men did not constitute an offence under this Act in itself. Such would be evidence, probably, that the party had committed a violation of the offence of "entering illegally;" it would be *primâ facie* evidence capable of being rebutted. Suppose a vessel came in without the captain having any intention of breaking the treaty; suppose, after the vessel is in harbor, he should ship his cargo, buy bait, or, his men having deserted, should ship men; the vessel would not be forfeited under the Statute, because she would not have been guilty of the offence of entering for a wrongful purpose. I call attention to this point, because the Act is confined to a specific offence, which is entering for an unlawful purpose. If a vessel enters lawfully she does not commit an illegal offence.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is probably so; but in order to remedy it we must go beyond the terms of the convention. I think we are safe only in going that far.

Mr. DAVIES. I call attention to it.

Committee rose and reported.

CARLETON CITY OF ST. JOHN BRANCH RAILWAY.

Mr. THOMPSON, moved the second reading of Bill (No. 137) respecting the Carleton City of St. John Branch Railway.

Mr. WELDON. This Bill gives power to the Government to expropriate the property, and an opportunity should be given to the shareholders to make known their views.

Mr. THOMPSON. The provision made last year with respect to the acquisition of this railway was simply an item in the Supply Bill authorising the Governor General to appropriate $85,000 for the acquisition of the railway, water front and other property. In carrying that out, a good deal of difficulty was experienced. No power of expropriation having been given, all that could be done was to seek to obtain the shares of the company. I understand the great majority, if not the whole, of the shareholders are willing, and in fact anxious, that this legislation should be passed. The greater proportion of the shares have been got in, largely from the fact that the city itself had $40,000 worth of them; but there was no absolute power possessed by the Minister to acquire the property. We now desire to take that power and expropriate the railway.

Mr. WELDON. I am well aware that the large proportion of the shares are held by very few persons, but they have a right to be heard.

Mr. BARKER. I have had a great deal of conversation with private shareholders interested in the Bill, and they are invariably desirous that the Government should acquire the property. The shares are not very many, and they are held by a very small number of persons. Some arrangement should be made by which those shareholders would be placed on the same footing as the city of St. John.

Mr. WELDON. If they were paid at the same rate as the city of St. John there would be no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON. This Bill provides that they shall be paid. One difficulty arose in regard to the matter. Some of the shareholders had not paid calls, and their own charter provides that under those circumstances they had no power to assign their shares.

Mr. WELDON. What amount has been paid to the city of St. John for the bonds? The city is not an ordinary stockholder, but has an interest in the railway, which enables them to appoint two directors. I see it is stated that 4,700 shares have been acquired by the Government. I would like the Minister to state what amount had been paid.

Mr. THOMPSON. All but about $2,000.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WELDON. What is the amount of the bond?

Mr. THOMPSON. $18,250.

Mr. BLAKE. How much was the stock which has been secured?

Mr. THOMPSON. Altogether the expenditure in paying the bonds and securing the stock was about $83,000.

Mr. BLAKE. And $18,250 of that was in bonds. What was the par of the stock which was secured?

Mr. THOMPSON. $20 a share.

Mr. BLAKE. But what did it amount to?

Mr. THOMPSON. The city of St. John held 2,000 shares, that is $40,000; the St. John and Maine Railway 2,700 shares, $26,029.64; sundry persons, 228 shares, amounting to $2,198.96; various persons, on whose shares were paid sums amounting to $36.33. Then there were sixty shares unissued and still in the hands of the company. I omitted to say that the company had in hand the money which was handed over, $1,738.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the amount which is to be expended will be in excess of the vote of last year?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, by about $2,000. I understand that there was $2,000 remaining, but that may be composed in part of the $1,738.

Mr. BLAKE. I should say so. What has been done as to paying the bonds at par without the accrued interest? Is the stock to be paid at par without dividends or interest?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. WELDON. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that par was paid for this stock?

Mr. BARKER. They were paid simply what they paid for it themselves.

Mr. WELDON. They were not the original stockholders; they purchased at a certain discount, and that sum they agreed to take and the Government agreed to give.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman, as I understood, gave at first $18,250 for bonds which, as I understood, represented the bonds without accrued interest; 2,000 shares of

the city of St. John, for which he said $40,000 was paid. Then he gave 2,700 shares, which, I understood him to say, belonged to the St. John and Maine Railway, and for that he said $26,029 was paid.

Mr. THOMPSON. I may have misled the hon. gentleman. I was stating what the values were. The city of St. John held that number of shares, and I was stating the par value of the shares.

Mr. WELDON. That amount was paid to the city?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. This $27,029 is the amount paid to the railway company?

Mr. BARKER. Yes. The shares were originally bought by the contractor, who sold them to the St. John and Maine Railway Company two years ago, for the same amount they now claim from the Government.

Mr. WELDON. They were bought at a discount?

Mr. BARKER. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. It is equally extraordinary and gratifying to learn that this valuable property has been acquired at par, and that the holders of the securities did not demand a premium from the Government.

Mr. WELDON. With regard to the second section it seems to me that the stockholders, under these circumstances, should be paid the amount they paid out upon this stock, but this puts it in the hands of the railway company to pay what sum they please. The Government have paid the city and the railway the full amount they paid for it, and I think the other stockholders should be placed in the same position, and that the amount they paid should be re funded, of course, with the loss of the interest, as in the case of the city.

Mr. BARKER. The section requires that they shall be paid.

Mr. THOMPSON. The clause is framed in this way merely to provide that the Minister shall not be bound to pay that sum if they will take less.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt, after the statement of the Minister, that it is not the intention to treat these individual holders on any different principle from that which applies to the others, this form of words "not exceeding" being used in all such similar transactions. Of course, I understand that the shareholders must be put on the same footing, the principle of the Government being to pay up the part of whatever the shareholder may have paid.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes. I understand there is no difficulty as to the shareholders, but that the principal difficulty is as to the transfer, as some of them have not fully paid up.

On section 3,

Mr. THOMPSON moved to strike out the words "300" in the second line.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. Are there any claims or encumbrances of any description on the property? If there are we should try to remove them, and if not, I do not see why we should adopt this form.

Mr. THOMPSON. There are none except as I have stated. It is intended merely as a safeguard in case there should be any at present unknown.

Mr. BLAKE. But that is what I complain of, if there be any claim or incumbrance on the property of this company, and I do not think we should deprive the holder of that claim or encumbrance of it by a statutory provision.

Mr. THOMPSON. The fourth section provides for that.

Mr. BLAKE. No, that relates only to shareholders.

On section 4,

Mr. THOMPSON. I move to insert after the word "stock," in the third line, the words "or with the holder of any encumbrance for the discharge thereof."

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has just stated that there are no encumbrances.

Mr. THOMPSON. I understood that the hon. gentleman wished this added as a precautionary amendment. I do not desire it.

Mr. BLAKE. No; what I wished was to omit that portion of the clause which assumed to make provision to vest the property in Her Majesty free from all encumbrances. The hon. gentleman has not stated the financial scheme. We want to know what we are paying. For all I know there may be $100,000 of encumbrance on the property.

Mr. THOMPSON. These are the words always used in reference to the expropriation of property.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. WELDON. I would like the hon. gentleman to provide in the second clause that each shareholder shall be paid a sum equal to that paid by him for his stock, instead of providing that he shall be paid a sum not exceeding that paid by him. That would put all parties on an equality. As it stands, the clause places the ordinary stockholder in a different position from large stockholders or the city of St. John. I think the amount actually paid in each case should be refunded.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is the basis of the negotiation and agreement with all the shareholders; but if I assented to the hon. gentleman's amendment, it would prevent any shareholder giving his shares for less than he paid for them. After the assurance I have given that the negotiations have taken place on that basis, I think the hon. gentleman should be satisfied.

Mr. WELDON. That is satisfactory to me.

On section 6,

Mr. BLAKE. This is another clause which proposes to deal with an appropriation, and which I apprehend should be initiated in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will withdraw that clause.

Mr. WELDON. What amount will be required besides this?

Mr. THOMPSON. About $2,000, and authority will have to be taken for that at the same time.

Committee rose and reported.

SUPPLY—DUTY ON FLOUR AND COAL.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before we go into Committee of Supply, I propose to bring under the consideration of the House a subject which is of very considerable importance, not alone to the constituency I represent, but to the people of the whole Dominion. It is in the recollection of the House that about eight years ago—I think in 1878—the policy of the country was discussed and the verdict of the people was in favor of what is now called the National Policy. I am afraid that I am somewhat responsible with others for creating a feeling in favor of the National Policy. I have never regretted the action I took in that respect; I am still a believer in the National Policy, but, now as then, I do not believe in running the National Policy to the ground. There are some things, in the application of the National Policy to the tariff of the country, that I think it is time this House should revise. It will

be recollected that one of the most serious objections—and I now particularly address my hon. friends from the Maritime Provinces—against the National Policy was the duty on flour and the duty on coal. To the people of Nova Scotia, of course, it was important to have a duty on coal. The people of New Brunswick felt comparatively no interest in that duty, except such interest as they might feel in the success of a great national source of wealth in a neighboring Province. With a very slight interest in coal mines, only one or two being in that Province, one a very large and another an unimportant one, that Province was but little agitated on this question. At the time, one of the greatest objections I had to meet, in endeavoring to impress the people of my county with the desirability of adopting the National Policy, a policy which would create industries in our Dominion, as we hoped it would, and as the results, I believe, have shown it has, was the duty upon the food of the people, particularly of the poor hard-worked classes. I found that objection met me on every platform, and while I was personally against the imposition of duty on the food of the poor people, and while, had I been elected, I would have endeavored to shape the policy of the Administration of that day so as to exclude the duty upon cereals and grains, which were necessary for the food of the people, and the duty on coal, which was necessary to warm the people while I would have done that, unfortunately or fortunately for myself, and perhaps my constituents, I was defeated, and therefore had but little to say in the framing of the National Policy. Had I been returned on that occasion I should have resisted at every stage the imposition of a duty on flour, meal, corn, wheat, and the imposition of a duty on coal. I was not returned, and therefore did not feel myself responsible, except in a secondary degree, for the duties imposed on these articles. It is unfortunate that the policy of the Government was so shaped that we could not have the National Policy without imposing a duty on the bread of the people and on their coal. No man regrets that more than I do. I suffered, I will not say I bled for it, but I felt on that occasion that I had lost my election largely in consequence of the fact that it was like putting a firebrand into the country to talk about taxing the food of the poor man, and very properly so. It was impossible almost to present any argument for the duty except the argument which was put forth on that occasion by its advocates, that after a year, or two years, or three at the furthest, the probability was the production of Canada itself would be sufficient for the food of Canada. When that event arose, and the probability was that, with our North-West peopled, we would raise more food than was required for our people, and it would then make little difference whether there was a duty or not, as the markets of Europe would regulate prices, not only in the States, but in Canada as well. It was a question on which arguments could be used on both sides. I used that argument, but as regards the theory of what might result and the practical fact of what did result—the practical fact that we were putting 50 cents a barrel on flour when, as the people said, they found difficulty in getting money enough to buy the flour, without duty, I felt the strength of the position in which the people were placed, and while I was in favor of the National Policy, as a whole, I was not in favor of that particular part of it. But I was aware, and everyone must be aware, that all legislation is more or less a matter of compromise, and, in order to get the necessary protection assented to by the farmers of the country in the west, more particularly in Ontario and the west, in order to get protection to encourage the industries, whether the principle was a right one or not—I am not going to open up that question now, but in order to get that encouragement to the industries which we hoped to create under the National Policy—it became a necessity, so the Government of the day thought, to impose a duty on the food of the people. And this was done against my protest but as I had lost my election I was powerless to avert the action of the Government. I think the time has arrived, with the magnificent North-West opened up, with means of communication as good as any in the world between the producers and the consumers there, when we may fairly ask that the question of taking off the duty from the bread of the people shall be considered by the Government. I may be answered that the duty does not increase the cost. That is a theoretical question which I do not think we should consider now, whether it increases the cost or not, it certainly does not make it any cheaper, and it is pretty hard to convince a poor man, who has the price of a barrel of flour, if he has to pull out of his pocket another half dollar to pay for the barrel of flour, that the half dollar tax is not costing him anything more for the food he is going to eat and to feed his family with. I am not going to take up much of the time of the House on this question, because it is too late in the Session, but I will read a few statistics which I have prepared on that point, and which I trust the House will give some consideration to. I have gone to the trouble of compiling the imports and exports of flour and wheat in two years, 1877, the year before this policy was adopted, and 1885, the last year. Perhaps the House will consider this statement read, and it will appear, in the Debates to-morrow.

Mr. MILLS. We want to hear the facts now.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then I will read it:

NUMBER of bushels of Wheat and barrels of Flour Imported into the different Provinces in the Dominion of Canada for the years 1877 and 1885, and the value of each:—

Year 1877.

Province.				Value.
Ontario	Wheat	Bush.	3,755,400	$3,992,847
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	28,131	164,890
Quebec	Wheat	Bush.	819,177	839,941
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	282,146	1,422,636
Nova Scotia	Wheat	Bush.	1,446	2,068
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	131,939	712,103
New Brunswick	Wheat	Bush.	27	54
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	61,216	385,253
P. E. Island	Wheat	Bush.	125	250
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	16,225	71,305
Manitoba	Wheat	Bush	3,748	2,946
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	9,922	41,620
British Columbia	Wheat	Bush.	9,128	8,698
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	30,385	161,466

Year 1885.

Ontario	Wheat	Bush.	291,385	271,190
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	79,283	324,917
Quebec	Wheat	Bush.	2,814,640	2,816,269
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	322,051	1,216,364
Nova Scotia	Wheat	Bush.	33	27
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	80,995	376,001
New Brunswick	Wheat	Bush.	8	7
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	22,229	110,150
Manitoba	Wheat	Bush.	1,798	1,075
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	1,141	5,489
British Columbia	Wheat	Bush.	19,829	13,854
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	53,667	266,673
P. E. Island	Wheat	Bush.	.....	.....
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	7,199	33,171

NUMBER of bushels of Wheat and barrels of Flour Exported from the different Provinces in the Dominion of Canada for the years 1877 and 1885, and the value of each:—

Year 1877.

Province.				Value.
Ontario	Wheat	Bush.	404,087	$440,294
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	60,621	336,784
Quebec	Wheat	Bush.	1,984,068	2,302,022
	Flour of wheat	Brls.	198,090	1,083,216
Nova Scotia	do	do	8,937	59,702
New Brunswick	do	do	259	1,635
Manitoba	do	do	20	120
British Columbia	.....	.....	.....	.....
P. E. Island	Flour of wheat	Brls.	679	3,991

Year 1885.

			Value.
Ontario	Wheat	Bush. 1,025,280	791,141
	Flour of wheat	Brls. 60,084	248,107
Quebec	Wheat	Bush. 1,224,086	1,099,445
	Flour of wheat	Brls. 59,069	286,961
Nova Scotia	Wheat	Bush. 91,631	75,692
	Flour of wheat	Brls. 4,067	18,671
New Brunswick	Wheat	Bush.	
	Flour of wheat	Brls. 541	2,706
Manitoba	Wheat	Bush. 7	6
P. E. Island	do	do 2	3
	Flour of wheat	Brls. 16	85

The total imports for the years I have named, in the whole Dominion, were as follows:—

Year 1877.

		Value.
Wheat	Bush. 4,589,051	$4,846,824
Flour of wheat	Brls. 549,063	2,964,273

Year 1885.

Wheat	Bush. 3,128,143	3,102,422
Flour of wheat	Brls. 565,562	2,273,355

EXPORTS.

NUMBER of barrels of flour and bushels of wheat exported from the Dominion of Canada during the years 1877 and 1885, with their values:—

Year 1877.

Wheat	Bush. 2,893,155	$2,742,383
Flour of wheat	Brls. 268,605	1,485,438

Year 1885.

Wheat	Bush. 2,340,956	1,966,287
Flour of wheat	Brls. 123,777	556,530

Now, Sir, I have prepared these statistics to show the value of the wheat imported into the different Provinces prior to the adoption of the National Policy. Of course, people may have various views about the propriety or impropriety of that policy, but one thing is clear, that in certain Provinces of this Dominion it works extremely hard against those Provinces. Take the case of the Province from which I come, or of the adjoining Province of Nova Scotia, but I will particularly refer to New Brunswick. That Province is a Province which depends chiefly upon its lumber, and the fish caught on its shores, having but few industries established within its bounds, and to a lesser degree on agriculture. Now, Sir, it is extremely hard upon a Province such as New Brunswick to have to pay a duty of 50 cents a barrel upon every barrel of breadstuff consumed by the people. I have no hesitation in saying that almost the whole of the working class in our community have to buy flour, which, if not coming from Ontario or from the North-West, is liable to duty. I think it is about time that that policy was put an end to. We have opened up our great wheat fields in the North-West, we have gone to an enormous outlay in the way of establishing and building railways at the expense of the people of the whole Dominion, including those from my own Province. It is about time that these wheat fields of the west, to which we are tributary for the means of conveyance and approach to them, should be relieved of this protection, and that the people of the east should no longer be made to pay tribute in the shape of imposed duty. I know it will be said that it does not change the price of flour; that we have never had flour cheaper than it has been for the last twelve months. That may all be very true, but the question is, if we had not the duty upon it, whether we would not have flour cheaper still. It is said that the markets of Europe regulate the price of flour in this country. So they do, to a very large extent, but if the consumption of the people of Canada is only equal to the supply I hold that the imposition of the duty is a charge, and it does increase the cost of the flour that the people eat. If I am correct in that proposition, then, Sir, I think it is about time that we should have a change in relation to it. Sir, I am not going to elaborate this thing. The House understands very well what the position of it is. But I think that in a county such as mine, that has scarcely a manufacturing industry in it outside of lumber, where a large portion of the people have to labor and toil, who earn their living by the labor of their hands, and where the fishermen of our sea coast have to undergo such great hardship, this duty imposes a serious charge. I may say that the farmers in that part of the country do not raise much wheat; their operations are more confined to raising the coarse grains, such as oats, peas, &c., and wheat can be bought cheaper than it can be raised, in a climate and soil such as ours. Therefore, I think it is a hard case that the people of a county such as mine—and there are many other counties in the Province almost similarly situated—should be compelled to pay a duty on the bread they eat, on the food with which they must sustain their families. In mentioning this matter, I think I am only doing my duty to my constituents. After they had elected me on the last occasion I made a statement of what I proposed to do, and I said I should endeavor to impress upon this House on every occasion that presented itself, the necessity of abolishing the duty on flour and meal and coal. I also stated that, while I was a National Policy man then—and I am as firm a believer, in the National Policy still,—I believe there are limitations to the operation of the National Policy, and I do not believe that 35 per cent., as an average, to protect cottons manufactured in our country, is a duty which ought to exist. I believe it ought to be reduced 10 per cent., and should come down to 25. In the same way, I believe that the protection which is given to woollens should also be reduced to about the maximum given to cotton manufacturers; and I believe, also, that the enormous monopoly that exists in favor of the sugar refiners should be changed and the protection reduced. Sir, I believe there is a very large public sentiment growing in this country in favor of the changes which I have suggested, and I hope that before this Session rises the Government will consider the propriety of ameliorating these evils in some way. In reference to coal, I may say that I prepared a short statement of the imports and exports in these two years which I will read to the House:

1877.

Exported coal, 249,536 tons, value		$ 855,968
Imported coal, 933,980	do	3,499,561
1885.		
Exported coal, 479,706 tons, value		$1,468,166
Imported coal, 1,989,657	do	7,297,985

Now, Sir, whatever may be said about whether the duty is paid upon wheat or not, one thing is clear, that the 50 cents per ton paid upon coal used in this country, and there is an enormous quantity of it used, is a direct charge upon the people who buy it. I think the time has arrived when this whole Dominion should not be taxed for the benefit of a few coal mines in any one Province, and the Government should seriously approach this question with a view to altering their policy in regard to coal, because we all know that it was a supposed compensation given to the Maritime Provinces in return for permission to tax their food. That might be very beneficial to some counties in Cape Breton and the county of Pictou, so ably represented in this House, but I think the whole Dominion should not be taxed from end to end for the sake of any set of colliery proprietors who may happen to make less profit, or have smaller outputs, if the duty is taken off. I know that this was an arrangement framed by the leader of the Government, one of the objects of which was to have something to throw off when he approached the Americans with a view to negotiating a reciprocity treaty. But it is time now that that argument was abandoned. We have suffered enough by listening to that argument. We have had during eight years the enormous duty imposed—because

it is an enormous duty—and it has been maintained as long as is desirable, and it is time the First Minister revised his policy, if he wishes it to be sustained, if he wishes its advocates to feel they are justified in supporting it. Let not the hon. gentleman run the National Policy into the ground, as he is doing, by retaining the duties on the coal and food of the people.

Mr. MILLS. Did the hon. gentleman say what is the total amount of duty proposed to be remitted by the resolution on the whole of the articles which it covered?

Mr. MITCHELL. I have not the statements ready, but the sum could easily be ascertained by referring to the blue-books. I move in amendment:

To leave out all the words after the word "that," and substitute the following instead thereof:—in the opinion of this House it would conduce to the comfort and well-being of the people of Canada, and especially of the working classes, if all import duties were removed from flour, meal, corn for feed or milling purposes, wheat and coal.

Mr. BURPEE. I am happy that in this instance at least I am able to subscribe to the proposal made by the leader of the third party. If he continues his policy in the same direction I will be able to follow him still further. The fact is I always advocated the repeal of the duties on the articles covered by the amendment as much on principle as in the interest of my constituents. I believe, and I have always believed, that food and fuel, at all events, that flour, meal and coal, should be free. I believe so far as possible the prime necessaries of life should be free. I believe that next to that the necessary articles of life that enter into the common consumption of the middle and poorer classes should be made as free as possible, and the luxuries of life should in the main bear the burden of the taxes imposed on the people for the government of the Dominion. The first tariff that was proposed and carried in this House contained a very moderate duty on flour of 25 cents per barrel. That, however, remained on the Statute-book only for about a year, and an hon. member upon the Opposition side of the House moved that the duty be repealed - I refer to the late Mr. Holton—and that duty was taken off. Not only did the Opposition vote for the proposal, but very many members on the Government side of the House supported it, and it was not resisted by the Government. It was then considered contrary to the principles on which the Government was conducted. But it is not so now. I fear I cannot anticipate so favorable a result in regard to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I fear that to-day party exigencies are so strong and party lines are so tightly drawn that the members following the Government will scarcely respond to the proposal made by the third party led by the hon. member for Northumberland. After a time the duty on wheat and corn meal was brought before the House in connection with the duty on coal. It was introduced by Sir Charles Tupper, at all events at his instance, and he called it a national policy. He stated that we would have a duty imposed on flour in the interests of the west, and a duty on coal in the interests of the east. That, in my opinion, was only making bad worse; it was only committing a greater violation of the principle, which should govern any country than the first proposal, because the first proposal only went to the extent of taxing food, while the latter taxed food and fuel. We find it now incorporated in what we term the National Policy, and so much is this the case that I presume the Government will resist this amendment, and their supporters will stand by them. There is an article which, I think, cannot claim to be put in that category, and that is the article of corn meal. Corn is not grown to any very large extent in the Dominion, and a tax on corn meal can only be levied for revenue purposes. We imported last year 122,442 barrels of corn meal, and of that quantity 114,877 barrels were imported into the Maritime Provinces. We paid on that quantity over $45,000 of duty, the amount for the whole Dominion being $48,000. This is a tax which we should not bear; it is a tax which is not necessary for the principle of protection. It is a tax which bears very heavily on the working classes of the Dominion, and especially of the Maritime Provinces. I think that upon this article, at all events, the Government should not insist on imposing this burden on the people, and that they should remit that tax. Of flour we imported last year 563,822 barrels, and the Maritime Provinces and Quebec together imported of that quantity, 432,457 barrels. Now, Sir, I do think that this is a vicious and sectional tax. It may be argued, as it has been argued, that this is a protective duty. I do not believe it. The fact is that while it adds very little to the profits of the farmer in the west it bears heavily on certain consumers, especially in the Maritime Provinces. As to a very large amount of the flour which is imported into the Maritime Provinces, they have to pay the whole duty. I will explain. They have certain products in those Provinces for which they have no other market than the United States. They are compelled to seek some market there for those products. The Upper Provinces have a surplus and they do not require them. No matter how our trade is crippled in that respect we have to seek a market in the United States. Now, it is well known that in order to carry on trade profitably, you must have a return freight; you must have the privilege of bartering in order to carry it on profitably. In sending our products to the United States we are prevented from getting return freights by being compelled to pay half a dollar duty on flour, so far as that article is concerned, and that rule applies to many other articles we require. Now you can get flour carried from Boston or New York to the city of Fredericton, which is eighty miles above the mouth of the river, very nearly as cheaply as you can from the city of St. John to Fredericton. In fact they require it for ballast to such an extent that they carry it almost for nothing. But under the existing tariff we have to take our products to the United States and buy our flour and other products there, pay the exorbitant duties imposed or bring back our money and send it to other Provinces to buy such articles as we require, while our vessels have to return in ballast. In this trade the tax on flour is a tax for revenue only, and, having to pay that duty, our trade is crippled to that extent, and that, I think, is a very strong argument why the duty on flour should be remitted. With regard to coal, as I said before, I do not think we should have a duty on food or fuel. I know we receive a large amount of duty on coal and that, as a matter of revenue, it is of some importance, but I think there are many ways in which we could reduce our expenditure to make up for the duty on coal, if we should remit it. I do think that in the necessaries of life, such as flour, and meal, and coal, that the Dominion Government, having their railway built now through the prairie country, having the Canadian Pacific Railway nearly completed, and expecting, as they do, a large amount of wheat and flour from that North-West country, which they expect to export to Great Britain, and as the market of Great Britain will then, if not now, control the price of flour, so that the duty in that respect cannot be a protection to western farmers —I say I think, under these circumstances, that the Government might remit the duty on flour, while as to the duty on coal, I contend that the tariff, as a matter of protection, has been a failure. I contend that it has not succeeded in forcing up our coal to Quebec or Ontario to any extent which would warrant the duty imposed upon that article. The statistics read by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) show that the importation, instead of decreasing, has been increasing, notwithstanding the duty which has been imposed on coal. I contend that

no duty we can impose on coal will, to any large extent, have a favorable effect upon the production of that article. I have much pleasure in supporting the proposition put in your hands by the hon. member for Northumberland.

Mr. KIRK. I was not aware that this question was coming up for discussion this afternoon, or I should have been prepared to have said more upon it than I am prepared to say now. I am glad, however, that the hon. member for Northumberland has brought up this question, because it is one which chiefly affects the Province from which I come, and especially the county I have the honor to represent in this Parliament. The hon. member for Northumberland said that the Province from which he comes was not an agricultural Province. I think I may say the same with regard to the Province of Nova Scotia. It is not an agricultural Province. Its business is divided pretty equally among fishing, lumbering, agriculture and mining; and although we may have a large agricultural industry in Nova Scotia, we raise very little wheat and no Indian corn; therefore, a duty on either of these articles falls heavily on the people of that Province—on the agricultural industry itself as well as on the other industries. There are none, or very few, of the farmers of Nova Scotia who grow sufficient wheat to produce flour for their own families, much less for exportation. Nova Scotia does not export wheat or flour. The hon. member for Northumberland quoted from the trade returns to show that Nova Scotia exported no flour and no wheat in 1877, but exported a large quantity of flour and a large quantity of wheat in 1885. But the Province of Nova Scotia did not produce that wheat and flour. Nova Scotia does not export one bushel of wheat or one barrel of flour of her own produce. The wheat and flour exported from Nova Scotia came from Ontario. The people of Nova Scotia are obliged to import all, or nearly all, the flour and all the corn meal they consume; therefore any duty on wheat, flour or corn meal is a burden upon them. It is said that this Dominion raises more wheat or flour than is necessary to supply all the wants of the people in all the Provinces; but the trade returns do not show that to be exactly the fact. Last year we imported 3,128,443 bushels of wheat and exported 2,340,956 bushels; that is, we imported 787,487 bushels more than we exported. Last year we imported 565,562 barrels of flour, and exported 123,777 barrels, or imported 441,765 barrels more than we exported. Therefore, it is an actual fact, according to the trade returns, that Canada is an importing country in respect to these articles; and the people of Canada are obliged to pay a tax on the food they use, which falls more heavily on the poor than on the rich. The duty paid last year on the flour we imported was $270,054; on the wheat, $55,956; and on the corn meal, about $50,000. These are burdens on the Maritime Provinces, where neither wheat, flour nor cornmeal is produced, and the tax is imposed on these articles for the sole purpose of fostering their production in Ontario and the North-West. In order to offset the duty on those articles, this House has placed a heavy duty on coal, which is a product of the Maritime Provinces, especially Nova Scotia; and the people of Nova Scotia, who consume flour and meal, are expected to pay the duty on those articles in order that the coal industry may be fostered. It was said when duties were placed upon coal, wheat, and flour, that it was done for the purpose of keeping our markets for our own people. So far as flour and meal are concerned, I think the duty has succeeded pretty well in keeping the markets of this Dominion for the producers; but this is not the case with regard to coal. Although there is a duty of 50 cents a ton on coal, we know that coals from Nova Scotia are not taken to Ontario; they go very little farther west than the place where I stand. A short time ago I moved for a return which would show the quantity of coal consumed in the public buildings here, and where it was purchased, and I found that large quantities of the coal consumed in these buildings were brought from the United States and not from the Maritime Provinces. One would suppose that a Government so willing to foster home industry would not have required the duty to oblige them to buy their coal from our own people, but that they would buy it even though the price was higher than the price of United States coal. But the coal of Nova Scotia is not consumed generally in the Dominion, while the people of the Maritime Provinces are obliged to consume the flour raised in Ontario, or pay the duty, and we find it more convenient to pay the duty. The very much larger proportion of the duties paid on flour is credited in the trade returns to the Maritime Provinces, and not to the Provinces where the article is produced. Now, I submit that it is unjust to tax the food of the people in order to benefit any industry, and it is greatly injuring the people of the Maritime Provinces. I am very glad the hon. member for Northumberland has brought this question up; and it will give me the greatest possible pleasure to vote for his resolution. You may talk about the benefit the duty on coal is doing to the coal industry of Nova Scotia. I believe it is not doing half so much benefit as its friends imagine; but I believe the people of all the Provinces are paying very much more for their coal than they would pay if this duty was not imposed. It is as great a hardship on the people of this country to be subjected to a duty on coal as to a duty on flour and meal. If there is anything that ought to be cheap in this northern climate, it is the food the people eat, and the fuel they use to cook that food; and this Government instead of trying to make these articles cheap, have done their utmost to make them dear, and they have succeeded. It is no argument to say that flour is cheaper now than it ever was before. I maintain that it would be cheaper still if there was no duty upon it. We are paying just the amount of the duty more than it is worth. Last year we paid $370,000 for our flour more than it was worth, or more than would have been paid for it if the duty was not upon it. The coal has also cost the people of this Dominion the amount of the duty more than it would have cost if the duty was not imposed. Why, the people of this country are paying more into the Treasury, as duty on the coal they consume, than would buy and pay for every ton of coal that is raised in Nova Scotia from one end of the year to the other. We are actually paying, as tax on the coal we consume, more money than would pay for every bushel of coal in Nova Scotia that has arrived at the pit's head. Yet hon. gentlemen, say this is not a tax, and this is just to the people. Although I am a Maritime Province man, I am prepared, as readily to take the duty off coal as to take it off flour and corn meal.

Mr. LANGELIER. This is a question of the greatest interest to the Province to which I belong. I do not think there is a county in the Province of Quebec which grows all the wheat it can consume and we are obliged to purchase large quantities of coal. The question of the duty on coal is of no interest to the country portion of Quebec, but it is of the greatest interest to the city portion. I am glad the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has brought up that subject, and I will vote with much pleasure for his motion should he divide the House on it. Without entering into the subject, I may say that during my election in 1884, that question was brought up. It was contended by those who supported the policy of the Government, that the imposition of a duty had no effect on the price of flour, that it did not, as a matter of fact, increase the price of Canadian flour; but proof was brought during the election of the falsity of that reasoning. A merchant of my county imported two cargoes of flour from Chicago, which he retailed in the county at the price of Canadian flour, and he offered it to every one who wanted to purchase, at 50 cents less, if the purchaser would pay the duty. He offered to sell any

number of cargoes of flour on the same terms. Leaving aside the question as to whether the duty on flour has or has not increased its price, the hon. member for Northumberland has given us statistics showing the large quantity of flour imported by the Province of Quebec, and almost every other Province. Whether that duty be of advantage to Ontario or not, it is a very serious tax on the consumers of the other Provinces which do not grow the quantity of flour they consume. It is very wrong to impose a duty on such necessities of life as flour and coal. Combustibles are just as necessary in a cold country like this as are flour and other necessaries, and there are not many members of the Province of Quebec who would receive the approval of their electors if they voted against the amendment of my hon. friend from Northumberland. I shall have much pleasure in voting for it, if the hon. member will divide the House on that question.

Mr. FISHER. I will detain the House but for a few minutes. I am entirely in sympathy with the motion before the House. I do not believe that in the Province of Quebec there is to-day any class of people who could possibly be injured by the passage of this motion. Duties upon food stuffs, upon flour and wheat, can, in no sense or way, benefit the farming community in Quebec, because there the farmers hardly raise enough of those products for their own use. Consequently the farming class of that Province would be certainly benefited by the removal of the duty. When the laboring classes and the consuming classes generally throughout the country have to pay higher prices for the absolute necessaries of life, I am in favor of removing those duties, independently altogether of the general principle. I have always advocated a general reduction of duties, and objected to the high protective tariff of which these duties were erroneously supposed to be an integral portion. The duty on coal cannot affect the people of Quebec in any sense except by raising the price to the consumer. In our cold country, where coal is essential as a necessary of life, it seems a great hardship that it should be taxed. I have only brought these few remarks before the House, so as to clearly show my sympathy with the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland. If this question is put to the vote, I will gladly support the motion.

Mr. VAIL. I am surprised that we do not hear something about this question from hon. gentlemen opposite. It is a matter of a great deal of importance to certain sections of the Dominion, if not to other sections. When this duty was placed on coal and flour, it was supposed it would have a very good effect upon the coal business in the interests of Nova Scotia. Now, I think it has been clearly proved since the duty was put on coal that it has not benefited Nova Scotia to any great extent, so far as protecting us against the importation of coal from the United States is concerned. If we had a duty on coal coming from England, it would have exactly the same effect as the duty has had, and the effect of this duty has been to make the people of Ontario pay a very large amount into the public Treasury, while it has not benefited Nova Scotia, at all events, to any appreciable extent. This was a sort of compromise arrangement, the duty being put on flour in the interests of Ontario, to offset the duty on coal which was intended to benefit Nova Scotia.

Mr. HESSON. On what would you put a duty to raise revenue ?

Mr. VAIL. At that time we were having surpluses, and there was no necessity to put on a duty at all. Whatever might be the answer now as regards the future, it is evident the duty then was put on to take money out of the pockets of the people, and did take money out of their pockets, when there was no necessity to raise money for expenditure on our public works. I have given my opinion before as to the duty on flour and corn meal, so that I need not repeat it, but as the western portion of Nova Scotia must pay a large proportion of this tax I cannot help occupying a few minutes in referring to this question. The business of the people of the western portion of Nova Scotia is largely with the United States. They export nearly all they have to export, with the exception of what is sent to the West Indies and a little to Great Britain, to the United States. It is therefore of the greatest importance they should purchase their flour in the United States, and bring it back in their vessels, as my hon. friend from Sunbury has said, for ballast. Some gentlemen seem to think that this duty has forced the people of the Maritime Provinces to buy flour from Ontario. That may be the case to a very small extent, but a large portion of the flour which is imported into the western part of Nova Scotia is American flour, and within the last year or two I know of my own knowledge that people have been able to import American flour into the western part of Nova Scotia and pay the duty on it at a less cost than they could import Canadian flour for. The flour dealers of Ontario, as a rule, in order to get the Maritime trade, have their prices every day from the principal towns of the United States. They know exactly what American flour can be laid down for in the Maritime Provinces, and they endeavor to put their flour a few cents lower, in order to hold the trade, if possible. The result of that is that, by putting it about 10 cents under the American flour, they may possibly force a trade to a small extent, but to a very limited extent. When they do that, the importer in the Maritime Provinces pays 40 cents a barrel more for his flour in consequence of this duty, if he does not have to pay the 50 cents, so that the difference is only 10 cents. Thus it is a direct tax to the extent of 40 cents on every barrel of flour he uses. I know poor men in the country who have large families who tell me they use fifteen or sixteen barrels of flour in the year. Their county, school and poor rates only amount to about $4 in the year, and they pay $7 or $8 on the flour and meal which they bring in. That is a very heavy tax on a poor man. Some hon. gentlemen may not know that our population is largely composed of lumbermen and fishermen, and these are the people who have to buy flour and meal, and have to pay this tax. The year before last, I asked for a return of the quantity of flour and meal imported into Nova Scotia for the six months ending the 31st December, 1884, and I found that the amount of duty paid in the six months on flour and corn meal in that Province was $56,175, making a tax of $112,350 on flour and meal alone in one year. Take that for the time this duty has been in force, and you will find that we have paid three-quarters of a million in duty on flour and corn meal. This is a very large tax when it comes from the very poorest classes of the people of Nova Scotia. Even if there were an excuse, as my friend behind me said, for putting a tax on flour, there is none whatever for putting it on meal. We cannot raise corn in this country and must import it from the United States, and must pay the duty, and it is an exorbitant duty to put 40 cents a barrel on corn meal which costs $2 or $2.50 a barrel. It is an extreme duty, and ought to be removed from the list. If the Government are determined to keep the duty on flour, I ask them, at all events, to remove it from corn meal, and let the poorer classes have the benefit of that. The richer classes must use flour, but meal is not used by them to the extent that it is used by the poorer classes. It is said that Nova Scotia has benefited by the duty on coal. It may be a benefit to one portion of Nova Scotia, but the western portion of Nova Scotia has to pay the duty without deriving any benefit. It is true that the coal owners, if any, benefit from that duty; but I contend there is not much benefit to be derived from it by the

other inhabitants of Nova Scotia. I hope my hon. friend will insist on a vote being taken, and then we shall know who are the friends of this policy and who are opposed to it.

Mr. PAINT. The speech of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail), and the speech of the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), are nothing but election speeches.

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

After Recess.

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY—ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before the debate continues, I wish to state that to-morrow I will move that when the House adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until Tuesday, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. WELDON. I see no reason why we should not meet on Monday, and on Saturday too. As far as the members from the Maritime Provinces are concerned, they have had no opportunity this Session to attend to their business, and it is every day more important that we should get away to attend to it. I see no impropriety or disloyalty in meeting on Monday. Last year we sat on Dominion Day, and I am sure we did not intend any disloyalty to our Dominion, and further, we know that the 24th May is not the day which is celebrated in Great Britain. I think the day is the 29th, and I observe in the Revised Statutes that it is the Queen's birthday or such other day as the Governor General may appoint. Therefore, I hope, under the circumstances, and considering the late period of this Session, and that every day is valuable, hon. gentlemen will see their way clear to meet on Monday in order to get through the business as rapidly as possible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid we shall have to ask the House to adjourn over till Tuesday at three. Those Statutes or Bills have not yet been passed by the House, therefore we remain yet under the old state of things, and, Monday being the Queen's birthday, the intention of the Government is to ask the House to adjourn over till Tuesday. As to Saturday, the hon. gentleman must remember what was stated before, that the Government require the Saturday for the general business of the country. Of course we have a great deal of business here in the House, but we have the general business of the country as well, which cannot be attended to on any other day than Saturday. Therefore, we will have to ask the House to allow us to pass over Saturday and Monday and adjourn till Tuesday.

SUPPLY—COAL AND FLOUR DUTIES.

Mr. WELDON. This is a matter of very considerable importance to the Maritime Provinces. I supposed, when my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Paint) rose just before recess, that he was going to defend these impositions, and to show that they were in no way a burden to the Maritime Provinces, but my hon. friend simply stated that the hon. members for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) and Digby (Mr. Vail) had merely made election speeches. I suppose my hon. friend did not propose to make an election speech in this line, and that he prefers actions to words, and perhaps we shall find substantial reasons why my hon. friend should keep silence on this question. In this matter, I think silence on his part may be considered golden. Since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, I have felt that no vote I have cast has been of more importance and more in the real interest of my constituents, as well as of the whole Maritime Provinces, than the votes I have cast on this question. The taxes are, there especially, a burden, and I say further, that I believe the discontent that exists in the Maritime Provinces with regard to Confederation, is owing to a large extent to these duties. Had it been known when the union was formed that these taxes would be imposed, those Provinces would not to-day be in the Confederation. In the Province of New Brunswick we are paying taxes on flour for the benefit of Ontario, while the duty on coal is alleged to be for the protection of Nova Scotia. Our special industries and our trade with the United States are handicapped by these special impositions. The hon. member for Perth says these taxes are put forward for revenue. If they are only for revenue then I think this House owes it to the Maritime Provinces to cut down the expenditure, and release us from the necessity of these impositions. If my recollection serves me aright, Sir Charles Tupper stated at Cobourg a few years ago that, to satisfy the people of Ontario, a duty was put on flour to balance the duty on coal, and that was wholly borne by the Maritime Provinces. With regard to coal, the figures given by the hon. member for Northumberland show that the import was more than doubled, and consequently the imposition of the coal duty for purposes of protection has proved useless, while at the same time imposing heavy taxes upon all the people of this country who use coal. These duties bear specially hard upon the western portion of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, because our natural trade is with the United States on account of our geographical position. It is a great advantage to us to be able to exchange commodities with the United States. We all know well that throughout the western portion of those Provinces there is a large coasting fleet. I think the city of St. John alone registers 700 vessels employed in the coasting trade with the maritime cities of New England and New York; and these vessels, carrying our commodities from our own coast to New England and New York, are obliged to come back without any cargoes, or, if they bring coal, it has to be brought at such a rate, in consequence of the duty, that dealers cannot afford to give a fair freight. In consequence of these vessels being obliged to return without any cargoes, they have to charge heavy rates for freight carried out. I saw by a paper that, last Wednesday, in the port of St. John, out of thirteen arrivals from the United States, of our coasting vessels, only one of them had a cargo, and the others were obliged to return in ballast. Therefore, not only does this tax increase the burden on our people, but it affects materially our coasting trade with the United States. It affects our lumber trade, which is handicapped by the duties imposed upon it, a trade which is now in a state which affords very little remuneration to those engaged in it. We find that when we desire to seek a market in the United States for our commodities, we are again hampered, not only by the imposition of this duty, but by the fact that higher freights are necessarily charged upon vessels in carrying commodities. I know it is urged in favor of this tax that one portion of this Dominion receives a benefit from it, and that other portions receive benefit from some other duties. But, Sir, I fail to find for the Province to which I belong, that we get any benefit or any compensation from any of these taxes. I consider this tax on flour, this tax on coal, as entirely sectional, as oppressive and impolitic, because I believe that there should be no duty unduly pressing upon one part of the Dominion in favor of another. The local tax is also a heavy burden upon our people, because in New Brunswick we are obliged to import anthracite coal which cannot be obtained elsewhere than in the United States. Therefore, so far as the western portion of New Brunswick is concerned, we find that the effect of this is simply to check and hamper our industry, both in regard to the lumber business and to the more important fishing trade in which so large a portion of our people are engaged. As I said before, this tax is sectional, it is impolitic; it is a tax which must bear harder upon the poor man than on the rich, because it affects the necessaries of life. Since I have been in this House, not only by my vote but by my voice, I have advocated a repeal of these taxes. I shall be glad to see them

taken off; and I will support any effort to reduce the expenditure so that the revenue would not be injured by the duties being taken off from these necessaries of life. Feeling that this is a subject of vital importance to the Maritime Provinces, I heartily support the resolution of my hon. friend from Northumberland.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I do not propose to detain the House with any lengthy observation upon this subject, but as the hon. member who has just taken his seat, and the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail), referred to the fact that no hon. gentleman on this side had been heard on this subject, I propose to define my position in order that our silence may not be misinterpreted. I have listened to the argument brought forward by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) who moved the resolution, and by those who have since addressed the House, but I have failed as yet to find any arguments which have thrown any new light upon this question. I have heard no reason brought forward in this discussion which would lead me, or I feel, should lead any other hon. member, to take any different course, or take any different position with regard to this question, than they would have taken at any time since the National Policy was introduced. I quite agree with some observations that have been made with regard to the duty upon corn meal. So far as this duty is concerned, it is a direct tax upon the consumers of corn meal in this country; there can be no doubt about that. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House referred to this as a special burden that bore upon the people of the Maritime Provinces. I feel, Sir, with regard to the Province from which I come, that although it may be, to some extent, a burden on that Province, we have a direct compensation under the National Policy by the abolition of the duty on tea, and in the reduction of the duty on molasses. I can tell the hon. gentleman that so far as my knowledge of that Province goes, the same class of people who use corn meal to which he refers, use, to a very large extent, imported molasses. It is an article of very general use among the poorer classes of the people of New Brunswick, and for the additional duties that they are obliged to pay under this tariff on corn meal in those other articles, they receive direct compensation. In addition to this, the Provinces, as a whole, receive an immense advantage from the duty which has been imposed upon coal. This duty has not only had the effect of largely developing the coal mine industry of that country, by the protection afforded against foreign coal, but also largely increased the consumption of coal throughout the Dominion by the establishment of numerous manufacturing industries; so that, both directly and indirectly, the people of the Maritime Provinces have been compensated for the additional burdens imposed upon them by this tax—compensated by the advantages which they have received in the ways I have indicated. With respect to the duty imposed upon flour I cannot endorse any of the arguments which have been used, based upon the assumption that this duty has increased the cost to the consumer.

An hon. MEMBER. Then why not put on $1.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). So far as the cost to the consumer in the Maritime Provinces is concerned it would not matter. At least that is my view of the case. The hon. member who last spoke referred to the fact that our coasting vessels could not bring American flour to our Maritime Provinces at the present time on account of the existing duty. That hon. gentlemen knows that Canadian flour could be brought through the United States in bond to Boston and New York and thence by schooner to St. John; but since the introduction of the Intercolonial and since the cheap freights at which flour is brought down from the western grain producing districts to ports in the Maritime Provinces, it is brought in that way instead of through the United States as formerly and by schooner to St. John. The hon. gentleman knows that that is the real cause why flour is not brought as formerly by coasting schooners from American ports to the port of St. John. I quite agree with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that this was accepted at the time the National Policy was adopted as one of the necessary parts of that National Policy. The hon. gentleman very correctly said that the National Policy was to a certain extent a policy of compromise; it was the policy best adopted to suit all the various interests and all the different classes of people in this Dominion, and while the people in the Maritime Provinces accepted the duties on corn meal and flour, on corn, wheat and other grain, in the interests of the farmers of Ontario, on the other hand the farmers of Ontario accepted the duty on coal in the interests of the people of the Maritime Provinces. And if this was a necessary part of the National Policy at that time, I can see no reason why it should not be a necessary part of the National Policy at the present time. I regret this motion should have been made by so prominent a member from the Province from which I come, as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). We all know he occupies a very prominent position in this House as the leader of an important party. We all respect him for the energy and ability with which he discharges his duties in this House, and we all are accustomed to attach a great deal of weight to any opinion that he may express, from the fact that he has had such a long and intimate acquaintance with the public affairs of the country. I regret he should have moved this resolution, for the reason that I feel as one of the younger representatives from that Province, that I am not able to support him in this matter. I could not, under any circumstances, go the length of this resolution. So far as the single item of corn is concerned I should be glad if the time arrived when the duty on corn should be abolished; I would not go to the extent of abolishing the duty on corn meal. I believe that corn can be brought into Canada from the United States and can be manufactured with advantage here. It is done under the present tariff in the Maritime Provinces, but not to a large extent, but if the duty on corn were abolished and the duty on corn meal reduced to 25 cents a barrel, the industry would be largely increased, and it would be of great advantage to the Maritime Provinces, and the milling industries would be so largely developed in a few years that the cost to the consumer would not be increased by the duty imposed on corn meal. I should be glad if the time ever arrived when, without injury to any other important industry in the Dominion, that change in the tariff can be made, and if at any time it can be done I shall be prepared to give it my hearty support; but at the present time I am not able to support the motion introduced.

Mr. CASEY. I was rather astonished to hear from a representative of the Maritime Provinces, one generally supposed to be so well posted as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that he does not believe the present duties increase the price of flour in the Maritime Provinces, and that a duty of even $2 a barrel would not make the least difference to the consumer. If he will go to an importer of American flour in Nova Scotia, and ask him what he will take for his flour in bond, and what he will take for flour duty paid, he will find the difference between the two prices exactly corresponds with the duty on flour; and how, in the face of such undisputed facts, the hon. gentleman can make the statement he has made, I cannot comprehend. But the hon. gentleman goes a little further. He says that this flour duty was part of the National Policy, and accepted by the Maritime Provinces as a necessary part of it. Why there should be any hesitation on the part of the Maritime Provinces in

accepting the proposition, unless it increased the price of flour; why the millers of Ontario should ask for this duty, unless to increase the price of flour, I cannot imagine. It was evidently intended that the breadstuffs duties should have a beneficial influence on the farmers of Ontario, who should make something out of the duties, while the Nova Scotians made something out of the coal duties. We have tried this system for several years. How has it worked? Let us take the coal duty first. Who has made anything out of the coal duty? Certainly no Province can have been benefited by the coal duty except Nova Scotia, because no other Province produces coal to any considerable extent—I believe some is produced in New Brunswick, but not sufficient to make any difference. How has it been beneficial to Nova Scotia? Has it, as was represented, induced the people of the western Provinces to use Nova Scotia coal? It is a question that needs only to be asked to be answered in the experience of everyone—that it has not. This policy has therefore not produced an interchange of Ontario grain for Nova Scotia coal. Coal does not come any further west than it did.

Mr. PAINT. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. I shall be glad if the hon. gentleman will show me some statistics to prove his statement.

An hon. MEMBER. He has spoken.

Mr. CASEY. Probably he can give some statistics to some friend, showing how much further west the Nova Scotia coal now comes than it did before. I know that it is virtually an unknown quantity in Ontario. We were told we would exchange Nova Scotia coal for Ontario grain. We do not get any chance to do so. Whether Nova Scotia coal is used in Quebec to any extent we do not know. There may have been an increased output of Nova Scotia coal, but it is not so large that it cannot be accounted for by the application of a little extra capital and enterprise, an increase which would have taken place even without the so-called protection to these coal mines. But what effect has the coal duty had in the west? We were told in the most glowing language that if we had a duty on coal and iron we would bring Nova Scotia coal up to Ontario; we would smelt our native ores and become a great iron producing country. How has that promise been carried out? Go across the Ottawa river to Hull and look at the deserted iron mines, mines producing the finest quality of magnetic ore, mines which were in operation and had smelting works attached to them years before the National Policy was talked about, mines which were turning out a first rate quality of Bessemer steel—for I have seen it—before the National Policy was heard of. These mines are idle to-day. Go up into the county of Hastings, a district which the Minister of Customs and my hon. friend for East Hastings know something about. We have magnificent mines there of first rate ore. Are we bringing up Nova Scotia coal and smelting that iron, and sending the product all over the world? No, we are shipping that ore to the United States in order that our American cousins may have the profits of smelting the iron. That is what the National Policy has done for the iron mines in that district. I am not surprised that the hon. member for East Hastings grows excited when this is mentioned.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Not a bit of it.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman shows his usual signs of excitement by standing up and interrupting, and I do not wonder at it, because I have no doubt he held out the prospect to his constituents interested in iron mining——

Mr. BOWELL. He has not a pound of iron ore in his constituency.

Mr. CASEY. I did not say he had, but that he had some people in his county interested in iron mining, and the hon. gentleman has too. And I have no doubt that they held out the prospect to them that the National Policy, by protecting iron and coal, would do a great deal for that industry, while the result is that the small amount of smelting which was going on in the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec has been entirely put an end to; the industry has been squelched, as many other industries have been, by these ill-considered attempts to foster it. Now, Sir, let us look at the other side of the question. Who has benefited by the tax on breadstuffs? Well, if we had any doubt as to which Province it might be, that doubt has been dispelled by my hon. friend from Northumberland. Evidently all the Provinces, except Ontario and Manitoba, are not wheat producing Provinces. Even Ontario imports largely; even Manitoba imports a little; and if any farmer is benefited by this tax, it must be the farmer of the Province of Ontario and the farmer of the Province of Manitoba. Quebec evidently does not profit by it; she is a large importer, an increasing importer. I think, according to the figures read to us by my hon. friend from Northumberland, she imported nearly twice as much last year as she did in 1877, and paid duty on it. Evidently Quebec is paying a very heavy tax in consequence of this duty on wheat. The Lower Provinces are in the same position. Ontario is evidently the principal Province to be benefited, if any one is benefited, by this tax. In fact, it was to benefit Ontario, or, at all events, to lead Ontario to think that she would get some benefit, that this tax was imposed. How does it affect the farmer there? Well, I read statistics last Session, with which I will not trouble the House again in detail, proving conclusively that the price of wheat is now, and has been for a year or two, not only lower than it was before the National Policy was introduced—which might have arisen from accidental circumstances, from a general lowering in the prices of wheat all over the world—not only lower than before the National Policy was introduced but has been constantly, ever since the National Policy was introduced, lower than the price of wheat on the other side of the line, at points correspondingly distant from the seaboard. In other words, wheat is and has been regularly lower in the principal wheat markets in Ontario than in the principal wheat markets of New York and Michigan, equally distant from the seaboard, and frequently lower than in the wheat market of Chicago, hundreds of miles further from the sea than we are. Under these circumstances, it is absurd to urge that the imposition of a duty on wheat has kept up the price of wheat in that Province. How could it do so? Only by excluding lower priced wheat from the United States; and since wheat in the United States is higher than it is with us, it is nonsensical and absurd to argue that the National Policy excluded any of that wheat. Wheat like any other article will seek the dearer market and not the cheaper. I do not charge this difference on the National Policy. I do not believe the duty on wheat has had any effect on the relative price. I simply urge that the duty on wheat in Ontario has not kept up the price of wheat in that Province.

Mr. BOWELL. If wheat is lower, flour is necessarily cheaper?

Mr. CASEY. We will come to the flour question presently; one thing at a time. The hon. gentleman laughs as if he had made a point, but we will see. I will give him the opinions of some people who know something about the question of flour. The price of wheat is lower than when the National Policy came into existence, and relatively lower than it is to-day across the border, and I tell hon. gentlemen that the farmer of Ontario is not such a fool as

to persist in the delusion which overtook him for a few short months, when he was induced to support the National Policy because it included a duty on wheat, as well as on barley and other products of the farm. Let us go again to the county of Hastings and ask the people there if barley is as good a price now as it was before the National Policy, and whether it is as good a price as it is across the Lake at Oswego. They will tell you that they know better. They will tell you that they know it is lower, proportionally, than in the United States. I met scores of Liberal farmers in 1878 who hesitated to support me because they were going to have a duty on wheat, barley, walnut lumber and a host of things they produced. They have a duty on some of these things, and they know that they have been deceived as to them and as to others, and what is the consequence now? Why, Sir, I cannot get the most extreme Tory farmer in my own riding to talk to me about the duty on wheat and other farm products upon which a duty was imposed. They will not discuss it; you cannot raise it on a public platform; it falls as flat as possible. You cannot get a Conservative speaker to take up the gauntlet if you throw it down to him, and the same is true, I believe, all through Ontario. The farmer finds that he was deceived, that he has been induced to put up with an oppressive tax on articles which he has to buy, on a delusive promise that he would get a higher price for what he has to sell—a promise which has not been kept with regard to wheat and other products Let us take corn. Of course, in the extreme western part of Ontario, there is a small district where corn can be profitably raised for home consumption, though I do not believe it very profitable to raise for export. At all events, there never was much exported. But in the rest of Ontario, including the county in which I live—one of the most favored counties in the whole western peninsula of Ontario—corn is a subsidiary product, only raised for fattening hogs and cattle on the farm. For most years, I may say for nine years out of ten, we have to import from the United States the corn we use for fattening cattle. One of the principal industries of that country is fattening cattle for the English market. I need not tell this House what an enormous trade of this kind has grown up—how many millions of dollars of British capital it brings into the country annually. But when we import American corn to feed cattle for that market, we have to pay a duty on it; and that duty is as great a tax on the farmers of my county as it is on the farmers of Quebec and Nova Scotia. To carry the matter further, some starch manufacturers came down here a few years ago and obtained from the Minister of Customs a rebate of duty on corn they had imported to make starch; but when I asked in this House that the farmers should have a rebate of duty on corn imported to feed cattle for the English market, to add wealth to the country, what answer did I receive? It was a sneer in such language as I would not care to repeat in this House. It was intended as a joke, a very rough one; but it showed that the Minister of Customs and the Government of which he is a prominent member had not considered this matter seriously in the interest of the farmers. It is the old story: when a ring of manufacturers come here asking for favors, and threatening opposition if they are not granted them, they get them; but when the farmer asks for similar favors, he is met with a sneer. That is the experience of the Ontario farmers with regard to the corn duty. But we shall be told, perhaps, that the Ontario miller reaps a benefit from this wheat and flour duty. Upon that point, too, I am qualified to speak from conclusive information. Last Session I wrote to all the millers of my county, and to several millers outside of my county, but in the same part of the country, one in Chatham and one in St. Thomas, for example, and the unanimous report I had from those millers was: We do not want an increase in the flour duties; we do not care much about the flour duties at all; what we do care about is that we should be allowed to import one kind of American wheat free to mix with our own wheat; if we were allowed to do that, we could almost do without the present flour duty; but if you leave the duty on wheat, the present duty on flour is not sufficient to give us protection, and none would be sufficient short of $2 a barrel, a prohibitive duty in fact, so long as that kind of American wheat is excluded. Now, we have first, the fact that this duty causes an increased price in flour to the consumer in the Lower Provinces, and, second, that it does not increase the price to the producer in western Ontario. This looks like an anomaly, like an absurdity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I have no doubt it appears so to the hon. gentlemen who are interrupting me, because they will not look into the matter. But the hon. member for Westmoreland admitted that the coasting schooners used to bring American flour from Boston and other American ports.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did not say that. I said they sometimes brought Canadian flour from Boston.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman said they brought flour from Boston—I supposed it was American flour. At all events they could have brought American flour from Boston very cheaply, and now they cannot do so. My milling friends tell me that the American millers, those at Minneapolis, for instance, make several grades of flour; they are able to send the cheaper grades to Boston and sell them at a low rate for consumption in the Maritime Provinces because the higher grades sell at a very high price; so that by averaging their product in that way they get a pretty fair price for their flour. Now, Sir, that flour could be sold cheaply at ports in the eastern States, such as Portland and Boston; it is a cheaper grade, but still good, and the people of the Maritime Provinces were perfectly willing to use it; that flour could be brought to the Maritime Provinces in schooners, and exchanged for fish or coal or some other product. But this trade has been prevented by the duty of 50 cents a barrel, and the Canadian flour is sent down and held by dealers at a price above the actual price of the flour by the freight and this extra protection of 50 cents a barrel. The dealer in the Maritime Provinces may make money by it, but the miller in western Ontario does not get a materially increased price for his flour. He gets the market, you may say, secured to himself. We have proof that he does not get the market secured, because there is a great deal of American flour imported yet. But suppose he did get exclusive control of the market, does he need it? Some of my milling friends tell me that if they were allowed to bring American wheat in free and mix it with Canadian fall wheat they could compete in the open market with the American manufacturer, and they do not absolutely need this protection to enable them to compete. What they want is to avoid the unnecessary cost put upon them by the National Policy. The effect of the duty on wheat is that some of the mills in my county have stood idle for months together because they could not afford to import American wheat at the price charged plus the duty, and they cannot go on milling flour profitably out of our native fall wheat without the addition of this American wheat. Scores of men in my county are out of employment for months every year in consequence of that provision in the tariff. And yet hon. gentlemen say that this duty is imposed for the benefit of Ontario. Ontario is represented in the eastern Provinces as a selfish Province, making a tariff for itself. Why, this very provision, which was put in the tariff on the pretence of recompensing Ontario for what she sacrifices for the Maritime Provinces, is doing as much harm in Ontario as it is doing in the eastern Provinces. We are told that Confederation cannot long be satisfactory to the Maritime Provinces, because it involves

high taxation—because Ontario will have high taxation. The people of those Provinces are mistaken. It is not the people of Ontario who want high taxation; it is the rings of Ontario who insist on the Government maintaining a high tariff, and who help that Government to remain in power against the wishes of the people of Ontario. If the people of the Maritime Provinces appeal to the people of Ontario to come out and show their strength against high taxation, to organise and work against it as earnestly as these interested monopolies and rings have worked to maintain high taxation, they will have their answer and their reward, because the people of Ontario will work and organise against this system. I may be told that I am setting class against class—the farming class against the manufacturing class. It is inevitable, Sir. The Government have inaugurated this war of classes; they have made a tariff which is nothing but an attempted balancing of classes against each other. They have made mistakes in it, no doubt, and have injured classes that they intended to benefit—the cotton manufacturing industry, for example; but they have tried to balance one class against another, and from one class to make up another's loss. It is a war between the consumers of Canada and the producers of Canada, between the producers of manufactured articles and the consumers, and we are to this extent, on behalf of the consumers of these articles, seeking merely to see fair play. We do not want to tax the producers of manufactured goods for our benefit, but we do not want to continue taxing ourselves to the extent to which we are, for their benefit. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has put the question fairly. He admits there must be comparatively high taxation for a time, under the present state of things; he admits we cannot go back at once to a revenue tariff. He says he does not desire a mere revenue tariff, but he declares that this tariff, called a protective tariff, is a failure. His position is a logical one. He takes the ground that duties are too high and that they must come down, and I believe he is right. If there be a strong case in respect to the wheat duty, it is in the Province of Manitoba. Manitoba is subjected to special and oppressive taxes from which the other Provinces are free; for instance the tax on agricultural implements; she appears to have a strong case for the wheat duty, and I would quarrel with no one from Manitoba who urged that, in her interest, this duty should be maintained. But as to the effect of the duty, I must give my opinion, and it is endorsed by prominent millers, that the wheat duty does not raise the price of wheat in Manitoba. I enquired of my milling friends, to whom I have already referred, whether they could get Manitoba wheat under this tariff, at such a price that they could use it, and they said they could not, and that if they could not get American wheat they would simply have to shut down their mills. On account of freight arrangements, they could not get Manitoba wheat at such a rate as would enable them to grind it; so that, instead of this duty of compelling our millers to use Manitoba wheat, its only effect, if it had any, would be to compel them to shut down their mills. They told me, however, that millers in Montreal and further east, who got more favorable freight rates, could afford to use Manitoba wheat, perhaps, altogether. They could get it almost as cheaply as American wheat, and in the case of large millers, who were doing a large export trade, it was possible they could use it at a profit. They do use it anyway, because the Manitoba wheat is better in quality than any American wheat; but as regards Ontario and the rest of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, the duty does not compel the consumption of a single bushel of Manitoba wheat. The fact remains incontrovertible that the market, which actually affects the price of our wheat, is the Liverpool market; and any local arrangements we can make, cannot make any appreciable change in the rates fixed by that market. For these reasons, I shall be glad to support the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland, and shall be glad to have the opportunity of recording my name in its favor, if he sees fit to call for a division. These two taxes, which were imposed for the purpose of making a balance of profit and loss between Ontario and the Lower Provinces, have resulted in the mutual injury of both, and I am glad to see a motion coming from a resident of the Lower Provinces asking for the abolition of them.

Mr. McLELAN. I would not trouble the House on this occasion but for the remarks of the hon. gentleman who, in addition to contradicting the arguments of the mover of this resolution, has thought fit to deliberately insult the Province of Nova Scotia and her people. He has stated in his argument, or rather in his attempt at argument, that the Americans make several grades of flour, that they use the best grades themselves, and ship the inferior grades to the Maritime Provinces, because the poorer classes of flour are quite good enough for these Provinces.

Mr. CASEY. Well, the laboring classes of these Provinces do not, any more than these of the other Provinces, consume the best flour.

Mr. McLELAN. The people of Nova Scotia are as wealthy as any portion of the people of the Dominion, and it ill becomes the hon. gentleman to insult us by saying it is quite good enough for us to have the refuse flour of the United States. We consume as good flour as does any other portion of the Dominion, and we get that flour from Ontario, which is a better flour than what we formerly got from the United States.

Mr. CASEY. That is what I said.

Mr. McLELAN. I know the quality from the United States and the quality of the flour from Ontario, and I say the latter is the better and gives more satisfaction to the people than the American flour we formerly received. We receive a better quality of flour and at lower rates than we would if we imported from the United States. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to ride two horses, and he has fallen between the two. He says that the National Policy does not affect the price of wheat, that the price of wheat throughout Ontario is lower than it is in the United States.

Mr. CASEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLELAN. Why, then, have we not cheaper flour? The hon. gentleman takes the raw material, which is the basis, and if that be obtained at a lower price the produce must necessarily be lower, and the seller be able to sell at a cheaper rate.

Mr. CASEY. Not necessarily.

Mr. MILLS. Why do you give a drawback?

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution told us he was an advocate of the National Policy, that he went before the people in 1878 as an advocate of that policy—and I know that the hon. gentleman, from his great ability, must have used strong arguments in its behalf—but that the people of the county of Northumberland did not quite comprehend that policy as clearly as he, did not quite see its effects as clearly as he, and that therefore he was defeated on account of his advocacy of that policy. But that was before it was known to the people that any tax was going to be placed on breadstuffs, before it was known there was to be duty on flour and corn meal. Four years afterwards, however, when this duty was placed on flour and corn meal, and the people of Northumberland county had four years' experience of the National Policy, the hon. gentleman presented himself before them again, as a candidate and an advocate of the

National Policy, and he was triumphantly elected by acclamation after the people had had four years' experience of the National Policy. The hon. gentleman has given us very voluminous statistics respecting the importations and exports of breadstuffs. I was not able to follow him sufficiently close to see whether he had given, under separate headings, that entered for consumption and that entered for export. On a previous occasion, I gave figures dealing with the whole imports and exports of breadstuffs for four years under the free trade policy of hon. gentlemen opposite; and I contrasted those figures with the imports and exports of American breadstuffs in the five years under the National Policy. What was the result? The House will bear with me if I repeat what I stated on a former occasion. I gave the whole imports of American breadstuffs for the four years from 1874 to 1878, and deducted the exports; and this left $26,707,126, as the net balance consumed by the people of the Dominion during the four years, or an average of $6,676,000 a year of American breadstuffs consumed by the people of the Dominion in those four years. Then I took six years under the National Policy, and I showed that there was only an import of $18,784,000 worth of American products for consumption, or an average of $3,130,500 a year against $6,676,000 worth under the free trade policy, so that, notwithstanding the increase of the population, the imports of American breadstuffs had fallen out one-half what they were under a free trade policy On the same occasion, I showed that our exports of home produce of breadstuffs had averaged $9,371,376 worth a year more than under the free trade policy. And I may state that, in the nine months of the present year, as compared with last year, the importation of American breadstuffs for consumption in the Dominion of Canada has fallen off $1,623,572, so that we are year by year increasing our own products and keeping out the American produce. And so with coal. The hon. gentleman says that because there has been a large importation of coal into the country, therefore the National Policy has produced no benefit to the coal mining industries of the country. The hon. gentleman knows that there has been a very large increase in the consumption of coal, and if he will turn to the returns he will find that, in 1877, the year which he has taken to make his calculations and comparisons upon, of slack coal, which was comparatively valueless before the National Policy was inaugurated and manufactures were started, there was only 109,155 tons sold, while in 1884 the sales had risen to 316,132 tons, and the total quantity of coal raised in 1884-85 had more than doubled since 1878. If the hon. gentleman will consult the coal owners of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, they will tell him they would rather have the National Policy than have reciprocity in coal with the United States.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes "hear, hear." The coal raisers, the coal mine owners of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton would prefer to have the trade of the St. Lawrence and of Canada under the National Policy, which it gives them, than have the duty on coal removed and reciprocity in coal with the United States. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said that it was all very well to put on this duty on corn meal and corn and flour when you inaugurated the National Policy, but now, when you have communication with the great North-West, when you have your road opened, and when you are able to produce in the North-West an unlimited quantity of wheat at very low cost, and you have your communication with that country and can supply your whole Dominion at low rates, now is the time to throw off the duty. What advantage would it be to the Maritime Provinces, in dollars and cents, to throw off the duty at a time when you can get your supplies from the North-West more favorably than you have hitherto done from Ontario? But, even when they were got from Ontario, there was no increase of cost to the people of the Maritime Provinces for the flour they consumed. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) says that, at all events, the duty upon corn meal should be thrown off, and I think it was the member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) who complained most of the tax on breadstuffs because there was a duty upon corn meal, which was ruinous to his Province. I turned to the records to see what this enormous amount was that was grinding down the people of New Brunswick, and of which he complained as causing a stagnation in trade. Why, the whole amount paid in the Province of New Brunswick upon corn meal, as returned in the blue-books, is $11,000, about 3 or 4 cents a head of the population. My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) made a comparison and said you are gaining more by being exempted from the tax which hon. gentlemen opposite had on tea and coffee in 1878. When you turn to the records and make the comparison, you find that, while the people of New Brunswick are paying from 3 to 4 cents a head on corn meal, they are exempt from a tax of 20 or 25 cents a head by the exemptions on tea and coffee. I think hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick ought not to complain very severely of a tariff which exempts them from so large a taxation on an article which every poor man in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and I think throughout the Dominion, consumes so largely and imposes so small a tax upon corn meal. I shall not trouble the House further. I think the hon. gentleman from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) completely answered all the arguments presented by the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), because he took a different view. He tried to make out that there was no increase in the prices of breadstuffs in consequence of the National Policy, while the hon. gentleman from Northumberland, from a different Province, was trying to make out that there was a great increase, and the hon. gentleman from the city and county of St. John (Mr. Weldon) was trying to make the House believe that his county and his people were suffering extremely because they were taxed on corn meal to the extent of 3 or 4 cents a head.

Mr. MILLS. I understood the hon. Minister to contend that the people of the Maritime Provinces get their flour at as cheap a rate as if there was no duty at all.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, I maintain that they get their flour as cheap over the Intercolonial Railway; and I know at present that, without the Intercolonial Railway, large quantities of Canadian flour are sent down to Boston in bond, and shipped up to the Bay of Fundy to different ports in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Even if we were without the Intercolonial Railway, that mode of supply would prevail, and would accommodate all the coast of Nova Scotia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It certainly is very remarkable that the people of the Maritime Provinces, assuming the fact to be as stated by the Minister of Finance, should be so blind to their own interest as to go and buy American flour, and pay 50 cents duty per barrel. However, that is one of those things that "no fellow can understand;" and I will not presume, therefore, to attempt to unravel the mystery. In the meantime, I will say to the leader of the third party, that I have great pleasure in supporting his motion to abolish the two most barbarous taxes which are to be found, even in our present very barbarous fiscal system. I doubt, Sir, whether it is possible, in any community calling itself civilised, to find two more utterly odious and detestable taxes than those on coal and flour and corn meal. Sir, this tax on coal may be considered to be the tax which, of all others, sets most at defiance every sound principle of political economy, and every principle

of common sense. What are the requisites which every statesman ought to look for in applying a tax? He ought to endeavor, as far as possible, to avoid taxing the necessaries of life; he ought to endeavor, as far as he can, to see that the tax is equal and just, that it falls with equal severity on all classes and sections of the population; that it does not discriminate against one particular section, or one particular part of the country; and, above all, he should have regard as much as possible to the interests of the poorest portion of the community, and take as little as possible out of the pockets of the poor. Now, Sir, judging by all these conditions, you can conceive of no tax which is more indefensible, which is more absurd, which is worse in its practical operation, than this same duty on coal. In the first place, this is a heavy tax on an article of the first necessity of life, particularly in a country like ours, where, in a large portion of it, the thermometer always averages a good many degrees below zero during certain portions of the year. In the next place, that tax, as the Minister of Finance must well know, falls almost exclusively on certain small portions of the population; an undue proportion of this tax is borne, as I shall presently show, by one single Province, and in that Province it falls with very great severity on certain small portions of the population. Vastly the greatest portion of this tax is borne by the people of the large cities, and it is a tax which, of all others, presses with most severity on the poorest portions of our population. The fuel of the poor man, in every city in Canada, and notably in every city in Ontario, is made a great deal more expensive to him by reason of this same tax.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there a man here who will get up and tell us that if you put a duty of 50 or 60 cents on coal, you do not increase the price?

Mr. FARROW. The Yankees pay it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Yankees pay it! The Yankees pay the coal tax! Well, Sir, if they pay the tax, why does not the hon. gentleman, when he wants more taxes, put $1, $2, or $3 a ton on coal? If the Americans are going to pay this tax, double the tax, treble the tax, quadruple the tax, and fill the Treasury at the expense of the Americans. Sir, there is another argument against this. It has always been laid down, and with great force, that we ought to avoid levying a tax at an inconvenient time. When is this tax practically levied from the poorer classes of the population in our large cities? Why, Sir, at the most inconvenient time of all, in the depth of winter, when these men's wages are smallest and hardest to get. This Government demands 20 or 30 per cent. on the value of the fuel from this section of the population alone. Moreover this is open to the other objection which I have mentioned, that it takes a great deal more money out of the pockets of the people of this country than it puts into the Treasury. Coal, in addition to being a necessary of life, is a prime motor in almost all important manufactures; and as everybody knows who studies this question, when you tax an article of prime necessity, a sort of raw material of manufacture, before the goods which are produced, by means of that raw material, reach the ultimate consumer, a very much larger sum will be taken out of the pockets of the people than will find its way into the Treasury. Sir, in respect to the duties on flour and wheat, not only do most of these objections apply as to the Maritime Provinces, but there is another argument. I believe, of all the shams, of all the deceits, that were ever palmed off on a country, the attempt to pretend to the people of Ontario, that by reason of a tax on wheat and flour you are going to add to the price they could obtain for those articles, was the most absurd. Why, Sir, within the last year or two, have not the organs of hon. gentlemen been ringing the changes, from day to day, on the plain and manifest fact that the price of these articles was regulated by the price in the great consuming centres of Europe? Have they not pointed to that as a proof that, as they urged, this present Government were not to blame, that it was out of the power of the Government to regulate the price of cereals, because that price was regulated by the price in Europe, with which the present Government had nothing to do? Now, Sir, if they are able to regulate the price of these articles, if it does depend upon their legislation, then how are they going to defend themselves, after promising to the farmers of Ontario that they would get good prices for all the cereals they had to bring into market? If they are not able to do that, they stand convicted out of their own mouths, of having made promises which they were utterly unable to fulfil. And if they are not able, if, as their organs have latterly contended, these things are regulated by causes entirely beyond their control, then I say this duty on wheat and flour is, as far as regards any effect that it may have on the price earned by the farmers of Ontario, an utter delusion. It may, and most probably does, add largely to the price in the Maritime Provinces, because Ontario is a longer distance off, and because there are heavy freight charges in bringing down flour and wheat there; and besides, on account of the trade that subsists between these Provinces and the adjacent cities of the United States, it is easier and cheaper to obtain that flour in the way of barter from the adjacent portions of the United States than to bring it down from Ontario. Sir, the truth is this, that the whole doctrine of duties to defend the products of the farmers of Ontario, was simply a piece of financial thimble-rigging. They knew, they cannot deny that they knew, that they were going to add enormously to the cost of living to the farmers of Ontario, that they were going to add very heavily to their taxes—not merely to the taxes that go into the Treasury, but to the taxes which do not go into the Treasury, and which are likewise very heavy. Hon. gentlemen now admit that after imposing these duties, they are utterly unable to keep up the price formerly paid, and they imposed those, knowing, I fear, the most of them, that they were not able to add one single farthing to the ultimate price which those cereals would fetch. More than that, I desire to point out how these duties affected particular Provinces. In the last Trade and Navigation Returns I find that the total duty paid into the Treasury for coal amounted to $1,071,000. Now, the duty ought to be evenly distributed over all the Provinces, it ought to bear some just proportion also to the wealth of the people. I find that Ontario paid $850,000 out of the $1,071,000 coal duties, a most enormous disproportion, a gross injustice to the people of Ontario, and a gross injustice, more than all, to the poorer classes of the population in the large towns and cities of Ontario. I turn to the duty on flour. There is a duty extracted from the people of $270,000, and I find that $230,000 of that sum are paid by Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. There is an injustice. Those two injustices do not make each other right. In the case of such a Province as New Brunswick, which pays both the coal tax and the flour tax, you have a double injustice, as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has pointed out. The hon. gentleman tells us that in the Province of New Brunswick they need not mind because they were relieved of a tax of 25 cents per head as respects the duty on tea. We will apply his argument. He says that the people have been relieved of a tax of 25 cents per head on tea. We tax Ontario, with its population numbering about 2,000,000, a sum equal to 44 cents or 45 cents per head as a duty on coal, and so the result of this policy in Ontario has been that an evenly distributed tax has been exchanged for an unjust and oppressive tax, by

which the people of that Province in the matter of coal alone are obliged to pay twice as much as they had to pay for duty on tea. I do not attach very much weight to the argument myself, for the simple reason that the hon. gentleman was no doubt well aware that the duty paid does not by any means represent the cost to the consumer. If we impose a duty on American flour and meal and allege it adds only 3 or 4 cents per head to the cost in the Maritime Provinces, the hon. gentleman must recollect that the price of the other flour, of the remaining corn meal brought in, is regulated by this duty, and he increases the cost not merely of that brought in from the United States but that brought down by an expensive line of railway, and at considerable cost from Ontario, to be sold to the people of the Maritime Provinces. And a result may happen in regard to that article which has happened in a good many instances, that while hon. gentlemen opposite are apparently taking only 3 cents or 4 cents per head out of the pockets of the people of the Maritime Provinces to go into the Treasury, the duty may easily amount to 30 cents or 40 cents, taking into account the whole quantity of corn meal and flour consumed by them. There is no denying that position. But I am aware of the impatience of the House, and as my views on this question are pretty well known, I do not propose to detain hon. members longer. I merely say that I believe the good sense of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has led him aright. I believe hon. gentlemen opposite will find that such an atrocious tax as a tax on the food and fuel of the people, a tax which bears heaviest upon the poorest class, will not be much longer endured by the people of Canada, and in the hope that to-night's discussion and to-night's vote may open the eyes of a good many of those who were deceived and duped by the First Minister a few years ago, I shall have very great pleasure in recording my vote in support of the resolution moved by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). As I have the honor to represent a very important section of the Dominion which is interested to so very large an extent in the cheapness of flour and in a good market for coal, I deem it my duty to say a few words in answer to the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), who made some very extraordinary statements which deserve correction. He endeavored to convince this House, if he did not convince himself, that we imported 778,000 bushels of wheat more from the United States than we exported; and he also endeavored to convince himself that we imported 441,000 barrels of flour more from the United States than we exported from the Dominion. This he convinced himself, if no one else, that we produced at least 500,000 barrels of flour less than we need for the consumption of the Dominion. That is the statement which has called me to my feet, and since the hon. gentleman has made it I have examined the Trade and Navigation Returns and I have convinced myself, and I will convince the House and the country, that the hon. gentleman is egregiously mistaken in his figures. I find the whole importation of the Dominion amounted to 3,102,422 bushels. There were entered for home consumption 373,101 bushels. Therefore 2,727,321 simply passed through Canada to a foreign market. The total exports of this Dominion were 5,423,805 bushels; the imports were 2,729,321 bushels, which passed through the Dominion from the United States to foreign markets; showing that we exported from the Dominion over and above what we imported, not less than 2,694,484 bushels of wheat. This manufactured into flour would amount to, in round numbers, 600,000 barrels, so that our export of wheat was equal to that quantity of flour. The hon. gentleman has shown that our imports of flour were 565,562 barrels, and our exports 161,054 barrels, and from wheat 598,754 barrels, or a total of 759,794 barrels. Besides this, the hon. gentleman did not show how much Canada produced last year, over and above what was necessary for home consumption. It is not impossible that 500,000 barrels, or even a million barrels were stored by our manufacturers for want of a market at home and abroad. That has not been taken into account by the member for Guysboro', and therefore his statement was misleading and unfair. But it was intended for the people of the Maritime Provinces. I invite attention to the fact that we can raise over and above what we require, at least, not less than 100,000 barrels a year. We are interested in having flour produced as cheaply as possible. I have no hesitation in saying that flour has been largely cheapened by the National Policy; and I go further and say that I have no hesitation in stating that coal has also been reduced in price owing to the effect of the National Policy. Against facts no arguments can prevail. My idea is this: That the price of a commodity is fixed by demand and supply. If the National Policy had the effect of increasing the supply beyond the demand in any part of the Dominion, the result is a decrease in values. I hold that the National Policy had the effect of largely increasing the production of flour in this Dominion, and largely increasing it beyond the demands of the Dominion, and therefore, that it had unquestionably the effect of largely reducing the price of flour in this Dominion. That is the reason why the people of the island which I have the honor to represent sent an unanimous representation from that island in favor of the National Policy. And I think I can prove boyond a doubt that it also had the effect of largely reducing the price of coal. My hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) says he takes a very great interest in reducing the price of food and fuel. If I can prove that the price of food and fuel has been largely reduced by the effect of the National Policy, I think the island I have the honor to represent will sustain the policy in the future, as they have in the past. I have, I think, already proven, at least to my own satisfaction and to the satisfaction of the people I represent, that it had the effect of largely reducing the price of flour. I can show from statistics that the price of coal, since the inauguration of the National Policy, has been largely reduced throughout the whole Dominion. And why? Because the effect of the National Policy is to bring competition between the producers on the other side of the line and the producers of Canada. We meet in common ground in the markets of Quebec, and we have a very large market in the Province of Quebec, and while the producers of the United States are sharply competing with our producers in the Quebec market, the effect is that the supply in Quebec is greater under the National Policy than ever it was before Confederation, and the direct effect of supplying it in excess of the demand is that the price of coal is lower in the Province of Quebec now than it was before the introduction of the National Policy. My hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Casey), ridiculed the idea that the people of the Maritime Provinces pay for their flour with coal. I have no hesitation in assuring my hon. friend that the people of the Maritime Provinces do pay for their flour, if not directly with coal, at any rate indirectly. The effect of the National Policy was to increase largely the output of coal in Nova Scotia. It has afforded a market for our people, and also enables them to pay in cash for the flour which is produced in Canada and consumed by our people. The output of coal, since the inauguration of the National Policy, has been doubled in the Province of Nova Scotia; and this large output, coming in competition with the coal produced on the other side of the line, has the same effect on the price of coal in the Dominion of Canada as the competition which exists between Ontario and the United States, in the article of flour in the Dominion, had upon the price of flour. The unquestionable effect of the National Policy, therefore, is to largely reduce the price of food and fuel, not only for the poor but for the rich as well. Before resuming my seat, I

desire to call attention to the fact that history repeats itself. It is repeating itself now. Sixteen years ago the National Policy was adopted in this Dominion. Some suppose it was adopted at a later period, but that idea only prevails among the juvenile politicians. Old stagers like myself distinctly recollect that in the year 1870 this Parliament adopted the National Policy. It had been adopted at that time under the guidance of my hon. and learned friend the member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby). I distinctly recollect the time, and the great pains he had taken to inculcate his own ideas into my head, and I am happy to say that he succeeded remarkably well, and that the lesson he taught me in 1869, 1870 and 1871 were valuable lessons to me since that time, and I believe to the people I have the honor to represent. I recollect that hon. gentleman sat somewhere in the centre benches. I sat at no great distance from him, and through his instrumentality with a few of our Ontario friends, who were Reformers or Grits then as they are now, we rather conspired to make a compromise amongst ourselves, and to give a slight protection to articles in which they were interested. It was compromise legislation as all legislation is—a compromise of one interest with another. We desired to compromise the interests of coal and the interests of agriculture; and to extend protection all over the Dominion we secured the passage of chapter 9 of 1870, "An Act to amend the Acts respecting Customs and Revenue." Among the articles enumerated in that Act, upon which certain duties were imposed, were the following:—Coal and coke, per ton, 50 cents; salt, except salt imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession, or imported for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries, which shall be free of duty, per bushel of 56 lbs, 5 cents; hops, per lb., 5 cents; vinegar and acetic acid, per gallon, 10 cents; rice per lb., 1 cent; wheat, per bushel, 54 cents; pease and beans and barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat, and all other grain, except wheat, per bushel, 3 cents; flour of wheat and flour of rye, per barrel, 25 cents; Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour of meal of any other grain, except wheat and rye, per barrel, 15 cents. By that compromise we managed to place the agricultural produce of Canada under a protective tariff so-called. The National Policy, which was then very young and very feeble, the bantling of the few who occupied an independent position in this House, only lived a short time. It was strangled the following Session, as an attempt is being made to strangle it now. In that Session, by a singular coincidence, it was a resident of Montreal who represented another constituency who succeeded in strangling the National Policy. On page 131 of the journals of 1871, I find the following:—

"The Hon. Sir Francis Hincks moved, seconded by the Hon. Sir George E. Cartier, and the question being proposed, that the Bill be read the third time to-morrow "——

That Bill was relating to the Custom laws.—

"The hon. Mr. Holton moved, in amendment, seconded by Mr. Mills' that all the words after 'be' to the end of the question, be left out, and the words 'now recommitted to a Committee of the whole House, for the purpose of so amending the same as to repeal the duties on coal, coke, wheat and flour,' inserted instead thereof."

Now the coincidence is that the hon. gentleman who moved in this direction was a resident of Montreal, who represented a distant constituency, and on this occasion we have my hon. friend from Northumberland, who is a resident of Montreal representing another constituency, moving in a similar direction. And the singular fact is that he has moved to place on the free list articles in which Quebec is particularly interested. This would almost lead me to believe that he is going to abandon Northumberland and get some part of Quebec for himself. But at that time it was deemed advisable, by the friends of those who were earnestly in favor of the National Policy, to move an amendment:

"The Hon. Mr. Blanchet moved, seconded by Mr. Ryan of Montreal: That the words, 'and also salt, peas, and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat, and all other grain, Indian meal, oat meal and flour, or meal of any other grain,' be added to the end thereof."

This was carried by a majority of the House with a view of reviving the National Policy at some future day. I am happy to say it was revived, and I am also happy to bear witness to the fact that the effect of that policy has been to reduce the price of food and fuel to the people of the eastern Provinces. It is admitted by hon. gentlemen opposite on all hands that it has largely reduced the price of wheat and flour in Ontario; and I think I can say that it has largely reduced the price of coal as well. It may be said, and it has been said, if the duty reduces the price, why not increase the duty and reduce the price more? The reason is this, that up to a certain point the duty reduces the price, but beyond that point one element which reduces the price would be taken away, that is, the competition between the Canadian and the foreign article, and we do not want to deprive the people of this country of competition which reduces the price of the commodity. Our idea is to encourage the production, and by increasing the supply beyond the demand, to reduce the cost of the article to the consumer. The following statement of a large sale of coal made to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, last year, conclusively proves that the price of coal was much below the price which existed previous to the adoption of the National Policy:

"On Saturday night Mr. Jos. Hickson awarded the contract for the supply of 375,000 tons of coal required by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Of this amount, 250,000 is to be delivered at the Suspension and International bridges, 55,000 at Detroit, 20,000 at Sarnia, 20,000 at Brockville, and 30,000 at Portland, Me. The contracts for the supply at Niagara were awarded as follows: 80,000 tons to Messrs. Bell, Lewis & Yates, of Buffalo; 130,000 to the New York, Lake Erie and Western Railway, and 20,000 to the Rochester and Pittsburg Railway. The coal to be delivered at the International bridge was sold at the following rates: Lump, $2.25; lump and nut, $2.20; run of mine, $2.05. At the Suspension Bridge the same kinds of coal fetched $2.40, $2.35 and $2.20 respectively. The Detroit and Sarnia contract was awarded to the Cleveland, Loraine and Wheeling Railway. The prices were $2.05 at Detroit, and $2.20 at Sarnia. The coal for Brockville is to be furnished by Messrs. Bell, Lewis & Yates at $2.50, while the contract for Portland, Me., was secured by the Chesapeake and Ohio Coal Company, at $3.50."

Coal would not have been delivered at Brockville last year by the American producers at the very low figure of $3.50 a ton, except for the keen competition with the Canadian producers which they met at Montreal; and I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to show that coal was sold at so low a figure at Brockville at any period previous to the adoption of the National Policy. Now, I desire to sustain the position taken by the hon. Finance Minister, that the coal producers of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton would much prefer the continuance of the National Policy to the reciprocity with the United States, and when I make that assertion I know whereof I speak, because I am from a coal producing part of the Dominion. The American companies last summer delivered coal in Portland, Maine, at the very low figure of $3.50 a ton. I have no hesitation in admitting that the producer in any part of the Maritime Provinces would fail to place coal at that price at Portland or any other port of the eastern States. If the adoption of a reciprocity treaty would increase the price of coal in the United States it would be to the advantage of our coal producers to have that market; but instead of increasing the price it would have the opposite effect, because it would bring American coal into direct competition with Canadian coal at the seaport towns of the United States, and therefore would increase the supply beyond the demand more than it exists at the present time. Naturally, our friends opposite realise the fact that it is not the duty that regulates the price of any commodity, but it is demand and supply, coupled with the ability of the consumer to pay. Sometimes the consumers find themselves unable to pay; and when they are

unable to purchase even the inferior flour spoken of by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), a great many of them must live on the flour produced from coarser grains. Let hon. gentlemen realise the fact, then, that demand and supply regulate the price of all commodities in the Dominion, and from that point of view in the future argue as to the effects of the National Policy. From that standpoint, it is clear that it will not have the effect of making food or fuel dearer to the consumers of the Dominion.

Mr. GILLMOR. It is unnecessary for me to speak on this resolution, so far as regards my views on this question, for they are well known in the House and in the country. I am very much pleased that the resolution has come from our old and honored friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and I hope I shall have the pleasure of congratulating him on having the largest support to his party he ever had. No doubt he is going to have the largest vote he ever had; whether he has come to our side or whether we have gone to his side, is a matter of opinion. With regard to this resolution, I supposed the speaking was going to be all on our side before recess, as our friends opposite did not seem disposed to pay any particular attention to the question. I cannot understand how any representative, from the Maritime Provinces at least, can be convinced it would not be in the interest of the Maritime Provinces to have this resolution carried. I have listened with great pleasure to my hon. friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), who, when he has treated a subject, leaves very little to be said by anyone else. It is always a pleasure to hear him and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) speak on subjects of political economy, because they understand those subjects and make them clear and comprehensive. With regard to the argument that flour is not increased to the consumer by this duty, that contention is simply absurd. We paid into the Treasury for duty on flour and corn and meal some $431,000 last year. How then can any hon. member say that the price of flour and corn and meal was not increased by the duty? If there had been no duty, the people would have had these articles at $431,000 cheaper than they paid for them. With regard to my hon. friend, I was pleased the resolution came from him because I know he is an advocate of the National Policy, and has still a lingering desire for it and, strong free trader as I am, knowing we must have a revenue and a high revenue, I could almost adopt for a revenue tariff the one my hon. friend suggested. If I understood him rightly, he said he would have free flour, free corn and meal, and free coal, and he would re-adjust the tariff on cotton by reducting it 10 per cent., and the tariff on woollen goods by reducing it 10 per cent., and make a large reduction on the sugar duties in order to destroy this enormous monopoly which is carried on by the refiners. I do not know if the making of a tariff were left to the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), that his would differ very much from that one, because it is well known, seeing our debt has so largely increased and so much of our income has to go as interest on our public debt, and for the support of certain institutions we must maintain, we must have a high tariff, and I think my hon. friend's tariff might very consistently be called a revenue tariff. I hope this resolution will be adopted, but I do not expect it will, because this monument, the National Policy, has been erected by compromise. It was necessary to begin by compromise. We talked about the duty on flour benefiting Ontario and the duty on coal benefiting Nova Scotia. There you find the basis of the whole thing, you have got to begin somewhere. The coal men could not expect to succeed alone, so the flour men come in and get a duty on flour. Then the cotton and woollen men come in, and so, by degrees, the Government built up this pyramid by compromise, until they had succeeded in bringing enough interest in-

to it to secure a majority. Having secured a majority, they cannot afford to take all the rest in, because, if all hands got in all parties would be even and there would be no profit in the thing at all. The Government cannot afford to allow this resolution to pass, because the moment you begin to break in on the structure, it shows its weakness, and by-and-bye, after a few more inroads have been made upon it, it will fall. Only two or three more interests need be taken out to burst the whole thing. It is not my intention to discuss the National Policy, as that seems to be for the present a settled policy; the people so far have adopted it, but I do not despair that they will see the falsity of the system and in due time abandon it. The Finance Minister spoke about a free breakfast table. Well in this Canada of ours, as the hon. member for Northumberland is fond of calling it, we have vast wheat fields and vast coal fields, of which we are fond of boasting; but because Providence has showered upon us these blessings, we, by Acts of Parliament, make them as dear as we can. We have not got any tea and coffee, so we do not tax them, and it would be a great blessing to the people of Canada if we had not wheat and coal, because in that case they would not be taxed. The things we cannot produce are given to us cheap, but those we can produce we have to pay dear for. It would, therefore, be a great misfortune if somebody would chance to find a coffee mine or a tea mine in this country, for hon. gentlemen would make of it a plank in this National Policy. Some monopolists would get hold of this mine, just as they get hold of timber limits and coal limits, and they would demand protection. Everything that a kind Providence gives us in abundance is to be made dear under this National Policy. When the Dominion of Canada becomes so straitened in circumstances that we have to tax the food and fuel of the poorest portion of society and raise taxes on the necessaries of life, that shows a very low state of things. Then again they are trying, and honestly too, to encourage manufactures, but there is a most important article, this article of coal, which is the basis of all manufactures as well as the fuel of the poor and the rich alike, and they are now, by this tax, making that dear which we have in abundance. As my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon), has pointed out, in this deal New Brunswick seems to have lost all. They had no interest in coal mines, they had not any great wheat fields. Our industries are the fishing and lumbering industries, and, of course, we have some manufactures which may benefit to some extent by this National Policy, but we are suffering more than any other part of the Dominion. I say this tax levied upon flour does not at all embrace all that the consumers of flour or those who import it in the Maritime Provinces have to pay. If the duty on flour does not help the producers of flour, the millers of Canada, what does it do? I contend that not only do we pay the duty upon the flour we import, but we pay an equal amount of additional cost upon the flour produced in the country, and that argument holds good throughout the whole system, and there is the worst feature of a protective policy, that only a small part of what the people contribute goes into the Treasury. My hon. friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) says we pay as much more, but those who have looked into the subject and are capable of forming an opinion say we pay a great deal more into the hands of those who produce in the country than we pay on the goods we import into the country. I do not intend to weary the House because there is no real practical result to be gained from it. I am only surprised that those from the Maritime Provinces, who know, who must know, that we are suffering very much with regard to these articles at least, should take the position they have taken. I cannot understand why a duty should by kept at least upon corn. If you would let the corn come in free, you would encourage somebody to build a grist mill and make the meal in

the country, and I do not see why this should be levied. With regard to this tea and coffee duty, that is a very different thing. I do not ask to have a duty put on tea; I am glad to have anything free; but, if a duty were put on tea, it would not bear hard on any particular part of the Dominion, it would be equalised over the Dominion, and every part would contribute to the revenue; and so with coffee. I cannot resist the impression that, if we are to raise a revenue, we ought, as far as possible, to raise it on articles which are not produced in the country. Then it will be all revenue; it will all go into the Treasury and not into the pockets of the manufacturer. I am satisfied that, the longer this National Policy is tried, and the people have time to reflect and to wipe away the fallacies that have been urged in its favor, the more they will come to their senses, as our friends across the water in England have come to their senses and abandoned this principle and confined themselves to a revenue tariff, which is the best for all the interests concerned. I am satisfied now, that, if the truth was known, this National Policy has been a failure. I am inclined to think it has been a failure as far as the manufacturers are concerned, but it is hard for them to give it up, it is hard for any protected industry, after years of protection, and after being flattered into the idea that they are going to have a chance to make money out of it, to give it up, and so they struggle on. I believe this system is the cause of a great deal of the discord among the laboring classes across the border. These laborers say that the capitalists are protected by law, that they have the ear of the Legislature and that they have the power and the influence, and that, while labor is free, capital is protected. That has led to discord and will lead to discord. We find now how it is looked upon. Here, in Canada, I do not know that there are very many pools or combinations of manufacturers, but there are some. I do not know that the men employed by the coal owners find very much fault, but I think last year there was a strike. These men are protected by law, and the laboring classes are not protected. Hence the discord. What is done by these manufacturers in their meetings, and in their combinations and pools, is looked upon as a good thing, it is going to do a great deal for the country, it is going to make prices dear and articles scarce, and, when you make articles dear, it is a good time; if prices are dear everyone thinks the times are good, everyone who is making money out of it, everyone that has the ear of the newspapers, everyone that has the capital and the influence. It is all very good for society. But let the workingmen who have no protection and have to live upon their scanty earnings meet together, and they are at once charged with disorderly gatherings, they are at once considered to be producing discord in society. This protective policy leads to all that, but still we have got to learn by experience, and I will conclude by saying that I have very great pleasure indeed in voting for the resolution of the hon member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and I would rejoice greatly if I could see a majority of this Parliament adopt that resolution. I believe it is the correct one. I believe that, in the minds of the people of this country, those who look at it fairly, those who look at it disinterestedly, those who look at it judiciously, will believe that that resolution is, in every respect, a worthy one, and I am happy to support it.

Mr. GAULT. I am to-day the representative of one of the very largest coal consuming constituencies in this Dominion of Canada. There is more coal consumed by the manufacturers in my division than in any other town in this country. I have yet to learn that the First Minister has applied to me to have a reduction in the coal duty. Never yet have I had a person speak to me of a reduction of the coal duty. Our manufacturers are industrious and they are prosperous. I am proud to say that in the city of Montreal to-day any man of industrious habits can get employment. All our people are well employed, our city is growing rapidly in every direction, houses are being built, and I know it is the same in every city in Canada where manufactures are established. I will take Valleyfield, Cornwall, Chambly, every place in the Province of Quebec where there is a manufacture, and to-day every town and village is growing very rapidly. I want to say a very few words about our industries. The worthy representative for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has said he would like to see the cotton duties reduced. Never in the world were cottons so cheap as they are in Canada to-day. They are cheaper than they are in the United States of America. Cottons that in 1878 were 8 and 9 cents a yard are to-day 3 and 3½ cents a yard. Woollen goods that were sold in 1878 for 70 cents a yard are sold to-day for 37½ to 40 cents a yard, and I say it is all owing to the National Policy, to the very great competition among manufacturers, which will always exist in this country hereafter. We never have had any complaints whatever about the duties on coal in the city of Montreal, and I think, with the present prosperity and rapid growth of this country, we ought to rest satisfied with the National Policy which was established in 1878.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Representing a rural constituency in the Province of Nova Scotia, one would almost suppose that, with coal interests there to foster, and with no manufactures at all in the western part of the Province, if the arguments of the hon. gentlemen opposite were correct, we would not have been returned here—that the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulback); that the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Allison); that the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Kinney), would not have been elected as supporters of the National Policy. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), by his motion, proposes to affect the National Policy in a very material way. I regret that I was not in the House when he made his speech, but I understand that the hon. members who followed him have taken the same line that he took. I have to say this, that while these articles of corn meal, flour and coal, might possibly be taken off the list, and be allowed to come in free, yet if we did that we would violate the general policy of protection which was inaugurated by Parliament and sustained by an overwhelming majority in this House after full discussion, in the year 1879. I can have no better warrant for that statement than the able and eloquent speech of the hon. member for Northumberland, made in this House in 1878, when the National Policy was first promulgated by the present Prime Minister in a very wonderful, and exhaustive speech, on an amendment which he made on going into Supply. My hon. friend, in the most graphic language, showed why he was in favor of a duty upon coal. He stated that his county was not interested in having a duty placed upon coal, but he was more than a county representative, he was a Dominion representative; he looked to the whole of Canada, and he would be willing to put a tax upon coal, but if you took it as an isolated case, he was not willing to do so. A perfectly legitimate argument, and an argument that I intend to follow. He said:

"He was prepared to advocate such a duty if it was adopted as a general principle, and if it was proposed to consider the interests of Canada in this relation—our manufactures, the shoe and iron manufacturing interests, and a host of other industries which he need not mention. He was prepared to consider these interests as a whole, although his county was interested in having the least possible amount of taxation imposed, as it imported and did not manufacture. Nevertheless, he was prepared to consider, in a general system of protection, these interests as a whole, but he would not take them up as individual interests, but do as his hon. friend would do."

He concluded his very able speech by these remarks:

"These were the views which he entertained, and he took this early opportunity of putting them on record. While prepared to vote for a duty of 15 cents a ton on coal, if adopted in connection with the other

interests of Canada, he was not prepared to do so as an isolated measure"

Now, Sir, the National Policy was then carried with my hon. friend's consent, he was an advocate of it. To-day we do not find a single petition upon the Table of this House against that policy. I do not know of one member of this House who has a petition from his constituents to violate the letter or the spirit of that policy, which was approved by the largest majority of the people that ever approved any public measure. If the words of my hon. friend were not sound doctrine at that time——

Mr. MITCHELL. You had better read the whole speech.

Mr. WOODWORTH. If I did, I would have to read somebody else's speech, and somebody else would reply to it, and we would never get through. I have read the hon. gentleman's whole speech at my desk, and his whole argument is exactly what is there. Surely, my hon. friend does not accuse me of garbling his speech by quoting those extracts. I would, by so doing, degrade myself in the estimation of this House, as I have never yet done in my life. I am not trying to make him inconsistent. I am saying that he delivered an able speech, an eloquent speech. I do not know what has come over his mind since, but, at that time, he made a very eloquent defence of the National Policy, and it was inaugurated with his consent. Now, I say that no petition has been presented against this policy. Why, if it bore so hardly on my Province, as hon. gentlemen opposite say it does, if I am misrepresenting my constituency, if my hon. friends are misrepresenting their constituencies, why don't we have petitions? I should suppose, for instance, that the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), would have his desk filled with petitions against this policy. The hon. member for South Huron called it the most disgraceful thing that ever disgraced a Statute-book. Why, if that were true, would he not have 500 men here from his county on a delegation against it. In the case of the Franchise Bill, we had some petitions against it, but there is no petition against the National Policy. What is the reason? The reason is, that the people know more than we do; the people—the fountain of power, the fountain of laws—know quite as much, if not more, than their representatives do upon this question, and when their representatives do not carry out their wishes in Parliament, the latter soon hear from them. We had an election four years after this policy was introduced; we said to the people: What do you think about it? We all know what the result was, and by what a majority the National Policy was endorsed. Is it possible, then, that the people are in darkness because they send no petitions here, that they do not know what they want? To my mind, this is a most conclusive argument. It is true, my hon. friends opposite might go into the Library and take the speeches of the past and read them here, and some one on this side might read speeches in opposition, and we would be kept here as long as we were on the Franchise Bill. I am obliged to my hon. friends that they do not do that, but I do say that all the arguments of the ablest men in this House, all the learning they can bring to bear, are light as vanity and empty air, as compared with the solid sense of the yeomanry and artisans of this country. They know we would be recreant to our duty as their representatives if, after having sent us here on that issue, and when they have never sent a petition against it, we were now to turn round and reverse that policy. The hon. member for Bothwell and his friends, if they did that, would soon find staring them in the face a storm of disapprobation coming up from the people in defence of this policy or against it. They cannot get out of that. What has come over the spirit of the dream of the hon. member for Northumberland who has moved this motion? He may see further than I do, or further than a great many members of the House, for he is an old and experienced parliamentarian and a very able man. But I certainly would have thought, with that speech on record, which will stand as long as the *Hansard* and the English language endure, he would have waited until he had petitions from Northumberland, objecting to the tariff, declaring that it was a monstrous tariff; but his constituents have not taken that course. The member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault) has told the House that so far as regards coal, he represented the views of the people of Montreal, and there was no protest against the tax there. What is the fact? Half a million tons of Nova Scotia coal go to Quebec every year and most of it to Montreal.

Mr. VAIL. The Corn Exchange of Montreal petitioned this House in 1878, to remove the duty on breadstuffs.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Do not let us extend the range of the argument beyond its present confines, or we will never close the Session. An ounce of experience is worth a thousand speeches. There is not a petition, said the hon. member for Montreal West, against the coal tax. One would have thought they would have made an outcry in regard to it, if the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite are correct. The product of Nova Scotia coal mines that goes into the other Provinces is one million and a quarter tons. I will not enter into the arguments presented by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), who has given figures to show, as everybody knows, that coal has fallen in price, and that the price of coal on this side of the line is as low as it is on the other. Why the Americans do this we need not wait to discuss. The fact is that the coal ring have put the price down. Do not the people of Montreal know whether they are paying too much for their coal as well as any hon. member? A few words in regard to flour. Have we any petitions from the counties round Halifax where there is a large agricultural district in which there are no manufacturing or coal interests, and where the tax might be expected to bear very heavily—is there any man petitioning against the tax on flour? Not one. Flour is as cheap there as it was before the National Policy was introduced. I do not go into the argument, I state the fact; and I say the people have not been complaining. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) leader of the late Government came down to Halifax in the autum of 1878 and stated that a duty imposed upon an article of which a country produces a surplus would not raise the price one farthing. The hon. gentleman may ask me to explain that. I would have to enter into the other question of interprovincial trade and into a long argument; the reasons can be shown—there is no result that has not a cause—but we need not stay all night to ascertain causes, there is the fact. Nobody in Nova Scotia has complained by petition of the tax on flour. During my election campaign in 1882 I addressed farmers and brought up this question; and it was said that here was a gentleman advocating a tax on flour, and that the Conservative party advocated and imposed that tax. I asked: Are you paying more for your flour? Thousands of voices screamed out, "no." What, then, is the use of taking up an hour in talking on flour if there are no petitions asking that the tax should be removed. Would I not be recreant to my duty after my constituents have elected me, after I explained my position to them and without a petition being forwarded, I should vote in favor of the hon. gentleman's motion to remove the tax? And if we did remove the tax where would the policy be? The country would have no National Policy. The hon. member for Northumberland cannot get out of the fact that he is an advocate of the National Policy. He nailed his colors to the mast long ago; but he cannot have a piece of a National Policy, he must have a whole National Policy; he must have a whole blanket and not strips of a blanket. If such a motion as this is adopted, the blanket becomes too short. The hon. gentleman cannot continue his politi-

cal course in that way. He is either a National Policy supporter or he is not. I merely rose to state my reasons, without going into statistics, which I could do very easily, but they have been entered into *ad nauseam* in the past why I will not turn my back on the professions I have made and against the wishes of my constituents vote for the hon. gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MILLS. I do not propose detaining the House more than a few minutes to state my views with respect to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Northumberland. I am rather surprised at the line of argument pursued by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) who is usually very logical in discussion. The hon. gentleman says that the people in the Maritime Provinces, notwithstanding this tax on meal and wheat, are paying no more for their breadstuffs than they did before the tax was imposed; and if I rightly understood the Minister of Finance he informed the House that in fact the people did not pay any tax whatever, that the tax was paid by the producers of those products, and if the tax were doubled it would still be paid by the producers and not by the consumers of the necessaries of life. If the hon. member for King's is right in the view he enunciated, why does the hon. gentleman support a proposition to give a drawback to millers who manufacture American wheat when flour is shipped? Does not the hon. gentleman see that the tax is not paid by the buyer; it is paid by the man from whom the miller makes the purchase, and why should Government take money out of the public Treasury to give to a miller after he manufactures wheat into flour for exportation, if the miller has never paid the tax? The hon. gentleman should be consistent. If the hon. gentleman was disposed to maintain that this tax was not paid by the consummer they should at once abolish all those provisions for recouping those parties. While I will support this resolution I cannot say I am enthusiastically in favor of it, because it seems to me it has been made in some degree an inseparable part of a system which is vicious in every portion of it. The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution declared himself generally in favor of the National Policy. In that I differ with him. I was not in favor of it when it was introduced; I have no reason to think more favorably of it now after it has had seven or eight years' trial. I do not believe the experience of the past is in favor of the proposition. The hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault) informed the House that people were buying their cotton goods, notwithstanding the tax of 40 per cent. cheaper now than they did a few years ago. If the hon. gentleman is satisfied that such has been the effect of the National Policy he ought to oppose it, because certainly if the manufacturers of cotton are obliged to sell their goods at much lower prices than they did before that national taxation was imposed, and that reduction in price is the result of that taxation—and unless it is a result there is no propriety in alluding to it—the hon. gentleman should seek its repeal in the interests of the manufacturers. If I am rightly informed the hon. gentleman had before him as a member of an important committee of the House not long since the proposition to protect the insurance companies of Canada, to legislate in their interests and against the insurance companies from abroad, did the hon. gentleman support that proposition? Did he come to the conclusion that, if that protection had been given, the insurance companies would be able to carry on business in Canada more cheaply than before; that insurances would fall, that insurances upon property and life would be secured upon more favorable terms after this protection was given than before? Well, Sir, if the hon. gentleman did not think so—and it is clear from his actions that he thought that the protection of the insurance companies would have the effect of increasing the cost of insurance—if, that was his conclusion in that matter, how comes he to arrive at a different conclusion with reference to this tax on other products? My hon. friend from Northumberland, when he moved this resolution came to the conclusion, which is the right conclusion, that taxation is a public burden. It may be a public benefit: that depends on the purpose to which the tax is applied. But hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who support this tax declare that the imposition of taxes is a benefit, wholly regardless of the purpose to which the money which is raised is applied. Now I do not take that view; and I say that these taxes are very objectionable taxes. They are taxes on the necessaries of life; they diffuse taxation unequally. They are taxes which do not fall on our population in proportion to their ability to pay. Those who have the smallest incomes are those who frequently pay the largest proportion of these taxes, and, upon this ground, taxes on the necessaries of life are always objectionable. Now, we have this point, however, to consider. These taxes are a portion of a general system. There are many other articles which are taxed more highly that they would be were it not for these duties on coal. The manufacturer under a system of protection would be equally protected at a lower rate of taxation—assuming that protection is a proper thing—if the duty upon coal were removed. So, while I was disposed to leave this National Policy experiment to continue to be tried as we have it with all its imperfections—for you know there are many cases in which the worse a matter may be the greater may be the chance of remedy—while I was willing to leave the system to operate with all its imperfections, still, when a proposition is made for the purpose of producing a better condition of things, although it is not all I could desire, I am ready to support it. But, let me say this on the subject of this tax. We are not in the position we were in 1878. I contended then, and I maintain now, that it is the duty of Parliament to maintain a sufficient tax to meet the public necessities, and provide all the revenue which is required for the maintenance of the Government and the meeting of existing obligations. I think it is our duty, in the imposition of that tax, to impose it in such a way as to take as little as possible from the people, beyond what is required for the State. The objection to many of these taxes, under our system, is that they take a great deal from the pockets of the people which never finds its way into the Treasury. The taxes upon cotton, and many of the ordinary manufactured articles of the country, may have the effect, as in the case of flour, of imposing a serious tax on the consumer, without putting a dollar into the Treasury. What is the object of putting on these taxes? Is it not for the purpose of increasing the price, and making it profitable to produce that which under other circumstances, would not be produced? When we put a tax on coal is it not for the purpose of increasing the cost of coal in the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. WOODWORTH. No.

Mr. MILLS. Compare the price of coal at Ogdensburg and Prescott, or at Windsor and Detroit. The last time this subject was under discussion, I telegraphed to these places and I found that the difference was exactly the same as the amount of duty; and so it is under other circumstances where there is less of the article produced than is required for consumption.

Mr. WOODWORTH. What I meant was that the hon. gentleman was incorrect in this way: It is not the object to increase the price of coal in Nova Scotia, but to increase the output, so that it will minimise the price.

Mr. MILLS. We know the effect of it. The percentage of Nova Scotia coal consumed to-day is no greater than it was in 1878. In fact, it is less.

Mr. WOODWORTH. No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, yes.

Mr. MILLS. I say that the imported coal has more than doubled and to preserve the same proportion of consumption the output should have more than doubled, and it has not done so. The hon. gentleman has but to look at the facts to see that the increase in the consumption of the domestic article has not kept pace with the general increase of the consumption of coal in this country, and that being the case, it is perfectly obvious—it is too plain to require any serious argument—that the tariff has not accomplished the object which these hon. gentlemen professed to accomplish by it, at the time it was imposed. Now, the Minister of Finance told the House, in the discussion of this question in the early part of the evening, that the people of Nova Scotia would prefer protection to reciprocity.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MILLS. Yes; that is what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Except in reference to coal.

Mr. MILLS. I am speaking of coal; that is the subject now under discussion, so far as the Nova Scotia people are concerned. And let me say this, that the hon. gentleman stated what is undoubtedly a fact, so far as the protected section of the people are concerned. It is true everywhere. One of the things I charge against hon. gentlemen who support the tariff as it now stands is that they have not dealt candidly with the country in the discussion of that question. When the question first came under discussion what did hon. gentlemen state? They said: We want a retaliatory tariff. They said: If the people of the United States will give us reciprocity we will accept it, but we have been on our knees for years, begging of the United States to remit their duties when we will remit ours. We have provided by Statute that we may, by Order in Council, at any time, do so, but they have spurned our proposition and we will retaliate. It was on that ground that they sought the support of the people of this country, and asked the people of this country to return them. They said: Look at the American population. They are making Canada a sacrifice market. They are using your market, driving your own industries out of your market, and making a close preserve for themselves. They did not say they were going to put a tax on every article which was imported here from England that came into competition with the domestic products of the country, notwithstanding that the people of England put no tax on their products. What they proposed was not protection; they did not mention protection, but the policy of retaliation, which would have meant, if honestly carried out, free trade with those countries ready to trade freely with us, and protection and retaliation against those imposing restrictive duties on us. That was the ground upon which they appealed. They appealed, not to the judgment of the people, but they appealed to their passions, and they said: Gentlemen, this is the way the Government and Congress of the United States have treated you; let us deal with them in the same way that they have dealt with us. And it was upon that ground —though it was a false pretence—that these hon. gentlemen sought the support of the country. But when the manufacturers of Canada accepted the policy of the Government, did they accept it on the ground that the Government said: We are ready at any time to enter into negotiations with the United States for the purpose of establishing reciprocal trade relations with them? Not at all. The hon. Minister of Finance expressed the true sentiments of those in favor of this so-called National Policy. He said the owners of the coal mines of Nova Scotia do not want reciprocity; they prefer the present tariff; they prefer that the people of Ontario should pay a tax of $1,000,000 a year on the coal they consume, which is brought in from the United States, so long as they can make a close preserve of their own market. That is what the hon. gentleman said; and what he said of the coal manufacturers may be said of the whole class of men who sustain the present tariff. When the hon. gentleman talks about reciprocity, he knows that if the Government had made an honest and earnest effort to secure reciprocity with the United States, they could have had it. They have not reciprocity to-day because they do not want it—because those who support them are not in favor of reciprocity, but are in favor of high taxation, in order to make a close preserve of the markets of Canada for themselves. That is why the hon. gentlemen have maintained their tariffs, and why they prefer a feeling of hostility to a feeling of friendliness and reciprocal trade with our neighbors to the south of us. I will support the proposition of the hon. gentleman for the repeal of these duties. I believe it is better than the state of things we now have. At the same time, I admit that it is far from satisfactory. Our whole tariff requires revision. It is true, we cannot for many years to come get back to a low tariff; our obligations are too great; and there is no manufacturer of this country who need be afraid that we are going to or can reduce the duties to so low a rate as to make Canada a free market. There is no possible danger of that; and that being the case, I shall support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Northumberland. But before sitting down, I would just say this to hon. gentlemen opposite. There is one hon. gentleman who makes it a point to interrupt others, and who has a very great deal to say in the discussion of public questions in this House. Let me tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that they did not make a great deal by their interruptions and disturbances last night, and they are not going to hasten the conclusion of this Session by any unparliamentary proceedings of that sort now, and they may just as well understand that first as last. They did not do anything to shorten the Session last year by unparliamentary conduct, and they are not going to succeed this Session.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the House will bear with me for a few minutes while I answer some of the statements made in this debate. I will first refer to the argument used by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) that we accepted the duty on flour as a compensation for the duty on coal, and while he would like to see the duty reduced, he does not think the present the proper time now. I will state for the information of the House that so far as New Brunswick is concerned, we did not accept the duty on flour as a compensation for the duty on coal, because New Brunswick was in no way interested in the duty on coal—was not then and is not now a coal producing Province, and therefore could not be compensated in the sense the hon. gentleman states. The hon. Finance Minister speaking of myself, said that I advocated the National Policy, and that I stated that I was defeated because of the National Policy, and that I was re-elected after four years. Sir, all that is quite true; but if the hon. gentleman imagines that I was re-elected on the question of the National Policy—rather on the question of the duty on flour and the duty on coal than the question of the National Policy—he is very much mistaken. I was elected on quite a different basis and with a different object by the gentlemen who sent me here. They elected me because they felt that although, in their opinion, I had gone astray in permitting the duty to be placed on flour and on coal, and for which I was not responsible as I was not in the House when the policy was adopted, I was at all events sound in my desire not to have a duty placed on those articles; I never favored it, and never supported it. While the hon. member for King's quoted part of my speech, he did not do right in quoting only that part, and leaving the impression that I took a different position then from what I take to-day. The hon. Finance Minister referred to another point that requires a little attention. He said, con-

sult the coal mine owners of Nova Scotia, and they will tell you that they would rather have the duty on coal than reciprocity. Consult anyone who is looking after his own interest rather than the interest of the general public, and he will tell you the same thing; but how many of the people of the Maritime Provinces will tell you that they would rather have a duty on coal than reciprocity? Why, Sir, the people who now support the duty on coal actually voted down the resolution of Mr. McKay, of Cape Breton, when he proposed a duty of 75 cents a ton. Then, the hon. Finance Minister asks, what is the advantage of throwing off the duty? The advantage is this, that the general public would not be under the necessity of having to pay 50 cents a ton of duty on the coal they burn, and the poor people of the cities would receive a great benefit. I am a little surprised at the statement of the hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault) that the people of Montreal are satisfied to pay a duty on coal. I think that hon. gentleman, when he goes before his people for election, will hear this story repeated perhaps in a way that will be rather serious for him. I venture to say that if he polled the city of Montreal to-day, he would find that four-fifths of the people would vote to have the duty on coal taken off.

Mr. GAULT. Why do they not send petitions?

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman may find petitions, and votes too, to teach him differently from what he has stated. Then, the hon. Finance Minister says we, in New Brunswick, have received compensation for the coal and flour duties in having tea and coffee exempted from duty. I am amazed that a gentleman occupying the position of Finance Minister should put forward an argument like that before an intelligent assembly—that New Brunswick, which receives no benefit from the National Policy, because it has no manufactures to be protected, is compensated by the removal of the duty on tea and coffee. Do not Ontario and Quebec and the other Provinces, as well as the Province he comes from, get the advantage of the exemption of tea and coffee as well as New Brunswick? Why does he put that forward as compensation for a Province which does not derive any special advantage from it, or any benefit from either the flour or the coal duty. The hon. gentleman said I had tried to make out there was a great increase in the price of flour. I never made such a statement. Everybody knows that flour is to-day as cheap as we have known it to be almost in a generation. But the position I took is this, that if it were not for the duty, cheap as it is to-day, it would be still cheaper for the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman from Montreal West (Mr. Gault) says that no man ever spoke to him about a reduction in the coal duty. All I can say is that the hon. gentleman must be a very singular representative, for hundreds have spoken to me, and as a journalist, hearing public sentiment and having opportunities of learning what people think, I say the hon. gentleman has lived, not amongst the business men, not amongst the manufacturers, not amongst the workers or the people who suffer by the tax, when he puts forward the statement that the hundreds of manufacturers and thousands of workmen of that thriving city which he represents are satisfied with the coal duty. Why, almost every man of them wants to have it repealed, and it is only natural and reasonable that they should. As to cottons, he says they were never so cheap as they are now. True, but they are cheap because of the cheap price of the raw material and the excessive duty, amounting to 35 per cent., which has been put upon them. I have had the calculation made by gentlemen as much interested in the trade as the hon. member for Montreal West is, and they have told me the duty was equivalent to 35 per cent. Cotton is cheap because of its enormous production. The high duty led men foolishly to put their money into the manufacture of cotton; consequently a great deal more was manufactured than was necessary, and hundreds of people have felt the effect by the depreciation of their stocks, which went from par down to 15 and 10 per cent. True they have gone up again, but there has been, undoubtedly, great loss suffered. The manufacturers had to keep their machinery running, and consequently produced more than could be consumed. Not being able to export it, the result was loss of property to people who had, by the excessive protection which was given this business, been foolishly induced to go in far beyond what the wants of the country required. If the tariff had been only 25 per cent., people would have never invested their money to anything like the extent they did, and the investments which have been sunk in these cotton speculations would not have been lost. I am not going to say that the general public has not been benefited to a certain extent by this great competition and consequent great reduction in prices; I am not going to complain of that. Capitalists have lost their money, and the people, I admit, are getting the benefit. But I ask, is it good policy of the Government and the Parliament to give such unnatural encouragement to an industry, that production far beyond the requirements of the people and consequent disasters to the investors and others interested, are the results? Turning to the woollen factories, how many of them are idle?

Mr. GAULT. Not one of them is idle.

Mr. MITCHELL. How many of them have paid dividends? How many of them are raising money at from 10 to 12 per cent. to enable them to keep afloat? How many of them have become embarrassed? There is a pretty long tale to all this. Now I will just say a word or two to the hon. gentleman from King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth), who took the trouble to refer to a speech of mine on the question of the National Policy. One would suppose, from the extracts read by the hon. gentleman and the remarks he made, that my course now is in contradiction to the one I then took. The speech to which he refers was made by me in 1878, on a motion of Mr. McKay, member for Cape Breton, who moved this resolution:

"That all the words after 'that' to the end of the said motion be left out, and the following be inserted instead thereof:—'In the opinion of this House, it is advisable to impose a duty of 75 cents per ton, upon all coals imported into the Dominion, so as to help to meet the financial deficiency, and, at the same time, give a stimulus to a most important industry.'"

That was the resolution on which I spoke. I have stated ever since we got into the position that we could not get fair trade with the United States, that I had become a National Policy man. I will, with the permission of the House, read what I said on that occasion, to which the hon. member for King's refers as expressing an attitude different from that which I take to-day, and I will leave the House to judge whether the statements I made then would bear a different construction from those I make now. I am not adverse to the National Policy now. I stated then that I was in favor of the National Policy, but I was against the National Policy being run into the ground. I was against unnatural protection, as in the case of coal, flour, cottons, woollens and sugar; I was in favor of the total abolition of the duty in the cases of food and fuel. I assumed the position that the manufacturers of the country should be protected, but not unnaturally protected, as some are, and I will read the speech to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and of which he has read certain passages to sustain his position and to place me in the wrong, and let the House judge between that gentleman and myself:

"Mr. MITCHELL said that hon. gentlemen should express an opinion on this question, as initiating a principle upon which the interest of the country would in the future depend. He would vote against this amendment for this reason: He was not a Protectionist in the true sense of the word; but he was this much of a Protectionist. He thought that the interests of this country called for the consideration of read-

justment of the tariff with regard to our position towards the United States. While he was prepared to take up the whole question of considering how they should readjust the tariff, which was necessary to maintain the expenditures required for the carrying on of the business of the country, he was not prepared to take up, piecemeal, items and individual interests and protect them against every other interest in Canada. He wished to be clearly understood in this matter. He came from a county which had every interest in securing free trade, manufacturing nothing save lumber, which was sold, not on this continent, but in Europe; and no system of protection that this House could devise would tend to promote the interests of the people he had the honor to represent. He considered the question from higher and nobler grounds than of interest. He was not going to deal with the interests of this country and he cared not how this might affect him in the coming contest next summer, for he was bound to look at what the interests of Canada were as a whole, and this was what he was going to do. He proclaimed his intention in order that there might be no misunderstanding regarding his views on the great issue which lay between the hon. gentlemen who advocated Protection on the one hand and those who advocated Free-trade at any cost on the other hand,—the gentlemen who occupied the Treasury Benches and who advocated Free-trade and the sacrifice of Canada's interests to any extent, and the hon. gentlemen, on the other side of the House, who advocated Protection. He was not answerable for the course taken by the regular Opposition. He was propounding the views which he himself entertained on the question, on which he was at all events going to appeal to his constituents, and while their interests lay in the direction of having as few taxes as possible on imports, being not manufacturers, yet looking to the necessities of the revenue, he prepared to represent their wishes and views, and say that, 'The interests of Canada called for a readjustment of the tariff, so that the 22 or 24 millions required were raised.' He was sure they would be willing to endorse the sentiments he uttered and to have their representative place upon record his opinion in respect of what might or might not be for the interest of Canada in the readjustment of those imposts which were necessary for the maintenance of the Government and the public works of the country. The views that he entertained on this matter were these: He was not a Protectionist, he was a Free-trader in the abstract, but they had to put on a certain amount of duties to raise the 22 or 24 millions required to maintain our public works, to meet the indebtedness created, and to provide for the necessary legislation and the other public service, requisite to carry on the business of Canada; and he was prepared to support—no matter from which side of the House it came—the principle of so readjusting the imposts and taxes necessary to raise this revenue as to encourage and promote, within our own borders, the manufactures which would keep within our own borders, our own people, and create a home market for the products of our farmers, and give employment to the sons and daughters of the people of this country. This was the doctrine which he laid down. Hon. gentlemen opposite might call him a Protectionist, or Free-trader, but he was in favor of adopting a policy which would secure the revenue required, while it aided our industries, and, at the same time, did not increase the burdens of the people. Such a policy would encourage our own manufactures, and keep within our borders our young men and our young women, who, for the last 15 years, had been going to the United States to find employment, and make homes for themselves there. He desired to see this system changed.

"Mr. YOUNG. That is the present system.

"Mr. MITCHELL said that this was not the present system. This was a system which the hon. gentleman repudiated, and did not recognise. It would keep our own people in our own borders, and give them employment. The Government which the hon. gentleman supported, and blindly followed and gave his adhesion to, did not adopt the system or policy which he (Mr. Mitchell) now indicated, and which he thought Canada ought to pursue. He was bound to vote against the motion of the hon. member for Cape Breton, because it was politically dishonest with regard to the people of this country. The hon. gentleman desired that he (Mr. Mitchell) should impose a tax of 25 or 50 cents a ton on coal consumed in this country.

It was 75 cents—

"And why? In order to build up the coal mines in Nova Scotia. Doubtless, the members for Nova Scotia would support this motion; but the people of New Brunswick would not do so, and why? They did not think that it was necessary to put 8 or 5 cents a ton on the coal of Nova Scotia, and do nothing more in this direction. He was prepared to advocate such a duty, if it was adopted as a general principle, and if it was proposed to consider every interest in Canada in this relation—our manufactures, the shoe and iron manufacturing interests, and a host of other industries which he need not mention, he was prepared to consider these interests as a whole, although his county was interested in having the least possible amount of taxation imposed, as it imported and did not manufacture. Nevertheless, he was prepared to consider, in a general system of Protection, these interests as a whole, but he would not take them up as individual interests, and do as his hon. friend would do. He would not ask for Protection on coal. When the question of general policy came up hon. gentlemen opposite might be placed in an awkward position, and come out and condemn the very principle which the hon. gentleman now asked them to support, because he was specially interested in it. He wished to place his views on this point on record. He desired the traffic to be so readjusted that, while no more revenue was raised than was now obtained, our manufacturing and agricultural interests should be encouraged, and the people across the line be prevented from sending over their surplus articles and destroying the manufactures of the people of our own country. These were the views which he entertained, and he took this early opportunity of putting them on record. While prepared to vote for a duty of 15c. a ton on coal, if adopted in connection with the interests of Canada, he was not prepared to do so as an isolated measure; consequently he would record his vote against the amendment.

Now, there was the speech which I delivered on that occasion and for which I have been arraigned to-day by the hon. gentleman from King's (Mr. Woodworth). I find no fault with his arraigning me on it, but, on reading certain paragraphs in the speech apart from the rest, an impression might be left on the House, and through the House on the country, that, while I was in favor of a duty on coal at that time, as he says, I had changed my opinion and was opposed to it now. I was not even then in favor of a duty on coal. It is clear that, when a motion was made to put 75 cents a ton on coal, I objected to it, but I said that, as a part of a system, I would consent to 8 cents or 5 cents or even 15 cents a ton duty on coal as part of a system of protection. Is that a variation from the attitude I take now? No; I was against the duty on coal then; I am against a duty on coal now. I was against a duty on flour then, and I am against a duty on flour now. The hon. gentleman, or any other hon. gentleman, cannot find that, in any of my utterances, I was ever in favor of a duty on the food or fuel of the poor people of the country. It is contrary to good policy and contrary to good government to impose such a duty. But, when I advocated in 1878 that a system of protection should be established, who dreamt at that day that the men who subsequently came into power and who are in power to-day would have imposed a duty of 50 cents a barrel upon the food of the people? I certainly did not, or I would not have consented to it, but I was drifted into it with others, and I consented to a National Policy, which is strictly a protection of the manufacturing industries of our country, and that was not to tax the food of the poor man but to protect the labor of the poor man, it was to encourage manufactures in the country, to build up our industries, to give employment to people in those industries, and to keep at home the people who were drifting out of the lines, and to create a home market and consumption for the production of our factories. The same reasons, the same motives and the same objects that I had at that day I still entertain. I am still a National Policy man in the sense which I have explained, but I am not a National Policy man run into the ground, I am not in favor of taxing the food of the people, and I think the time has arrived when we should remove from the Statute-book what never should have been placed upon it, the tax imposed upon the bread of the poor man. I think I have sufficiently explained the position I occupied at that time and the position I occupy to-day, and I am very much mistaken if we do not find that the country will shortly endorse those views. The hon. gentleman from King's says: Where are the petitions? We could get cartloads of petitions if they were wanted, but what is the use of bringing petitions here? This House has ceased to be a deliberative body.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is an institution for recording the decrees——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, it is still in name a deliberative body, and I hope its members will carefully deliberate upon what they have heard to-night, and will consider what the true interests of the people are, and that is, not to tax the poor man's bread.

Mr. EVERETT. At this late hour, I do not feel myself justified in occupying any large portion of the time of this body. I regret that I was not present during the greater part of the discussion upon this subject. I rise, however, for the purpose of expressing my opinion, as one of the representatives from the Province of New Brunswick, that

it will be found at the coming election, whenever that election takes place, that the great proportion of the people of that Province will be in favor of the policy which has been governing this House for a number of years past. I am sorry to hear so much said in objection to the National Policy. I am sorry to hear so many things said which I believe are not correct in reference to it. What was the object of the National Policy? Was it not to give employment to our people? Was it not to keep our workmen in our own country instead of sending them abroad to find employment? That I believe was the object of the National Policy. The object was not to raise the price of goods in this country. It was not to raise the price of the food of this country. It was for the purpose of giving employment to our people. In the first instance, perhaps, the effect of the National Policy might have been to raise the price of certain articles of our manufactures because the number of people who were engaged in them may have been exceedingly limited, but, as time went on, and as it was well established in this country that this National Policy was to continue to exist, more of our people went into manufactures and we had that competition in the country which enabled us to keep our prices down as low as the circumstances would permit, as low as the profits necessary to support the families of the people engaged in them would permit, and as low, I believe, as they are in other countries similarly situated to ourselves. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) a moment or two ago said one of the effects of the National Policy was to induce persons to go into manufactures in this country and as a result ruined those who were engaged in them. Is that the fact with regard to Canada alone? Have we not found the same difficulty existing in the United States?

Mr. MITCHELL. And for the same cause.

Mr. EVERETT. And do we not find the same thing in Great Britain, where another cause exists? Do we not find distress existing there, and manufacturing suffering as well? I will not attempt to follow up all the arguments adduced, because I have not the figures before me. But we are told that the people of New Brunswick are obliged to pay an additional 50 cents per barrel on flour as a result of the duty. Is that a fact? I deny it. What is the price of flour in the city of Toronto as compared with the price of flour in New York? Is it 50 cents higher per barrel in Toronto than in New York? If so, perhaps these gentlemen are correct; but it is not so. So far as the city of St. John is concerned, we have the Intercolonial Railway, which brings flour down from Toronto, and the cost per barrel of that may be compared, having regard to the freight, with the cost per barrel which we would pay if it came from the city of New York. If it costs more to bring it from Toronto to St. John, then, to that extent, must we pay more for our flour than if we imported it from New York without duty. I have some figures—but unfortunately not with me now—that will show that the freight upon flour coming from Toronto, keeps the price as low as the price would be if we chose to buy flour from the city of New York. But it is not a necessity at all for us to buy flour at New York. I believe this House will agree with me that the same quality of flour can be found in the Dominion of Canada for the same price as we can get it in New York. Flour is produced in abundance in this country, as it is in the United States, meeting the necessities of the people of both countries. The surplus finds a foreign market, and that foreign market controls the price, therefore we pay for the flour just the same in any portion of this Dominion, excepting the cost for freight, and that is the only difference. Therefore, I believe that a very small proportion of additional expense is incurred by our people in consequence of the duty on flour from the United States. Now, a good deal has been said about the importation of flour from the United States. I find from the blue books that a large quantity of flour has been imported into Canada from the United States. What became of it? A large proportion of it was exported again, and but a small proportion was used by our people; so with reference to wheat. I find that we imported into this country during the year ending 1st July, 1885, 3,128,141 bushels of wheat, and we exported 5,423,805 bushels, being an excess of 2,295,000 bushels over and above what we imported. That shows that we produced a surplus of wheat in this country, that we were not able to use it all, and we sent the balance abroad.

Mr. MITCHELL. Where did this wheat grow?

Mr. EVERETT. 3,128,121 bushels of wheat were imported into the country. If the whole of that was sent out of the country, then 2,295,000 additional bushels were produced in this country and sent abroad. Here is where it came from. In reference to the articles manufactured in this country, I am convinced, from my knowledge of business and from what I hear, that many articles can be produced in this country, in spite of the duties imposed on similar articles coming from foreign countries, just as cheaply as articles of a similar character are sold in the United States. I know that is correct in reference to certain articles of cotton. The wholesale price of certain articles manufactured by Mr. Parks, in the city of St. John, are sold to the people of New Brunswick and the Dominion exactly at the same price as the same articles are sold at the factories in Rhode Island and Massachusetts. Sir, I merely rose to express my opinion that the people of New Brunswick to-day are satisfied with the operation of the National Policy, and I believe that when they are asked to pronounce upon it, they will say so. It is said we have no manufactures in the Province of New Brunswick. I am sorry to say we have too few of them, but they are growing, and the day is not far distant when, under the operation of this tariff, if it is continued — and I believe that it will be continued—we shall have industries, and good paying industries, in the Province of New Brunswick, occupying the time and the attention of our people, giving employment and making wealth for them instead of sending our people and their money into foreign countries.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mitchell.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Auger,	Forbes,	McIntyre,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gaudet,	Mills,
Béchard,	Geoffrion,	Mitchell,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Glen,	Platt,
Burpee,	Guay,	Ray,
Cameron (Huron),	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright (Sir Richard)	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Irvine,	Springer,
Casgrain,	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Charlton,	Kinney,	Trow,
Davies,	Kirk,	Vail,
De St. Georges,	Landerkin,	Weldon,
Desaulniers (Maskn'gé),	Langelier,	Wilson.—46.
Edgar,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Everett,	McLelan,
Allison,	Farrow,	McNeill,
Amyot,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Welland),	Moffatt,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Fortin,	Montplaisir,
Barker,	Foster,	O'Brien,
Barnard,	Gagné,	Paint,
Beaty,	Gault,	Patterson (Essex),
Bell,	Gigault,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Gordon,	Pruyn,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Reid,

Bergin,	Guilbault,	Riopel
Billy,	Guillet,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Hackett,	Rykert,
Bossé,	Haggart,	Scott,
Bowell,	Harley,	Shakespeare,
Bryson,	Hay,	Shanly,
Burnham,	Hesson,	Small,
Burns,	Hickey,	Smyth,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hilliard,	Sproule,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Taschereau,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Tassé,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jamieson,	Taylor,
Chapleau,	Jenkins,	Temple,
Cimon,	Kaulbach,	Thompson,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Tyrwhitt,
Colby,	Kranz,	Valin,
Coughlin,	Labrosse,	Vanasse,
Coursol,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (Albert),
Curran,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wallace (York),
Cuthbert,	Lesage,	Watson,
Daly,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Cardwell),
Dawson,	Macmaster,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers(St.Maurice)	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Renfrew),
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wigle,
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Wood (Brockville),
Dodd,	McCarthy,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dugas,	DeDougald (Pictou),	Woodworth,
Dundas,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wright.—119.
Dupont,	McGreevy,	

Amendment negatived.

House again resolved itself into Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Subsidy, Canadian Pacific Railway..... \$460,000 00

Mr. McLELAN. This is the balance of the subsidy which has not been voted. There has been voted and expended on the eastern section, up to 1st March, 1886, \$10,207,529; on the central section, \$14,191,483; making a total of \$24,399,012. There remains in the vote unexpended items of \$141,000 odd and \$460,000 odd, making a total of \$25,000,000 named in the contract as subsidy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What steps have been taken to ascertain whether the work has been performed within the stipulations contained in the contract.

Mr. McLELAN. The steps taken have been an examination and report of the chief engineer over the whole line.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That has not been laid before the House.

Mr. McLELAN. The Minister of Railways has been ill for some time and not able to attend the House, and he is not likely to be able to attend for a few days.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In asking this vote the Minister in charge should be able to inform the committee how far the inspection has proceeded and whether any and what parts still remain to be inspected?

Mr. McLELAN. From the papers I have it appears that the inspector has gone generally over the whole line. From an estimate made of the work remaining to be done on the eastern section it will require to complete \$25,000. There will be required, as I stated on another occasion, \$284,000 to complete the central section. This is independent of a tunnel that it is intended to make where there is now a temporary line, which is estimated to cost from \$750,000 to \$1,000,000. The amount unexpended is \$460,000 and \$140,000, making a total of \$600,000 and 600,000 acres of land.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What security have we that the tunnel will be completed?

Mr. McLELAN. We have \$600,000 in cash and 600,000 acres of land, and there is \$300,000 worth of work to do outside of the tunnel; and then there is the bonds of the company. The balance of the money and the land it is estimated will be sufficient to guarantee the completion of the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must say that there is still a very large amount of work that may remain to be done. We are aware that on the British Columbia section the grades are exceedingly high, and there will be a very considerable difficulty in bringing them within the stipulations of the contract, tunnel or no tunnel; and the hon. gentleman ought to be able to refer the House to some detailed statement of the engineer to whom we pay several thousands a year for inspecting this very work. I have not been able to examine all the papers laid on the Table, but I have not observed any formal report made as to portions of the work completed within the last year or so. I do not think there has been laid on the Table any formal report of the engineer as to the work north of Lake Superior, and we ought to have that report before we are asked to discuss this item. Has the hon. gentleman no information as to whether such a report has been made--I am speaking more particularly of the section north of Lake Superior.

Mr. McLELAN. I am not aware that it has been laid on the Table. In a memorandum, which I used on another occasion, it appears that the chief engineer reported that on the central section, between Winnipeg and Donald, at the east crossing of the Columbia, the track is laid throughout, and the work is far advanced and is fully up to the standard required by the contract. The eastern section is under traffic; it is not fully completed; it is up to the standard required by the contract, except in some instances where it is superior, especially in regard to masonry, culverts, massive masonry and abutments. The grades, with the exception of where the temporary line is made, the engineer reports, are fully equal to contract, coming east especially. On the western section the maximum is 53 feet, central section 111, prairie section and eastern division 53 feet. I understand that coming eastward the grades are specially favorable, 25 or 26 feet to the mile, that is from the mountains down to the end of the line very favorable for hauling.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was particularly desired to be known was, as to what was the actual position of things, as reported by the Government engineer, with respect to the British Columbia section, as to which a great deal has been said, both in the press and in this House and elsewhere, touching the extreme severity of the grades. In any case, the hon. gentleman should be prepared to assure us that a report of the engineer will be laid on the Table of the House before he asks concurrence in that item.

Mr. McLELAN. If it be not already in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not prepared to say that some report may not have been laid on the Table; but I do not recollect any, and I think my attention would have been attracted to it.

Mr. McLELAN. I will call the attention of the Department to the matter, and see it is sent down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is understood that if the item goes now, the Minister of Finance will have a report of that kind prepared before concurrence.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Expenditure in British Columbia, Canadian Pacific Railway..... \$460,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that expected to close the account?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total cost?

Mr. McLELAN. I have not that here, but the following are some of the articles covered by that vote: Iron piles, Port Moody wharf, $28,000; driving piles and setting wharf, $30,000; engine house, $28,000; contractors' balance, $53,000; land damages, $25,000; North Point engine house, $6,000; general settling up of works along the line, $180,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The chief amount is terminal apparently. Now, what is our position? The company have not agreed to accept this work.

Mr. McLELAN. Not yet. The chief engineer reports that the western end is practically completed, but that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have not taken it over.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What demands are made by the contractors? Have not they made a large demand.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not think so. I think Mr. Pope said a few days ago that they had not.

Mr. DAVIES. Is that amount paid to the contractors paid to Mr. Onderdonk?

Mr. McLELAN. No; it says, contract balance, $53,000.

Mr. DAVIES. Has that balance been settled with Mr. Onderdonk, and if not, is there any unsettled claim pending against the Government?

Mr. McLELAN. I understood from what Mr. Pope said some days ago that Mr. Onderdonk had not presented any claim naming any amount. I think there is a balance due him under the original contract of $53,000, and that the other sums are in connection with the terminus.

Mr. DAVIES. The Minister is of course aware that according to common report Mr. Onderdonk has a large claim, founded or unfounded, which he is pressing against the Government, verbally or otherwise. I think it is very desirable that Parliament should have information as to the extent of his claim before passing this item.

Mr. McLELAN. There has been nothing brought to the notice of the Government, though it may have been to the Department. I have nothing more than the statement of Mr. Pope, and personally I know nothing of it.

Mr. DAVIES. I hope the Minister may be in a position before asking concurrence to obtain accurate information from the Department, so that the House may know exactly whether this $53,000 closes the account, or whether we have a large unsettled balance which may end in a lawsuit. Will the hon. Minister make a note of that point, and promise to obtain the information before concurrence?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And also what are the claims of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with respect to this particular line. The Minister of Finance is probably aware that it has been stated, on what authority I am not prepared to say, that the Canadian Pacific Railway consider that a large amount will have to be expended on this line, in order to put it in such a state that they can operate it. Has the hon. gentleman no information on that point? Has no correspondence passed between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Department with respect to that?

Mr. McLELAN. Nothing has come under the notice of the Government, nor is there anything in the papers that have been sent to me. I may say that the officers of the Department were here last evening to give information, expecting that this vote would come up, but they are not here this evening; I do not know for what reason.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I would suggest that they should have been sent for.

Mr. McLELAN. I will get the information before concurrence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And as a matter of course the Minister understands that in this case, as in all such cases, we reserve the right to discuss as in committee.

Mr. McLELAN. Certainly.

Port Arthur to Red River, Canadian Pacific Railway	$72,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this for?

Mr. McLELAN. This is the balance of the contract on that section which had never been paid to the contractors. There was an arbitration, I think, upon their claims for damages. The hon. gentleman is probably aware that when they took the contract there was an estimate made and a contract signed to do about $1,000,000 worth of work, and that that was reduced largely. The road was given over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company before this work was completed, and they made a claim. The contract was $4,130,707, and the work was reduced to $2,934,308, a reduction of $1,195,000. The contractors made a claim for damages, and that claim was referred to arbitration, and a large sum was awarded them.

Mr. DAVIES. What section was that?

Mr. McLELAN. Manning, Macdonald & Co.

Mr. DAVIES. Section B?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes. On the work they performed there was a sum which the engineer reported due to them which did not go into arbitration, and did not form any part of it. It was the final certificate he made, and it has been left unpaid up to this time.

Mr. DAVIES. Has this amount been lying over, although certified, and although these matters were referred to arbitration?

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know whether it was certified before the reference to arbitration or not, but it was certified by the engineer as work which he recognised as performed exclusive of the work referred to the arbitrators.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are to receive this amount?

Mr. McLELAN. The contractor on this section.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the sum is to be paid to the same firm to whom we paid the $359,000. Is it an extra?

Mr. McLELAN. Not an extra.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it extra to the amount which was awarded, which award our own arbitrator, Judge Clark, dissented from, and thought so dubious that he strongly recommended that it should be contested in the courts, although the hon. gentleman's colleague would not allow us to see Judge Clark's letter. They are the same parties.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; because this is certified as a balance due upon a work actually performed, and not upon any of the matters under arbitration. The award of the arbitrators deal with claims put forward by the contractors for extras on loose rock and other matters, that is to say that work which had been described as loose rock should be paid for as something else. There was an award made on the 8th of February, 1884, dealing with loose rock, outside of the prisms, and cross-logging. The second award, on the 5th of April, 1884, dealt with eleven items, all relating to damages, which were sustained to the amount of $395,600. The first award being for work performed, is embodied in the final certificate of the chief engineer. The certificate does not touch the matter decided in the second award, and

the balance is simply money due for works executed, but so far not paid for. The contractors have agreed to accept the amount of this final certificate in full settlement.

Mr. CASEY. But all the matters between the Government and the contractors were included in those eleven items, and Sir Charles Tupper said last Session that this was the winding up of the whole affair. I am satisfied that all matters in dispute were referred to the arbitrators, and there was nothing left on which to make a further claim, unless some other ground was found for making a claim since the arbitration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps this was for 'the boy?"

Mr. CASEY. It may be for the nigger in the fence.

Mr. DAVIES. I examined all the returns brought down with reference to the submission to arbitration. My own opinion was that the arbitrators were not justified in making the award they did. I remember giving a great deal of attention to the matter, and opposing very strongly the vote of $395,000 which Parliament was asked for to close up the whole transaction. My recollection is the same as that of the hon. member for West Elgin, that we pressed very strongly on the Government to know whether this was a final winding-up of all the claims of Manning, Macdonald & Co., and my impression is very strong that Sir Charles Tupper gave a positive assurance that this closed up the whole matter.

Mr. McLELAN. The first award of $45,000 was never paid.

Mr. DAVIES. Why, it was voted the year before last?

Mr. McLELAN. The first award of $45,000 forms part of the final certificate, which is covered by this vote of $72,000, and thus never paid.

Mr. DAVIES. The engineer refused to certify to that amount and that is the reason the matter was referred to the arbitrators, and the arbitrators awarded it in defiance of the engineer's opinion. If he has given a certificate for the amount between $45,000 and $72,000, I want to know what the items are.

Mr. McLELAN. The items making up this amount are: trestle work, $44,273.69; allowance for strengthening and improving trestles, $10,735; sidings estimated by chief engineer, $1,209; 15 per cent. on drain filling, $13,132.80; carriage works, $1,925; total, $71,336.21; less overpaid, $1,187.71, leaving $70,148.60; also due to them on account of their contract, $1,002.81.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman is misusing language when he says the award is included in the engineer's certificate, or else the engineer is acting contrary to all usage. The engineer cannot certify to the amount of an award; the arbitrators certify to the amount of an award; and to say that the engineer's certificate is included in this vote of $72,000 is simply absurd. It is clear that this whole amount is something outside of and beyond the award. We are perfectly well aware that the engineer refused in the first instance to certify to these items.

Mr. McLELAN. I am just stating what is on the paper given to me, that the $45,000 is embodied in the final certificate of the engineer, and forms part of it. I do not imagine for a moment that the Department would send me an incorrect statement. However, if the hon. gentleman has any evidence to the contrary, let the item stand or let it be understood full particulars will be given on concurrence.

Mr. DAVIES. Will the hon. gentleman let the matter stand, as far as the $395,000 item is concerned, which was

paid immediately after the vote; so quickly that we complained of it.

Mr. McLELAN. There are two other matters we agreed would be fully discussed on concurrence as if not passed. Should not this stand in the same position?

Mr. CASEY. When the memorandum of the Department of Railways is in direct contradiction of our recollection of what has been done, we should not pass the item.

Item allowed to stand.

Salaries and Expenses of Staff..... ..... $30,000 00

Mr. McLELAN. Several of the engineers will be required in the Department here, commencing with Mr. Schreiber. All along the line, wherever there is work being done, there are engineers. We have dispensed with a number of junior officers, but have still to keep on a portion of the staff to inspect the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand it, to all intents and purposes, the road, except possibly with respect to its small section as to which disputes may arise, will be handed over within a month or two completely to the company, and $30,000 appears to be a large sum to spend in connection with a road with which we are going shortly to have nothing to do. I can understand that during construction it was necessary to employ a considerable number of engineers inspecting the work of the contract, but the hon. gentleman says the road is expected to be in running order from end to end and completely under the control of the company in another month, and I do not see why we should spend this $30,000 during next year, unless for the purpose of making a perfect survey of the road; and if that be the case, we should not have been in such a hurry to part with the control of the $5,000,000 we voted the other day.

Mr. McLELAN. Although trains may be running in a few months and the road be practically opened, still it will be necessary to have a supervision of the road so as to see that the whole work is completed. The hon. gentleman will see there is a reserve of $600,000 in cash and 600,000 acres of land, for about a million dollars of work to be done at the tunnel and at two other points.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But that would not require an expenditure of $30,000 on the staff.

Mr. McLELAN. Well, taking the whole extent of country, a number of engineers will be required to see that the work is finished up. This is only a rough estimate. It is difficult to say how long these people will be occupied. The staff is being reduced as quickly as possible, but we have still to keep a number on. We thought $30,000 would be sufficient to meet expenses, as only what is absolutely necessary will be spent.

Mr. TROW. What proportion of the road is in the hands of the Government and what proportion is in the hands of the syndicate?

Mr. McLELAN. None of the western section constructed under contract by the Government has as yet been taken off the hands of the Government by the Canadian Pacific Railway. That western section is still in the hands of the Government or Mr. Onderdonk.

Mr. DAVIES. I notice a saving of $20,000, is that in the head office or among the engineers along the line?

Mr. McLELAN. In both.

Mr. DAVIES. Does he intend there shall be a chief engineer when this road is completed. It is practically

completed now. Will it be necessary to retain a chief engineer at a salary of $4,000 or $5,000—$4,500, I think it is—and chief clerks at $6,850, first class clerks at $2,750, and so on. This is an enormous staff, and I have no doubt was required during the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but now that it is all completed, is it intended to retain this enormous staff?

Mr. McLELAN. It is certainly not intended that the same staff shall be kept up at Ottawa or along the line that was kept up during the construction of the work. It will be reduced as rapidly as possible, and as the public interests will permit of its being done.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I do not see why that question should be asked so many times. The Minister has made the statement three times that the number of officers will be reduced as the work ceases, and I do not know why the question is repeated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think we require to be instructed in our duties here by the hon. gentleman, nor are we disposed to be so. We shall put such questions to the Government as we think it right to put, and I have to tell the hon. gentleman that items of this sort have never been passed in this House before with so little information. Because the hon. gentleman's colleague is not here, we do not feel disposed to press them, but very far from the full explanation which should be given has been afforded.

Mr. PAINT. I trust the services of the staff will not be dispensed with until the extension of the railway into Cape Breton, to Louisburg.

Mr. DAVIES. The official explanation that anyone could give as well as the Minister, that the staff will be reduced as far as the public interests permit, is no doubt perfectly satisfactory to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Shakespeare). He does not want any explanation at all. I have not heard him make any enquiries about the Public Accounts. He is willing to swallow them all, but I intend to ask for the information that I require, and I ask whether the chief engineer or any of the officials at the chief office have had their services dispensed with, or is it intended to dispense with their services, or is the saving only made because the services of the construction engineers along the line are to be dispensed with? Is the railway office itself to be maintained?

Mr. McLELAN. It is expected that the staff at the head office at Ottawa will be largely reduced during this year. Whether their work will entirely cease during this year or not, I am not prepared to say. I think it is improbable that everything connected with the construction of that great work can end before the close of 1886-87. It is not necessary to have a chief engineer with his time and services devoted to the Canadian Pacific Railway after it shall have been passed over and all matters closed with that company, because it is their own work and business, and they will have to provide their own engineer. All we want to do is to keep sufficient staff here, a chief engineer and staff, to see that our contract with the company is properly performed and finally closed. Certainly the hon. gentleman will not expect us to keep a chief engineer looking after the Canadian Pacific Railway after our connection with it has entirely ceased. We may require a chief engineer for our Government railways elsewhere, and of course we shall require a railway staff to look after them. It may be, if matters arise as to any work at any time, that the service of the chief engineer may be called in to settle them. In so large an undertaking, extending over so much and covering so many different works, it will perhaps be many months before this can all finally be closed, and the services of some one conversant with it may be necessary even after the general supervision shall have ceased.

Mr. DAVIES. That I can understand. I can understand that the services of the chief engineer will be required for some time, but the hon. gentleman still skilfully evades giving the information which I seek. I want to know what the reductions in the chief office are to be, whose services are to be dispensed with?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot give you the names of the officers whose services will be dispensed with. I asked about this, and was told that the services of some officers had been dispensed with and that others would be. Some are still on the staff. Mr. Marcus Smith and Mr. Tomlinson are still in the employ of the Department here, their work is not finally concluded, but the services of all the men whose work has been solely connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway must be dispensed with shortly.

Mr. DAVIES. The Department must know, when they send in an estimate of $30,000, what they want it for and which officers they will dispense with.

Mr. McLELAN. They may consider that before a certain period a certain man's services may be dispensed with, but, with the amount of work yet to be done and the supervision required, they cannot say how many men will be dispensed with.

Mr. DAVIES. Then how do they make up their estimate?

Mr. McLELAN. They estimate that in so many months they will dispense with so many men and so reduce the amount to $30,000. I understand that already some of the juniors have been dispensed with.

Miscellaneous works, Intercolonial Railway..... $6,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to the amount, but I call the attention of the Finance Minister to what I think is an objectionable practice, the practice of carrying such an item as that to capital account, on the Intercolonial Railway in particular, which is supposed to have been completed with the exception of such things as the St. Charles branch, for which I see a separate vote is taken. To carry little matters involving so small a sum as $6,000 to capital account seems to be not at all in accordance with the usual practice. It ought to be charged to income.

Mr. McLELAN. I understand there are still a number of unsettled matters on the books of the Department which have been there for years. There are allowances for right of way that, in some cases, have not yet been called for, and it has been customary for two or three years to carry this amount forward to meet these cases should they arise. I understand that very little of this amount was called for last year, but it is thought safer, knowing that there are claims that may arise, to vote the amount. Some of these may never be called for; it is not likely now; but they may be. I suppose in a year or two this may be dropped altogether.

St. Charles Branch, Intercolonial Railway.....$57,000 00

Mr. LANGELIER. What is that intended for?

Mr. McLELAN. That is mainly for a terminal station at Point Lévis, the purchase of property to make a siding and yard for trains and engines.

Mr. LANGELIER. I do not see that anything is demanded for paying the expropriations that still remain to be paid. I understand there is still a large amount unpaid, and there are judgments against the Government for some

of these expropriations. I know of my own knowledge that in one of them, the case of Murphy *vs.* The Queen, a judgment was rendered by the Supreme Court lately for $11,000 against the Government, and, unless that has been paid in the last three or four days, it is still outstanding.

Mr. McLELAN. There is money to pay that in last year's vote of $168,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does this close the St. Charles Branch?

Mr. McLELAN. I understand so.

Mr. VAIL. There are still a number of claims unpaid, are there not?

Mr. McLELAN. On the vote given last year we have a month and a half of this year yet to run. This $57,000 is intended to complete.

Mr. LANGELIER. Will that complete these permanent buildings and pay the expropriation already decided on?

Mr. McLELAN. That, with the money that is unexpended, is to complete the whole.

Mr. LANGELIER. There are some very large claims, I think one of them amounts to $250,000, although I do not suppose so much will be awarded. There are several other claims which must amount altogether to more than $300,000 and they will not be settled before the 1st July, so that they will have to be paid during the next fiscal year. I refer to the claims of George Taylor, Carrière and Beaulieu.

Mr. McLELAN. No provision is made for claims of that kind. I undertood that there was a number of smaller claims still pending, that would be covered by the $168,000 and this $57,000.

Mr. LANGELIER. No doubt these other claims are greatly exagerated, but if I am not misinformed, in one case the Government offered more than $50,000 to one of the claimants.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman is right about these claims, but the Government cannot even appear to admit them by asking money now to pay them. Therefore, we must wait until we have a judgment of the court, and then we will ask for what is needed. The hon. gentleman sees that we have $168,000. I am not in a position to say the exact amount that remains, but there must be a large amount of that still remaining in the hands of the Government, and that will be good for the remainder of the fiscal year. If there is a balance, it may be carried over to meet these other claims, should judgment go against the Government.

Mr. LANGELIER. I can well understand that the Government should not ask for a vote for each of these claims equal to the amount demanded; but the Government must be prepared to pay something, they must admit that they owe something. I should think that the Government would have asked an amount to pay to these parties, at least, the amount that the Government have offered to pay. In the case of Carrière, I think the Government were prepared to pay $20,000 or $25,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like the Minister to make a note as to the total cost of that branch; also what will be required to complete.

Expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway..... $60,000 00

Mr. WELDON. Has the amount been all expended for sleeping cars? This year the Minister brought down a return showing that three sleeping cars were re-built in Cobourg, Ont., this year.

Mr. McLELAN. I think there is an item in the Supplementary Estimates respecting sleeping cars.

Mr. VAIL. What is that Stellarton branch going to cost?

Mr. McLELAN. $310,000.

Lachine Canal..... $70,000 00

Mr. McLELAN. That sum is required to make the side wall, the raceway, drain ditches, stone fences, booms, new timber, basin, to build a guard-room on section 1, electric light, superintendence, &c.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Should not such an item as electric light rather go to ordinary expenditure for income than be made a capital charge?

Mr. McLELAN. I think not for so large an expenditure as that.

Cornwall Canal..... $75,000 00

Mr. McLELAN. That is required for the enlargement of the upper entrance, now under contract with Jobson & DeLorimer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that complete the work?

Mr. McLELAN. That is given as completing the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. While we are on this item, it would be convenient for the Minister to state whether the Government have come to any decision as to the proposition for deepening these canals?

Mr. McLELAN. No decision has been arrived at.

Williamsburg Canal—Construction of Entrance and Lock..... $100,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In building a work of this kind which involves a pretty large expenditure, the committee should know whether the Department is building it in such a fashion that it can be used in case it should be decided to deepen the canal.

Mr. McLELAN. The amount is to enlarge and deepen the upper entrance of the new locks for 14 feet draught.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be a judicious expenditure if the Government has come to a conclusion upon the point of deepening the canals. But there is no use in providing for 14 feet unless the Government have really made up their minds to deepen the canal system.

Mr. McLELAN. The plans are so drawn that the locks can be arranged for a depth of 14 feet.

Mr. SHANLY. The new locks are being constructed with a view to the future enlargement of the canals at no distant date, and they are being built about 50 feet longer than the present locks, and with an increased depth of two feet, 12 feet instead of 10 feet, and with a view to increasing the depth to 14 feet by raising the banks afterwards. The locks are being made with a view to the deepening of the whole canals. Of course, it would be of no use building and improving the locks unless it was the intention to deepen the canals.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is only reasonable that the Government should inform the committee at what conclusion they have arrived. I shall renew the question on concurrence.

Enlargement of Upper Entrance to Galops Canal. $100,000 00

Mr. McLELAN. This sum is required to complete Allan's contract, $50,000, and for the construction of a new lock, $50,000.

Murray Canal..... $180,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A good deal of doubt exists in the minds of those conversant with these works as to whether they will answer the purpose for which they were intended. The statements made to me are to the effect that there has been very considerable difficulty in constructing and maintaining this canal, and a good deal of work has had to be done sometimes twice and sometimes three times over, whether owing to the nature of the bottom or not, I am unable to say. What is the length of that work?

Mr. McLELAN. It is 4½ miles or 6⅓, between the extreme ends of the pier. It gives an expenditure up to the 30th June 1884, of $209,000; 1885, $148,000, and from July to December 31st, 1885, $136,000. Total, $495,000. The amount of the accepted tender was $1,140,675.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What time was it to be completed?

Mr. McLELAN. The date is not given.

Mr. BOWELL. I think it was to be completed in three years. When I made my remarks before I thought the enquiry was in reference to the Trent Valley. I have heard the statements made, to which the hon. gentleman referred, and have taken the trouble to enquire into their correctness, and I find they are not correct. It has been asserted, over and over again, that the canal was being constructed through a large bed of quicksand, which, as fast as it was dredged out, filled in from the sides. Not only the chief engineers but the contractor assured me that they have not struck on any bed of quicksand.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason for the delay?

Mr. BOWELL. I think the work is of much greater magnitude than they supposed when they took it in hand. I am also under the impression that it is not being pushed as rapidly as contemplated—why I cannot say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would ask the Minister of Finance to be prepared to give us fuller information on concurrence as to the cause of delay, as I think it is not right that it should be delayed two or three years longer than the contract time.

Mr. BOWELL. I quite agree with you.

Welland Canal $235,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will this complete the work, apart from the next item?

Mr. McLELAN. I think a sum of about $112,000 will be required to complete.

Welland Canal, deepening to 14 feet; land and damages, Grand River..... $776,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When does the hon. gentleman expect that this 14 feet navigation will be ready for use.

Mr. McLELAN. In June, 1887. The permanent structures are already the proper depth.

Grenville Canal..... $25,000 00

Mr. CASEY. I wish to make some remarks on this vote, and I would ask the hon. Minister to allow us the same freedom of discussion on concurrence as in committee.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

For construction of works on Tay Canal $44,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman tell us what these works will cost, and what purpose they will serve when completed?

Mr. McLELAN. The works consist of the construction of a dam and locks 134 feet by 32 feet, the depth at the lowest place being 5 feet 6 inches, and deepening the channel of the river.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know whether there has been any negotiation to hand over the Rideau Canal bodily to any parties?

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know that there has been any, but I understand that the Government would be ready to take an offer into consideration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What bonus would you give? I happen to know that an offer was seriously contemplated.

Welland Canal, chargeable to Income..... ..... $34,700 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the waste weir at Dunnville a new construction, or the vote of $25,000 to repair damages.

Mr. McLELAN. The chief engineer states that the floods that have taken place at the Grand River render it necessary that provision should be made to stop the further discharge at Dunnville. When that was first built, the banks of the Grand River were for the most part covered with trees, and the drainage was not so rapid as it is now, and as the country got cleared up it became necessary to increase the means of discharge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the pond near St. Catharines which $5,000 is wanted to fill up?

Mr. McLELAN. The chief engineer reports that the pond is a great nuisance. It has been formed by the waters of the canal, and he states that an expenditure of $5,000 would be sufficient to raise three or four acres fully one foot over ordinary water.

For works necessary to increase the supply of water to Rideau Canal and the Gananoque River $20,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How came this money not to be expended before?

Mr. TAYLOR. This is a revote from last year. Arrangements are being made to have it expended this year. It is for damning up a lake called Devil Lake.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend is sure that this will not hurt the Gananoque water supply?

Mr. TAYLOR The intention is that it shall restore a portion of the water works taken away from Gananoque.

Canals, chargeable to Capital—Miscellaneous....$30,000 00

Mr. KIRK. These are very large sums that have been voted away for canals—upwards of $1,800,000, chargeable to capital, and $123,000 chargeable to income. These large sums are voted to other Provinces than Nova Scotia. We have a small canal in that Province which requires some repairs. An application was made to the Government two years ago to repair that canal. The Government were good enough to send an engineer down to get a report upon it, and he reported that it would cost $6,500. That is a very small sum, but I do not see it in the Estimates. Perhaps the Government intend to repair this canal out of the miscellaneous items. If not, I hope the Minister will place the item in the Supplementary Estimates. I refer to the White Head Canal.

Mr. McLELAN. I will bring it to the notice of the Minister.

Collection of Revenues—Customs..... ..... $ 804,365 00

Mr. WELDON. You add to Ontario and take away from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If this item goes through, it must be distinctly understood we are free to take up the discussion with respect to seizures at Montreal on concurrence, as if the item had not passed.

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly. I may mention to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) that the increase in Ontario arises from the fact that there has been a very rapid growth of settlement in the district of Algoma, and it is absolutely necessary that sub-ports and ports should be established on the northern shores of Lakes Huron and Superior, and on many of the Manitoulin Islands. The islands of St. Joseph and Cockburn are now inhabited by hundreds of settlers. There are large fishing stations there, and as they are near the Sault they trade to a great extent with the United States, so that it is absolutely necessary to have officers at these ports.

Mr. KIRK How is the reduction of $2,915 in Halifax brought about?

Mr. BOWELL. By keeping the staff down as much as possible, and reducing it to what is absolutely necessary to carry on the work of the port. In many cases where I have made reductions, I have increased the salaries of those left who are willing to do more work when they get better pay.

Mr. KIRK. And they will not be so much in each other's way.

Mr. BOWELL. It has taken me some six years to get it down from which hon. gentlemen opposite brought it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By reducing it from $717,000 to $804,000.

Mr. BOWELL. You are speaking for the whole service, and I am speaking for Halifax. I admire the astuteness of the hon. gentleman. I do not think it is necessary I should repeat what I have said with respect to the rapid growth of the Algoma district, or to the fact that nearly the whole North West Territories and Manitoba have been added since the Customs came under my control, or to the fact that the Customs service has been rapidly extended in a great many sections of British Columbia, so that it has been necessary to increase the item for various reasons which I could explain.

Mr. WELDON. Moncton shows an increase of $1,200, and St. John a reduction of $1,200.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In Quebec you have reduced it from $192,000 to $203,000.

Mr. BOWELL The increase in Moncton has been brought about by placing the outports of Shediac under Moncton, and by the appointment of an additional clerk. In St. John the decrease arises from the superannuation of one or two of the older men who received large salaries, and the appointment of others in their place at smaller salaries.

Mr. VAIL. The last item here, to meet expenditure in connection with the Board of Customs and outside detective service, including $800, salary of the Commissioner of Customs, as chairman of the board—is that $800 a new item?

Mr. BOWELL. No, it has been in ever since the Board of Customs was established.

Mr. KIRK.

Mr. VAIL. I call the attention of the Minister to the fact that, where seizures have been made of vessels, and they have been put in the hands of parties for safe keeping and put alongside of wharves where some expense has been incurred, it is the most difficult thing in the world to get a satisfactory settlement of these accounts. I think these small bills, which are very moderate, should be paid and should receive more attention from the Department than they do. I have sent two or three small accounts to the Department myself, accounts which have been sent to me, and I cannot get any satisfaction. On the 15th March, I wrote an official letter and enclosed an account. I heard nothing of it, and on the 4th of this month I wrote again, and received no reply. A few days ago, I sent a third letter, and the day before yesterday I received an acknowledgement of that, saying the matter would be enquired into. I think that is an unpardonable delay, and it strikes me that this Commissioner of Customs, who may have been a very good man in his day, has rather outgrown his work, and I am not sure that it would not be well to get a younger man to take his place, who would be a little more active in his duties, and a little more prompt in replying to communications. I call the attention of the Minister to this, because I am sure he cannot be aware of it. The amounts to which I have referred are owing to men who cannot afford to be out of their money. Some of them are officers of the Department, tide-waiters, getting $50 or $60 dollars a year; and, if they have accounts for $60 or $100, those are large amounts to them, and it is unfair to keep them out of their money for eight or twelve months.

Mr. KIRK. I notice there are several increases in the Customs in Nova Scotia as well as some decreases. There is an increase of $450 at Digby, $480 at Lunenburg, $500 at Pictou, and some smaller amounts from $100 down. What is the reason for these increases?

Mr. BOWELL. At Digby it was necessary to give the collector some assistance.

Mr. KIRK. Consequent on the building of the Short Line branch?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know that that would interfere with it. At Lunenburg, there is an increase of $50 to the salary of the collector, who receives $750. He has been in office for a good many years and the business is steadily increasing. Then I propose to give Mr. Reinhart an increase from $350 to $400. Mr. Moorash formerly received $200 and gave only a portion of his time to the work. I propose to give him $500 a year, with the understanding that he gives his whole time. Rudolph, at one of the outposts, will receive $100 instead of $60, and Mills, another of the preventive officers, will receive $100 instead of $60. That makes the amount of $480.

Mr. VAIL. I am glad to hear the Minister say he has given the collector at Digby some assistance. He has been applying for it year after year. He does his work very well, but it is impossible for him to do all the work connected with the port.

Mr. DAVIES. Who is the new officer in Charlottetown?

Mr. BOWELL. His name is Moran.

Mr. VAIL. Who is appointed at Digby?

Mr. BOWELL. There has been no appointment. I think it was paid to the collector's son who was attending to the business for the old gentleman in his office. The collector was instructed to secure some one who could assist him, and,

with the consent of Mr. Hill, the inspector, young Mr. Veitch was selected.

Committee rose and reported.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON presented the report of the Department of Militia and Defence upon the suppression of the rebellion in the North-West Territory.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1.40 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 21st May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY—ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That when this House adjourns to-day, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday next, at three o'clock, p.m.

Mr. DAVIES. It is idle, I suppose, to offer any objection to the resolution of the Government; but I must say that at this period of the Session it is not fair to the gentlemen who come from the outlying sections of the Dominion. We have been here since February, and have not been able to get to our homes since that time. I am quite aware that the Government must consider the convenience of the majority, and that the minority have to bow to the majority; but we have to bow too often. I think our convenience should be considered a little more than it has been. I do not think it is fair to adjourn over both to-morrow and Monday. I understand that we are to have prorogation next week, and this motion will throw it over two or three days farther than it would otherwise be.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman considers the interests of himself and his friends, and I feel very much for them; but he must not find fault with this action of the Government, because he knows that according to the rules of the House we do not sit to-morrow, and he knows that Monday is the Queen's Birthday, and as a rule we adjourn over that day to rejoice with our Sovereign. As I stated yesterday, the Government require a certain day each week for the general business of the country, and if we could not take to-morrow, surely the hon. gentleman would not ask us to take Monday, and not have the advantage, with other members of the House, of a day's rest. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman will see that the motion is reasonable, at all events, for a very large majority of the House.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY FROM STRAITS OF CANSO TO LOUISBURG OR SYDNEY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (for Mr. POPE) moved that the House, on Tuesday next, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the Minister of Railways and Canals be authorised to construct a railway from a point on the Straits of Canso to Louisburg or Sydney, as a public work; that the Government Railways Act, 1881, shall apply to such work, and that the location and all other incidents of the said work shall be determined by the Governor in Council.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman is prepared to lay on the Table any statement as to what this means, what the work would cost, and what preliminary examination has been made by the Government to ascertain the cost; I do not, of course, speak of a regular survey, because I suppose that has not been made.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My intention is, when we take up this motion on Tuesday, to lay before the House all the data in possession of the Government, as I have no doubt we shall be able to show the House that this resolution should be adopted.

Motion agreed to.

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (for Mr. POPE) moved that the House, on Tuesday next, resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That whereas by an Act, 46 Victoria, chapter 25, the Governor in Council was authorised to grant to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company, incorporated by Act of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $320,000, for one hundred miles of their railway from Metapediac, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Paspebiac, in the Province of Quebec, and by the Act 47 Victoria, chapter 8, further authority was given to the Governor in Council to grant a subsidy, not exceeding in the whole $300,000, for a branch of the Intercolonial Railway from Metapediac eastward towards Paspebiac, twenty miles in the Province of Quebec, subject in both cases to certain conditions mentioned in the said Acts respectively; and the said company, by two separate instruments designated as articles of agreement, made in duplicate, between Her Majesty Queen Victoria and the said company, both bearing date the seventh day of November, 1885, have undertaken to construct, in the manner and subject to the conditions set forth in the said instruments respectively, as well the said twenty miles as the remaining eighty miles of the railway from Metapediac to Paspebiac, and it was further agreed that the Government should request Parliament, at the present Session, to authorise the arrangement hereinafter mentioned as to the application of the subsidies aforesaid to the several portions of the said 100 miles of railway; it is expedient to provide: (1) That the said subsidy of $300,000 shall apply to the first section of twenty miles eastward from Metapediac; (2) that the subsidy of $3,200 per mile authorised for the said first section shall, with the $3,200 which alone would have been applicable to the second section of twenty miles eastward from Metapediac, be also applicable to it, making $6,400 per mile applicable to the said second section; and (3) that to the remaining sixty miles of the said 100 miles the subsidy of $3,200 per mile shall apply.

2. That it is expedient to provide, that the two instruments of agreement mentioned in the next preceding resolution, which were made subject to the approval of Parliament, be approved and confirmed.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 136) further to amend the Act respecting fishing by foreign vessels.—(Mr. Foster.)

Bill (No. 137) respecting the Carleton City of Saint John Branch Railway.—(Mr. Thompson.)

LAND GRANTS TO MILITIA IRREGULAR FORCES.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution making provision for grants of land to members of the irregular forces of the Militia of Canada.—(Mr. White, Cardwell).

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many grants will likely be made under this?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). So far as my information goes, I do not think it will include more than about a hundred altogether. It is chiefly to the Prince Albert volunteers, those who went out in the first instance and fought at Duck Lake, and the few who went from Edmonton and Battleford.

Mr. WELDON. Do you give them scrip, the same as the regulars who went out?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes.

Mr. WELDON. Has the hon. gentleman considered the propriety of extending the scrip to the regiments that were ordered out? The New Brunswick regiment was ordered out and made ready to march for the North-West, and a Montreal regiment was under the same instructions. The men were put to a very great expense, as much as if they had gone to Winnipeg or further. They, of course, are not entitled to the medal, because they were not engaged in actual warfare; but as this is compensation to the men for the expense they incurred in being engaged in the service, it should apply to the regiments who were under orders. The New Brunswick regiment were under orders drilling from the 3rd April, when called out, to the 12th May, and then were kept in camp a considerable time, at great personal sacrifice to many of them. Some of the men were most unfairly treated by employers who filled their positions with others and refused to take them back. The Government might extend to these the benefit of the land scrip.

Mr. HICKEY. I would like to call the attention of the Government to the claim of the volunteers of 1866-67 who drove back a foreign invasion, and have never received recognition from the Government of any kind. If scrip and land are to be given to volunteers, those men who exposed themselves more than many who went to the North-West deserve recognition.

Mr. CURRAN. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), I have been advocating the claims of the Montreal regiment to which he referred. From my own personal knowledge, the Prince of Wales regiment, commanded by Colonel Bond, a gentleman who has made great personal sacrifices in the interests of the volunteers and is a deserving and popular officer, were called out and subjected to most severe drill for a length of time. They had to get themselves ready and undergo all the expenditure necessary in preparing themselves for a campaign. We all know that the great grievance of those men was that they had not the honor and privilege of going to the front, and really it is too bad that these men, who made all these sacrifices, after having been debarred from the privilege of going to the front in the service of their country, should now be debarred from the benefit extended to their brother regiments who were more fortunate than they. I have had a good deal of correspondence on this subject, and I hope the Government will see its way to meet the just demands of the Prince of Wales regiment. At the same time, I hope that the Minister of Militia will be able to attend to a small claim I brought under his attention last year, with reference to Widow Martin, of Point St. Charles, whose son lost his life in the North-West, and who has now lost her husband, to whom a pension was given for the loss of his son. She is in the 86th year of her age, and something ought to be done towards continuing the pension. I take this opportunity to again urge this matter upon the attention of the Government, and I am satisfied the Minister of Militia will take it up and give it his favorable consideration.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend, true to the traditions of his profession, has always been the protector of the widow and orphan, and I must say he has brought before me more than once the case of Widow Martin, whose name is almost familiar to this House. The matter has been considered on more than one occasion, and it has been found extremely difficult, as I had an opportunity of explaining before, to take up the case of Widow Martin, however deserving she may be of recognition at the hands of the Government, without taking up all the other cases which come up every day almost before the Department. I fully concur in what the hon. gentleman has said about the regiment he has spoken of, and which displayed the greatest possible zeal in getting ready, at the smallest possible notice, to follow their comrades to the front if required. With the battalions composing our militia force, we stand as high as any other country, but my hon. friend must see it was a necessity for the Government to discriminate and draw the line somewhere. Almost the whole militia force was kept in readiness in case the circumstances would require the services of a larger number of men than the number we sent forward to the front, and it would be almost impossible for the Government to treat them all on a footing of equality. So far as the troops are concerned who had to bear all the hardships of the trip from older Canada to the North-West, more particularly going up north of Lake Superior, and having to pass several months away from their home and away from their business in the North-West in case their services should be required, they all deserve from us that recognition which I am sure we all feel so happy to give them. They were all ready at a moment's notice to go to the front and to fight the battles of the country. It has been the misfortune of some—I believe that as soldiers they will call it their misfortune—that they were not called to the front, and were not called upon to take part in the battles which some of their comrades took part in, but I feel that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, who has charge of the lands of the Dominion, had to draw the line somewhere, and the line was drawn in favor of those regiments that saw active service west of Port Arthur. However much I am ready to acknowledge the services which those other regiments were prepared to render, I do not see how it would be possible to put them on the same footing as those who went west of Port Arthur.

Mr. WELDON. My hon. friend includes in that regiments which were not in active service.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Of course.

Mr. WELDON. There were regiments that never went west of Winnipeg, but they got the lands.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, those which went west of Port Arthur.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. Minister draws the line at those in actual service, but those who went west of Port Arthur and not beyond Winnipeg did not see actual service.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It was actual service.

Mr. WELDON. In one sense it was, but it was not service in the field. It was only a question of distance. These men were taken away from their business and from their homes and were put to very great expense. I can speak personally of some of them that I know were put to considerable expense and great inconvenience, and some of the men when they came back found their situations filled, and I am sorry to say their employers showed a want of patriotism and refused to take them back. I think, under the circumstances, the Government might be a little more generous and extend the provision to them. My hon. friend from Montreal and my hon. friend from Bruce can speak of this, as the three regiments were all called out at the same time and are in the same position.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to another class of cases which he has determined is not already provided for by any existing law, and which will not come within this measure, as it is now before the committee. I understand that under the Militia Act power was given to the Department to allow aid, to allow money in certain cases, where, for example, those serving had actually received bodily injury, but the Department has held that no provision in law, or, at all events, as a matter of finance, had been made whereby compensation can be given in the case of men who have served and, in consequence of the privation or the trials they had to undergo in the campaign, have had their intellect seriously impaired. I have had my attention called to the case of a man named Thomas Neely, who served, I am informed, during the campaign in Company C, Infantry School, from Toronto. It is stated that Neely underwent serious privations during the campaign, and that, as a result of them—I do not vouch for this bit of evidence, but it is asserted in the public press—his reason became weak, and ultimately he became a lunatic. On the return of the company to Toronto, it is stated that at last his infirmity became so decided that he had to be placed in confinement, where he is to-day; that application was made by his family to the commanding officer at Toronto, Colonel Otter, for relief; that his family consists of a wife and children who are solely dependent upon this man for support; that Colonel Otter communicated with the authorities here, and that General Middleton investigated the case, and finally sent a reply to Colonel Otter, which concludes, according to the newspaper report which I have, in these words:

"There are no funds available for such cases."

He gives that as the decision of the Department, that there are no funds available for the case of a family whose head is taken from them under the circumstance to which I have referred. We know that the law does provide for relief where a man only happens to lose a limb, to be wounded in his body, but General Middleton asserts that there are no funds provided and no provision whatever made for relief where a man practically loses his head, where he goes mad. I will read an extract from the Toronto *News*, of Tuesday last, referring to this case. If the facts are as stated, I have no doubt the Minister will see, before the Session closes, that provision is made for relief in such a matter, and I think he might well assume that such applications may be made, and it would be prudent to take power to deal with them in case they should come under his notice. The facts in this case may or may not sustain the statement in the press. I will read the article, which is as follows:—

"A case of extreme distress has come to my notice that should receive careful consideration. The facts are said to be these: Some three years ago one Thomas Neely, who had served in the Irish constabularly and in the police force here, joined C company, Infantry School. He went with that corps to the North-West and served throughout the campaign, but the hardships he endured unsettled his reason. This was discovered after the return of the force, but it was only about two months ago that he was finally pronounced unsafe and sent to gaol to await a vacancy in the asylum, which was obtained about a week ago. He has a wife and two children. Now, here is where the painful part of the story comes in. The wife and the two little ones are left totally unprovided for. Col. Otter, I have no doubt, did all that he could to obtain some relief or assistance for the family. He communicated with the authorities at Ottawa, and consulted with Gen. Middleton when that officer was in the city, but the answer, as he writes Mrs. Neely, was: 'There are no funds available for such cases.' Col Otter says in his letter: 'I thought Gen. Middleton might be able to do something, but he cannot, and I am afraid there now remains no hope.' Further on, duty compels him to say: 'I have received an order for the discharge of your husband from the company, which must take place in a few days. In the meantime, I wish you would send his plain clothes to him, as when he is discharged he will have to return his uniform.'"

I am sure the Minister of Militia will admit that should such a case arise in the service, this country is bound in honor to do something. Therefore, I hope, that before the Session closes, he will take all power necessary to deal with such a case.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to the case of those regiments and battalions that were called out on duty but did not proceed to the North-West. I know that a great many of the 32nd were obliged to give up their employment, situations of emolument which they were filling, and when they came back they found their places taken by others, and were thrown for weeks and for months out of employment. I know, also, that some of the officers and men were put to expense in providing certain equipments which were not provided by the Department, and altogether very serious loss was involved upon members of that force. I think it would be a most unfortunate thing if the country, through the Department, should appear in any way to make little of the gallantry of our volunteer force, who were prepared to lay down their lives for their country, and who came up with such promptitude at the call of duty. There is no doubt at all that unless some kind of recognition is afforded to them for their services, there will be a feeling of soreness, there will be a feeling that their services have not been appreciated. It is not the value of the thing they look at so much as it is the fact that their services and sacrifices have not been sufficiently considered. I am sure the Minister of Militia, if he will consider their case, will feel bound to do something in the direction I have indicated.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock), I can say that I am not aware of the facts as related in the extract from the *News* which he has just read. I shall take care that the case is investigated immediately. Of course, the matter will have to be reported upon by a medical commission appointed for that purpose. If the facts are found to be as related in the extract, and if any relief can be granted by the Department under the circumstances, of course it will be granted.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Militia says "if any relief can be granted." Of course, it would not be right that the hands of the Department should be tied by want of power. He is familiar, of course, with the Militia law, and knows whether the Department has to day sufficient statutory power to enable him to deal with such a case.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Of course it depends altogether upon the facts of the case. I am not in a position to say, until I investigate the matter, whether it comes under my Department or not. If it is a fact that Corporal Neely has, in consequence of going to the North-West, lost his mind and suffered as the hon. gentleman represents, the Department has jurisdiction over such a case.

Mr. GUNN. I think the Department should also consider the case of the 14th Battalion, who were ordered out to the North-West, and who were put to a good deal of expense and loss of time. They served in the fort at Kingston for several months, and I think their claim should be considered as well as the others.

Mr. GAULT. I regret very much to hear the Minister of Militia say that no grant can be made to the volunteers who turned out last year and who went under canvas, such as the Prince of Wales Rifles, of Montreal, under Lieutenant Colonel Bond, a man who has spent a good portion of his life in the militia service at Montreal. I hope that before this Bill becomes law, the Minister will take the case of those men into his favorable consideration. I have likewise always considered that the volunteers of 1866, who went out to repress the Fenian invasion, should have had their services recognised by the Government. I think it is a great shame that the important services they rendered on that occasion should thus far have been wholly ignored.

We know that the volunteers from Montreal, and the Queen's Own of Toronto, suffered very severely, and that some of them lost their lives on that occasion, and I trust that before this Bill passes, some recognition will be made of their services.

Resolutions concurred in.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) introduced Bill (No. 142) to make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the militia force on active service in the North-West.

Bill read the first time.

THE LAW RESPECTING THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 133) further to amend the law respecting the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Thompson).

(In the Committee.)

On section 7,

Mr. WELDON. It is a very grave question as to whether judges should be members of the North-West Council. It is a legislative body for the purpose of initiating and carrying out legislation in the North-West Territories. To adopt the principle that judges should be a portion of the North-West Council is to go back to a principle that has long since fallen into disfavor. The only exception in the Mother Country of a judge being in the Cabinet is in the case of the Lord Chancellor, and that is a special exception. The only instance in which a judge was taken into the Cabinet is that of Lord Ellenborough, who was subjected to severe comment and animadversion. So strong was public opinion against that action that no member of the judiciary has been a member of the Imperial Cabinet since that time. At one time the Master of the Rolls was allowed to have a seat in the House of Commons. When Sir John Romilly resigned his seat for Davenport and was made Master of the Rolls, he acquiesced in the general feeling that the House of Commons was not an arena in which the judge of a court should take part. Since that time no person holding a judicial function has been a member of the House of Commons. The House of Lords is in a different position. That body exercises judicial as well as legislative functions, and therefore the principle does not apply. In those two instances to which I have referred, both of them were innovations and were founded on a wrong principle. We know, with respect to the Provinces—I can speak with respect to New Brunswick, and it was the same in the other Provinces—that when the Legislative Council was first formed the judges were members of it. In New Brunswick we had only one Council, Executive and Legislative, and when it was separated the judges remained members of the Legislative Council, but only the old judges, and the feeling was so strong against that system that many years have elapsed since a judge has sat in the Legislative Council. The same thing also occurred in Nova Scotia, and there has been no judge in the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia for years. Chief Justice Haliburton was a member of the Legislative Council, but he resigned his seat while a judge in deference to the feeling that judges should not take part in legislative proceedings. Such was the feeling, in fact, long before the days of responsible government, and whatever the justification for that system might have been at the first formation of the colonies and the commencement of our system, when that necessity passed away the feeling arose that judges should not be members of a legislative body. Throughout the Dominion the system has long ago fallen into disfavor, and looking at the practice in the Mother Country and in the Provinces, it is evident that it would be a very bad principle to adopt if we were to allow judges to become members of the North-West Council.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. Minister ought to drop all that portion of the clause after the word "territory." By doing so it would be provided that no judge of any court should hold any other office of emolument under the Dominion or under any Province or Territory. That would express precisely what has been the general policy of Parliament in all the Provinces ever since the establishment of responsible government, and there is no reason why a different rule should be adopted in the North-West Territories. If this Bill were to come into operation, and judges were to become members of the North-West Council, as at present constituted, when the number of elected members is very considerable, it is clear they would be called upon to take part in political discussions and express opinions on questions coming before the Council. The judges might take opposite sides. It was hardly in the nature of things that they were going to be all on one side and with one party in the Council. They would possibly become leaders of opposite parties. They would be called upon to sit in caucus and decide upon a policy, and when they came to discharge their judicial functions they would be called upon to interpret and enforce laws which they might have opposed and about which they might have differed with respect to their construction. The position in which they would be placed is one altogether contrary to our conceptions of the duties of one holding a judicial position. If there is one portion of the Dominion where a judge ought to hold himself aloof from political discussions and from taking part in the settlement of questions of public policy and of party government, it is in a country like the North West. The law is likely to have less force. A judge ought not to be mixed up with questions of party expediency, as he certainly would be if he were to take part in the discussions as well as the deliberations of the Council of the North-West Territories. Those judges, as members of the North-West Council, as members who took an active part in the discussion of public questions, would be amenable to criticism, their conduct would be reviewed, their motives would be impunged. Feelings of personal hostility towards newspaper men and other parties would necessarily spring out of the discussions, and there was nothing they could do in the administration of the law as judges which would not be open to question, and they would be assumed to be more or less influenced by what was said in regard to them in the discharge of their duties as members of the Council. It would be impossible for the hon. Minister or for any hon. member, if he were to be a judge of one of the Superior Courts of the country, to administer the law without suspicion attaching to him after taking part in political discussions, and he would become the subject of criticism, that men are necessarily, and I think in most cases fairly, subjected to by the public press. I think it would be singularly unfortunate if we adopted this provision, which might not be very seriously objected to, as long as those who were entrusted with the administration of affairs were simply magistrates and nothing more, whose conduct in their judicial capacity was always liable to be reviewed by the judges of the Superior Court, as they have by the Court of Queen's Bench in Manitoba. But the hon. gentleman proposes to establish a Supreme Court in that country, and to give to the judges of that court the widest possible jurisdiction, to give them control over rules of procedure, to authorise them to deal with all important cases that may come before them in their judicial capacity; to make these men members of a legislative body in which political considerations must come into play, and where they will be obliged to take sides, would be in the last degree mischievous, and would seriously affect the opinions which the public might form with regard to the

administration of justice. It is not alone sufficient that justice should be fairly administered. In most cases, I suppose, justice would be fairly administered if the judges were allowed to be members of this House. But what confidence would the public have in their administration of the law in such a case? And if you cannot afford in the public interest to allow the judges to become members of Parliament, you cannot any more afford to allow the judges in the North-West Territories to become members of the North-West Council. It is not sufficient that the men who are engaged in the administration of justice should act fairly. It is of the utmost importance that the public should believe they act fairly; that the public should have confidence in the administration of justice, and it is impossible that the public should have confidence that the administration of justice can be retained, so long as the judges are members of the Council. Let me suppose that there are contested election cases growing out of the elections to the North-West Council. Who are to sit in judgment on the respective candidates in such a case? Why, these very men. Here you have provision made for an election of members of the Council, and for the trial of controverted elections in the North-West Council, and who are to sit in judgment on those controversies? Why, the members of the Council. Are they going to decide fairly? If the hon. gentleman appoints his own friends—as the majority, and perhaps all of them, are political friends of the hon. gentleman—I should like to know what chance a member of the opposite party would have in contesting an election before the members of a court so constituted. It might be that a fair decision would be had. But I should like to know whether the public would believe that the decision was fair, when it was adverse to the opponent of the judge? Why, Sir, the judge is put in a totally false position. When you introduce the principle of the trial of controverted elections—and that is what you do and what is done by the North-West Council at this moment—I should like to know how you are going to have a fair trial, or one in which the public will have confidence, when the members of the court trying the case are to be members of the North-West Council? I say you must abandon one position or the other. You just go back to the position of things which existed when we had the trial by petition before a committee of this House, or we must restrain the North-West Council from resorting to those means of settling disputed contests that we ourselves believe are demanded in the public interest and in the interest of public justice. Yet the hon. gentleman proposes to adopt a system here utterly at variance with a fair trial in the cases of controverted elections. I trust the hon. gentleman will agree to repeal the latter part of this section, and will not insist upon a provision which is so totally at variance with what is right and just, a provision which will certainly go a long way to destroy public confidence in the integrity and fairness of those who are called upon to administer the law.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I trust the hon. gentleman will not press this clause of the Bill providing that the judges which the hon. gentleman proposes to create by this Bill should be members of the North-West Council. We have so much confidence at present in our judges, that they are treated as if it were never possible for them to destroy that confidence. Public confidence in them remains established. Nobody questions that public confidence. Now, there were not, I dare say, any very valid objections to the stipendiary magistrates being members of the North-West Council. The sparsity of the population and the difficulty of getting representative men into the North-West Council was, no doubt, very great, and no doubt there were some excuse for allowing these stipendiary magistrates to occupy seats in the Council. But that difficulty has long since disappeared, or, at all events, it does not now exist. Intelligent, qualified and able men can be got to represent the people in the North-West Council. Now, there is another reason why this provision is very objectionable. We know that in the earlier days of the administration of the North-West Council, politics did not, to any extent, prevail in that board. But anybody who has watched the proceedings of the Council during the last year, can come to but one conclusion, and that is, that political lines are about as clearly defined there as they are in the Parliament of Canada. The discussions which took place during the last meetings of the Council, the actions of the members of the Council, both the nominees of the Crown and the representatives of the people there, clearly indicate that. Now the effect of this proposition is that we are creating five Superior Court judges, and we are placing them in the political arena, to take part in political discussion; because, where party lines are drawn, as they are there, the judges will undoubtedly—they are but human; they have political sympathies, though they are judges—they will undoubtedly be ranged on one side of politics or the other. The result is, that you are going to place those judges in an unenviable and disagreeable position—a position in which public confidence, at no distant day, if not at the outset, will be completely shaken in the judgment of those judges. Now, I say it is hardly the thing that the men who make the laws should be the men to administer the laws. The hon. gentleman might just as well propose here that the judges of the Superior Court of the Province of Ontario, or the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, should be members of this House. Why dare not the hon. gentleman so propose? He dare not so propose, and why? Because public opinion is against it; because the faith and confidence which the people have in the administration of justice would be completely shaken, and, therefore, no person would think of proposing that the judges of the courts should occupy seats in the Parliament of Canada or the Local Legislatures. Now, if they should not occupy seats in the Parliament of Canada or the Local Legislatures, upon what principle can the hon. gentlemen justify their occupying seats in the North-West Council? They will have as much politics there as the rankest politician, Liberal or Conservative; and it is putting them in a position in which no judge should be placed. It is going to have the effect of shaking public confidence in those judges. Therefore, I hope the hon. gentleman will not press that clause of the Bill, but will leave the judges of the North-West, as they are now in the other Provinces—men who are supposed, at all events, to have no political bias or leaning, who are supposed to administer the law without any leaning to one side of politics or the other.

Mr. THOMPSON. With great respect for my friends on the other side of the House who have discussed this question this afternoon, I beg to say that I think there is a very marked distinction between the case of the North-West Council and that of this Parliament or a Local Legislature. As was intimated by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), in the organisation of the different colonies where Imperial Councils were established, judges were almost always placed upon the board, and they remained there in many cases until responsible government was conceded. The condition of affairs in the North-West Territories is very similar. We are still to a large extent, so far as local legislation is concerned, in the position of organising those territories, and giving them for the first time a code of laws; and I think it just as desirable that the experience and legal assistance the judges are able to give should be given in those Councils as it ever was in the organisation of a colony. But I wish particularly to call the attention of my hon. friends opposite to the principle underlying this part of the Bill, which will appear after I make

this explanation. I do not propose in this, or any other respect, to make any change in the laws of the territories, except with reference to the establishment of the court itself. I do not desire to alter the substantive law relating to property, procedure, or the North-West Council itself. The only way in which clause 7 touches that question, is that it says that nothing herein contained shall make the judges ineligible to sit in the Council. Let me call the attention of the committee to what the law is in reference to judges sitting in the Council. At present it enables the Governor in Council to appoint six members of that Council; the others are, of course, elected in the North-West Territories themselves. It is also provided that stipendiary magistrates of the North-West Territories shall, *ex officio*, be members of that Council. Now, I propose to repeal that provision, and to strike out that provision of this Bill which increases the number of appointed members to eight, leaving the law just as it is, and saying nothing about the judges being either eligible or ineligible. Then, if at any time it should be considered unnecessary to continue the judges in the North-West Council, they will not be appointed. I think the interpretation of clause 7 will not be altered by striking out the words the hon. gentleman suggests, because the judges would still be eligible to sit at the Council board unless they were specifically excluded.

Mr. MULOCK. I hardly think the constitution of the North-West Council affords us a safe precedent for its future constitution. We must remember that the present law was framed when the territories were in a much less organised condition than they are to-day. In the beginning the Council was entirely nominative. At that time there were very few settlers in the North-West, and the necessity of the case perhaps justified a policy which, under the altered conditions of to-day, is an unsound policy. Suppose that to-day we were for the first time providing for the case of the North-West by establishing a Council, would we make eligible to sit in that Council men occupying judicial positions in the North-West? If we would not, then we must not make judges eligible under the legislation which is sought to-day. There is no practical necessity, in my opinion, for judges to be chosen to fill places in the North-West Council. Since the Act creating the Council was passed, a large population has gone into the North-West, and we are told that settlement is rapidly taking place, that people are now going in there by thousands. It is quite clear, therefore, that the territories will themselves supply the necessary material to fill that Council, without our having to fall back on the judges of the land. The duties of that Council are largely administrative. It has to deal with local questions, school questions, educational questions, municipal questions, and so on. Are the judges the fittest to deal with these questions? I submit that they are not. I believe the Government would be strengthened by not being free to make such appointments. The settlers themselves, I think, are better qualified to discharge the duties falling upon the members of the Council than the judges. Necessity, therefore, will not justify their appointment; and I do not think a member of the bar, at all events, would advocate the appointment of judges, who ought to occupy a neutral position, who ought to live rather in the serene atmosphere of the bench than be brought down to the discussion of municipal or other politics. In the last proceedings of the North-West Council we find the members arraying themselves on similar political lines to those of the people of the older Provinces. The committee will remember a discussion which came up in that Council touching the treatment of the Indians by this Government, in which a recently elected member, Mr. Jackson, made a very strong speech against the Lieutenant Governor of the Territories. He asserted that his politics had been Conservative, and that he was still a Conservative, but that justice to the Indians made it necessary for him to repudiate the action of the Lieutenant Governor with regard to the Indians of the North-West. Look at the division list. If I remember rightly, the elected members supported the attack on the Administration, and the nominated members defended the Administration. What happened then will happen to-morrow if the Government appoint judges to that Council. What will their action be when the time comes for them to pass upon the conduct of the Administration? They will be trammelled, however honest may be their motives, and being trammelled, public confidence in them as judges of the land will be weakened. You can strike no greater blow at our institutions than in the slightest degree to afford a foundation for the withdrawal or withholding of public confidence from the judiciary. Neither expediency nor necesity would justify at this day the appointment of a judge to the North-West Council, and we should go further by making judges ineligible for that office. They are not eligible to-day in the older Provinces to sit in any Legislative Assembly, or to cast a vote or choose a representative for a member of that Assembly. Were our legislators wrong when they adopted that policy, a policy which did not originate with us, but was borrowed from a country greater than ours? For these reasons, I trust that the Government will introduce such provisions in the Bill as will meet this view of the case.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I had occasion to look over the ordinances of the North-West Council, and I never saw such a crude lot of laws got together; I never saw laws passed in so complicated a way as these evidently were. In some of them there seemed to be no regard for logic, and hardly any regard for the English language, so that nobody could tell what they meant. It would puzzle a Philadelphia lawyer to understand them. I brought this to the attention of some of the attorneys of the North-West, and asked why some of them did not go into the Council, so that there would be a likelihood of the laws being passed in a more intelligible shape. But they replied that their practice took up their time, and that as they were the principal agents in the carrying on of lawsuits, they were not as popular with the people as others were outside the legal profession. The North-West Council is therefore principally filled by men who have no legal training, and the consequence is that the ordinances passed are often incomprehensible. If this North-West Council were a Parliament, in which politics took the lead, it would be improper to allow the appointment of judges to it, but when, as my hon. friend who spoke last has said, party lines are effaced and politics are not known in the Council, as is shown by the fact that at elections in the North-West. Nobody is asked what his politics are, but often Liberals from the older Provinces vote for the Conservative candidate, and *vice versa*, that objection disappears. The Council is, in fact, a deliberative body from which politics are excluded entirely, and if judges were appointed the laws would be properly framed and no question of incompatibility could arise. Let my legal friends opposite take up the ordinances of the North-West Council, and then say whether it is not necessary that a judge should have a seat in the Council, who would be both interested in and competent of seeing that the laws were properly drawn up. Of course, as the country grows older and politics are introduced, no Government would see fit to appoint a judge to the Council. But in the present condition of the North-West, when its society is not crystalised, when there is more or less chaos out of which order must be brought, it will be admitted that no person would be more competent as a member of that Council than a judge, and as there are no politics at stake, I do not see why a judge should be ineligible.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the hon. gentleman, on reflection, will see there is not much force in the argument he advances. The condition of affairs he depicts, which has resulted in the lamentable consequence that a large number of the ordinances are so framed that they cannot be understood, is a condition which exists, despite the fact that three stipendiary magistrates are *ex officio* members of the Council of which Lieutenant Governor Dewdney is the head.

Mr. WOODWORTH. He is not a lawyer.

Mr. DAVIES. But the three magistrates are.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Who are they?

Mr. DAVIES. Judge Richardson, Judge Rouleau and another judge. That shows simply what all our experience points to, that when you appoint men to a position of this kind, and do not attach any emolument to their services, their duties are performed in a very perfunctory manner. If the North-West Council want laws properly drawn they must appoint a proper law clerk, who will put the laws in proper shape. It would never do to allow the principle which has been discredited in every British colony to be introduced in a new country. I endorse every word which has fallen from hon. gentlemen on this side, as to the impropriety of admitting judges to be appointed members of the Council, whose duties will be partly administrative and partly executive. It does not seem to me that the Minister of Justice met at all the objections raised. He said formerly these officials were *ex officio* members of the council, but that in future they would have to be appointed by the Governor in Council. That is still more objectionable. Under the old system they do not owe their appointment to any political party. These judges, when they are members of the Council, will distinctly owe their position to political favor, and therefore their presence in the Council under the new mode of appointment will be, if possible, more objectionable than if they were made *ex officio* members; but I object to their being made either *ex officio* members of that Council or being made eligible for appointment by the Administration of the day. I think either mode of appointment is highly objectionable; it has been discredited and done away with in all the British colonies since the introduction of responsible government, and in many of them it was done away with before the introduction of responsible government. I can see no good reason for it, and some of the objections, notably the one raised by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in reference to the trial of election petitions, seem to me to be unanswerable. It is just as important that the people should believe they are getting justice done as that justice should be done, and if we constitute this Supreme Court, and constitute an administrative body composed partly of judges, as is intended by this Bill and, if, when they sit upon the bench, they have to discharge functions which are to some extent in conflict with their duties as members of the Council, you will throw an amount of suspicion upon their judicial duties which is highly undesirable. Now that we are establishing the institutions in the North-West is the time to place them on a just and firm basis, a basis which experience has shown to be productive of good and not of harm; and these old ideas of our forefathers many years ago—that it was desirable that the judges should sit in legislative assemblies, not being elected by the people—should no longer be entertained.

Mr. MULOCK. I am somewhat surprised at the attitude taken by my hon. friend from King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth), on this question. I venture to say that he has argued somewhat against his convictions, for I give him credit for having too much respect for popular institutions and popular rights to seriously press upon the Government the control of a popular body by Government appointees. He only justified the proposal, however, by the necessity of the case, and his evidence of that was that the legislation, so far, had been so crude as to indicate an entire absence of legal knowledge on the part of the framers, and the necessity, therefore, of introducing some legal acumen into the Council. Let us see how destitute that present organisation which he complains of is of legal attainments. I cannot profess to say who all the members of the North-West Council are, but some of them, at all events, are lawyers. How many lawyers will satisfy my hon. friend, so that there should be some legal knowledge there?

Mr. WOODWORTH. It is according to the quality.

Mr. MULOCK. Will he say that the present Government appoints unfit men to administer the law? Who appointed the following persons to office in the North-West? Mr. McLeod is an Ontario lawyer, a man who practised at the Ontario bar for many years, and at last went to the North-West. I believe he has been a stipendiary magistrate for some time. I do not know whether he is at present or not. He is a member of the Council. He is a good lawyer.

Mr. WOODWORTH. No, he never was articled.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, I know him personally, and, though I will not contradict my hon. friend, I assert that he is a good lawyer. He practised in the town of Bowmanville for many years.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That is not the one.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, James McLeod; I am not mistaken.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). He is a lawyer. That is right.

Mr. MULOCK. What about Judge Rouleau? He acted as judge at Battleford. Who appointed him? I suppose he had a legal education, though I do not know anything about him. Then there is Judge Richardson. He was qualified to hang a man. I suppose he ought to be able to make a law or revise a little statute, anyway. Judge Travis—what are his qualifications? Why, Judge Travis is one of the finest lawyers the world ever knew; he is one of the ablest lawyers the Lord ever put breath in. Is there any other lawyer in Canada who has been able to accomplish as much as he has since he has been on the bench?

Mr. WOODWORTH. Not one.

Mr. MULOCK. Before he was appointed he was able to cast odium on the Privy Council. It was not up to his standard of what a judiciary ought to be. And then he badgered this Cabinet so much that at last, to get rid of him and to satisfy a then member of the Government, he was appointed a stipendiary magistrate.

Mr. MITCHELL. What member of the Government?

Mr. MULOCK. He is not in the Government now. I mean the member who appointed him, and very shortly after left the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. Who is he?

Mr. MULOCK. You know who he is.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. Has not Judge Travis the qualifications for a judge? Will you say he cannot make a statute or revise legislation? He was able first to imprison the mayor of Calgary, and then to imprison the whole council of Calgary, and then to imprison the whole editorial staff of Calgary, and then he threw the whole burgh of Calgary into the dungeon cell. Has any member of the bar proved his knowledge of the law so much as Judge Travis? And yet you tell us he cannot pass a little ordinance in the North-West. It is true that he has had a little check since he performed these great exploits, but he has only stepped back to take breath, and who knows, after this symposium

he is now having, but that he will advance to new conquests—and he is a member of the Council.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He is not a member of the Council.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, he is a member of the Council, or he was one.

Mr. BOWELL. He never was a member of the Council.

Mr. MULOCK. Very well. You see in that case what great talent the Government has left unavailed of. They had the right to appoint him, and they have been so grossly negligent of their duties that they have not appointed this great man.

Mr. WOODWORTH. They are afraid he would imprison the Council.

Mr. MULOCK. Judge Travis, the embodiment of all the law west of Winnipeg, not a member of the Council! I enter my protest against his being passed over in favor of any new creatures of the Statute now proposed. But, joking aside, I think we have shown that, apart from Judge Travis, there is a sufficient legal element in the Council, whereby the Council's measures should not now be discredited on the ground taken by my hon. friend from King's; but, as was said by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), the necessity for having the Statutes correctly drafted, will not justify a departure from sound principles, so I am satisfied that my hon. friend from King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth), argued against his convictions when he asked to perpetuate a system which has been discredited already by the Council. What was the opinion of the North-West Council when they discussed the management of the Indian affairs? They said—and if you read their deliberations, you will find that they asserted—that the will of the people, the opinions of the people were stifled, were gagged, were over-ridden by the appointees of the Crown, and why? because these appointees were not free to express their views. They were in the service, in the pay, and under the control of the Crown, and therefore they did not enter fully into the consideration of the questions before them. Cannot it be said that, though a judge occupies a position from which he cannot be removed except by an Address from Parliament, he is not still under some governmental influence, some party influence? He must necessarily be. Every judge, however pure he is, however anxious to serve, still has an eye to the future, still has an eye to promotion, and likes to stand well with the authorities of the day; and apart from that, apart from the danger of his own actions being controlled or affected by other considerations, the one great consideration that ought, of all others, in my opinion, to which against the proposition to have them eligible is this, that he will be unable to enjoy the entire confidence of the community as a judge, if he is brought down to take part in the various conflicts that must necessarily arise in connection with the administration of local affairs in the North-West Council.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) did not get up for the purpose of saying that he had been converted to my view of the case, but he has said so, in fact, in his argument. He stated that Judge McLeod was a member of the North-West Council; and had he not legal talent? The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), also said that he had legal talent. The hon. gentleman says that Judge Rouleau has legal talent. I did not speak of Judge Travis, because my hon. friend was doing so well in his pleasantry that I did not wish to interrupt him. I say these men had talent enough to perform the duties for which they were appointed. But this Act supersedes them; they will no longer be members of the Council; they are *ex officio;* they are stipendiary magistrates; this Act supersedes them, and they are no longer stipendiary magistrates. They may be appointed judges, however. Rumor has said—I do not know with how much truth—that some of them, who are eligible and who are competent, are going to be appointed under this Act, but ceasing to be stipendiary magistrates. Then, if my hon. friend wishes to see Judge Rouleau made a judge, he is still a member of the North-West Council, so this Act has not done anything contrary to the views of my hon. friend for North York. He does not object to Judge McLeod, the present stipendiary magistrate; he does not object to Judge Rouleau; and I understood the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., to say that they are members of the North-West Council *ex officio*. He does not object to that at all. If he does not object to it, and these men are appointed judges instead of stipendiary magistrates, under this Act, why should they not be appointed *ex officio* members of the North-West Council as they were before this Act was passed?

Mr. WELDON. The hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth), took objection to what he called the crude legislation of the North-West Council, and the hon. member for Queen's pointed out that the judicial functionaries of the North-West were members of that very Council which made this crude legislation. Therefore, that is an answer that at the very time that these ordinances of the Council were being passed, of which the hon. member complained, the judges, with the exception of the later appointment, were *ex officio* members of the Council. It seems to me the Bill does away with the principle which we advocate: that persons who exercise judicial powers should not take part in the legislation of the country. The North-West Council is composed at present of six members, who are appointed by the Government, and, I think, fourteen or fifteen who are elective under the North-West Territories Act. Therefore we have got two classes. First, we have members who are appointed by the Government, of which three are *ex officio* and do not owe their appointment, as members of the North-West Council, to the Government, and they get the appointment by virtue of being stipendiary magistrates. That, of course, will cease, because the present stipendiary magistrates cease to exist when this Act is passed. Then we have the elective body. Now, this is totally different from the old Legislative Council which I referred to some time ago, where they were all appointees of the Crown. If the Minister of Justice wants to carry out the old principle, then he should, according to the practice in the old time, appoint not only the judges, but the bishops.

Mr. THOMPSON. Why not?

Mr. WELDON. Why should not Bishop McLean, the Bishop of Saskatchewan, be appointed as well as the judges, on the same principle? I am merely pointing out that on the hon. gentleman's own principle he should appoint the bishops as well as the judges.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is well worth thinking about.

Mr. WELDON. I should be very glad if the hon. gentleman, as a good churchman, would adopt my suggestion. But, Mr. Chairman, the difficulty is this, that the stipendiary magistrates are *ex-officio*, by virtue of their office, members of the Council, and you have here a proposition that the Crown, at its mere pleasure, shall appoint say three out of five judges. The difference between them naturally will create a feeling of jealousy on the part of the judges who are not appointed; then, what will be the result? The two who are not appointed will go into politics and stand for some of the electoral districts, and there is nothing to prevent them. If they are allowed to act as members of the Council, they can either act as members appointed by the Government, or they can stand for election. I think we do not want to see in-

troduced in the Dominion the principle of a judge running an election. I think even in the United States where the judges are elected by the people, you will not find a single instance where a judge is eligible, either to the Senate or to the House of Representatives. The principle is condemned in England, it is condemned by the practice of the Provinces, it is condemned in the United States, and I think it is an unsound principle which ought not to be introduced into a body which must necessarily be, to a large extent, political. We find already between the Lieutenant Governor and the Council strong differences of opinion expressed as to the policy of the Dominion Government, and the conduct of the legislation, and I think that shows that the judges ought to be kept entirely out of that arena.

Mr. MILLS. My hon. friend has pointed out that under section 7 the judges may be appointed to the North-West Council, or that they may be elected to that Council. Now, let us suppose a judge is a candidate in an election. The Government is not obliged to appoint them all, they may appoint any one of them. A judge becomes a candidate, another party is opposed to him, and a contested election grows out of the contest between the judge and the ordinary civilian; who is to try the case? Why, his brother judges. Does any one suppose that the civilian will stand on a footing of equality when he is contesting an election, and the matter is being tried between him and a brother on the bench? Then let me suppose that there is a division among the members of the bench, whether that judge should or should not be returned to the Council. He is returned by a majority of the bench. They are divided upon the question; some of them decide that he was duly elected, and a minority holds he was not. Well, what will his relation be to the majority and the minority in the Council? He meets there in the Council with the judges who sat in the trial of his election, some of whom were in favor of him, and some who thought he was not entitled to the seat. What will his relations be? He may think that his trial has not been fair on the part of those who sought to exclude him, he may think that some of them showed a want of patience on the bench, and his relations will be anything but friendly when he meets them in Council. Now, I say that if the Government wished to devise a scheme to destroy the influence of the judges in the administration of justice, if they wished to destroy the confidence of the public in the fairness of the judges, they could not have devised a scheme better than this. A judge may be a candidate; he may be tried by his brother judges; he may be excluded by his brother judges, or he may be admitted by them. In fact, if anything in the world could create a state a chaos in the administration of justice, it is the clause we have now under consideration.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see that I was not so inconsistent as he was himself in his allusion to the bishops. I do not think it would be a very great calamity if the bishops in the North-West Territories were appointed to the Council.

Mr. MILLS. Let us know the policy?

Mr. THOMPSON. I wish to say to hon. gentlemen that at present the policy, whatever it is, is now the law, and that while they are opposing a change of the law with respect to judges, they have not yet uttered a word of complaint as to the eligibility of other persons. The hon. gentleman knows that bishops are eligible to-day, and he does not propose to make them ineligible, although holding up both hands in horror at the idea of judges being eligible. I leave the committee to say where the inconsistency lies. This is, however, a temporary provision. It is only for the present that this body exists at all. Section 21 of the North-West Territories Act, as embodied in the Revised Statutes, and the same section of the Act itself, provides that when the number of elected members reach twenty-one the Council shall cease and determine, and the members so elected shall be constituted as a Legislative Assembly for the Territories, and all the powers of this Act vested in the Council shall be vested and exercised by the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. WELDON. They can be elected still.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will come to that presently. The same Act provides that whenever the population of any electoral district reaches 2,000 people of adult age, and whenever a population shall be claimed to include 1,000 to 1,000 square miles, the Governor shall issue his writ for an election of a member for that district; so that, in the course of two or three years, we have every reason to believe the Council will reach twenty-one members, and it will be superseded by a Legislative Assembly. Under that clause, I am informed, at the last session of the Council five new members took their seats. But while the Territory remains, as at present, in the condition of a colony, it does not seem to be a very extravagant proposition to say that judges may be eligible to sit in that Council. That system has not been discredited, and hon. gentlemen opposite fail to name a colony in which it has been discredited or surperseded until the affairs of the colony have been managed by a Legislative Assembly. The Bill proposes no new provisions. I think the last proposition mentioned of the possibility of a judge running an election for the Council is rather an extravagant one; but I am quite willing to meet that objection by altering the words so as to read, "being eligible for appointment as a member of the North-West Council." A good deal has been said with respect to the qualifications of the judges in the North-West. The hon. gentleman also referred to alleged acts done by Justice Travis in regard to which he said the judge had achieved remarkable distinction. Whatever the judge's qualifications or disqualifications may be, the acts spoken of, that of having imprisoned the mayor, the town council and all the editors, are acts to which Judge Travis is an entire stranger, and which were never asserted in regard to him until the last half hour. As regards the position of those gentlemen referred to in this connection with the North-West Council we are making no new provisions except to say that they shall no longer be *ex-officio* members and I think that is a step in the direction in which the hon. gentleman is desiring us to go, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), that the present provision will be more objectionable than that. If the objection to their having seats is because they might be, to a certain extent, under the control of the Government, the objection is really less strong when it applies to judges, who are appointed on good behavior and can only be removed by this Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister asks for a precedent showing that evils have resulted out of such a system as he proposes to adopt by this measure. I refer the hon. gentleman to the experience of the late Provinces of Upper Canada and Lower Canada. It is perfectly well known that the difficulties that occurred in olden times in those two Provinces arose largely from the legislative institution being controlled by appointees of the Crown, not all judges, but appointees, who were not independent. The Minister has questioned my remarks in regard to Judge Travis, and he has said that judge did not imprison the mayor or council, or any other distinguished persons. I have seen it stated in the press, and I have received communications from persons at Calgary stating that he issued edicts for those personages to go there; whether they finally went there or not I do not know. In regard to the mayor he issued an order that he should serve six months until he paid a fine. In regard to the council, he treated them in the same way;

they were ordered to pay a fine or go to gaol. In the case of Mr. Cayley, a member of the press, he sent him to prison, and it was not until his father came here and interceded for him that he was liberated. Why, I do not know. He was sentenced to serve several months in gaol, but he was liberated after serving a few days. The hon. gentleman is surely not so unfamiliar with what his officers are doing as not to be familiar with the actions of Judge Travis.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken as to the nature of the judgments of which he has spoken.

Mr. MULOCK. I refer to the Calgary *Herald* and communications I have received from the people in question.

Mr. WATSON. In regard to the statement made by the hon. member for King's, N. S. (Mr. Woodworth), that the statement of the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) was wrong, that party politics enter into the North-West Council, and the reference to Mr. Jackson. Mr. Jackson was a Conservative and had pitched into Governor Dewdney about the maladministration of North-West affairs. Mr. Jackson represented a class of people there, he did not represent himself, but the people; and unless Mr. Jackson had seen that his people were in sympathy with the views he expressed in the Council, I do not think he would have given expression to them. This appointment of members of the North-West Council is very unpopular, and I hope, as the Minister of Justice says, that it will not be long before we may have a deliberative body there. That time cannot come too quickly in the interests of that country. As the Minister of the Interior who has been there knows, there are plenty of men in that country fully competent to become members of such a body and pass its ordinances.

On section 14,

Mr. THOMPSON. In reference to the views which were expressed the other day, I have drawn a section conferring jurisdiction on the court very much in the same words in which jurisdiction was conferred on the superior courts of Ontario. I thought there was some force in the reasoning that it was desirable to apply to this court the language which was used in conferring jurisdiction on the courts of Manitoba, for the reason that, as the Territories are divided into Provinces, it is desirable that their general system of law should correspond:

This court shall, within the Territories and for the administration of the laws for the time being within the Territories, possess all such powers and authorities as by the law of England are incident to a superior court of civil and criminal jurisdiction and shall have, use and exercise all the rights, incidents and privileges of a court of record and all other rights, incidents and privileges as fully to all intents and purposes as the same were on the 15th day of July, 1870, used, exercised and enjoyed by any of Her Majesty's superior courts of common law, or by the Court of Chancery, or by the Court of Probate in England, and may and shall hold pleas in all, and all manner of actions, causes and suits as well criminal as civil, real, personal and mixed, and may and shall proceed in such actions, causes and suits by such process and course as are provided by law, and as shall tend with justice and despatch to determine the same, and may and shall hear and determine all issues of law, and may and shall also hear and (with or without a jury as provided by law) determine all issues of fact that may be joined in any such action, cause or suit, and judgment thereon give and execution thereof award in as full and as ample a manner as might at the said date be done in Her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench, Common Bench or in matters which regard the Queen's revenue (including the condemnation of contraband or smuggled goods) by the Court of Exchequer or by the Court of Chancery or the Court of Probate in England.

On section 27,

Mr. THOMPSON. This section prescribes the scope of the authority of the Council at present, and the clause is only reinserted in order to make it clear that the same authority extends to this court, notwithstanding the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS. Then I understand that the intention of this clause is that the Council of the Territories may alter the constitution of this court.

Mr. THOMPSON. They could not depart in any way from the provisions of this Act.

Mr. WELDON. Does the Act of 1880 go quite as far as this, and allow them to establish a provincial court?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. WELDON. The only question is whether they would have power to create other courts while this court is in existence?

Mr. THOMPSON. I suppose, in practice, they could, but it could not possibly work without the concurrence of Parliament.

Mr. MILLS. I think my hon. friend has confounded the Act of 1880 and an Order in Council passed under the authority of that Act, conferring on the North-West Council just such jurisdiction as it is proposed to give them by this Bill, and it is under that Order in Council, I suppose, that up to this time they have exercised their power.

On section 28,

Mr. WELDON. Does not this conflict with the present Act? The hon. gentleman takes power to repeal the 76th section of the North-West Territories Act, which allows a jury of six in criminal cases, and the question might arise whether a jury of six or a jury of twelve should be taken.

Mr. THOMPSON. The clause makes the procedure subject to any Act of the Parliament of Canada, which, I think, cures the objection, but I will give full consideration to the hon. gentleman's suggestion before the third reading.

Bill reported.

LAW OF EVIDENCE.

Mr. THOMPSON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 141) further to amend the law of evidence in certain cases.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS. Is this not a portion of the Bill which has already been passed through this House and sent to the Senate Chamber. Why should we be asked to deal with this subject when it is perhaps already embraced in a Bill which has gone to the Senate. We have no notice that the Senate have rejected our Bill, and it would be undesirable to legislate on a subject we have already legislated upon.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is not contrary to the rules of Parliament to legislate again on the same subject.

Mr. DAVIES. The history of the Bill is simply this. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson) introduced a Bill last Session to amend the law of evidence and had it referred to a select committee, to which several Bills of a cognate nature were referred. I had the honor of being a member of the committee, and I moved this clause in the committee, and they adopted it, and it came in under what is known as the agnostic Bill. It was not necessarily part of that Bill, but was on the same subject. That Bill passed the House last Session and was rejected in the Senate. It passed this House again this Session, and I understand that portion of it which referred to the allowances of witnesses, who have conscientious objections to taking the oath, to make affirmation, was objected to by the Senate, very unadvisedly, I think; and this section, which we now have, was introduced as a subsequent Act of itself.

Mr. MILLS. I do not know whether the whole Bill is rejected or whether this is simply the Bill sent to the Senate coming back in an amended form.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is a new Bill.

Mr. DAVIES. This is what took place. They went into committee on the Bill, and one hon. gentleman moved that the committee rise, and that was carried, and so the Bill was lost.

Mr. MILLS. It is only suspended; it is simply a case of suspended animation.

Mr. DAVIES. It cannot be restored very well.

Mr. MILLS. It could be put on the next day.

Mr. DAVIES. It was not restored at all events. First, they agreed not to report at all, and subsequently they agreed to report the fact.

Mr. MILLS. I still raise my question for the decision of the Government. This is a part of a Bill which has already been carried through this House. It has passed three readings here; it has not been rejected by the Senate, and the Minister of Justice now proposes that we shall pass another Bill upon precisely the same subject upon which we have already legislated this Session. I submit that that cannot be done. If the Senate had rejected the Bill; if they had moved the three months' hoist, we might have introduced a Bill on part of the same subject, or might have re-introduced the whole Bill, but the Bill sent to the Senate has not been rejected. The committee has risen, and it may be restored to the Orders in the Senate to-morrow. I think it would be highly irregular to undertake to deal with it in this way until that measure is finally disposed of in the Senate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot agree with my hon. friend. In the first place, we cannot constitutionally know what happens in the Senate.

Mr. MILLS. Then we cannot legislate at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot know what they do except by communication from themselves, or unless we ask them for leave to search their records, and they give their assent. All we know is that a Bill went up containing this clause with other clauses. That is there. It has not been reported to us. We do not know what they have done. We do not know whether they have done anything or not. That would not prevent them, on any principle that I know of, from sending down a Bill containing one of the clauses of the measure we have sent up, and we should not refuse it on that ground. I do not see that there is any ground whatever to prevent our discussing this Bill which they send down, merely because the same clause in principle, or the same clause *verbatim et literatim*, is included in the Bill we sent up there.

Mr. MILLS. Then the hon. gentleman contends that this House might to-day carry through a Bill upon a particular subject, and that it might to-morrow carry through another Bill upon precisely the same subject, in precisely the same terms or in contradiction or variation of those terms. That, practically, is laying down a law which is at variance with the well settled law of Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see that. If we have passed a Bill, there is practically no necessity for the other Bill coming down in the same terms, and such an extreme case could never by any possibility arise, but, when a portion of a measure is sent down, I do not think we should refuse it.

Mr. WELDON. It is not sent down as a part of the old Bill, but as a new Bill altogether.

Mr. DAVIES. There is no evidence before us at all. This Bill may have been introduced in the Senate before the other Bill was introduced in this House. We have no official knowledge of it. It is here before us, and, deeply as I regret the action of the Senate in rejecting the portion of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson)—we do not know in any constitutional manner what took place in the Senate, and I am only stating what I gather from the records and from conversing with some members of the Senate—I think this is a very desirable clause. I know in my own practice I have found the want of it, and, unless there is some rule which we are directly violating, I should be sorry to see it thrown out.

Mr. MILLS. I am not objecting to the principle of the Bill. That is not what I have submitted to the committee. We have already legislated upon this matter this Session by passing a measure containing the same clause. It was read three times in this House regularly, and it has gone to the Senate, and the First Minister says we do not know what the fate of that measure is. We have not searched the records of the Senate, we do not know that it has been rejected, and now the Government are asking us to adopt a measure containing one of the same sections. It may be exactly in the same words. I do not know, but I say that is a most irregular and unparliamentary proceeding. The Government are bound to know and to inform the House what has become of the Bill on this subject before they propose to introduce another Bill on the same subject. Supposing they passed the Bill which went from this House and sent it down here to-morrow, which is to become law?

Mr. THOMPSON. Would there be any harm done?

Mr. MILLS. Supposing they vary, does the hon. gentleman propose that Parliament should stultify itself? Does he assume that the rules of Parliament will allow anything so absurd to be done as that would be? If he is right, it would be within the parliamentary right and usage to pass a hundred measures on the same subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I should think that such an absurdity in practice would never arise, and therefore there is no use in fighting shadows. But supposing we send a Bill to the Upper House, and afterwards there came down a Bill initiated there, containing the same terms exactly. All that we would do in such a case would be to send a respectful message to the Senate informing them that before their message came to us, we had sent up a message of the same kind, and asking them to deal with that.

Mr. MILLS. That is exactly the case that has arisen, and you have not sent a message.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it is not the same Bill.

Mr. MILLS. We have sent a Bill to the Senate, and we do not know what has become of it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Everybody does. We may shut our eyes to it and affect to act upon some exalted notion of consistency, which does not exist at all, but we do not know it.

Mr. MILLS. Suppose the Bill sent up is altered by the Senate, are we *going* to stultify ourselves?

Mr. THOMPSON. We will consider that when the amendments of the Senate are read.

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

After Recess.

THE NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS TUNNEL RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 128) to incorporate the Northumberland Straits Tunnel Railway Company.—(Mr. Hackett).

(In the Committee.)

On the preamble,

Mr. DAVIES. Before passing that, I beg to ask whether the Government have considered the importance of this matter, with a view to assisting in the preliminary survey necessary to the construction of that undertaking. When the Bill came up in the Senate some time ago, Sir Alexander Campbell made a few remarks on the second reading, in which he entered a kind of protest in behalf of the Government, which seemed to me at the time somewhat unnecessary, to the effect that the Government must not be considered as in any way countenancing this matter, and that in assenting to the second reading it must not be understood that there was any implied promise on their part to assist in the construction of this tunnel. A remark or two fell from the Premier the other night, in the course of some general observations he was making in respect to the North-West, led me to believe that possibly the Government had modified their policy on this matter. Considering the very great importance of this measure, not only to Prince Edward Island, but to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and the absolute necessity of having correct and proper surveys made to give data upon which the company, before they commence the construction of their work, can ask for stock to be taken, I am anxious to know whether the Government do not consider that there is an obligation on their part, at any rate, to provide a sufficient sum of money to make the necessary surveys. I am not going to enlarge upon the importance of the case now. The hon. gentleman who had charge of the Bill in the Senate, the Hon. Mr. Howland, did so at great length and with great ability, and the facts which he collected are before the House, and before the country, and have been before the Government. I am strongly in hope the Government do not intend to adhere to the statement made by Sir Alexander Campbell, because it fell like a cold water blanket upon the whole scheme. Of course, I am not here asking that the Government endorse the scheme in any sense further than that it is their duty to take it so far under their countenance and control as to see that proper surveys are made, and at the Government expense. I think that is the very least the Island has a right to expect, and that New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have a right to expect. I hope the Government will be able to give me some assurance on this point before the preamble is passed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman was shocked at the announcement made, it appears.

Mr. DAVIES. Not shocked, disappointed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Very well, I will use the word "disappointed" instead of the word "shocked." I do not know what difference the hon. gentleman makes between the two words. Of course he is an English scholar, and I am only a French scholar, and I cannot see much difference between the two words. But at all events, the hon. gentleman was not satisfied with the answer given by Sir Alexander Campbell in the other House. So far as I am concerned now, as representing the First Minister for the moment, I must say that I do not know what has passed in the other House. I think it would be as well for the hon. gentleman not to press me to answer him on this matter. This is a private Bill, and I think he should allow it to be passed. Whenever a great undertaking is to be accomplished and aided, the Government always consider the work, to see whether it is one that they can recommend to the support of Parliament. In this case the Bill has passed only one House. It has passed the Railway Committee of this House also. I think the hon. gentleman will do better to allow the Bill to become law; then, if application is made to the Government for aid, of course the Government will have to consider the matter. Beyond that I can give no other answer to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HACKETT. I am glad to see that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is not opposed to this Bill, and I hope he will assist us in carrying it through this House and making it as perfect as possible. The Bill is one of great importance, and if it can be carried out will be a great boon to the people of Prince Edward Island. I am sure the hon. gentleman and his colleague from that Province will be only too glad to see the Bill carried through. As regards surveys and matters of that kind I think the Government will deal fairly by the people of Prince Edward Island, and if they think it is in the interest of the people that surveys should be made, as I believe it is, I am quite confident the Government will undertake those surveys and see that justice is done, and thereby confer a great boon on the people of the Island and largely benefit the people of the whole Dominion.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman feels quite confident that the Government will, if they deem it necessary, undertake those surveys. I do not know on what ground the hon. gentleman bases his belief. I was in the hope that possibly the Government would do that. I must, however, call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the leader of the Government in the other House distinctly threw cold water upon this scheme, although a remark made by the leader of the Government the other night, led me to believe that possibly the Government might look with a favorable eye upon the undertaking. So far from offering any opposition to the Bill passing through the House, it will have my most cordial co-operation; but I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that the undertaking is not only a novel one, but will be necessarily an expensive one, and that when the company ask capitalists to take stock in the undertaking, they will be met by the question: how do you know that it is feasible? The carrying out of that work may or may not be a duty incumbent upon the Government—I am not going to raise a long discussion upon that question here; but I am going to raise this point: I say the question whether that work is feasible or not is one in regard to which the Government has the onus resting upon them, and I have a right to call on the Government on this occasion to say that this Bill and the scheme embodied in it have their sympathy, in so far that they are prepared to undertake the work of making the surveys. After the surveys are made and we are able to say what the cost will be, then will arise the question as to whether the Government should not subsidise the work largely or undertake it altogether. But in the meantime I am not throwing any obstruction in the way, but I am assisting the Bill in ascertaining exactly what the Government's policy is, whether the Bill has their sympathy and support or not. The practical way to express sympathy is for the leader of the Government to disavow the remarks made by Sir Alexander Campbell in the other House and give some assurance, which I am sure will be received with very great pleasure by all of my constituents, as in fact it will be by the whole Province, of their practical sympathy to the extent that they will assist in making the necessary surveys. I know the surveys cannot be made without a very large outlay for a private company; but in view of the compact made by the Dominion with the Island, in view of the fact that a controversy has been going on this year between the Dominion and the Island, which has been carried to the foot of the Throne, and in view of the despatch of Lord Granville to the Governor General expressing the hope that the Dominion Government would see their way clear to assist this tunnel undertaking, I would be lacking in my duty if I did not, at this fitting opportunity, ask the Government to distinctly announce their policy in the matter; and I shall be

very much disappointed if the Bill passes through both Houses with no other declaration by the Government than that of Sir Alexander Campbell, which simply means that the Government do not intend to assist this scheme at all. I do not want to press anything unduly, or to ask the Government to commit themselves to an undertaking which may involve a larger expenditure than they are prepared to make at present; but I say, in view of all the facts, in view of the compact made and broken, in view of the language used by Earl Granville, urging on the Dominion Government as a means of remedying, to some extent, the neglect of the Government to carry out the compact made with the Island at the time of Union, that they should assist this tunnel enterprise—I think, in the face of these facts, I have a right to expect from the Government, on this occasion, some more clear and definite statement than I have obtained. I am not satisfied, as is the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Hackett), that the Government will, in the long run, do right.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman I must say this: I thought I hinted it in the answer I gave him in the first instance, but I will make it plainer this time, that I do not think it is in the interest of the work now under consideration that he should press me for an answer, and being so convinced, he must excuse me if I do not give any further answer than that I have given.

Mr. SHANLY. I am not sure whether the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) declared or not that his support of the Bill would be contingent on the answer given by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. DAVIES. Certainly not. I shall support the Bill whether the Government give any assistance or not.

Mr. SHANLY. The Bill is an ordinary one and gives no extraordinary powers. The amendments proposed are simply those thought expedient in order to assimilate its general features to ordinary Bills of the same kind.

Mr. HACKETT. If we want to enter into a discussion of the merits of the Bill it will not pass this evening. But it is not necessary to enter into the merits. This is a private Bill, and it has passed through the Senate and the Railway Committee, and it is not necessary to enter into any controversy in respect to it.

Mr. MILLS. Have any soundings been taken as to the character of the bed of that arm of the sea, and is there any estimate as to the probable cost.

Mr. HACKETT. Soundings have been made and measurements have been taken at that place. The bed of the strait is very suitable for the laying of this mechanical structure. As regards the estimated cost, I have here a letter from a gentleman who is very competent to speak on this matter. It must be understood that thorough surveys and borings must be made before an accurate estimate of the cost can be obtained. I will read a letter written by Mr. Walter Shanly, an eminent civil engineer, in response to a letter written to him by the leader of the Government. Mr. Shanly says:

"Replying to the questions contained in your letter of yesterday touching the construction of a subway under the Straits of Northumberland between Prince Edward Island and the mainland—(1.) Whether the construction of such a subway is feasible; (2.) Within what time could it be constructed; (3.) Probable cost.

"1st, I consider the construction of a subway undertaken according to the very ingenious plan proposed by Mr. H. H. Hall, of New York, entirely practicable, and that the work might be completed in three years from the time of its actual commencement. As to the cost: I have not myself visited the locality, but I have carefully examined the plans and soundings furnished by Mr. Hall. They give a good deal of valuable information, but more will be required; that is to say, further surveys and borings are necessary before an accurate estimate of the cost of the work can be arrived at. My opinion is it will fall within $5,000,000."

Mr. SHANLY. I would say to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that considerable examination and investigation of the place are still being made; but, of course, that comes within the purview of the Bill itself; the company do not ask any privileges before they carry out the work, and if the Government do not carry out the surveys the company must do so. The Bill does not ask for extraordinary powers or for any Government grant.

Mr. MILLS. I did not suppose it did involve anything of that kind, but I was interested in knowing how far information had been obtained, and whether the cost would be such as would stand in the way of its construction.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS—IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 139) respecting tolls over the Dunnville Dam and Bridge connecting works constructed over the Grand River.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

Bill (No. 140) respecting the improvement of the Harbor of Quebec.—(Mr. McLelan.)

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

Mr. THOMPSON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 138) respecting the Electoral Franchise and the Dominion Elections Act, 1874.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. THOMPSON moved to amend by substituting the following:—

The day to be fixed for the final revision of the voters lists under the Electoral Franchise Act shall be not less than five weeks after the publication by posting up of the lists, and the sitting for such final revision shall include, when practicable, at least three polling districts, and the place of the holding of the final revision shall be in one of the polling districts, the lists for which are to be so finally revised."

Mr. MILLS. I think it is desirable that we should know precisely what the hon. gentleman intends to accomplish by this section. If I rightly understand the amendment, it would enable the revising officer to hold the courts of different municipalities together. The original section provided that there should be a court of revision in each city, town, township, parish, incorporated village, or other known territorial division, except in the Province of Nova Scotia, where there are no such territorial divisions, and that in that Province there should be at least three polling divisions embraced in each electoral district for the purpose of holding the court. If I understand the hon. gentleman's provision rightly, its effect would be to put all the electoral districts in the Dominion in exactly the same position as the electoral districts in the Province of Nova Scotia. I think that will be extremely inconvenient. I know myself of newly settled townships which have only two polling divisions; and while it might be fairly convenient for the people of those two polling divisions to meet at one place for the purpose of the revision, it would be extremely inconvenient if one polling division had to be taken off an adjoining township for the purpose of the revision. In almost every municipality in Ontario there is a town hall, which is built at a convenient place of meeting, and I do not think it would be convenient to provide that where there are more than three polling divisions in a township, the revising officer should not hold more than one court.

Mr. THOMPSON. The present provision in the Act makes it compulsory in Nova Scotia to have at least three

polling divisions in each district. The proposed amendment makes it merely directory; it says that each district shall include, when practicable, at least three polling divisions. It is not intended, where it is inconvenient or undesirable, that the revising officer shall include a polling division of another municipality. At the same time it does not seem to me reasonable that he should not do so if the polling division is in the near neighborhood. The clause, as worded, would apply to Nova Scotia and the other Provinces alike. I do not think the Act as it stands at present accomplishes the object the hon. gentleman thinks so desirable in Ontario. I do not think it confines each sitting of the court of revision to the polling divisions in the municipality. It only applies to cities, towns, townships, parishes or incorporated villages; and when you go outside of these——

Mr. DAVIES. Or other territorial divisions.

Mr. THOMPSON. What is that? It seems to me that it only requires the revising officer to sit in the municipality when revising the list of the municipality.

Mr. MILLS. He must sit within the limit of each municipality. Under the section which the hon. gentleman proposes to amend, it is impossible for the revising officer to hold less than one meeting of the court in each municipality. Every riding is composed of several of these municipalities, unless it be a portion of a city. So, there must be at least one sitting of the court of revision in each township, town or village. Under the amendment as proposed, the revising officer might put several municipalities together and hold a court for them, which would be far more inconvenient than the plan prescribed by the law as it stands.

Mr. DAVIES. The object the hon. gentleman has in view cannot surely be to alter the Act so that there will be one final revision held in each district.

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. DAVIES. I am afraid that is the effect of his amendment as it is drafted; and that would be absurd.

Mr. THOMPSON. The present Act makes no provision on that subject.

Mr. DAVIES. The Act says a court shall be held in each electoral district and in Prince Edward Island. There are five electoral districts. In the other Provinces, one must be held in each city, town, township, parish or other known territorial division.

Mr. SCRIVER. It would be unfortunate if there was not one court of revision held in each municipality. It would complicate matters if any combination was made of districts or different municipalities.

Mr. WELDON. Last year when the Bill was under discussion, it was understood the preliminary revision might be held in one court, to be held at the place the revising officer might fix, yet in the final revision the principle was set out that a court should be held in every municipality or parish, city, town, township, &c.

Mr. HACKETT. If we are to have only one revision of the lists in each provincial electoral district of Prince Edward Island, it would be very inconvenient for the people.

Mr. DAVIES. As the amendment now stands there will be only one final revision for each county. The whole list will be revised at the one place. This cannot be done, as people would have to travel fifty and sixty miles to get a hearing.

Mr. THOMPSON. The section, as printed in the Bill, is exactly the same as it is in the Statute-book, but if it is desirable there should be a provision to hold a court of revision in each city, town, township, parish, incorporated village or other territorial division, I have no objection to amend the Bill to that effect.

Mr. MILLS. Last year it was proposed at first there should be but one place for the final revision as for the preliminary revision of the lists, but after discussion it was decided there should be at least one place in each municipal division. There are townships in some parts of the Province which are very large, and where it would be very convenient to have more than one polling place. In my own county, in the township of Chatham, if there was but one court of revision, no matter where you would place it, people would have to travel twenty miles to reach it. It will be well, therefore, that the revising officer should have power to establish more than one place for holding a court in counties where there are over a certain number of polling divisions.

Mr. BOWELL. There is not more than one court for the final revision of the voters' lists in any one municipality of Ontario. The hon. gentleman advocates giving the power to the revising officer to hold one or two courts in the same municipality. I never heard of any hardship arising under the present system, and although in some of the townships there are six or seven polling sub-divisions.

Mr. LISTER. Under the Statute now, there is nothing compelling the revising officer to hold his final revision in more than one place in the constituency.

Mr. THOMPSON. What I said is that there is no obligation that he should sit in every municipality, town, township. The principal difficulty of the new section is the apparent necessity it would create for the sitting of a court of final revision in every polling district. I think that is very inconvenient and causes a great expense. In the case of a town or city, it is much more convenient for the electors as well as for the revising officer to sit in one place.

Mr. LISTER. That is perfectly reasonable. So far as the wording of the Act now is concerned, the revising officers have considered it their duty to hold a revision in every municipality. Of course some of the municipalities are large, and it would be more for the convenience of the electors if more than one court could be held, but I think the Act could be worked, in Ontario at any rate, by holding one court in each municipality. That has been the law hitherto, and there would be no greater hardship than there is in carrying out the provision of the provincial Statute.

Mr. HACKETT. With regard to the Province of Prince Edward Island, if we have only one court of revision for each district, it would by very inconvenient for the electors. I represent a county that has thirty townships, and five provincial districts. If you have only one court for each local district, the people will have to travel a great distance to attend the revision court, and I think it would be far better to have two courts of revision in each local division. Some years ago, we had a Registration Act in force in the Island containing a similar clause to this, and it was found most inconvenient. In fact, a great number of people were disfranchised, I may say, because they would not travel that great distance to attend the revision court.

Mr. DAVIES. All the members from Prince Edward Island are agreed upon this point. Last year, the Franchise Bill was hurried through a good deal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, notwithstanding the length of the discussions, it was hard for a little place like Prince Edward Island to get a hearing. My hon. friend (Mr. Hackett) is

right in this, and I suggest to the Minister that he should substitute "at least two sittings in each provincial electoral division, except in the royalty of Charlottetown."

Mr. VAIL. You are bringing Nova Scotia now under the general clause, instead of leaving it as it was before?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes. Where there is a city, town or incorporated village there will be a sitting, but we continue the same provision as regards Nova Scotia, and extend it elsewhere, that there shall be at least three sub-divisions revised at each court.

Mr. KIRK. How about counties where there are no cities?

Mr. THOMPSON. There is a provision for them.

Mr. VAIL. The Minister of Justice will agree with me that our position in Nova Scotia is quite different from that of the other Provinces. Our counties are long and narrow, and in some cases the shire town with the court house is in one end of the county. The alteration was made at my suggestion last year, and I objected to the wording of the Act because it stated that not less than three polling districts should be revised at the same court. I thought then and I think still that it should not be more than three polling districts.

Mr. THOMPSON. In cities and towns such as Halifax and Windsor, it is much easier to revise at the court house than to sit all over the town.

Mr. VAIL. Some of the polling districts are sixty or seventy miles from Halifax, and, if those districts are long and narrow, the electors would have to go a long way. The hon. gentleman will understand the position of Digby county, which is almost two counties. Under this Act they may take five polling districts, but they shall not be less than three. I want them to feel bound not to take more than three districts.

Mr. KIRK. There is nothing binding the revising officer to hold more than one sitting in any county; it is entirely optional with him whether he holds more or not. At present, as far as Nova Scotia is concerned the Act provides that the sitting shall comprise not less than three polling districts, as the revising officer may think most convenient. Now, he may think it most convenient to hold but one sitting in each county. Take the county of Guysboro', for instance. If he holds but one, of course, he will hold it in the court house in the town of Guysboro', and to reach that town some of the electors would be bound to travel 80 miles. As the law now stands he may hold a sitting in a district comprising three polling districts, but he need not do that unless he likes. I think three is rather small to require in many counties; but I think it ought to be defined how many polling districts should be comprised. The revising officer should not have it it in his power to require electors to travel too far to the sittings.

Mr. THOMPSON. With regard to Nova Scotia the present Act is improved in two particulars. I agree with the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), as regards the interpretation of the present law, that it is not imperative for the revising officer to sit in more places than one in the county. But the law is changed in that respect, and it is obligatory on the officer to include not less than three polling districts in every revision. It says now that he shall hold a revision in every city, village and township, so that it will be impossible for him, under this Act, to sit in the court house at Guysboro' and revise the lists for the whole country.

Mr. KIRK. I want to know what is a town or city, or village, under the law. We have no incorporated towns or villages in the county of Guysboro'. Then the question is, what is a township?

Mr. THOMPSON. In Guysboro' you have two polling districts, you have two municipalities.

Mr. KIRK. But it does not require the revising officer to sit in the municipalities at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. "And other territorial divisions," of course, it will be very inconvenient if he shall only hold two. But it is very difficult to frame a clause that will meet every case. We must trust to some extent to the will of the revising officer to consult the convenience of the electors.

Mr. VAIL. Would it not be well to say not more than three places? It is necessary to define it, to some extent. I think those words "not less than" should be changed. Take Digby Neck, in the county of Digby, there are five polling districts in a distance of 45 miles. Now, if the court is held in the central flat, some of the electors will have to travel 22 miles. Of course if it is in the centre of a thickly populated district there would be no difficulty. I think we might make it not more than five, to cover these very extensive rural districts.

Mr. TROW. I want to know from the Minister whether it is permissive or imperative on the part of the revising officer to hold his court in each municipality, in each town, city, township and incorporated village.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is imperative.

Mr TROW. Of course, I cannot speak for the other Provinces, but in Ontario there are large municipalities, on the average ten or twelve miles square. Usually the town hall is located about the centre of the municipality, and if it is imperative to hold the court there, I think it will answer the purpose in Ontario admirably.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am inclined to adopt the view of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail). As far as my experience goes I think it would be more convenient if the number, so far as townships and villages are concerned, was put as the hon. member proposes, not more than three or not more than four. The revising officer in my riding has adopted that system; he is holding two courts of revision for each township, and it is certainly much more convenient for the electors to be able to attend close at home than all to assemble in the middle of a township, as suggested by the hon. member for South Perth. I think it is just a question of the balance of convenience. Is it not easier for the revising officer to hold sittings at either end of the township than to bring all the people together? There might be a number of contests and a number of questions raised which would prolong the court over one day. I am quite satisfied that it would be better in townships, although in towns, cities, and incorporated villages, one is quite enough. In townships in Ontario I think it would be better if it was put in such a way that he would be practically compelled to hold at least two sittings in each township. That is the course adopted by the judge in my riding, and I think it is a great convenience to the people.

Mr. MILLS. There are townships with not more than two or three polling divisions, and there are others with fifteen. The same rule should scarcely be applied to the two cases.

Mr. DAVIES. Nova Scotia was in a different position from the other Provinces when this law was passed. What I complain of is that we are placed in the same position as other Provinces, and what would be suitable for Ontario would not be suitable for the peculiar position of some of the Nova Scotia counties. I would prefer that the old clause remain. I am not complaining of the revising officer, because I believe in the final revision he intends to hold his court in districts comprising three divisions; but I am not sure we shall not always have the same revising officer and he may take a different view.

Mr. WALLACE (York). The clause proposed by the Minister of Justice is an admirable one. Many of our townships in Ontario have nine or ten polling sub-divisions or more. We have one county with nineteen polling sub-divisions, and this clause provides that the judge shall take three or four polling sub-divisions. That would be very convenient for the people. The old arrangement by which the lists for a large township were revised by the judge at one meeting was very inconvenient. In a township ten miles square the town is not always in the centre and persons had to travel a long distance there and back, and it must be remembered that the class desiring to be placed on the list will be largely those who do not own horses and waggons. The provision with respect to incorporated villages will also prove convenient.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. So far as my experience goes of townships in Ontario the Act will do very well as it stands. I do not live in one of the largest townships, but still it is large enough to have eleven polling sub-divisions. A court of revision has always been held in one place for the whole township and I never know any complaints made of inconvenience arising therefrom. If you break up the boundaries of municipalities confusion arises as to where the parties have to go in order to attend the court of revision.

Mr. WELDON. Does the hon. Minister propose to apply the Act to revision now going on?

Mr. THOMPSON. It will be convenient to have it apply where there is yet time.

Mr. VAIL. In looking at the advertisements of Judge Savary, who revises for our county, I see he has in one of the divisions included five polling sub-divisions. He agreed with me that he had a right to take in more.

On section 2,

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps it will be convenient to discuss the amendments of which I have given notice, in order that hon. gentlemen may have an opportunity of considering them. With regard to the first of these amendments, the first object which I have in view is to consolidate, as it were, the provisions which were separated in the Bill as to cities, towns and townships. That, of course, is merely a matter of form and not of substance. There are some other provisions, however, which, if the committee will bear with me, I will point out briefly, and that I think are matters of some importance. One is that the period of time which at present is a year prior to the first of last January, and after this year would be a year prior to any succeeding January, should be a year prior to the time the person makes application. For instance, if he is an occupant at present he must have been an occupant for at least the previous year, that is, he does not actually become entitled to vote until August of this year, so that practically he has been an occupant, or an income earner, or whatever other class it is as to which it applies, for 19 months before he becomes entitled to vote, and he remains entitled to vote, before another list is made out, for another year practically. Now I propose to change that, which I think is a hard feature of the law, by providing that this term of 12 months, which I do not alter, should be prior to the time of making the application to be placed on the list. Then with regard to the income voter, a good deal of difficulty has been found to arise in this way. According to the law as it stands a person is only entitled to vote if he has been a resident in a particular electoral division for the 12 months—whether it be before the 1st of January, or before the time of making application, as I propose. Now, that works very great hardship, I find, on experience. Take the case of a bank clerk, or a Methodist clergyman who are continually changing in the course of their duties. They may have lost their vote in one place and may not be a year resident in the particular electoral district. I propose to change that by saying that if any person is entitled by his earnings, if he has earned the income required, $300, during the preceding year, and has been resident in Canada one year he shall be entitled to be registered on the list. Those are the important clauses. The clauses have been put together and apparently made more simple, and if the committee is willing to deal with them at all, I think it would be well to take them up *seriatim* and see whether they are or are not in practical amendment to the law as it stands. The first, as to the age, is, of course, the same; the second is the same; the ownership clause is also the same; the tenancy clause is changed in the way I speak of, as to the period of residence required, but I think only in that respect. The occupation clause is changed in an important way, though the intent of it, I think, is not affected. I am told that in some parts of the country the language used in the occupation clause has led to considerable hardships. It has been contended, and I think with some reason, that it limits the kind of occupants to those holding under the particular title mentioned The owner is provided for, but if a man is not an owner, is not a tenant, but is still in occupation of real property and is enjoying its rents and profits, he should be entitled to vote. One of my hon. friends from British Columbia drew attention to the fact that there people holding under the Crown did not hold by occupation, under the words of the Statute, and that the revising officers would claim that they were not entitled to be registered as voters. This clause with regard to income allows in townships the earnings to be in money or money's worth, but in cities or towns that is not permitted, so that this ridiculous result has, to my certain knowledge occurred. A man is boarding say with his employer, and so boarding he may be getting $20 a month and his board. He is not entitled under that class to be registered. Another man is getting $26 a month and boarding himself and, although he is really getting less he is entitled to be put on the list. I do not see why this provision as to money's worth should not apply as well in cities and towns as in townships. Then with regard to the farmers' sons and the owners' sons' clause, this difficulty has occurred. Sometimes, although a man may be farming and his sons may be living with him, they may be living immediately off the farm, and in that way the sons are not entitled to vote. Now the object, I take it, is to give both the farmers' son and the owners' son a vote, provided they are living with the father and provided he is the owner or farmer, and I would suggest an amendment in that way. I would suggest, therefore, that the amendments should be dealt with one by one if they meet with the approval of the committee.

Mr. TROW. In clause 2 I would suggest that in the 21st line the word "shall" be inserted instead of the words "may if he thinks fit"—making it imperative.

Mr. WELDON. In the first line of the clause I should say that instead of the word "person" being used—allowing any person not on the list at all to make application, he should be a "voter."

Mr. THOMPSON moved that in the 21st line the words "may if he thinks fit" be struck out and the word "shall" inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 3,

Mr. LISTER. No appeal would be necessary to correct, I suppose, under this clause.

Mr. RYKERT. This is the same as the provision in the local Act,

Mr. LISTER. There is an appeal for corrections in the local Act. Suppose that a person is on the list for the wrong property, and the revising officer is satisfied there ought to be a correction, should he not be empowered to make the correction without any appeal? I think that ought to be made clear.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I would like to submit another class of cases, that is, the case of those who may be possessed of different parcels of property, anyone of which would entitle them to vote. A voter may have parted with the particular piece of property on which he qualifies, and it might be held that he was therefore entitled to vote. Would this clause entitle him to have such an alteration made as to entitle him to vote? If persons in that position were deprived of their votes, there would be great injury done, especially in cities.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the latter part of the clause makes that plain.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I would like to ask this further question, whether the change will require to be made before the list is finally revised? For instance, a man who is possessed of a number of pieces of property does not choose to qualify on all of them, because the description on the printed list would necessarily be long; but he parts with the particular piece of property mentioned on the list. Will this clause deprive him of the right to vote?

Mr. THOMPSON. No, I take it if he has any qualification at all under the Act up to the time of the final revision, he must go on the list, and having gone on the list, he is a voter.

Mr. LISTER. Without appeal? Assuming that his name is on the list, and it turns out on the final revision that the description is incorrect, then the revising officer should correct the description, so that the name should remain on the list?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

On section 4,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This clause leaves it altogether at the option of the revising officer to strike out the name of any person if he thinks that person is deceased. This is giving him a rather wide power. He is not obliged even to receive evidence as to the decease, but may strike the name off on a mere report.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). He might strike a score of names out of persons who were represented to him as dead and who are alive. This is giving the officer more power than we should give him. He might be acting in perfectly good faith, and yet wrongly strike off a name, and when the person comes up to vote he will be told his name is struck off the list.

Mr. WALLACE (York). We should be careful about striking off names. There may be several of the same name, and if the officer strikes off, say "John Smith" as deceased the voter whose name was on the list may be another John Smith altogether, and yet he will be deprived of his vote.

Mr. THOMPSON. We will drop that clause.

On section 5,

Mr. WELDON. We had considerable discussion last year on this point, and the First Minister consented to allow the price of 50 cents per list to stand. It was generally supposed that rate would cover the cost of printing.

Mr. THOMPSON. Last year's Act provides that the revising officer and the clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall supply copies of the voters' list at a price sufficient to defray the cost of printing, not to exceed 50 cents. This has been complained of because it is uncertain how many copies of the list must be prepared, and it is not reasonable, should the demand exceed the number printed, that the revising officer should have to copy these lists at 50 cents a piece.

Mr. MULOCK. We should provide, then, for a certain number of printed copies; and if the demand exceed that number, fix on some reasonable rate. If left in this way, the revising officer may charge almost any rate he may choose.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not intended to print the lists, except for people who may require them in that way. This is the list spoken of in this section. It is the list at the final revision.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That will have to be printed?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; there is no object in printing that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Oh, yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. What for? You print your first lists and distribute them. You must remember that after this year, there is no first and second court, there is only one court, which is practically the final court. It is very important for the committee to consider whether it is wise to have the expense of printing the list after all the work is done.

Mr. MILLS. Certainly, that is the time.

Mr. McCARTHY. The only object is to enable the candidate to obtain the lists at a cheap rate.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Is not that very important?

Mr. McCARTHY. No doubt it is for the candidates, but I do not think the country should be asked to pay for that.

Mr. MILLS. This was discussed last year. The Minister had a provision in the Bill very much like this. I proposed an amendment which the First Minister accepted, that the list should not cost more than 50 cents. There is no difficulty in getting a large number of lists printed, and it is very much easier to provide a sufficient number in the first instance than to impose upon the party the burden of employing the revising officer or his clerk to make a written list, and to make him pay these extraordinary charges for it. The hon. gentleman says there is no object in publishing the list as finally revised.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is no provision for publishing the list as finally revised.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. It is the duty of the revising officer to make provision for the publication of the list as finally revised.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. MILLS. I say that is the provision, and the hon. gentleman is proposing that there shall be no necessity for this publication. That is practically the provision of the 11th clause. I do not agree with that. Scores of names may be added to or erased from the list, and how are we to know whether the copy handed to us is correct or not? After all the corrections are made, it is necessary in the public interest that the list should be published and should be in the hands of the candidates and their agents in the various polling divisions, and the lists printed should be sufficient for that purpose. If the expense is considerable, that is the misfortune of the system, but it is of far more consequence to the public that there should be no room for fraud connected with this matter than that the country should be put to the additional expense of publishing the list as finally revised and corrected. I think it is of great consequence that the whole provision of the law, as we settled it here last year after long discussion, should remain, and that any party should be entitled to obtain a copy of the list on payment of 50 cents.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I agree with what has been stated. This Act is expensive no doubt. Who is to blame for that we do not go into now. But it is important that people should know, and should have their rights. I do not know that there is any bounden duty on the part of certain individuals to be put to the expense of operating an Act passed by this Parliament. If it is in the public interest, as we suppose, to pass this, and if it is necessary in the public interest that information in reference to the lists should be given, clearly then it is the country upon which the expenses should come. I wish to point out to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that this clause not only applies to the final lists, but it applies to the preliminary lists; it applies to all lists.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think my hon. friends have both lost sight of this, that after this year there are no two lists, there are no two courts. Next year and in subsequent years, there is to be one publication and one court. If the hon. gentleman will look at section 29, and section 30 of the Bill as it stands, he will see that the list as finally revised is to be sent to the clerk of the Crown in Chancery. You do not publish it again, but section 31 enables any person to obtain a copy on payment of not more than 50 cents. The question is, if there is a very considerable change in the list at the sitting of the court by the elimination and addition of names, is it necessary to put the country to the expense of printing the list all over again because perhaps half a dozen copies will be required. That is not done in Ontario. The lists are printed after they come from the court of revision, but they are never printed after the appeal is made to the county judge. The corrections are written on, and are sent to the clerk of the peace, and we all know that, after the printed list is distributed, we have to send to the clerk of the peace and get the corrections that are made. That is not a very serious matter for any person, but to entail the expense of printing the whole list just because at the coming election the candidates may want it seems to me extraordinary.

Mr. LISTER. It is contemplated that the list shall not be printed at all?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, the Bill remains as it is in that respect. It will be the duty of the revising officer to make out and print his list and distribute it, as is done by the municipal councils under the local system, to hold one court and determine and settle, at that court the list finally. But the question now is whether, after that is all done, because there may be some few amendments made, there is to be the expense of going over all this and printing it again, and I do not think any of us, when we come to consider it, would contend for that, because all we want is to keep the original list and make the corrections on it.

Mr. LISTER. The list will be published by the revising officers, a court of revision will be held and alterations made. Suppose the revising officer says that, for copies of this list which he has had published, and on which the only writing will be the alterations, he will charge 10 cents a hundred names, names which have been printed and have not cost 2 cents a hundred. As to the local lists, every member gets a considerable number, I think a dozen, and they are furnished to the different officers throughout the county, so that, when the elections come on, there is no difficulty in getting an abundance of lists.

Mr. McCARTHY. This can be changed in that respect.

Mr. LISTER. Yes, so that we could have a greater number of the printed lists, and then we could get the information at the clerk's office.

Mr. McCARTHY. We can amend this so that any person could inspect the list and be at liberty to correct it himself, or to apply for it and pay for it.

Mr. WELDON. Does not the 24th section provide that it shall be printed?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, that is printed.

Mr. LISTER. It is of no consequence except for the returning officers whether the list is attested by the revising officer or not. Everyone can satisfy himself as to the correctness of his list. The only thing is to get enough at a reasonable cost.

Mr. WALLACE (York). The Act now provides that the list shall be printed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood from the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that in years subsequent to this the list will be printed, and the exception he took to my statement was that it would necessitate the printing of a second list after it is corrected, that is not the point I raised.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the point I raised.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says as to that. But, under the provision of the clause as I read it, the first list which he prints should be made available.

Mr. McCARTHY. So it is. This does not affect it at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). "The revising officer and the clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall supply copies of any list of voters prepared under any provision of this Act." What does that mean?

Mr. McCARTHY. This is substituted. You must read the whole section of the next page. "Section 30 of the said Act is hereby repealed, and section 36 is hereby repealed and the following is substituted therefor." If he will look at those two sections he will find that they apply merely to the list after the final revision.

Mr. LISTER. In the list we are going to have hereafter there will be a great many alterations, because the local lists are prepared on that year's assessment roll.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It is quite evident that in making a comparison between the printed list that is provided to be furnished under this Act and the local list, they will not agree very closely, because the local list printed by the municipal authorities is based upon the assessment for the year for which the list is published, while in this instance the list is largely based upon the final list of the year preceding, and necessarily there must be a great many changes. If there is no provision for the printing of the final list, it will be a very slipshod list indeed, and will not possess much value. We can make the comparison this way: Suppose we take the list printed by the municipal authorities for the year preceding and compare it with the list put in our possession; the changes in the two will be no more numerous than ought to exist betwen the list that the revising officer will publish in the first place, and the list that will finally be established as the complete voters' list. That, I am aware in some rural constituencies of Ontario, will represent something like a thousand names. If that is the case, clearly one-fourth, or one-fifth, of the entire number of names on the list, will be put on after that list is printed each year. If there is any value in a printed list, it equally applies as much to one printed after it is finally adopted, as it would to the list as it passes from the hands of the revising officer primarily.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We are here repealing a certain section and putting in another. Is the object of this change simply to provide against the power of any individual to demand a copy at the price of 50 cents, and to substitute the words: "A reasonable amount therefor?"

Mr. McCARTHY. There are two clauses which are repealed, and this is substituted.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is the object of the substitution to wipe out the rate which, under the Statute as it now stands, is provided for in section 16, and to substitute therefor the words "a reasonable sum," as in the amendment? Is that the only object?

Mr. McCARTHY. The only object. The revising officers say that they will be obliged to have a supply of printed lists on hand after their final revision for 50 cents, although they will not be demanded to any extent. If a person demands a copy of all these lists, they will have to write them all out for 50 cents, or else get them printed, consequently in order to meet an anticipated want, they will have to go to the expense of printing. I would say that the lists should be open to inspection to any person who might desire to see them.

Mr. MULOCK. It is to be borne in mind that in the final revision under this Act there are far more changes than in a revision under the existing law in Ontario, because the revising officer cannot make up the list with the same accuracy that the ordinary assessors do. I would suggest whether this should not be done after the changes are printed; so far as the striking out is concerned, it is not a great labor for the revising officer or his clerk to make the changes in the already printed list by striking out the names. I understand that to-day instructions have been given to the revising officers that, instead of reprinting the whole list, they shall simply print an *allonge* which shall contain the added names. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. They are added by the revising officer at present, and not written. Now, why not have the changes in writing, printed—I mean where there are additions, and have those changes distributed? That would not be any great expense. Supposing there are a couple of hundred names added in this way, the cost would be slight. The corrections consist in striking out and adding to, and the clerk can easily strike out of the stock on hand the names that have been struck out in the original list by the revising officer. Then let the added names be printed and let them be distributed, as under section 24 as an *addenda*.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask if it be the amount that is to be paid that is to be settled, and if this new clause is to refer entirely to the final list why does not section 38, that we propose to amend, read like the section we are repealing, which would be this:

> The revising officer and the clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall supply copies of such lists to any person or persons applying for the same, and paying a reasonable sum therefor.

But we depart from that language altogether. That has reference to the final list, but the section we are putting in does not confine itself to the final list, but it is entirely of different wording:

> The revising officer and the clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall supply copies of the list of voters prepared under any provision of this Act.

Now if it is only to do away with that 50 cents, why is not the language of the Statute followed?

Mr. THOMPSON. I would suggest that the clause be amended so as to read "shall send copies finally revised and shall at all reasonable times allow any person to inspect the list of voters."

Mr. MILLS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will adopt the suggestion made by some hon. gentlemen on that side and empower the revising officer to publish an *addenda* giving a list of the names struck off and those added to the list. If he printed that as a supplement and provided the same means of distribution, it would in a great measure supersede the necessity for the reprinting of the list and get rid of the difficulty we have been discussing.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is something apart from this clause, however, and it can be settled afterwards.

Section 5 struck out.

On section 6,

Mr. THOMPSON. There are some lines in this section which are not necessary as they do not properly conform to the schedule. I would therefore move that all the words from "or" in line twenty-three to the word "provided" in line twenty-seven, inclusive, be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. The assessors in the Province of Ontario—I do not know how it is in the other Provinces—do their work in the spring, so that it is pretty well done by the 1st June or perhaps a little earlier. I do not see why the revising officer, instead of commencing on the 1st of January, should not avail himself of the work of the assessor by beginning somewhat later in the year, say the 1st June or the 1st of July. If the assessment is made out and the assessor has collected his information, it will greatly facilitate the work of the revising officer and those interested in having the list made complete, as they have only to go up to the list and find out for themselves.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You do not mean that this shall apply to this year.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, say beginning in 1887.

Mr. DAWSON. In the large district which I represent, it is very difficult to get ready at the dates mentioned in the Act. The 1st of June for the preliminary revision of the list of voters should be made, I think, the 1st of July, and the final revision, should be extended to the 1st of October this year, because it is impossible in a district of such immense extent to get through with the work in the time mentioned. To make a separate provision for Algoma is quite in keeping with previous legislation, as it was done in the Act of 1874, in several particulars. I make the suggestion to the hon. the Minister of Justice.

Mr. WELDON. I will suggest that, in addition to the particulars provided for here, farmers' sons shall be required to give the place of residence and the name of the parent, as I think that it is important for identification.

Mr. THOMPSON. It would make a good deal of complication, as you would have to insert both parents' names. We have now taken a good deal of pains to establish identification.

Mr. WELDON. Yes, generally speaking, I think it is quite an improvement on the old list, but it is just a question whether there is sufficient identification of the farmer's son.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is the age, the post office address, the nature of the qualification and the residence. He must, of course, reside with his father and on the farm, and when he gives those other particulars he virtually gives his father's name and his place of residence.

Mr. WELDON. The proviso in the 33rd section would necessarily disappear in its present form, because it says that the assessment rolls shall be evidence of value. I think there ought to be some provision that the assessment rolls of any year shall be *primâ facie* evidence of value. I do not know whether the interpretation clause is sufficient, or whether that provision could not be made in this section.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will look into that.

Mr. LISTER. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Simcoe is a most important one, so far as Ontario is concerned. It is quite impossible for the revising officer to get the information as to who ought to be on the voters' list unless he resorts to the assessment roll; and under the Act at present, it must be the assessment roll of the preceding year. If the suggestion made were adopted, namely, that the time for preparing the list should be postponed until the 1st of July, then the revising officer's first list would be almost absolutely perfect, because the assessors do their work with a good deal of care and accuracy. But if the list is prepared, not on the last assessment roll, but on that of the year before, the list will be necessarily inaccurate, and will involve a great many appeals. I do not see any valid reason why this suggestion should not be adopted.

Mr. THOMPSON. You would lose as much as you would gain. You would have a much more perfect list, but it would not be completed until the end of the year, and therefore would be no good for that year; and if it were used for an election in the following year it would be open to the same objection. If the list were prepared on the 1st of July, we should have to give until the end of December for its revision.

Mr. LISTER. When there is no preliminary list. The proceedings already taken on this present list will not recur, and I think the whole list might be finally revised in six weeks. Say you fix the 1st of June for the preparation of the list; by the 1st of August there ought to be no difficulty in having it completed. I know that with us it is all done in two months.

Mr. McCARTHY. That, I think meets the case. If the revising officer commenced on the 1st of June, he would have a month to get his list out, then five weeks for the publication of it, which would bring him to the month of August; give him the month of August for the work of revision, and on the 1st of September the list would be completed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. What is the object of beginning on the 1st June?

Mr. McCARTHY. Beginning on the 1st of January the revising officer has to take the list of the previous years, which is stale, whereas if he commenced on the 1st of June, he would act on information obtained in the preceding month.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. But in the Province of Quebec the revision of the assessment roll ends, I think, in the month of September or October, so that we would be in the same difficulty.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that was the objection raised last year, and the time was changed, I think, from the 1st of October to the 1st of January for that reason.

Mr. MILLS. It would be a great advantage if the period for the preparation of the list were adjusted in each Province to the convenience of that Province. I am sure that in the Province of Ontario, June, July and August would be far the most convenient season of the year for the preparation of the list. It is after the assessment has been made, after the court of revision has sat, and when there are facilities for correcting the list by the assessment roll. In Quebec the assessment is made at a different season of the year. I do not suppose there is any special reason why one Province should adopt a particular time because it is convenient in another Province. That is a good reason for adopting a different period in each Province to suit its convenience. There is another reason for this. At the period when the members would be best able to assist their constituents in the preparation of the list they are kept here discharging their public duties; that is a very serious objection to the existing arrangement. The hon. gentleman proposes to dispense with the necessity of obtaining copies of the assessment roll. I do not know how it may be in the Maritime Provinces. But in the Province of Ontario change in the ownership of property is so frequent that unless the assessment roll is consulted every year, it would be impossible to have a correct voters' list. Perhaps five or six per cent. of the owners of property dispose of their property annually. I venture to say that in a list prepared two years ago ten per cent. of the persons do not qualify on the same property at the present time.

Mr. MULOCK. This section is rather a change in the law, than an adherance to the existing law. It is proposed to require the revision after the 1st of January. Such is not the law now. That provision was made merely for the commencement, when the revising officer had to make up an original list from nothing; and the preliminary list, which has been made up once for all, had to be published on or before the 1st of May, that is, the corrected preliminary list. That list is the one which corresponds with the list he will proceed to prepare next year. He could not hold his court until five weeks after the 1st of May. Now, if you are going to proceed according to the spirit of this Act, you should say that the preliminary lists, which he has now to prepare, shall be published on or before the 1st of May, and that he shall have five weeks, at least, after that to hold his court. The real question now is whether you require that preliminary list to be published on the 1st of May or the 1st of June.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend exaggerates the case a little. By section 24, it is the 1st of June.

Mr. MULOCK. The 1st of January here is not at all applicable.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not at all.

Mr. TEMPLE. What may suit one Province may not suit another. This may suit Ontario very well, but I do not think it will suit New Brunswick at all. The revising lists there are made in October; that is the assessment rolls are made and handed to the city clerk, and posted up through the different parishes on or about the 20th October. If you commenced in June, you would be no better off than if you commenced in January.

Mr. WELDON. Our assessments are made in March.

Mr. TEMPLE. Not the revised assessments.

Mr. WELDON. That has nothing to do with the assessments. The assessments are made in March, April or May, and we are relatively in the same position in January as the Secretary of State says the Quebec lists will be the 1st of June. What the hon. member for York (Mr. Temple) means is the revisers' lists, which are not the assessment rolls. The assessment is the basis of voters' lists, and the revising officers make up the register of voters from the assessment rolls. The revised list would only take, in New Brunswick, men of $400 income, because that is the provincial limit, and you have to go to the assessment rolls to find out the men who are worth $300 income. The 1st of July would suit us.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There may no doubt be a saving to the general public if we save getting a certified copy of the assessment roll, but will not that entail expenditure on individuals that otherwise would be defrayed by the Government? And should not the Government defray the expense if it is in the public interest we should have these lists? The revising officer is not instructed to take the assessmont roll, but simply instructed to get such information as he can obtain to proceed to revise the lists. He, therefore, will not incur the expense of getting the assess-

ment roll, it being no part of his duty to get the assessment roll; he will not incur the expense of getting it, and, if he should be a salaried officer, what is there to lead him to make particular enquiries as to who ought and who ought not to go on. He will do nothing at all, and the prospective candidates or others interested will have to find all this information for him at a great expense themselves. The Statute as it stands requires that he shall take the assessment roll that is made every year, so that it is imperative on him to note the alterations and changes that have taken place; and after that is done, if there are parties who believe that some names are left out they should supply the information. If he is not obliged to take the assessment roll, private individuals will have to pay the expense of furnishing him with information.

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot at all agree with the hon. gentleman in what he has just said. I believe the assessment rolls do not, year by year, vary more at all events than four or five per cent., as the hon. member for Bothwell has stated.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Oh, yes, they do in towns a great deal more.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps in towns, but certainly not in the rural parts. Now you put a revising officer in the country to the expense of getting those enormous long lists for the few names, which, somebody is sure to take care, will be put on. Somebody is always willing to look after the revised lists. If you make it compulsory on the officer to get the lists, he must go to the clerk of the municipality, and the clerk who is not obliged to furnish them, will charge him a heavy rate, and all this for the sake of a few changes, perhaps 15 to 20 in a list of 500 or 600 names. He must also get copies of the voters' list. I think that the expense would be saved and I am satisfied that there is no loss in having the matter in this way. The assessment rolls are not by any means now the full and complete thing that they were formerly. For instance, in the city of Toronto where perhaps they have the most experienced assessors in the country, paid officials of long standing, they have income voters there under the Local Act as there are under this Act, and this spring, when these lists were published, there was not a single income voter's name recorded, not one that was not assessed or who had to pay a tax, as there are many who are entitled to vote under the Local Act. I am told that 3,000 names had to be added, and, but for the fact of the trouble taken to correct those voters' lists in that city, they would not have been added at all, but the county judges very fairly took the statements furnished for this list as evidence to enable them to put those names on the local list. So that the assessment lists do not exhaust the matter, and it is making the revising officer pay a considerable sum for comparatively little value. I would go with the hon. member if he would amend the clause so as to say that it shall be the duty of the revising officer—he could do it by his clerk—to examine that list and correct by that list.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That will answer the purpose. I do not want the expense to be incurred if it is not necessary, but it should be made imperative that the revising officer shall go to the assessment roll and make such changes as are necessary by comparison with that, by leaving off names that are on the voters' list and do not appear on the assessment roll and placing on the list such names as are not there which do appear on the assessment roll.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is a presumption that the revising officers will obtain such information without his being absolutely required to get a certified copy at the immense cost which it involves. The law says that the revising officer must send a printed copy to each member of the council, to the treasurer of the council, and to the clerk of the council, and it is to be presumed that these persons will give the necessary information, otherwise there is no reason for their being supplied with the list, and the revising officer might go to the secretary's office to see the roll. It is to be supposed, however, that these persons will supply the information without the necessity of paying for a certified copy of the assessment roll.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That supposition may be correct in a sense, but in another sense it is not. If the clerk and treasurer and councillors of a municipality are all Liberals or all Tories, they will supply the information on one side only, whereas, if the revising officer was compelled to examine the roll himself, he would be able to obtain the information impartially. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) that the assessment roll ought still to be the basis. I do not say that the country ought to go to the enormous expense of getting certified copies of the assessment roll each year, but it should be the duty of the revising officer to take off, in the best way he can from the assessment roll for the current year, the latest information on the subject. If the Bill is left as it is now, it will be a great hardship on candidates. The change proposed to be made is on account of the enormous expense, but it will simply shift the burden of the expense from the shoulders of the people to the shoulders of members of Parliament.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They always used to take that trouble before.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). They never had to take the trouble before, there was no necessity for it, the local authorities made out the list, and it cost us nothing.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I mean it was always necessary to compare the list given to candidates or canvassers with the list of the treasurer in order to see that names were not omitted. It is only the work of comparing one list with another. The hon. gentleman mistakes if he believes I think that the assessment roll may not be a source of information. It will always be that, and I say that, without compelling the revising officer to get a certified copy of the assessment roll, it will still, by the Act itself, be the ground or basis of the information on which the revising barrister will necessarily act.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). How will it, unless you compel him to make it the basis.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not object to that.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That is all we want. We are not insisting that he shall year by year get a certified copy of it, because we admit that the expense is very great. One thing or the other should exist, either the revising officer should get a certified copy, or he should be compelled to examine the assessment roll and get his information therefrom. If the hon. gentleman agrees to that, I think on the whole that would be the best and least expensive way of doing it.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think it is shifting the expense. By requiring the assessment roll to be got every year, you make the revising officer get a lot of information he already has and pay for it, whereas the object is to get only the additional information. I would suggest the following amendment:—

On, or as soon as possible after, the 1st June in each year after the year 1887, the revising officer, being duly sworn as hereinbefore provided, shall cause the voters' list of the preceding year to be compared with the assessment roll, and shall, with such information as he can obtain, proceed.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Will that require him to accept the names on the assessment roll as he finds them? That roll should be made *primâ facie* evidence as it was before. Then the appeal lay with those who objected.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps the Minister will make it imperative on him to make the changes from the assessment roll.

Mr. MILLS. We had some discussion on this last year, and also on this point, how far you will erase names from the voters' list that has already been prepared where you find it varies from the assessment roll. For instance, John Brown is on the list as owner of a certain piece of property, and James Smith as tenant of another piece of property. The assessment roll shows John Brown has sold out his interest, and that another man is owner, and that James Smith is no longer a tenant, but somebody else is. Now, will it be the duty of the revising officer to strike out those names and to insert the others without any special application from any party?

Mr. THOMPSON. It strikes me, to be logical at all, he must make all changes of which the assessment roll gives information.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is what we want.

Mr. McCARTHY. You cannot reach that by words; you must leave that to the judge. We might make a separate clause about assessment rolls, and say to what extent assessment rolls are to be deemed *primâ facie* evidence, and instead of tacking that on to this clause as before, deal with it under the head of evidence, and say that the assessment roll should be *primâ facie* evidence, both as to value and qualification. Then it would be the duty of the judge, finding that on the assessment roll a property was assessed to A last year, and is this year assessed to B, to change the names.

Mr. AUGER. How is he to examine the assessment roll unless he gets a copy of it?

Mr. McCARTHY. He can send his clerk to the office.

Mr. AUGER. He will not examine it himself, then. I know it would be too costly to get a certified copy of the roll every year, but——

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Does the hon. gentleman know how much it has cost this year?

Mr. AUGER. I do not know how much it has cost this year, but I know it is very costly. But why not get a copy of the changes every year? Every year in each municipality the roll is revised. Sometimes there are many changes, and sometimes but few. Now, it would not cost much to get a certified copy of the changes from the secretary-treasurer. He would have the whole roll, and that extract of changes would be enough. It would cost less than for the judge to send his secretary or his clerk from municipality to municipality.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Will the Minister inform us what these copies of the assessment roll do cost? If it is considered cheaper to send the revising officer round to the various municipalities and let him copy them there, I fancy there can be no objection to it, but I think the law should be clear in making it his duty to correct the list by the assessment roll.

Mr. THOMPSON. I agree with the hon. member for Simcoe that it would be better to deal with this question in a separate section, and we will have one prepared before we leave that subject. I do not think that it is necessary that the revising officer should send his clerk to the different municipalities. I know in some of the other Provinces than Ontario, the assessment rolls in each county are filed with the clerk of the peace.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). In Ontario they are filed with the county clerk for the purpose of equalising the assessment; it is the finally revised assessment roll which does not reach him.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex).

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When does that go?

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It goes before the 1st of June in the year succeeding. For instance, by the 1st of June next, he must have had finally completed the assessment of 1885.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister has accomplished all that is necessary in the amendment he proposed with the addition of one or two words, without making a new clause, simply adding "he shall compare with the assessment roll and make such changes."

Mr. THOMPSON. I move that the clause be amended as follows:—

The revising officer shall cause the voters' list of the preceding year to be compared with the last assessment roll, and shall, with the information he can obtain from that or any other source, proceed to revise the list of voters then in force under this Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. I move that the following be added at the end of the clause: "Such assessment rolls as are offered shall be *primâ facie* evidence."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 7,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It will be a mistake to insert 400 instead of 200.

Mr. THOMPSON. I move that 300 be inserted.

Mr. AUGER. If you adopt this schedule at the end of the Bill you cannot poll 300 votes a day at a polling place.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Why is this change proposed?

Mr. McCARTHY. One of the great difficulties is that names are added after the final revision, and if 200 are added, the whole system is upset. There must be some elasticity provided. I think it is a mistake to suppose that you cannot poll more than 200 votes. I saw a letter from the revising officer at Winnipeg, and he says that they are in the habit of polling 600 votes in one polling division, and there are so many votes that at 200 votes each they would have about fifty polling divisions in the city.

Mr. WELDON. It does not oblige them to divide again until it reaches 301.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes; the idea is to go under 200 as far as practicable when the polling sub-division is established; but we do not allow any margin at all if we say that as soon as it reaches 200 we shall divide it again. Now, we propose simply to allow a margin of 100, and when it reaches 300 it is to be cut down again. At present, if you reach 201 you divide again.

Mr. TEMPLE. I think it should remain at 300. I have been at polls frequently where 600 votes were put in by ballot in polling hours.

Mr. WELDON. That was a different system from this.

Mr. TEMPLE. I have taken 300 under this system.

Mr. SPROULE. It is very rare that 200 votes will be polled where there are only 200 on the list, because there are so many names duplicated, and so on.

Mr. DAWSON. I have known instances where it was impossible to poll 200, by a system of swearing every man who came up.

On section 8,

Mr. THOMPSON. This section was drawn to correspond with the 1st section as regards the number of polling districts in one division, but now it appears to me that we may repeal section 48. I, therefore, move that section 8

be struck out and the following inserted in lieu thereof:—"Section 48 of the said Act is hereby repealed."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 10,

Mr. THOMPSON. I have a paper here from the revising officer which will explain the difficulty in Algoma. He states that the other revising officer for Algoma requested him to take in addition Algoma West, but it appears that he would have to leave the district and travel a considerable distance in order to take the oath of office, and it was impossible that he could do it and return in time for his work. This is simply to remedy the difficulty which existed in one place of the territorial limits having been changed after the revising officer took the oath of office.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does this apply only to Algoma?

Mr. DAWSON. I am glad to notice that Algoma is getting some attention. I merely rise to suggest that the time for the final closing of the list should be extended; I think communications have already been sent to the Government about it. It is made the 1st of August; but I think for Algoma it ought to be the 1st of October, because the district is so extensive that it is really impossible to do it within the time prescribed.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. member for Brant asked me if this section applied only to Algoma. The provision about the oath is only required for Algoma.

On section 11,

Mr. HACKETT. I think the law is imperfect in this regard, that it gives power to nobody but the judge to adjourn the court of revision. I think a clause should be inserted providing that in case of the absence of the revising officer through illness or death or other cause, the clerk should have power to adjourn the court.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P. E. I.) I would call the attention of the Minister to the amendment that was made to the first clause, providing that two courts of revision should be held in each electoral district in Prince Edward Island except Charlottetown and Royalty. The same exception should apply to Georgetown and Royalty, which is a very small electoral district, and does not require more than one court of revision.

Mr. WELDON. This section 11 practically does away with the printing of the final list of this year, which is the basis of all the future lists.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Act provides that the final revision this year shall be printed, but it does not make that provision with respect to future years, and the object of this section is to make it unnecessary likewise for this year. If there is no objection, this clause may stand.

On schedule A,

Mr. THOMPSON. A question arises as to whether it is desirable to have the column for age. It was inserted with the view of facilitating identification, but it has been suggested to me that there is some difficulty in ascertaining the age.

Mr. McCARTHY. It will lead to trouble of all kinds.

Mr. THOMPSON. I move that it be struck out.

Mr. DAVIES. The age, surely, is a very good guide to identification. In my constituency there are 35 or 36 people on the list of the same name, and the age is a guide by which to distinguish them.

Mr. THOMPSON. It might be worth while to put the age in a poll book, but not on the list.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DAVIES. I would suggest that in the case of a farmer's son and an owner's son, the name of the farmer and the owner should be stated. In Ontario the country is divided into concessions, and the lot occupied by the voter is a means of identification, but it is not so in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. THOMPSON. In the last column we have required in the case of a farmer's or owner's son that he shall state his place of residence and his post office address, but it would not do to give his father's name, because some times he may qualify in the name of his mother.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Then say in the name of the parent. In the case of landowner's sons this should be stated, because in many localities you will find twenty or thirty of the same name.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will add to the description of the son of an owner or farmer the words "the name of the owner or farmer."

On schedule B,

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Section 42 of the Election Act of 1874 provides that in the case of any elector entitled to vote and who has been appointed election officer or agent, he shall, on receipt of a certificate from the returning officer declaring he is entitled to vote at such a polling station where he is placed as officer or agent. Now, under Form B he can only vote, if asked to take the oath, on the list being shown to him. He must swear that he is the person named on the list of voters now shown to him; but if he is voting at a station where his name is not on the list, he cannot take the oath under this form, and will not therefore be allowed to record his vote.

Mr. THOMPSON. I see the force of the hon. gentleman's objections and will let that form stand.

Mr. DAVIES. I would make another suggestion with reference to that form. The last clause says that if the voter is registered as a farmer's son or an owner's son, he must swear that he is resident with his father or mother on the property. The intention is evidently that he must be a resident, not on the day he votes, but in the real sense of the word, and we ought to provide that he should swear he had not been absent for a longer period than three months at least.

Mr. FAIRBANK. In the 6th clause of form B, the oath requires that the son shall be resident on the farm or real property in respect of which he is registered on the voters' list. I believe that an owner who has parted with the identical piece of property but acquired another is still entitled to vote, but in this case, though the father would be entitled to vote, the son will be disfranchised.

Mr. THOMPSON. As that is to stand, I shall have an opportunity of considering that point.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman would introduce a Bill for the purpose of repealing the law and giving us the law as we had it twelve months ago, or would give us manhood suffrage, we should be better pleased.

Mr. McCARTHY. These are the amendments which I propose. The first part is the same as the present Act, with the qualifications grouped together. There is one provision which is new:

And has been in possession thereof as such tenant for at least one year before his being placed upon the list of voters or the date of the application for the placing of his name on the list of voters.

That is instead of being a tenant for a year before the 1st January. The change is simply in regard to time. I move the adoption of these first four sub-sections:

Section three of The Electoral Franchise Act is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor :—

3. Every person shall be entitled to be registered in any year upon the list of voters for the proper polling district of any electoral district or portion of an electoral district, and when so registered to vote, if such person—

(1) Is of the full age of twenty-one years, and is not by this Act or by any law of the Dominion of Canada disqualified or prevented from voting; and

(2) Is a British subject by birth or naturalisation; and

(3) Is the owner of real property within any city or part of a city in the electoral district, of the actual value of at least three hundred dollars, or within any town or part of a town in the electoral district, of the actual value of at least two hundred dollars, or in any place in the electoral district, other than a city or town, of the actual value of at least one hundred and fifty dollars; or—

(4) Is the tenant of any real property within the electoral district, under a lease, at a monthly rental of at least two dollars, or at a quarterly rental of at least six dollars, or at a half-yearly rental of at least twelve dollars, or at an annual rental of at least twenty dollars, and has been in possession thereof as such tenant for at least one year before his being placed upon the list of voters, or the date of the application for the placing of his name on the list of voters and has really and *bonâ fide* paid one year's rent for such real property, at not less than the rate aforesaid; except when the rental is an annual one and for a larger sum than twenty dollars, in which case it shall be sufficient that at least twenty dollars of the last year's rent which accrued next before the time aforesaid shall have been paid: Provided always, that a change or changes of tenancy during the year shall not deprive such tenant of the right to be registered on a list of voters if such change or changes have been without any intermission of time between the tenancies, and if the several tenancies are such as would entitle the tenant to be registered on a list of voters had such tenant been in possession under any one of them, as such tenant for the year next before the time aforesaid: Provided also, that in any place except a city, town or incorporated village, the rental hereinbefore mentioned may be payable in money, in kind, or in money's worth of like value; and, provided, further, that if on any revised or final assessment roll the amount of the tenant's rent is not stated, the fact that the real property in respect of which his name is entered on such roll as the tenant thereof is assessed on such roll in cities at three hundred dollars or more, or in towns at two hundred dollars or more, or in any place other than a city or town at one hundred and fifty dollars or more, shall be *primâ facie* evidence of his right to be registered on the list of voters.

Mr. WELDON. I have very great doubts whether it is wise for us to adopt the amendments, although they may be very good in their way, as the franchise has been settled and the lists are made upon it, and are being made up every day, I think it would be unwise for us to make these amendments. Perhaps at a subsequent period it may be advisable. My hon. friend says this is simply changing the language for the most part; but there is this difficulty, we passed the Act last year, the language is changed in the Revised Statutes, and now my hon. friend has got an amendment changing it again.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. WELDON. It is, practically. In the Revised Statutes the Act is very much altered indeed as to language. If we are going to open up the question of the franchise, we are opening up a very large field, which occupied some little time last year; and I think, under the circumstances, it is hardly worth while to press the amendments.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It would never do to adopt these amendments just now. At present every tenant is entitled to be placed on the voters' list who was such tenant for a year preceding the 1st January last. The hon. gentleman proposes now to make every tenant who has been a tenant for the year preceding his application, a voter if he wants to be. Now, in some municipalities, I believe the final revision has been completed, and in many other polling sub-divisions the revision will be completed before this Bill can possibly become law, and the tenants of that class will be cut out of the vote altogether. It would be unfair to place those in a different position to what they are, in cases where the voters' list would not be completed until this law could take effect.

Mr. McCARTHY.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not see the unfairness, because some tenants, under these circumstances, would not be entitled to get on the list, but I do not know that the hon. gentleman is right in saying that in many places the lists are already completed.

Mr. LISTER. They are in a good many counties in our own Province.

Mr. McCARTHY. Speaking of my own riding where, I think, the revising officers are as far advanced as in any others, it is only in two or three townships that the time for giving notice could have gone by before this day week. But the question is whether this is not a fair and proper change to make. It is now working great hardship. Take the case of the Methodist conference from whom the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) presented a petition. Take the case of bank clerks. I know one case where a bank clerk moved from Newmarket to Aurora, and he looses his vote, though there are only four miles between the two places.

Mr. MULOCK. Whose fault is that?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not that man's fault, at all events. And school teachers who move about in the same way are in the same case.

Mr. HICKEY. It is much fairer to tenants that the suggestion made by the hon. member for North York should be adopted, because, being a transient resident, he is more apt to get his vote by being as near the final revision as possible. If you put it several months ahead of the final revision, he has more chance of losing his vote.

Mr. WELDON. There is no doubt a considerable hardship to some persons, but the difficulty in my mind is that this change will create great confusion in the lists. I suppose there is hardly an electoral district in which everything is not completed except the final revision.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Changing the qualification just on the eve of closing the list, I think would be wrong. There is no time before the revision to give information to the people as to the change in the qualification. If the final revision is not already closed, I know it is very nearly so in some cases. If it is desirable to change the qualification at some future time it might do. But if it changes the present working of the Act, this proposition is of doubtful propriety.

Mr. SPROULE. If it is so far gone that it cannot be changed, then there can be no hardship to those parties, while in places where it could be changed, it would do them a favor. Many hon. gentlemen opposite objected last year to the very same provision.

Mr. LISTER. The trouble is that it is too late. There is no time to give the notice. This Act cannot become law for same days yet, and it is impossible for the people to have information about it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would not be unwilling, for my part, to give a special opportunity to these people to be put on after the Act came into force—I mean those who are now enfranchised by reason of this provision, should have an opportunity of applying. They are not numerous.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Make it apply to the future list?

Mr. LISTER. There are certain classes of people who ought to be on the list, such as ministers and school teachers. Those are the only two classes, as I understand, who suffer by the Act passed last year—and bank clerks.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think it is always a hardship when, of two men in precisely the same circumstances, one has a vote and another is deprived of it, for that is what you do by this amendment. In a town in my county there are at least thirty men who are deprived of a vote under

the old law, who would, if this were law last year, be entitled to vote.

Mr. McCARTHY. What are their politics?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am not talking about politics at all. Is not this particular thing for a purpose? I ask the hon. gentleman if it is not to cover some cases that have occurred in the western section, where all these classes have been put upon the voters' list, and it is intended to legalise them by this provision. If the Minister of Justice will look at the notices, he will find that in many electoral districts in western Ontario the voters' list will be completed by the 15th of June. Therefore, it would be utterly impossible for those men who would be entitled to vote, if this provision was in force, to get on the list. In other counties where the final revision did not take place until the end of June, they could get on the list. The effect of this would be that men belonging to these particular classes, in some counties, would be able to vote, while in other counties men with precisely the same qualifications would not be entitled to vote. That is not right. I should have been glad had it been the law; but not being the law, it is not fair when the voters' list is practically completed to now change the law.

Mr. McCARTHY. If this amendment is adopted I shall propose a clause providing that if application be made at any time before the holding of the last court the name shall be put on.

Mr. WELDON. How will this be known throughout the Dominion?

Mr. McCARTHY. There will be no difficulty in making such a law known.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee rise, in order that we may have an opportunity of considering these proposals.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I think the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), will reach an important class, namely, tenant farmers who change their tenancies on 1st April in each year. They are on the voters' lists of 1885 which has been made the basis of the Dominion franchise list; but by the law as it stands at present those names can be struck off if the persons have not been resident in the county in 1885.

Mr. FAIRBANK. The only argument in favor of the Act was the plea of want of uniformity, and to change the qualification at this time does away with that argument. It is utterly impossible at this time to inform the country as to new qualification clauses. It took many months to give the country as a whole a general idea of what the qualifications were, and within a few days the final revision will take place, and to change the qualifications now would be to wipe out all pretence at uniformity.

Mr. O'BRIEN. The class of persons affected by this proposed amendment are just those people who would become acquainted with what had taken place in Parliament, especially the clergymen. They would see the changes made, and would at once take advantage of them. If the qualification affected the general run of voters the amendment might be objected to; but it affects two special classes, and I think they are people who would be informed from the newspapers what had transpired in this regard even supposing no copies of the Act ever reached them.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). A large portion of the classes affected are classes of men who do not read newspapers. They are small tenants who change from year to year, who never take a daily paper, and will not become informed of any change. No doubt clergymen would see it; but we are not legislating only for clergymen. This would apply to tenants, occupants and almost every class of that kind, and clergymen are not mentioned. It is not to apply to them alone. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) knows that this law cannot reach the public within the time necessary for them to appeal and be placed on the voters' list. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that the people in the back districts of our counties will know anything about this change for weeks and weeks? Parliament is not likely to prorogue next week, and therefore the Governor General's sanction could not be obtained until the following week; and what time would those men have to take steps to have their names placed on the voters' list? This clause should not pass, and it is not fair to ask the House at this late stage of the Session and of the revision of the voters' list to adopt it. I am in favor of the amendment if it could have been done last year. The House would not assent to it last year. Let it apply to the following year if thought desirable, but do not do it now whenever a class of the community in every section cannot be placed on precisely the same footing.

Mr. MULOCK. I am in favor of the principle involved in the proposed amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe, but I am not in favor of the passage of a law that cannot be worked. We should not adopt a measure when it does not afford a proper opportunity for the whole community to take advantage of it. Last year after a great deal of trouble the House came to the conclusion that a certain length of time was to elapse in order that the public might become acquainted with the law. If the hon. gentleman will offer the public the same opportunity to take advantage of the amendment that was given under the Franchise Bill, I am in favor of it. If a list is published on 1st June the final revision could not be made until five or six weeks after publication. The Act of last Session gives persons claiming the right to vote three weeks in which to present their claims. So the Act of last Session gives to every person who claims the right to vote at least three weeks' notice. If the hon. gentleman will say that at any time within three weeks after the Act comes into force a person not on the list shall have the same right of appeal no injustice will be done.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no objection to do so. The hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Cameron) is so honest that he thinks every member on this side is dishonest and that every proposal made by them is actuated by sinister motives. I have heard complaint and I have proposed a remedy for some of the difficulty, and I cast back the hon. gentleman's insinuation that I am doing this with an object. There cannot be any object about the matter. I am willing to adopt any means and the simplest means by which the people can take advatage of this list. It is quite possible, as the new list will not come into force until 1st August, that upon this list the general election might take place. We ought to endeavor to make the present list as complete as possible. I will adopt any reasonable suggestion made. I suggest that application might be received within, say, the 15th July, which will give ample time. We must remember this, that the final list, according to the Act, is to be published on or before the 1st of June, and to be published five weeks, so that in many counties the revising officer is within the law, if he does not proceed to hold his final court, until the first week in July. In many cases they are holding the first courts in June, and it is not contemplated that they will be completed and certified before the 1st of August. That being so, the 15th of July or any time selected, would give ample opportunity to give notice to the country. Everybody in this House, and all the political organisations are interested in making this law known, so that I do not see the slightest trouble in applying the practice if the principle is acceptable; and nearly every hon. gentleman on that side who has spoken, adopts the principle, while he repudiates the practice.

Mr. DAVIES. No, that is hardly the position. I only repudiate the practice as to lists which are now in process of completion. I fear this provision will involve complications of a very grave character, in the outlying portions of the Dominion. They will become known, of course, to politicians and to communities where they receive daily papers, but how will the people in remote portions of the Maritime Provinces know anything about it?

Some hon. MEMBERS. It will be published.

Mr. DAVIES. Not in the outlying portions of the country.

Mr. MILLS. I think Sir, it would be a monstrous proposition, after we have dealt with the subject of the franchise, that at the end of the Session, when the voters' list is about being completed, we should propose to re-open the voters' list in perhaps one-fourth of the constituencies of the country. The other three-fourths of them cannot deal with the question at all. Why does the hon. gentleman propose to extend the franchise to large numbers of persons to whom be denied it last year? Why did not the hon. gentleman make his proposition three months ago, instead of now, when we have been sitting nearly three months? The hon. gentleman proposes to alter the franchise, and to re-open the whole controversy in 200 odd constituencies of this Dominion. If the hon. gentleman believes that the franchise ought to be extended, let him make his provision come into operation next year. Why is the hon. gentleman in such haste, when the preliminary revision has been made, when the preliminary list has been printed, when notice has been given for the final revision? Why should be propose a change in the elective franchise and propose that a large number of persons shall be enfranchised who are not enfranchised at this moment? Did the hon. gentleman consider this question last year? Was he not here when we were discussing the question as to whether the twelve months should count from the 1st of January——

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. MILLS,—or from the time the party made application. The Prime Minister objected, and although the question was again and again pressed from this side of the House he refused to agree to such a proposition, and, so far as I know, hon. gentlemen opposite did not object to it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps we had better fix the principle first, and then, in one clause, provide when it shall become applicable.

Mr. MILLS. I object to dealing with the subject in this way, at the heel of the Session. I am prepared, if the hon. gentleman will support me, and I certainly say now, when it is proposed to read this Bill the third time, I propose to move that we shall go back to committee to repeal the law, and to revive the state of things which existed before we legislated last year. If I fail in that, I am prepared to accept the principle of manhood suffrage, but I am not prepared to tinker with a Franchise Bill of this sort, when we have the preliminary revision already made, and when, in the majority of the constituencies, the date of the final revision has been fixed. Then the hon. gentleman has not provided here for the class who have asked for the electoral franchise.

Mr. McCARTHY. What class is that?

Mr. MILLS. Itinerary ministers.

Mr. McCARTHY. They are provided for. The hon. gentleman has not read the amendments.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman has made that provision, all very well; and that is a reason why we might consider the amendment of the Act for future years but not when the work of revision has already, in a great measure, taken place, and when nineteen-twentieths of the people of this country can know nothing about the Bill in time to avail themselves of it, if it were made law to-morrow.

Mr. MULOCK. I am in favor of the principle of the amendments, because I am in favor of extending the franchise, and in favor of as few restrictions as possible being placed in the way of a citizen, who is entitled to vote, recording his vote. This shortens the time and minimises the obstacle and I consider that it and the principle running through all the amendements dealing with this subject are in that direction, and for that reason I think it would be a subject of regret if we should not have the list, on which the next general elections are held, as complete as possible. I do not think there is any difference of opinion among us in the abstract. The only difficulty seems to be as to the application of the principle; and I believe that by a little conference, outside the committee, we might arrange the whole matter. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should allow the amendements to stand over to-night, and consult with a few members afterwards, and see if a solution cannot be arrived at.

Mr. McCARTHY. What we are doing now is consulting.

Mr. MULOCK. You said you had not contemplated this objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think we should settle the principle, and then by one clause decide when it shall come into effect.

Mr. MULOCK. Everybody is agreed as to the time running from the date of the application. I should be willing to cut in down to six months, though of course I am only speaking for myself.

Mr. MACMASTER. One hon. gentleman suggests that this proposition is brought in too late, and another suggests that while it is practically acceptable, it should stand over for some time for consideration. Now, it seems to me, if it is a good thing to extend the franchise to certain classes who are now disfranchised, the sooner it is done the better. Are the judges not occupied to-day in preparing the lists, so that those entitled to vote may be placed on them? And will they not be occupied in the same way for the next five or six weeks? If so, Parliament should make provision that those who, properly or improperly, are omitted, should have the opportunity of getting on the list. The only objection I see to the proposition is this: It is said that those who would be granted this right would not become aware of it in time. Is that probable? It seems to me that is entirely improbable. The classes of people affected are mainly clergymen and school masters. I will deal with the tenants in a moment. These are intelligent people, who read the papers and know what is going on in this House. The discussion on this subject will be telegraphed to-morrow, and in all the leading towns and villages the proposition will be well-known. If this proposition became law I venture to say that all the clergymen and schoolmasters in the country would know of it one week afterwards. With regard to the tenant farmers; the country is full of political organisations, whose business is to communicate information to the electors with reference to the franchise; and I venture to say that if there are hopes of the franchise being extended to parties who have not now the right to vote, it would not be thirty-six hours before the active political organisations would communicate with the people affected, and the tenant farmers would not suffer in the slightest degree for want of information. At all events, let the effort be made; let us pass such legislation as will give the right of the franchise to those who ought to exercise it. it may be that some will be left out; but is that any reason why those who should have the opportunity of taking advantage of the law should not be granted that oppor-

tunity? If it is right to be done, I think it is right to be done without any further delay.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman forgets that the revising officers have to receive this law; and they cannot get it by telegraph or action what they see in the newspapers. The difficulty is to work the thing out. In the county of Queen's, N.B., for instance, the 1st of June is the date for the final court, and all the persons affected by this amendment will have been struck off the list. Here we are in the midst of our revision, and, as Lincoln said: "It does not do to swap horses while crossing stream."

Mr. DAVIES. I think there is a great deal in what the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) says with reference to clergymen and school masters. I am thoroughly in accord with him on the principle, and if it can be adopted without very great inconvenience I should like to see it done. As we have to consider some other clauses, I think this amendment might stand till Tuesday. We are in accord as to the principle.

Mr. McCARTHY. Why not let us adopt the clauses, leaving the question how they are to go into force until we go into committee again?

Mr. WELDON. Suppose we pass the clauses to-night and find no means of carrying them out. Before we change the law, we ought to see what means we are going to have to carry the change into effect. It is a very serious matter, and I think it should stand over.

Mr. McCARTHY. There are three propositions, as I understand, before the committee. One is to change the law, and leave the change to be applied wherever it can be applied; one is to extend the time to a certain fixed date, as suggested by the hon. member for North York; the third is to postpone the operation of these clauses until next year. Surely if we deal with the clauses, we can settle how they shall be applied.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If you accept the middle proposition, what date will you fix?

Mr. McCARTHY. My idea is the 15th July. I would not say that a court should be held everywhere, but one court in each electoral district, giving notice to enable persons to get their names on the list.

Mr. WELDON. You would have to draft a special clause for that.

Mr. McCARTHY. It would not take fifteen minutes to draft a special clause.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But it is very late, and I venture to say that, owing to the late hours at which we have been engaged during the last two or three days, the hon. gentleman's amendments have not been read by many of the members of the House. Until they were brought up here, I never had the opportunity of looking at them.

Mr. LISTER. I do not think there will be any danger from delay, because the principle of the amendment is accepted.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). When hon. gentlemen accept the principle of the amendments, why not pass them? Here are three classes, clergymen, school masters and tenant farmers, and it seems that they refuse to give these people a chance to get on the list.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The trouble is exactly because, when the proposition to include these very classes was made last year, it was not adopted by the majority of this House. Had that been done, there would have been no necessity for hon. gentlemen to take the position they take now. We are to accept the assessment rolls for each year, and these include, in many cases, the names of tenants who were not residents of the riding on the 1st of January; but the trouble is that, in many cases, the notices have been sent to the revising officers already, and how are we going to do justice to those classes in such cases? It is largely a matter of fortune whether an individual living in a constituency where the revising officer has fixed his final revision, is going to get on the list or not. We want some means provided by which this provision will reach every man who has a right to be placed on the list.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what we want.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). What is the hon. gentleman's proposition? It is baldly to say that the name of every man who at the time of his application establishes his right to be on the list shall be put on; but very many would have to make application within the next two or three weeks.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is not fairly stating the proposition, I suggested the 15th of July.

Mr. DAVIES. Some of the courts of revision have been held.

Mr. McCARTHY. Suppose they have; make provision that one more shall be held for this purpose, and that it shall not be held earlier than the 15th of July.

Mr. MILLS. We are entitled to know what are the views of the Administration, who are responsible for the business of the House, upon this question. They know what the effect of the law as it stands will be. We know how far it will affect the existing voters' lists, and how far it will add to the expenditure incurred in the completion of the lists. If the Administration are prepared to say that they are ready to open all the voters' lists in the country again, so as to put this class of persons which the hon. gentleman proposes to enfranchise in a few constituencies on the same footing in all the constituencies in the Dominion, we would like to know it. If there is a special court to be held for the purpose of admitting people to the voters' list who are not on it now, and for whom the law does not make provision, if we are to have two revisions of the voters' lists this year, let the Government tell us what they propose, and we will be prepared to discuss the question.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think there is any division of opinion as to the change. As it is very desirable we should take a little time to consider it and consider what machinery is required to carry it out, I would let this clause stand.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think the hon. member for Bothwell opposed Mr. Mowat when he had two revisions in one year. In 1882 and 1878, Mr. Mowat re-opened the lists and had a second revision six months after the first, for the purpose of putting the lists right. There is no objection to the principle of this Bill, and we are all agreed we should frame such a clause as will meet the views of the committee.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would suggest that the Bill be completed and printed before the third reading, with these alterations.

Committee rose and reported progress.

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does the Acting Minister of Railways propose to bring down the papers, contracts and

correspondence with respect to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway before that matter is up for discussion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was under the impression that the contracts were before the House. I will take note of this and see that the papers are laid before the House before we take up this matter.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). One of the contracts is down and the other is not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1 o'clock a. m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 25th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 140) respecting the improvement of the Harbor of Quebec.—(Mr. McLelan.)

Bill (No. 139) respecting Tolls over the Dunnville Dam and Bridge connecting works constructed on and over the Grand River.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I intended, before the Orders of the Day were called, to bring up a matter which is personal to myself, and in justice to myself. With the permission of the House, I do so now, after the third readings and before other matters are gone into. I see that the Opposition press—some of them—have made unfair use of language that I used in the discussion on the Bill relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is alleged that I charged the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) with blackmailing Parliament and the Government. That would have been very unjust to the hon. gentleman, and not only unjust but untrue. But I did not say so. The language that I used was with respect to the Northern Railway, and even with respect to that railway the language used, in the heat of debate, was, perhaps, too strong, because that railway, of course, like any other institution of the kind, had the right to press their particular interests in any way they pleased, and Parliament would deal with their application. True, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is connected with the Northern road, but he took great care, both in his amendment and in his arguments, to sever himself from the Northern road. He stated, if I remember rightly, that he had received an amendment to be moved, an amendment coming, I suppose, from the executive of the Northern road, which he thought was going too far, being more in the direction of the interests of that railway than in the direction of the general interests of the country. He therefore declined to introduce that amendment, and laid before this House an amendment of his own, which was altogether based upon what he considered to be in the interests of the trade and commerce in Ontario, and his whole line of argument was based upon that principle. I may say also the hon. gentleman very fairly gave notice of the resolutions he introduced before he did introduce them, so that he took every care to sever his position as connected with the road from that as member of Parliament, he setting aside the amendment which suited that particular railway and proposing his amendment upon his idea that it was necessary for the protection of the commerce of Ontario. I differed from him in that regard, as I thought and still think, that the interests of Ontario and the railway interests of the country will be fully protected by the law as it is. I feel it necessary to make that statement, and I am exceedingly sorry any language used by me in the heat of debate should have caused misapprehension, which, I have no doubt, may have given my hon. friend great pain.

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (page 1455) respecting the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Has the Minister brought down the papers which were referred to the other day? The two contracts have, I believe, been already submitted to Parliament, but there was an advertisement for tenders and some correspondence between the contractors and the Government. The hon. gentleman intimated on Friday that he would bring all these papers down.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I could not bring them down sooner, as that conversation was on Friday, and the House has not sat since. I have brought down the two contracts, and I will explain to the House how the matter stands.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). As the papers are only now brought down, the hon. gentleman could hardly ask us to dispose of the matter now. He might, at all events, let it stand till after dinner.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a fair proposal. I have no objection to that. I will put the papers on the Table.

Motion allowed to stand.

THE FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU presented copies of correspondence concerning the working of the Franchise Act.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman expect us to examine the correspondence before we further consider the Bill?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; I thought it was useless to bring down all these papers, and I suppose it will be useless to look at it on the Table. I could not bring it down before. I suggested at the time when the address was proposed that, if the mover would ask only for the correspondence which was really necessary for the discussion, I would limit it to that, but I was answered that the motion was made and must be carried out.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is all this about?

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing before the Chair.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want to know what papers are submitted to this House, and I think I have a right to know. We ought to have the utterances of hon. gentlemen in a tone that we can understand.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend does it on purpose, because I always speak loud enough to be heard. This is correspondence concerning the working of the Franchise Act.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend is quite right; I did it on purpose, but it is because I could not catch what he said. He spoke loudly enough the second time, but he did not speak loudly enough in the first instance.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved the third reading of Bill (No. 133) further to amend the law respecting the North-West Territories.

Mr. WELDON moved in amendment:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend the same by striking out from the seventh section the words, "but this provision shall not prevent the judges from acting as members of the North-West Council, without emolument," and instead thereof add the words "or act as members of the North-West Council."

He said: I think, since I have looked into this matter more carefully, that it is most important that the judges should not be members of the North-West Council, that they should be excluded from taking part in the deliberations of a Legislative Assembly. I move this resolution without going into the reasons which I gave before in committee. I see that in England, where one of the judges has given his opinion in letters to the *Times* on the Home Rule question, it has caused a considerable amount of criticism in the papers, showing that the whole principle and policy of the present system of Government is against judges taking any part in the deliberations of a Legislative Assembly, or being in any way drawn into the arena of politics.

Mr. THOMPSON. For the information of those members who were not present when this matter was fully discussed the other day in committee, I may offer a few explanations. We are not proposing in this Bill any new enactment on this subject. Ever since the establishment of the North-West Council, there has been a provision on the Statute-book that the stipendiary magistrates of the North-West Territories should *ex officio* be members of that Council. The number of appointments to that Council in the hands of the Government is six, and up to the present time three stipendiary magistrates have been sitting in that Council. It is proposed by this Bill, not as originally suggested, that the number of appointed members should be increased to correspond with the increased number of judges, but that nothing contained in the Act should render ineligible any of the judges who are to be appointed under this Act to take the places of the stipendiary magistrates at the North-West Council. So we are keeping matters precisely as they are; we are not increasing the number of appointees, and are simply saying that, notwithstanding the provisions of this Bill, which simply, as regards the judges themselves, changes the name of their office and, to some slight degree, their emoluments and the tenure of their office, such persons may be appointed to the Council. At the present time, three of these stipendiary magistrates sit there. The work of the Council, unlike the work of a Legislative Assembly, has very largely to be done by the members who meet and at the time when they meet. There is no Executive in the North-West, as there is in the Provinces, to prepare the legislation, and it is only a few days since I had placed in my hands a letter from one of the elected members of the Council, intimating that, in the present state of the organisation of the territories, that gives rise to considerable inconvenience; the legal measures which it is desirable for the Council to adopt, have not been prepared; members frame their suggestions after they have assembled; and he states that, if the judges are removed from the Council Board, great as the difficulties are at present, they would be enhanced. It is not proposed, either as a part of the policy of this measure, or as the policy of the Government, as I understand it, that appointments of persons holding positions of this character should be continued indefinitely in the North-West Territories. On the contrary, the present law relating to the North-West Territories provides that, when the number of members of the Council reaches twenty-one, the power of appointments, on the part of the Government, ceases entirely, and, therefore, the right to appoint any person shall vest solely in the people, and depend upon their election. So rapidly are the Territories being organised into districts entitled to elect members to that Council, that at the last session of that body five newly-elected members took their seats, and it is anticipated that in the course of two or three years the power of appointment on the part of the Crown will be entirely withdrawn. I propose that until that takes place we shall make no change, and neither withdraw the present stipendiary magistrates who are holding seats in the Council, nor increase their number. There are reasons, as I have stated, why the presence of these gentlemen is at present useful, and why I think it would be undesirable to declare, as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) proposes, that they should no longer be eligible. I have already stated that we do not present this as a permanent measure, because the present law contains a provision that all appointments of every character shall cease at a time not far remote, in all probability now, when the whole power of electing members to that Council shall be vested in the people of the North-West Territories.

Mr. MILLS. I do not propose to detain the House more than a moment in the discussion of this question, as I stated my objections to the Bill on its second reading. The observations which have been made by the Minister of Justice, however, call for an observation or two. It seems to me that the hon. Minister altogether ignores the fact that the Government itself is taking a new departure in presenting this matter to the House. They propose to constitute something different from the stipendiary magistracy that has hitherto had jurisdiction in the North-West Territories, and to supersede those magistrates by the constitution of a Supreme Court. They recognise the fact that the condition of things in the North-West Territories is not now what it was a short time ago, and this altered condition of the inhabitants renders it necessary that the Government should make a different provision from that which has heretofore existed for the administration of justice. Now, in order to meet this altered condition, the hon. gentleman proposes that there shall be organised in the North-West Territories a body for the administration of justice on the same footing which exists in the various Provinces of the Dominiom. Would the hon. gentleman for a moment propose that the judges of the Supreme Court in any one of the Provinces should be eligible for seats in the Legislative Council, or for seats in Parliament? We all know that the hon. gentleman would not make such a proposal, but what the hon. gentleman now proposes is that the members of the court which he proposes to organise in the North-West Territories, shall be eligible for appointment or for election to the North-West Council. Now, I make serious objection to that. I say it is important that no such thing should be permitted. It is important that these men should be removed when the North-West Council ceases to have any appointed members, because, if the hon. gentleman were to alter the organisation of districts in the North-West, there would be no nominated members now. It is because those districts are constituted by the North-West Territories Bill that it is possible that there should be nominated members of the Council. Now, if the Government were to make a provision for the representation of all the people in the North-West Territories, there is a provision granting the half-breed population who are entitled to the franchise the right to elect twenty-three members

instead of twenty-one; and, that being the case, the hon. gentleman has recognised, not only in the Bill which we have already passed through the House providing for representation in this House, but also by the proposition now before us to constitute a Supreme Court, that the condition of things in the North-West Territories is approaching the condition that exists in the ordinary Provinces of the Dominion, and, that being the case, the time has come when what may be allowed under the exceptional circumstances that may be found in a territory when settlement is first taking place, ought not to be permitted at the present moment. I called the attention of the hon. gentleman the other day to the fact that the trials of controverted election cases must come before these judges, involving questions of election, of eligibility to the Council, of the regularity of an election to that Council, and these same judges must sit on those cases. Are they fit to try such cases, when it would be highly probable that they would be found on opposite sides in that Council, and when they would be biassed more or less by the political considerations that would prevail, and would present themselves to their minds when they would be called upon to adjudicate upon these cases? Why, Sir, in the election of members to this House, I suppose the trials of controverted elections in those territories represented under the Act, would come before these judges. These men hold seats in that Council themselves, and they would be called upon to take sides in the controversies that would take place in that Council. That being the case, I say it is highly inexpedient that these judges should longer be eligible to that Council. The hon. gentleman had his attention called to the fact that by this section, as it now stands, they are not only eligible to seats in that Council by appointment, but eligible for election also. He proposes to change that; but, in listening to the amendment which he made, I think it was perfectly clear that he did not effect that object. So, at this moment, as the Bill stands before us, it is proposed that the judges in the North-West Territories shall be politicians, that they shall assist in legislation, that they shall take sides in the controversies that arise in the North-West Territories; and that while they are party men, while they are taking sides, they shall also adjudicate upon contested elections and the appointments that take place to that Council. When this Bill was before the House for its second reading I pointed out the extent to which these men would be placed in antagonism to each other, to the disagreeable position in which they would find themselves, if they were compelled to decide upon the validity of an election of a brother member to the Council, a man who, if he obtained his seat, would be inclined to act with those who supported him in his election and to oppose those members of the court and members of the Council, who took a different view of the law. I say, Sir, we ought not to permit this. I think we are going back to a mediæval condition of things, one which is not only contrary to the principle of parliamentary government, but one which was recognised as being so wholly incompatible with our notions of representative government, that it ceased to be a part of the constitution of any one of the Provinces, even before responsible government was established.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman is hypercritical in his remarks in respect to this measure. Now, in the first place, about the judges becoming political men and taking part in elections. By the Bill of the late Government the stipendiary magistrates—and these are stipendiary magistrates—had power to sit as nominated members and at the same time to try elections of elected members. There is no alteration of the law in that regard. They were made political men by the Bill of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and there is no alteration made by this Bill. But the reason why the late Government appointed them and asked them to form a portion of the Council, was, that they wanted men supposed to be acquainted with the law of the country, who had dealings judicially and administratively, as magistrates, all over the country, and who would be experts, in fact, to decide upon what was really for the good of the Territory. Supposing this measure had not been introduced at all, supposing the condition of things had remained as it is now until this law is passed, and these men remain stipendiary magistrates, I do not find that any hon. gentleman opposite ever made any motion to alter the constitution in that regard. It was not considered wrong that these stipendiary magistrates should remain as nominated members of the Council. No complaint was made from the North West about these gentlemen sitting as members of the present Council. The Opposition, who are bound to attack any laches on the part of the Government in administering the affairs, judicially or otherwise, of that country, did not ask that the stipendiary magistrates should be removed from the Council. If this Bill had not been introduced matters would have gone on and no one would have objected; and this Bill simply changes the name of the stipendiary magistrates to judges. Now, that can make no difference certainly. The other difference is this: the stipendiary magistrates are at present practically absolute and their decisions are without appeal, because an appeal in important cases to the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba was so expensive and caused so much inconvenience. That was the case, and this Bill proposes to deal, and it does deal effectually with that question. The stipendiary magistrates or judges, as they are now called, instead of being absolute will meet together and will sit as a court of appeal on the judgments of individual stipendiary magistrates, whose decisions were formerly, practically, for most intents if not for all intents, without appeal. That is the only alteration, and I am satisfied those gentlemen, who are not increased in numbers—the nominated members—do good service, from their long acquaintance with the country, with the Indians and the white men, such as Colonel McLeod, Judge Richardson, and latterly Judge Rouleau, the last-named of whom brought with him a knowledge of law, having been a judge. This is simply a measure to meet the present condition of the country. I have no doubt, as the Minister of Justice has stated, that very shortly there will be a Council of the elected members so large that it will retire in favor of an Assembly. It is to be hoped, however, that among the elected members professional and legal men will seek to enter the Council as much as possible, because without professional men present the Council or Assembly will be without such guidance as every Parliament should possess. The Local Legislatures have legal men who consider legal matters coming before the House. It is to be hoped that legal men will make it their ambition to go into the Council or Assembly as it will be I hope ere long. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) spoke of some alteration in the law so as to expedite the change from Council to Assembly.

Mr. MILLS. No. What I said was this: The hon. gentleman is aware that the elected members are to be elected by a population within a limited area. If it were not for that limitation, the population of the Territory is sufficient to give it 23 members.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The alteration of that limitation would be an alteration in the law. That is a matter that can be dealt with subsequently. The North-West will not suffer very much from waiting for that change until next Session, if such a recommendation be made by the elected members in the Council. No doubt this Parlia-

ment will be only too glad to expedite the matter and make the Council an Assembly.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not know what the late Government may have done; but I again object to the present Administration pointing to the acts of the previous Administration as justification for anything it may choose to bring forward. I remember about fifty five or sixty years ago, fifty-five years ago, that the Legislature in our country was composed partly of judges, and when I came to take some interest very early in life in public affairs, it was found very difficult to get rid of the judges from the Legislature of our own Province. I know it was looked upon as a great evil to have the judges sitting as members of the Legislature, making laws which they themselves would afterwards administer. In the Bill now under consideration it is reviving what existed fifty years ago, and I am decidedly opposed to giving the judges of the North-West Territories any right to deal with legislation or take any part in legislation of the territories. It is enough for them to administer the laws without assisting in making them; and, notwithstanding what the First Minister has said, the people of the North-West are just as intelligent and equally prepared to elect members to sit in that body as are the people of the constituencies we have the honor to represent. In regard to what the hon. gentleman has said about lawyers and legal gentlemen, and the great assistance they render, I am of the opinion that if we had fewer lawyers in this House and more men with common sense we would get along equally well. We would not have so much legislation—and it is well known that we have a great deal of unnecessary legislation. The argument that it is desirable to have lawyers in the North-West Council should not carry any great weight in passing a Bill of this kind. What we want is plain, practical common sense, less of the great legal ability, less legislation with a view to hair splitting, and more bringing to bear on legislation plain, practical common sense, with a view to meeting the wants of the people. That is what we should do. That is not being done in this Bill. I therefore support the amendment.

House divided on the amendment of Mr. Weldon.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Forbes,	McCraney,
Armstrong,	Geoffrion,	McMullen,
Auger,	Gillmor,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Guay,	Mitchell,
Béchard,	Gunn,	Mulock,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Paterson (Brant),
Burpee,	Holton,	Ray,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Charlton,	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cook,	Kirk,	Trow,
Davies,	Langelier,	Vail,
Edgar,	Laurier,	Watson,
Fairbank,	Lister,	Weldon.—42.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Everett,	McLelan,
Amyot,	Farrow,	McNeill,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Welland),	Moffat,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Fortin,	Orton,
Barker,	Gagné,	Paint,
Barnard,	Gigault,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Billy,	Grandbois,	Riopel,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Shanly,
Bowell,	Hackett,	Small,
Burns,	Haggart,	Sproule,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Tassé,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Taylor,
Carling,	Jenkins,	Temple,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kinney,	Thompson,
Chapleau,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Tyrwhitt,
Costigan,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (Albert),
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Ward,
Daoust,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Cardwell),
Dawson,	McCallum,	White (Hastings),
Dodd,	McDougald (Pictou),	Woodworth,
Dugas,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wright.—70.
Dupont,		

Amendment negatived.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 141) further to amend the law of evidence in certain cases (from the Senate).—(Mr. Thompson.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 127) to extend the boundaries of the district of Keewatin, and to amend the law respecting such district.—(Mr. Thompson.)

RAILWAY IN CAPE BRETON.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That it is expedient to provide that the Minister of Railways and Canals be authorised to construct a railway from a point on the Straits of Canso to Louisburg or Sydney, as a public work; that the Government Railways Act, 1881, shall apply to such work, and that the location and all other incidents of the said work shall be determined by the Governor in Council.

Mr. MILLS. Explain.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The question of constructing a railway in Cape Breton has come several times before the House, and different measures have been passed and subsidies granted for the purpose of building such railway. The wish of Parliament, as well as of the Government, which proposed the matter to Parliament, was and is that the Island of Cape Breton should have the same advantages as other portions of the Dominion possess, that is to say, a railway across the island. Attempts have been made to obtain contractors who would undertake the building of the road. Those efforts have not succeeded, and after waiting thus far the Government have come to the conclusion that, under the circumstances, instead of delaying construction and waiting in vain for contractors to build the railway, they would ask Parliament to undertake it themselves through the Government in the same way as the Government have built other railways in the country. Under those circumstances the Minister of Railways has given notice of the resolution which I have moved. If this is assented to by Parliament, the intention of the Government is to afterwards come down with a resolution to ask Parliament for a sum of money with which to begin this important work. The Government have taken care, as they promised last Session, to have surveys made of different lines, of two lines across the island, in order to ascertain which would be the best line to be followed, should the Government undertake the work. Those surveys have been made, and, if I am not mistaken, the results have been laid before the House. The question may be asked, which of the two lines is to be selected? That information I am not in a position to give. Those surveys are now under the consideration of the Department of Railways, and the intention of course is to take the best line, the line that will be most feasible and most advantageous to the island and the country at large.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman ought to give the House further information. I have no recollection of seeing the plans and specifications which the hon. gentleman says have been laid before the House. It is most desirable that the House should be in possession of this information, and the hon. gentleman, in asking to commit

the House to an important measure of this kind, on the merits of which I do not wish to express an opinion at this moment, should give the House further information as to the character of the work, grades, probable cost, kind of work to be undertaken, length of line, so that the House, before it commits itself to the proposition which the hon. gentleman submits, should know precisely what it is doing. It may be a right and proper thing to do, but as yet the hon. gentleman has altogether failed to give us information which it is important we should possess.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The surveys, plans and reports were laid before the House on the 19th of this month. They have been here about a week. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the grades and curvatures; they are contained in the report before the House, which speaks for itself, and which is laid on the Table for the purpose of affording information. I may state generally that the line is supposed to be about eighty-five miles in length. The cost of the line is expected to be about $20,000 a mile.

Mr. VAIL. I am very glad indeed that the Government have at last agreed to take hold of this work and build it as a Government work. It is a very important road, and I am sure will be of great advantage to the people of Cape Breton. I am only sorry that the Government have not at the same time made some appropriation for the completion of railways in the western part of the Province of Nova Scotia; but I am in hopes that will be done before the House prorogues. I am glad also to hear the Minister of Public Works say that this road will not likely cost more than $20,000 a mile. I have heard that the reason a company could not heretofore be induced to undertake it is that it is a very heavy and expensive railway to construct.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does this estimate include the cost of equipment?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The information given to me is that the road will cost about $20,000 a mile. I understood that that would cover equipment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly the Maritime Province people ought to be grateful to the Government for recognising the necessity that exists for this railway, and for the disposition they are showing to meet that necessity by this vote. I do not know any portion of the Dominion that has been more long suffering than Cape Breton, or that better deserves railway facilities. Therefore I heartily approve of the action of the Government, and I am not disposed to question them closely. As they are willing to vote a sum to build the road, I am disposed to give them every latitude in the matter.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS. I think the position taken by the hon. Minister of Public Works is an extraordinary position. I am not expressing any opinion upon the merits of this undertaking; but Parliament is asked to vote $1,700,000, which may amount to twice that sum before this work is completed, and to do so without any information before it with regard to the undertaking—whether it be difficult or otherwise, what population is to be supplied by it, whether it is to be part of a great trunk line, or simply a tributary of the Intercolonial Railway—all the information which it is the bounden duty of the Government to give on an occasion of this sort is withheld. In fact the Government assume that the members of this House do not regard it as their duty as representatives of the people to give any attention to an expenditure of this kind. This work may be a very necessary work to the Island of Cape Breton; it may be that the circumstances of the people are such as to justify the Government in undertaking it; I do not know; but it is no answer to the enquiry for information for the hon. Minister to say that he has laid a report on this subject on the Table a few days ago. It may be that such a report was laid on the Table in manuscript; but no such report has been printed and distributed to the members of this House. The Government have assumed the responsibility of laying this proposition before the House; have they obtained all the information which they should obtain—which a company would seek before undertaking to invest money in the enterprise? If they have, then the hon. gentleman should give that information to the House. If they have not, the hon. gentleman is not in a position to submit this proposition to the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course I expected that the hon. gentleman would ask for more information. He is of an enquiring mind, and, of course, that is his duty; I do not find fault with him for it. If the hon. gentleman wants to know the direction of the two lines, it is very easy to tell him, because the reports and the surveys have been laid before the House.

Mr. MILLS. Have the Government made choice between those two lines?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have explained that the Government have not made choice. The Department, I said, was investigating as to which would afford the greatest facilities in construction, and be of the greatest benefit to the island and the whole country. Therefore all I could say was that one line would be about eighty five miles in length, more or less, and the other about eighty-three and a half miles. As to the population that will be benefitted by the railway, the hon. gentleman knows what the population of Cape Breton is, and this being the only railway across the Island, the population there will be greatly benefitted by it. As to how many will travel on the railway, I cannot say, but I hope a good many will. The hon. gentleman knows that the general system of railways of the country go as far as the Straits of Canso. The straits are not to be crossed, I suppose, by a bridge for some time; but the Government are informed that the straits may be crossed during the whole winter, and therefore there will be no difficulty in maintaining communication between the railway system of the remainder of Canada and Cape Breton. The maximum grade on either line will probably be about eighty feet to the mile.

Mr. CHARLTON. There can be no question that railway development in this country is a desirable object; but there is another question that should enter into our calculations: that is, what is our financial position, and our ability to embark in an enterprise of this kind? I think the House is entitled to more definite information as to the desirability of this line, as to the population of Cape Breton, as to the probable amount of business the line would do, and as to the probability of the line paying running expenses. The House are entitled also to have some data upon which to determine what route shall be selected for this road. Without giving this House the information we are entitled to, the Government ask us to vote $1,700,000 for the construction of the road; a further sum of a least $300,000 will be required for equipment, and further large sums will no doubt be required before the road is completed. We have made a good many railway investments in the East. We have expended millions on the Intercolonial Railway, which scarcely pays running expenses.

Mr. MITCHELL. Don't say anything against the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. CHARLTON. These roads are a great burden upon the taxpayers of the country. If our finances were in such a condition that we could spare large sums of money, we

could afford to be much more liberal than we can be under the circumstances. But, on the contrary, a very heavy debt is pressing on the country; we have not a surplus, but a large deficit; we have squandered large sums in unproductive enterprises, and it behoves this Government to be cautious as to the obligations it shall incur in the future. If this road were an absolute necessity, if it would even pay expenses, to say nothing of its giving a return on the capital invested, we might embark on its construction. But if it is to be an investment such as the Intercolonial Railway is, if, after it is built, it will not pay running expenses, and we must supplement the deficiency, certainly this country is not in a condition to build it. We have a net public debt amounting, if all our liabilities are included, to $250,000,000; we have an interest charge almost three times greater per capita than that of the United States to meet, and yet we are recklessly plunging into more debt, and I see in the action of the Government for incurring expenses for railway subsidies and the construction of lines that will be a burden on the country, great danger. We have voted over $10,000,000 to railway subsidies in the last two years; we are continually adding to the debt of the country in a way we are not justified in doing. I would like to see the people of Cape Breton with a railway; it would be a very desirable thing for them, but the question is: is it advisable for the taxpayers of Canada that we should add $2,000,000 to our debt. In our present circumstances we ought to move slowly, and the Government, in this enterprise, is proposing to place upon the taxpayers an additional burden which they are not justified in placing on them. I speak, of course, from the standpoint of an Ontario member. Were I a Maritime member I do not know but that I would be prepared to object to making the taxpayers of Ontario contribute to enlarging the railway system of my Province. The Government ought to exercise care and prudence before embarking on such an enterprise. I do not say the road ought not to be built, but the House is entitled to more definite information as to the character of the enterprise before incurring additional obligation.

Mr. DAVIES. As far as I understood hon. gentlemen on this side, they do not intend to offer any objection to the construction of railways in Cape Breton, if the Government will give them the necessary data on which to come to a conclusion. We are entitled to know whether this railway is to be built to Louisburg or to Sydney. The Government must have come to some conclusion in their own minds, but they will not give it to the House. The people of Cape Breton have the right to know, when such a large amount of money is voted, and probably justifiably voted, and the people of the other Provinces have the right to know, whether the Government have come to a conclusion, and what that conclusion is. I am anxious to know whether the Government intend this to be a part of the Short Line route or not; whether they intend to build to Louisburg or not. The Minister of Railways, a year or two ago, said Louisburg would be one of the termini of the great transcontinental road. Have the Government come to that conclusion, or are they going to build to Sydney? Surely the House have the right to know something about this. We are very often called to vote in the dark, but I do not believe, with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), that this House should entirely abdicate its functions. I do not believe it is a matter of indifference whether we should spend $2,000,000 or $5,000,000 in the construction of railways. If necessary to expend $1,000,000 or $2,000,000, so far from opposition this side will give cordial support, on getting proper information and being satisfied that the road will be built in the right way and on the right route. The Government could not come down and ask a vote without having come to a conclusion in their own mind. They would not insult the House by asking us to vote for a railway going they do not know where, and having come to a conclusion they should tell the House where they are going to build the road Is it to be part of the Short Line Railway, about the advantages of which we heard so much, two or three Sessions ago. I want to know how the Government are going to cross the Strait of Canso? Will they build a sub water tunnel? And they must have come to that conclusion, and have ascertained the probable cost of that tunnel. Either this road is to be part of the great Short Line or it is not. If it is, it must be connected by a sub-channel, or it will be perfectly useless in winter.

Mr. McLELAN. The straits are navigable in winter.

Mr. DAVIES. No, they are not.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, they are.

Mr. DAVIES. Not during all the winter. But, whether or not, how does the Minister of Railways propose to carry the short line across. Will he make a break in the railway system and transfer the luggage and other articles to a small boat crossing the strait? Surely we are entitled to some information.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I am not astonished to hear the Opposition from Ontario offer rather a factious opposition to the building of a railway on Cape Breton, but I am really astonished to see the hon. member from Prince Edward Island moving in the same direction. That island is about a third larger in size than the county of Inverness alone, yet it enjoys 210 miles of railway.

Mr. DAVIES. We built it ourselves.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). You built it at the expense of the Dominion.

Mr. DAVIES. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent facts, and I wish to inform him and the rest of the House that the people of the Dominion do not build our railways. We, the Prince Edward Island people, build for themselves. These 210 miles of railway they have built and paid for out of their own pockets.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I am very glad to see that Prince Edward Island built a railway and paid for it out of their own pocket book. In the Public Accounts I find, unfortunately, that that road has not been paid for yet, and that the cost of the road is part of the public debt of Canada, and that the people of Cape Breton pay their proportion of interest on that road as well as the people of Prince Edward Island. Such statements may do very well to draw the wool over the eyes of the people of other parts of the Dominion, but we down by the sea would be very glad, indeed, that the Dominion of Canada should be charged a few millions of dollars for public expenditures on Cape Breton Island, and, if so, I doubt very much if we would claim that we built that road out of our own pockets. To revert to the question which called me to my feet, I beg to call the attention of this committee to the fact that this Parliament unanimously granted the Pictou branch as aid to the building of railways east of Pictou. With that subsidy and an additional subsidy granted by the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia, it secured the extension of a railway from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso. Owing to a provision made by an Act of the Local Legislature in 1880, that road, from Truro to the Strait of Canso, was purchased by the Dominion Parliament at the cost of $1,2 0,000. I do not believe that there is an hon. gentleman in this House who will deny that Cape Breton has an equitable claim on the road from Truro to the Strait of Canso. The Pictou branch cost $2,400,000, and the Eastern Extension cost $1,200,000, besides $8,000 a mile granted by the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia. This is a valuable property. The Pictou branch is admittedly the best paying section of railroad in the Dominion of Canada, the Eastern Extension paying its working ex-

penses, and while I admit that the line through Cape Breton cannot be expected to pay more than working expenses, I hold that, in connection with the Eastern Extension and the Pictou branch, it will pay handsomely not only the expense of running it, but interest upon the cost as well. The net public debt of this Dominion is said by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to amount to $250,000,000. I think it is not to the credit of this Dominion that on Cape Breton, populated by 100,000 people, it may be said that up to this time not a dollar of money has been expended on public account except on the St. Peter's Canal. While the population of Cape Breton is one-fiftieth of the population of the whole Dominion, we would be entitled to an expenditure on public account to the extent of $5,000,000. Subtracting the cost of the St. Peters Canal from the $5,000,000, it would leave $4,225,000 which should be represented on that island in public works. Public works for which the Dominion is responsible and for which the people of the Dominion of Canada pay interest were accomplished on Prince Edward Island and in other sections of the Dominion of Canada, and I do not conceive of any reasonable ground why the Opposition in Ontario should offer any obstruction to the passage of this resolution, and I am certainly astonished that my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island should offer any.

Mr. DAVIES. You are mistaken altogether. I did not offer any.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I hope he will withdraw his opposition to the passage of this resolution.

Mr. VAIL. I do not understand that there is any opposition to this vote from this side of the House. Even my hon. friend who spoke of the large expenditure on railways, did not really object to this expenditure, but he asked very properly for further information in regard to it, and yet the hon. member from Cape Breton (Mr. Cameron) has charged my hon. friend from Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), with objecting to this. I understood him to say that it was only fair, it was only doing justice to Cape Breton. The member from Cape Breton stated that the Dominion had built the railway in Prince Edward Island. As I understand it, the Province of Prince Edward Island built that road. It was part of their debt when they entered Confederation. They were entitled to enter with a certain debt, and this railway was taken over as a part of that debt, so it was really charged against the Prince Edward Island Government, and they, to all intents and purposes, built the road and paid for it. In regard to this expenditure, there is a matter which has not been referred to by anybody yet, whether it is not an interference with private rights, I should like to hear from the member for Richmond (Mr. Paint) on that question. It seems to me that a Bill was passed through this House some time ago incorporating a company to build this road. I should like to know if that company has been bought off, or what they propose to do in connection with this vote that is being asked for by the Government for the purpose of building the road. Will the hon. member for Richmond tell the House that he is quite satisfied that this expenditure should be made?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not feel disposed to agree with my friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Cameron) when he makes the assertion that the Opposition from Ontario are going to oppose this grant. So far as I am personally concerned, I have no wish to offer any factious opposition to it, and I do not think that any member from Ontario has any such intention; but I do submit that, when a grant of this kind is asked, the House has a right to demand the fullest information which can be given respecting it, and that, I submit, has not in the present instance been given to the House. A large subsidy has been voted by this House to assist in building this road. The hon. Minister has told the House to-day that the Government tried to form a company with the aid of that subsidy, and that they failed. I think the House is entitled to know why they failed. There must have been some reason for it, the subsidy was large. Could no company be found to build and operate that road with the aid of that subsidy? That is one of the facts that this House has certainly a right to know something about. If the Government have failed to do it with that assistance, there must be some reason for it. Is the reason that the road is going to be of so little value that it is not going to pay the running expenses or anything like it? If that is the case, this House ought to know it. It is no use for the Government to say they have the matter in their hands and they are responsible. The House cannot abdicate its functions. The House has the right, and it is its duty and privilege, to ask for and to have the fullest information that can be given on the subject. Speaking for myself individually, so far as Cape Breton is concerned, I am willing to stretch a point, even if there is not a reasonable prospect of the road paying anything, even if we are to be saddled with some expense to keep the road running; but I am not willing to go into it blindfold; I want to know what we are likely to assume. We are asked to-day to vote $1,700,000, but I submit that that does not represent anything like the obligation the Dominion is going to incur in the building of the road. I am very doubtful, from what little I know about the building of railways, from the experience of railways in the past, and from the nature of the country through which this road is to run, if the debt which we are likely to incur for building and equipping the road does not amount to $3,000,000; and before we assume such a liability, the House is entitled to the fullest information that can be given.

Mr. HACKETT. I am glad to observe there is no real opposition to this resolution. The people of Cape Breton, as is well known, have suffered a long time for the want of railway accommodation. Now that the matter has been brought up in a practical way by the Government, I am glad to see that there is no real opposition; and although there is some criticism by hon. gentlemen opposite, they all aver they do not mean to oppose these resolutions. The Island of Cape Breton is a very rich island in mineral wealth and in agricultural and fishery resources, and I am quite convinced that when this road is built, traversing that island from one end to the other, it will be found to be a paying speculation. I rise principally, however, to correct a remark of my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron), to whose great exertions and zeal, I make no doubt, the people of Cape Breton are largely indebted for having these resolutions brought before the House. The hon. gentleman has stated that the people of Prince Edward Island have a railway built by the Dominion of Canada. Now, that is quite incorrect. The people of Prince Edward Island were engaged in building that railway when the island entered the Union. It is well known that when a Province enters the Union she comes in with a certain amount of indebtedness per head of the population. There is an assumed debt and an actual debt, and the interest on the difference between the two goes a long way to make up the revenues of that Province. Now, when Prince Edward Island came in it was charged with three millions and a quarter dollars for the building of this railway. That was the actual indebtedness of the Province, and amounted to $45 per head of the population. The island came in with the same rate of indebtedness per head of the population as the other Provinces, this amount being deducted, and the island has paid interest at 5 per cent. on the difference, which makes a portion of the subsidy at the present time. Now if Prince Edward Island did not build that railway, if the three and a quarter million dollars were

not charged to the island, the people of to day would be receiving $200,000 more of a subsidy than they do now. Consequently the people of the island will have 200 miles of railway while their debt has been assumed by the Dominion and interest has been paid upon it by the people of that Province ever since. I regret to see that a misapprehension prevails in the House to the effect that because the Dominion of Canada assumed the building of the island railway, it was not afterwards taken from the people of the island in another form.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I think the Government deserve the thanks of the people of this country for having at last grappled with this question in the only way possible to secure the construction of this road. It has been the play ground of parties for many a year. I can remember when I was a very small boy this question being urged of railway communication with the Island of Cape Breton. It has been the hobby horse of politicians *pro* and *con*, but to-day it assumes an aspect before the people that it never assumed before. It will be the highway between the old world and the new. It will affect Upper Canada as much as the Lower Provinces, it will be the shortest route of communication between the old world and the new.

Mr. MILLS. Which? There are two.

Mr. WOODWORTH. No, there is only one. My hon. friends always make a mistake the moment they come to discuss the geography of Cape Breton. They do not seem to know whether it is in Russia or where. I tell my hon. friend that I can take a horse and drive in an hour and a quarter between Louisburg and Cape Breton, and what is the good of talking about two lines Louisburg and Sydney are adjacent.

An hon. MEMBER. Twenty-five miles apart.

Mr. WOODWORTH. No, they are not. You may make them 50 miles apart if you like, but you can take your horse and drive in an hour and a quarter between the two places. I have been there and the hon. member for Bothwell has not. I want to say this about this proposed railway between Canso and Louisburg, or Sydney. To-day the steamer *Umbria*, if she coals at Liverpool, takes 2,500 tons of coal to last her to New York, but if she coals at Louisburg or Sydney she only requires to take 1,750 tons, and she can have the displacement of all these tons of coal in freight, she may supply that in freight, thereby making a great saving at so many pounds a ton; and any gentleman can reckon it up, and the same way going back to England. Besides that, you have only got two-thirds of the distance between Liverpool and New York by sea, and you can take the rest by railway and vary the journey. More than that, you are in New York one day earlier than you are to-day by steamship, or if you want to go to Chicago the distance will be very much shortened indeed. And as to the mails to the United States, I am not a prophet, but I believe that the mails to the United States will go by the way of Louisburg or Sydney, that they will be put on board of the train there and reach their destination many hours before they can reach it now. Any man taking his family across the Atlantic can leave New York one day after the time he needs to do it now, he can make part of the journey by railway and meet his steamship at Louisburg or Sydney, and this route between parts of the old world and the new will be conducted partly on land, while it is now altogether on sea. Canada is the spot where they land the mails, where the passengers take boat again, where they leave the boat and go over Canadian soil to go to the United States and to all parts of Canada. So that this question has a national importance. The Great Architect of the universe has placed Cape Breton out there in the sea, the nearest point to the old world, it is placed there for a purpose. Before we were confederated we did not feel the necessity of the question as much as we see it now. But now that the engineers of the world are competing against one another for the shortest distance between points, a few hours in time are of the utmost importance. I tell you that this railway connecting, as it does, all parts of America with the old world, in the shortest possible time, is of great national importance. But more than that, with the new line building there, with the shortest line you can get from Montreal to Louisburg, you will have but twenty-four hours, or four days from Montreal to the Pacific coast, making five days from the Pacific coast to Louisburg, and five days from Louisburg to Liverpool—only ten days from the Pacific away across to Liverpool. Why, it is a most wonderful stride and march in the affairs of men. I say now to my hon. friend from Bothwell, and to his friends, that not five years will go over their heads—not three years after this railway is built will go over their heads—before they will see the national importance of this work, that will give an impetus to the Upper Provinces, that will give to Canada a nationality and a solidarity that it never before possessed. This is not merely a Cape Breton question, but it has been elevated out of the class of local political questions and has become a national question, and I think the Government deserve the thanks of this country for at last coming to the rescue of that Province away down into the sea. But I want to say that there is a western part of the Province as well as an eastern part, and I trust that the eight counties lying to the west of Halifax will not be left out in the cold but that they will have a share of the public money. It is true that this road is more important from a national point of view. Although a western man myself, I concede freely and fully that this railway is of greater importance than perhaps any railways to be built in Nova Scotia to-day; but from a western standpoint, as a member of the western portion of that Province, I shall hold the Government to a strict account to give us a fair share of the public money in building roads that are necessary to be built, for instance, the missing link, and the Nictaux and the Atlantic Central Railway. I must congratulate the hon. members for Cape Breton on the fact that this is no longer a political issue, but that the dream of their lives is about to be realised. I know that the hon. member for Inverness and his colleagues have always been earnest advocates of this road, and I have to congratulate them that the Government of the country have at last seen their way no longer to "dicker" with a company in New York or anywhere else, but to come forward themselves and announce their intention to build the road forthwith, and to stand or fall on that question.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). This question has been before the country for over three years, and yet some hon. members are under the impression that this is the first time it has been before the House. In 1883 the Short Line Railway Company obtained a subsidy of $3,200 a mile. It was found that this was not sufficient to enable the company to build the road, and, in 1884, $150,000 per annum for fifteen years was granted for a line to Louisburg, being a total amount of $1,250,000. Therefore we have now a subsidy of $362,000 in cash and the Eastern Extension for the purpose of building a road from the Strait of Canso to Sydney or Louisburg. I have carefully examined the report of the chief Dominion engineer on this question, and I find the cost of the railway is estimated at $20,000 a mile, including equipment So the outside limit of the cost of a railway from Canso to Sydney or Louisburg, and the distance to each is about the same from the Strait of Canso, would be at the outside $1,700,000. We have already on the Statute-book a subsidy of $1,800,000, including the cash subsidy with the Eastern Extension Railway. We did hope, and I was one of those who did hope, that the Short Line Company, with the subsidies

granted, would be enabled to build a road from the Strait of Canso to Sydney or Louisburg. I was disappointed. On 14th May, 1886, the company submitted a proposal to the Department of Railways asking:

"That in lieu of the forms of subsidy above enumerated a fixed and increased sum be authorised to be paid semi-annually. That it be authorised to be placed in the form of guarantee of interest on bonds. That the bonds so guaranteed in respect to interest for a term of years may be sold, provided the whole proceeds of the sale of such bonds shall be placed on deposit in the treasury of the Government at four per cent interest to be paid to the company having such contract *pro rata* on completed sections of railway. And we respectfully suggest that $150,000 per annum, payable semi-annually for fifteen years, would not be an unreasonable subsidy in addition to the section of railway already authorised to be given, to secure the construction of so long a line of railroad in a country where the railroad will improve the country, and must make its business before it can be expected to earn enough above working expenses to pay interest on a sufficient amount of securities."

Thus the House will observe that the subsidy asked by the Short Line Railway Company for the construction of a railway from Moncton to Sydney and Louisburg aggregates $2,225,000 besides the Eastern Extension; and from Oxford to Sydney and Louisburg it aggregates $1,800,000 besides the Eastern Extension. That company, through whom we did hope the Short Line would be built from Oxford to Sydney and Louisburg, desired to obtain in subsidies more than the cost of the road to the Government. When the road is finished I am satisfied no one will be disappointed as to the quantity of freight which will pass over it. The mining properties of the island will be developed, the fishing industry will also be benefited and the business on the road will be such as will be not only gratifying to the Government which undertakes its construction but also will commend itself to the members of this House.

Mr. PAINT. I thank the Government for the liberal provision that has been made for railway extension into Cape Breton Island. It would be my duty, Mr. Speaker, as a representative of Cape Breton in this House, to advocate and plead for any useful railway in that island. If these miles of track began and ended in Nova Scotia and were the outcome of local enterprise, subsidised by the Dominion Government, as a ready means of dividing the Dominion moneys among the seven partners, I would not consider it an unnatural proceeding if any hon. member should question the propriety of granting such a subsidy. But, Sir, this railway is a Dominion one, it is the first and most important link of our transcontinental system of railway communication. Mr. Richard Potter, the late manager of the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada writes thus to me:

"Ever since 1873, I have anticipated the inauguration of Louisburg as the chief Atlantic port of the American continent, and your scheme provides for this."

Such being the case, any member of the House of Commons of Canada voting against or not voting for the railway project now under consideration will, in my opinion, be guilty of a violation of his duty to this Canada of ours in thus sacrificing her interests. Hon. gentlemen will remember that, in 1883, a subsidy was voted by Parliament for a railway from Oxford, Nova Scotia, to Louisburg, in Cape Breton. That vote was supplemented by Parliament in 1884, but the road was not proceeded with and that vote is still unexpended. Last year, however, Parliament voted a further sum of money to make surveys in Cape Breton on Government account. Now that the Government have undertaken to make surveys for railways in Cape Breton, the expectations of the people have been raised, and they fully hope and expect that the Government will follow up that survey by voting a subvention sufficient to ensure its immediate construction, and placing the enterprise beyond a doubt. This would be in reality an extension of the Intercolonial Railway direct to Louisburg. They have been for a great many years contributing towards the construction of railways and other public works in different parts of the

Dominion, yet no expenditure has been made, to this day, for a railway on the island, although it is one of the oldest settled portions of the Dominion. I may remind the Government that the discontent in Cape Breton is deep and universal, as it is impossible to remove from the minds of the people, in every portion of the island, that its five members exert no influence at Ottawa, and that the electors who send them here are, in this most important matter, treated with contempt. While rejoicing as a Cape Breton member, at substantial aid being afforded to any railway in that island, yet I cannot, as a member of the Dominion Parliament, allow the true interests of Canada to be injured by the possible selection of an unsuitable port as the terminus of the Cape Breton Railway. The option is given in the resolutions of making Louisburg or Sydney the terminus of this much-needed railway through the length of Cape Breton; but I hold that there is no choice, that there is but one port both in summer and winter as such terminus, and that is the port of Louisburg. Throughout the entire correspondence between the Dominion and Nova Scotian Governments, in 1874, on the question of subvention for this railway in Cape Breton, no mention is made whatever of any other eastern terminus but Louisburg. The following passage occurs in a letter addressed to the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, the then Premier of the Dominion, by the financial director of a wealthy English association:—

"It may not be out of place to state, also, allowing that the works now being executed on the canals of the St. Lawrence will permit, within three years, of vessels of 1,000 to 1,200 tons burthen proceeding from Chicago to the sea; that Louisburg, with its cheap and abundant coal and iron, an open harbor all the year round for steam navigation, and situated at the mouth of the St. Lawrence, cannot fail in becoming the true seaport of that river, and for the mighty trade which is yet to flow over it to England and the continent of Europe."

The same Mr. D. J. Kennelly, in November, 1874, writes:

"Moreover, I explained my firm conviction that Louisburg, with cheap coal and iron, must become the seaport of the St. Lawrence, for the enormous trade to come forward through the intended system of canals; and as passenger traffic gravitated to the place of shortest sea passage, so Louisburg eventually would form the trans-Atlantic port for mails and passengers."

The offer of this capitalist to build this road was based on calculations formed by Mr. W. H. Tremaine, C.E., after completing the field work of the survey for his employer, Mr. Kennelly. On the military principle that it is lawful to receive instruction from an enemy, and adopting the almost legal maxim that the best evidence is that extracted from the adversary's witness, I may be pardoned if I quote from a pamphlet written in support of the claims of Sydney Harbor to the terminus of such a railway as has just been provided by the Dominion Parliament. In February, 1851, at a public meeting in Sydney, C.B., a committee was appointed to prepare a report with reference to connecting that island by steam navigation with the Mother Country, and by railway with the United States and the neighboring colonies, and to enquire into the capabilities of the harbor of Sydney as one of the termini of the projected European and North American Railway. The following composed the committee: Hon. Mr. Justice E. M. Dodd, Messrs. R. Brown, T. D. Archibald, H. Davenport and P. Moore. The report states that:

"In the summer of 1850 a convention was held at Portland, in the United States, which was attended by persons of great influence in the Union, by delegates from the British Provinces representing their respective Governments, and others deputed to further particular local interests in the Provinces of Canada, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia proper. Cape Breton was not represented, but some of the delegates remarked on her important position on the map of North America.

"A series of resolutions were adopted declaratory of the unanimous opinion held in the United States and British Provinces that the spirit of the age demands a shorter way of interchange between Europe and America than even the present reduced passage affords, a determination to effect a junction by extending the lines of railway at present in operation in the United States to the eastern seaboard of Nova Scotia, and thence by bridging the Atlantic with powerful steamers to some place in Ireland.

"It appears to your committee that this object can only be accomplished by a route which, crossing the Atlantic at its narrowest part, obtains a footing on the most easterly point of America, and shortens the sea by adding to the extent of land travelling, since ocean steam vessels have not yet exceeded an average speed of twelve and a-half miles per hour, whilst the locomotive can easily accomplish forty miles."

I may remark that the ocean passage to Louisburg may be made in five days, and that the mails would be delivered about two days sooner in New Orleans and the Western States if landed at Louisburg, and not at New York. The committee continue:

"Cape Breton from its geographical position has been very generally designated in the United States the Long Wharf of America, a truthfulness of description peculiarly significant of the sagacity of its people; situated 59° 38' and 61° 40' west longitude, and 45° 27' and 47° 5' north latitude, its greatest length about one hundred and its greatest breadth eighty miles, comprising an area of about 2,000,000 acres, of which at least 1,000,000 are fit for cultivation, abounding with mineral wealth, the most important of which consists of extensive coal fields; with a climate singularly healthy, and a population estimated at, in 1886, 85,000, engaged principally in agriculture, mining and the fisheries; it is unquestionably one of the most valuable possessions of the British Empire. The island has several good harbors, including Sydney on its eastern and Louisburg on its southern seaboard * * * Louisburg is the nearest to Europe, being only 1,940 miles from Galway; Sydney is 1,950 miles from Galway * * * It is true the navigation of Sydney is impeded by ice, generally from two to four months in the winter whilst Louisburg, also an excellent harbor is open nearly all the year round * * * Sydney as has already been stated, is impeded by ice in the winter."

The practicability of constructing a line of railway from Sydney to New Brunswick, was then considered by the committee. They continue:

"No railway has yet been made in the Island of Cape Breton, but the concurrent testimony of travellers, land surveyors and others who know the country well, is conclusive that a most favorable line can be obtained—commencing at Sydney, thence up to and along the valley of the River Mira to Grand River Lake, thence through St. Peter's to the Gut of Canso—the distance of seventy miles."

Here I have conclusive evidence that the route of the railway should be through the county of Richmond, for after leaving Louisburg, I would follow the course given by the committee for the railway I desire to see constructed. The officially reported length of the present narrow gauge railway between Sydney and Louisburg is thirty-two miles, consequently a railway from Louisburg to the Gut of Canso would be many miles shorter, assuming the estimate given by the committee to be correct. It is very far from my desire to prevent communication with the port of Sydney from Nova Scotia proper. But I have naturally a determination to prevent if possible the sacrifice of the interests of Louisburg, and consequently those of the county of Richmond. A few miles from Louisburg, there is a convenient and suitable locality whence a branch line might deviate toward Sydney, utilising the present graded road-bed of the narrow gauge railway, now built between Louisburg and Sydney. In order completely to establish the vital point, that Louisburg, is open to navigators all the year round, which is not quite conceded by the Sydney committee, whose other arguments make so much in my favor, I may be permitted to quote from a pamphlet published in London by a gentleman having a perfect knowledge of what he asserts by personal investigation of Cape Breton in 1817, when General Ainslie was Governor. Writing about the climate he says:

"About the first of January navigation closes, and the harbors of the island, except Louisburg, Main-à-Dieu, and St. Peter's Bay, are frozen up so as to form a complete bridge of ice, &c."

In that accurate compilation known as Lovell's Gazetteer (Edition 1874) we find the statement that Louisburg has a fine harbor open the year round. The weight of business and trade tends to the south side of the island. If the road goes through Inverness, it will always be a mere local one with limited traffic. If the road should pass through Richmond county, its course will lie through the extensive and fertile district of Mira River, Loch Lomond, St. Peter', Black River, River Inhabitants to Hawkesbury. The vast cod banks off Louisburg and along the coast line of Richmond, where fishing can be carried on all winter, and the fisheries in the Bras d'Or Lake will furnish this railway with thousands of tons of freight, in the shape of fresh fish for the markets of Western Ontario and the United States. While Louisburg remained in the hands of the French, it exported 500,000 quintals of cod annually, amounting to 30,000 tons in weight; and 600 vessels frequented this harbor. This freight of fish would not be secured if the line takes the northerly route, for not a boat ventures out from the gulf ports to fish for five months in each year, the Gulf of the St. Lawrence being covered with ice.

Mr. KIRK. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is in order or not. But it does appear to me that it is unnecessary, at this time, to discuss which route shall be selected. The object of the Government in making this vote——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. KIRK. I think I am in order, and if I am out of order on one point, I shall not be out of order before I sit down.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman can state the point of order.

Mr. KIRK. I wish you would allow me to do that. The point of order is that the hon. gentleman is reading his speech, and I doubt if we can be expected to sit here listening for an hour to a gentleman reading his speech on a subject which is not under discussion at all.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You can never make a speech you do not read.

Mr PAINT. I am reading a report of a very important committee, and I am nearly through. Arichat, as capacious and safe a harbor as one could desire, freezes later and opens weeks earlier than Sydney. Cariboo harbor now called Port Malcom also in Richmond county, near the Strait of Canso, which could at any time contain in perfect safety 1,000 large ships, is open the year round. This would be the natural outlet of the county of Inverness. All these fine harbors in the county of Richmond, with others which I have not named would serve as feeders to a railroad through the county and should not be treated with indifference by this proposed line of railroad being deflected to the so-called central route. The choice should fall to the best harbour. We accept on this point the decision of the French engineers and naval commanders, who, in 1713, spent about $7,000,000 on its fortifications, convinced of its being the best naval station in Cape Breton. Sydney was founded in the year 1786, when the fortress, citadel, and town of Louisburg were abandoned. It was only selected as the seat of Government, because Louisburg was considered as not being well situated for the encouragement of settlers, and a constant temptation to France to seize it if it remained intact. The harbor of Louisburg is among the best in North America, and contains good anchorage. Its entrance, formed by two small islands, is four hundred yards wide; and by means of the high cape and lighthouse in its vicinity is discoverable by ships at a great distance. The location of the Cape Breton Railway is a question which concerns every person, and affects the interests of every citizen or resident of the Island of Cape Breton, the Dominion of Canada, and North America, and therefore should be calmly, deliberately and intelligently discussed in the spirit of justice and impartiality. If a false step is now taken in the final settlement of this question, the consequences would be most deplorable, for it would be most disastrous to the interests of our country. Every person cannot expect to have the railway pass through his district and by his door. It ought not to be for personal conveniences and individual advantages that millions of dollars are expended in the construction of railways, but for the opening up of the country and for the good of the public in

general. Among the different lines proposed for the Cape Breton Railway, the one that would take the least money and would be of the greatest benefit to the island should certainly be considered. The question at issue, then, is where should the railway line be located, having Louisburg for its objective point, so that it would be of the greatest benefit to the whole island? This can only be ascertained by clear and thorough information as to the various proposed routes. Let me first commence with the central route. This line is to start from the Strait of Canso, following in a direct course to the lower part of the River Inhabitants, thence in the valley along the river by River Dennis to the head of Whycocomah Bay; thence winding its way through the Whycocomah village and by the north shore of said bay through the settlements of Middle River and Big Baddeck into Baddeck town; thence to a point opposite to Big Harbor, where it crosses Big Bras d'Or at a place called the Three Islands; from there through the Island of Boularderie to Little Bras d'Or to North Sydney and Sydney and Louisburg. This route would be about 100 miles long to Sydney. The great drawbacks and difficulties of this line would be the high grading of the road and its expensive bridges.

Mr. MULOCK. How many bridges would there be?

Mr. PAINT. About twenty. Some parts of the country through which it would have to pass are very hilly and mountainous. The second line is the Grand Narrows route. This also starts from the Strait of Canso, following the same course and going the same way as the central route, till it comes to the waters of the River Dennis Basin, where it turns to the east, following the windings of the land and the indentures of the shore to the Grand Narrows, where it crosses the Barra Strait to Grand Narrows, south side; thence to Benacadie, Escasoni, north side of East Bay into Sydney. This road is reported by the engineers to be ninety-two miles long with the possibility of shortening it five miles, which would leave it eighty-seven miles long; but it would not pass through any important town or village. Besides the difficulties of bridging the Grand Narrows is a matter which should claim most serious attention. The third, or East Bay route starts from the Strait of Canso, follows the course and direction of the southern route to the Lower River Inhabitants, continuing on to St. Peter's, thence it keeps by the south shore of the Bras d'Or Lake through Soldiers' Cove, Red Islands, Irish Cove, Big Pond, to East Bay, where it separates into two branches, one leading into Sydney town and the other into North Sydney. The distance is about 88 miles from Hawkesbury into North Sydney, and eighty-three miles into Sydney. The fourth line, or southern route, leaves Guernsey, Point Tupper, near Hawkesbury, Strait of Canso, county of Richmond, and follows in a direct line the southern shore to the north of Isle Madam, and River Bourgeois to St. Peter's; thence to the north of L'Ardoise by Grand River, and between Loch Lomond and Framboise and Fourchu to the head of Mira Bay, thence by Gabarous Bay and Eagle Head, where the only important rock cutting occurs, to Louisburg Harbor. It is eighty-two miles long, and has been twice surveyed, once by the Local Government, and last year by the Dominion Government. Let us now consider more particularly the respective merits of the routes most worthy of attention so far proposed for the railway extension into Cape Breton. If the so-called central or northern route were adopted the result would be to deprive the county of Richmond and its 18,000 inhabitants of all railway communication whatsoever. This line has just been surveyed and no serious difficulties encountered in the shape of deep cuttings or heavy bridges. I ask therefore can it be seriously contemplated to construct a railway about 115 miles to Louisburg by way of Sydney when eighty-two miles is ample to reach Louisburg direct, ten miles shorter than any line possible to Sydney by the miscalled central or northern route; the latter involving the construction of an immense drawbridge at the Grand Narrows some 2 000 or 5,000 feet long over a swift current, some seventy to eighty feet deep, costing one million dollars. Such a bridge would greatly interfere yearly with upwards of 1,000 vessels passing through St. Peter's Canal. Many captains would prefer going by sea to hauling through a bridge in a swift current and night detention. To my mind the first and most important point to be decided is, what railway is wanted? Do you want a railway to Cape North, then by all means have the railway through Inverness and Victoria counties. Do you want a railway to Christmas Island? Then by all means go *vid* Grand Narrows and get ferried over until we can afford to build a bridge the cost of which would astonish the Finance Minister of the Dominion. There are no less than twenty heavy bridges *vid* Grand Narrows route. Do you want a railway to Louisburg as a continuation of the railway system of Canada, to form a part of a main line from Europe on the east to China and India and Australia on the west? Then by all means go *vid* St. Peter's direct to Louisburg, where there are no serious engineering difficulties to be encountered, no ferries nor bridges of consequence. The idea of a crooked line of railway endeavoring to tap a number of counties is, to use a homely expression, played out. I contend that the commerce on the Bras d'Or Lake must, for all time to come, depend largely on steam and sailing craft for accommodation. Besides, a bridge at Grand Narrows would greatly obstruct steamers and sailing vessels, with a tendency to drive them off, if anything, leaving the towns and villages worse off than they now are. But with a railway from Louisburg, along the southern route, *vid* St. Peter's, connecting with the railway system of Canada, sufficient fish could be shipped to supply all Western Canada, including United States—that portion bordering on the great lakes—thereby developing trade relations between east and west, to the mutual advantage of both, and creating inter-provincial trade, and a better union than that began by the British North America Act. It might also induce our western relations to eventually understand that Western Canada is not the whole of the Dominion, and that the Maritime Provinces, with their fisheries, coal and shipping, are entitled to much more consideration from the Government of Canada than they have yet received. A letter, lately received from Cape Breton county, reads as follows:—

"I am glad they are getting weak on the Grand Narrows route and this East Bay route they will find wont do, either, as it will require ten or more miles to get from St Peter's to Sydney than from St. Peter's to Louisburg and will make the line from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg at least thirty miles longer. How hard it is to get those people to see the thing in its true light."

The idea of a road swinging round the southern shore of East Bay Mountains merely to satisfy a morbid spleen against Louisburg and destroy our claim as the shortest road to Europe. If they would only adopt my plan, *i. e.*, St. Peter's to Louisburg, thence to Sydney, thence to Little Bras d'Or, tapping North Sydney, they would have the most profitable and accommodating road that can be possibly built for Cape Breton, then for Victoria and Inverness a road from Baddeck to Margaree, some thirty-six miles. By this plan you would have the whole thing arranged for a splendid steamboat system and will avoid the boats competing with the railway.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What Counties would the southern road go through?

Mr. PAINT. Through Richmond and Cape Breton counties. The port of Louisburg is in Cape Breton. As regards the relative distances, I will read the following letter from Cape Breton:—

From Sydney to Valentia Island	2,010 miles.
From Louisburg to Valentia Island	1,987 "
In favor of Louisburg	23 "

"Now this twenty-three miles will grow into forty-six if the proper view is taken of it, viz., a steamer coming from Europe steers directly to Louisburg passing about nine miles south of Scatterie. Now look at the map and see the actual distance from this line to Sydney. You will see that a ship bound to Sydney from Europe has to deviate from her direct course to get to Sydney after passing Newfoundland and will have to come back out of Sydney bight the same distance of the deviation, before she is on the direct route to Europe, or going west as the case may be, which in most all cases will make ninety to 120 miles sea voyage in favor of Louisburg over Sydney. So that it is essentially necessary to preserve and protect the great interest of Cape Breton in the shortest route that there should not be thirty miles lost on land as would be the case if the railway is built *via* those routes advocated (by the East Bay and Narrows to Sydney), and Louisburg being evidently nearer Europe and possessing a magnificent harbor and accessible all the year round. There should be no question respecting the routes. Only to adopt the shortest, and Sydney and North Sydney would find it to their advantage to be connected with Louisburg in the most direct way possible than to be the fag end of a railway shut up in the gulf ice for four and a half months of the year."

Again he says:

"I regret very much to see a scurrilous article in the Ottawa *Free Press* of the 24th inst. *re* yourself, in connection with the proposed southern railway route in Cape Breton from the Strait of Canso, *viâ* St. Peter's to Louisburg. I have no doubt but that this article has been inspired by the advocates of the so-called 'central route' on this island. 'People from Cape Breton' who have a practical knowledge of the country—its trade, latent mineral and commercial wealth—know well that the southern route is the one and only route that will advantageously and economically accommodate and develop the resources of the island; and to be brief, in regard to the silly remark of 'half a carload of blueberries as the only likely freight over this road' is simply the worst kind of ignorant spleen. Now I will give you my idea of what it would likely be. First, this road will accommodate fully ninety miles of a coast from the Strait of Canso to Scatterie, which is one of the finest fishing districts in the Dominion, and the port of Louisburg, being the most central in the great fisheries of North America, would naturally become—when connected with the great western cities by a railway—the great fish depot of Canada and largely that of the United States, and a thousand tons of fish daily, preserved in ice, would be only a reasonable estimate of what could or would be sent over this road to the great markets of the west. Now the next, and perhaps the greatest, would be the Atlantic European mail and passenger traffic. This is warranted by Louisburg being the nearest available port to Europe and being on the line of the most direct route from Montreal to Liverpool, which, without exaggeration, will make a saving of about 30 hours over any other route that can be adopted. Louisburg being already connected by rail with the principal coal mines of Cape Breton would become the great commercial centre of those mining districts, and being situated half-way between Liverpool and New Orleans, must eventually become the coaling port or halfway house for those steamers that ply between the two places. Now take those several great commercial feeders for the railway to Louisburg and the subsequent local traffic that would result, and you will find there is no section of a proposed railway in America that has such a promising future. As for the barrenness of the route from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg, as asserted in the *Free Press* item, it is not true. It is fairly an agricultural country and abounds in mineral wealth, such as iron, copper, gold, bismuth, cobalt, zinc, molybdenum, manganese, &c., &c. The southern railway route is the one that should be adopted as being the most essential to the prosperity of this much-neglected island of ours, notwithstanding the spleeny assertions of interested land lubbers whose ideas of a country's wealth is the agricultural products of the vicinity in which they themselves vegetated. To conclude, I may say here that the idea of a railway in Cape Breton *viâ* what is called the 'central route,' is the silliest scheme that men could possibly be guilty of under the circumstances, as it neither accommodates one side or the other of the island. I am sorry that any one from the island can be so stupid and sectional as to advocate it.

"Yours truly,

"A CAPE BRETON MARINER."

Now, as regards the port of Louisburg. This is from the special correspondent of the Halifax *Herald*:

"LOUISBURG, C. B., May 13.—During the past fortnight our harbor has been thronged with vessels of every size and rig, waiting for the ice to move off the coast. They are all bound for Sydney and outport mines to load coal for the States, the late strikes there having caused quite a scarcity of the black diamond. It is a great pity that the railway from here to the Reserve mines and Sydney was not in a fit condition to be travelled over. Coal was in great demand this spring, freights were high, our harbor open all the winter, and the coast from this west free from ice, so that quite a brisk and large trade might have been carried on. If ever, this winter and spring, I think, has shown the superiority of the harbor of Louisburg over that of Sydney and others in Cape Breton, as a winter-shipping port. It must prove to any unprejudiced mind, that is the only fit terminus for the railway extension into Cape Breton. I dare say many think otherwise, but I fear that in nine cases out of ten they have 'an axe to grind.' I have none, but I speak merely on account of the natural advantages which Louisburg possesses over other ports in Cape Breton, and which must tell sooner or later."

Here is a letter from a gentleman of standing and importance, a leading clergyman in the island, Donald Sutherland, an old country minister:

"GABARUS, C.B., 2nd April, 1886.

"In the Ottawa *Daily Free Press* of 24th March, under the heading of 'Sessional and other Notes', is an item on the Cape Breton line of railway which truly surprises me. The writer there says 'that Mr. Paint's scheme is generally considered impracticable.' This is not true, so far as people down here are concerned, and I am one of them. The writer says again: 'People from Cape Breton state that so barren is the country along this proposed route that as regards local traffic about one-half a carload of blueberries a year could be obtained and nothing else.' This is a lie, and the tongue that would make such a statement should be kept for a curiosity. The truth is, Sir, your scheme is the only practicable one, and although I do not make it my special business to interfere in these matters, I should say that the line should make Louisburg the terminus if for the sake of connection with the coal railway line ending there, but that the chief terminus should be in Gabarus, which affords one of the most magnificent harbors in the world, and that a branch might go from Gabarus to Sydney—the distance of about twenty miles. By this means, as the coal railway already connects Sydney with Louisburg, Sydney would have in reality two branches connecting with this great line instead of one, viz., with Gabarus and Louisburg. The coal railway to Louisburg should be operated and must be operated at any rate, and it might be subsidised by both the Local and the Dominion Governments to do the work now so irregularly and expensively done by so many indifferent harbors and breakwaters along the coast.

"With regard to amount of traffic, it would have the traffic of the whole Island of Cape Breton run over a road of seventy miles in length, from the Strait of Canso to Gabarus, or of eighty-two miles to Louisburg, fed by a productive country and an extraordinary wealthy ocean, minerals, grain, fish and forest, the very berries spoken of and many more kinds in cartloads. Even this spring we do not know what to do with our potatoes—so plenty are they, and withal so good. This country is thoroughly stocked with meat, more than the people require for home consumption, and if there was a railway line they could get it away; and they could consign their fish, fresh or salt, in like manner. And the most experienced fishermen we have say that all winter they could carry on the work of fishing and packing it in ice and consigning it all over America, and by the convenience of steamer to England as well. At Mr. Donkin's request I gave him in writing a statement of what minerals are to my knowledge to be found on this line of railway, and that statement should accompany his report to Government. But whether or not, it is proper here to say that copper, bismuth, gold, silver, iron, manganese, lead and coal exist on this line of railway. From the St. Peter's Canal to Louisburg is one continuous belt of valuable minerals.

"The line itself is easy, on good bottom, not through barren or soft yielding land, and not through rock, with the exception of a few yards at Eagle Head, perhaps, between Gabarus and Louisburg. I have travelled extensively on railways in Europe and America, and I have to say that it would be hard to find an easier line than this is. From my conversation with the engineers employed on it too, I think their report will carry me out in this. I conclude in my honest convictions that this line to Gabarus and Louisburg would pay a company better eventually, without one cent's subsidy, than any other line of equal extent that can possibly be selected even with a subsidy of $6,000 a mile, *i.e.*, within the extent of the Island of Cape Breton. It will be the embouchure of all the American lines pointing in the direction of shortness to the old world, and it will command its own commerce—let adversaries to it say what they will. Might as well instruct a cannon ball, as soon as discharged, to deviate from its course, as overbear the natural lines of sea and land in point of directness in the channels chosen by commerce and trade.

"I have the honor to be, yours sincerely,

"DONALD SUTHERLAND."

For vessels engaged in the immense traffic between Europe and the United States of America, Louisburg is by far the most important station of any. It presents the following advantages:—1st. Its harbor is open and free from ice all the year round. Sydney is usually closed from December to May. This I can attest to from an official record kept for sixteen years in succession by myself. Even Boston and Halifax harbors, though several degrees more southerly, are not free from occasional inconvenience in severe winters from floating ice. Louisburg, with rare and brief exceptions, is kept open during the winter by the unceasing restlessness of the Atlantic waters which feed its harbor, while the St. Lawrence ice is deflected by its impact with Scatterie Island, which impels the ice, aided by the tide, in a south-east direction. 2nd. It is the nearest port on the American continent to England and Europe. Its distance from the nearest English port—Milford Haven—is 2,055 miles. It

is nearer to Europe than Halifax, on the line of a great circle, by 196 miles, and than New York by 780 miles. 3rd. It offered, whilst the railway was in order, to coaling vessels, the best steam coal at the cheapest price, viz., $2 to $2.50 per ton, 2,240 lbs., free on board, and with the quickest possible despatch. 4th. It is about half-way between Europe and the shipping ports of the southern States. Therefore a steamer laden with cotton, &c., from New Orleans, or other southern ports, can carry a much larger cargo by taking half the necessary coal at port of departure, and replacing it by the other half obtained at Louisburg. Forty-eight steamers in one season were supplied in this manner. 5th. This economical process of replenishing with coal half way, is now partially carried on by filling the bunkers at Halifax; but as the cost of coal at Halifax is very much higher than it is at Louisburg, while the despatch is not so great, the superiority of Louisburg as a coaling station is manifest. It requires four hours to steam into Halifax and out of it, and less than one hour into and out of Louisburg. 6th. Louisburg is situated in latitude 45° 51′ and longitude 59° 57′. Its harbor, will be found to be safe, capacious, easy of access, and capable of accommodating the largest class of vessels afloat. Bayfield's chart shows a depth of water varying from 24 to 60 feet, with good anchorage. By calling at Louisburg the danger of running on Sable Island, which is 100 miles west of Louisburg would forever be avoided. 7th. From its position, as the most easterly port of the American continent, it is well fitted to become the recipient and warehousing depot of American and Canadian grain and other produce ulteriorly intended for European markets. For as its communications seaward are open all the year round, the shipments might be effected thence at any period, and to any point, as markets might offer inducements. 8th. The Cape Breton Railway, taking the southern route, will connect Louisburg with the vast arterial system of railway communication that traverses the continent of North America, and will make it the most eastern terminus of the great Canadian Pacific Railway of Canada. The missing link, less than eighty-two miles, once supplied, a passenger from Europe landing in four or five days at Louisburg, might step from the Atlantic steamer into a railway carriage which would convey him to any important town in North America. This will be accomplished before long, and then Louisburg will form an important point of contact between the new and the old world. Mr. Chairman, my desire to secure justice for my Province and for my county must stand as my apology for the length of this speech. The interests concerned are apparently local and provincial, but on examination will be found in reality national. Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, I desire to ask the hon. French members of this House to give me their support in my endeavor to secure the building of this railway to the great harbor of Louisburg, in order to raise this ancient city from ashes and dust.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. KIRK. It is not my intention to occupy the time of the committee at any great length in discussing this question. I do not think it is necessary to do so. All parties in this House are agreed that this resolution should pass; all parties in this House are agreed that a railway should be extended through Cape Breton Island. It is, therefore, not necessary to discuss the question as to whether this resolution should pass or not, and I am not going to occupy much time in discussing it. I do not know that I should have risen to speak on this question were it not that the hon. members for Cape Breton Island seemed to take credit altogether to the Government for the fact that this resolution has been laid before the House, and that it is the intention of the Government, seemingly at least, to extend the railway through Cape Breton. We cannot always tell what is the intention of this Government when they place motions of this kind upon the notice papers, for notwithstanding that they sometimes pass such resolutions as this, they do not always expend the money or build the road. I remember distinctly that, previous to the time Mr. Mackenzie came into power, a resolution of this kind was passed, and an amount appeared in the Estimates year after year, to extend the railway to a deep water terminus at Halifax; but the Government of the hon. gentleman never built the road. It was left to the Mackenzie Government to extend the railway into Halifax. It may be that this resolution may pass and a sum may be placed in the Estimates to extend the railway to Louisburg; but it may be left to the Liberal party when they come into power to build that road. The adoption of such a resolution by Parliament, at the instance of the Government of the day, is no evidence of the fact that this Government will extend the railway through Cape Breton. I believe it will rest with the Opposition when they come into power to carry out what seems to be the policy of this Government. I need hardly say that it was the policy of the Mackenzie Government when it was in power to extend the railway to Louisburg or Sydney. They gave evidence of that intention by the fact that when in power they enacted a law by which the Pictou and Truro Branch was voted for that purpose; and in connection with the Local Government they extended the railway from New Glasgow, eighty miles towards Cape Breton, until it touched that island. The Mackenzie Government was defeated in 1878, and up to this time eight years have passed and not one foot of railway has been built or any attempt made to construct the railway further into Cape Breton. I am glad therefore that this Government has at last after eight years of waiting by the people of Cape Breton been aroused to a sense of their duty by moving this resolution. I venture to say that if it had not been for the opposition brought by myself and other hon. members on this side of the House to another resolution which was passed in this House this Session, we should have heard nothing about the Government proposing such a resolution as this to extend the railway to Louisburg or Sydney. Whoever heard hon. members from Cape Breton Island pressing on the Government the building of that railway? None of those members ever did so unless it was in answer to something said by the Opposition. Then, in order to defend themselves those hon. gentlemen found fault with the Local Government for not expending money in extending the railway to those points, thus excusing this Government for their neglect or refusal. But the Government found that the people of Cape Breton had become incensed at the fact that they were building a railway to Pictou, where a railway is already in operation and where another railway is not much needed, and had called meetings and denounced the Government for not doing something towards extending the railway to Louisburg; and from the fact that the Opposition raised the question in the House when the extension of the railway to Pictou was before it,—the people of the island in support of the Opposition here called meetings, manifested their feelings through the medium of those meetings, and the Government felt they either had to carry out this work or Cape Breton would be lost to them at the next election. Therefore this Government has no right to think they are deserving of being so profusely praised as they were praised by the members for Cape Breton Island; I do not think they deserve the thanks of the House or of the people of Cape Breton for being forced, after occupying their seats for eight years, to do that which they should have done several years ago. I maintain that the Opposition in this House have a right to at least a share of the

credit with the members from that island and from the people that such a resolution as the present is being discussed and is likely to pass. Three years ago when the Minister of Railways was expounding his policy in the House—his policy of taking over the Eastern Extension Railway—he pointed out the fact that the Local Government of Nova Scotia had not the means to extend railways in that Province, in Cape Breton or anywhere else in Nova Scotia. He pointed out that in Provinces more wealthy than Nova Scotia the Local Governments were unable to do much towards extending railways, and therefore he pointed out the reason why a bargain was made with Nova Scotia to retain the Truro and Pictou branch and take over for a certain sum the Eastern Extension Railway leading to Cape Breton, that this Government were by that act assuming the duty of extending the railway further into Nova Scotia; and I am glad that now, after the late Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, had announced on the floor of the House that the Government were anxiously desirous of securing this railway communication, the present Government should seek to carry out the policy enunciated by him. The hon. member for Richmond, N. S. (Mr. Paint) had a good deal to say about routes and different harbors. I do not know that it matters much to me, so far as I am concerned it matters but little, upon which route the Government builds the road. I do not, however, think this is the proper time to discuss the route, from the fact that we are not in possession of the necessary information to enable the House to decide upon the route which should be adopted. I believe there are three routes proposed. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) says there are only two. I always thought there were three—southern, northern and central routes. It matters not to me, at all events, which route may be selected; but I think with the hon. member for Richmond that the road should be built on that line which would be in the interests of the whole Island of Cape Breton, and in the interest, if possible, of the whole Dominion. The hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth), said that this road through Cape Breton was of importance to other Provinces as well as to the Province of Nova Scotia and the Island of Cape Breton. Well, I agree with him that it might have been of interest to all the Provinces, but I question very much if now it will be of much interest to the other Provinces or to the Upper Provinces, at any rate. Sir, if this Government had built the Short Line Railway from Montreal to St. John or Halifax upon the shortest and most direct route then it would have been of vast interest to the people of Ontario and Quebec that this road should be built, for then they would have had a direct short through route to the most eastern seaport in the Dominion of Canada. But as the Government has adopted a different route for the Short Line, a route which carries the traffic to Bangor and other ports in the State of Maine, I do not think the argument of the hon. gentleman amounts to much. As I have said, hon. members of this House are all agreed that this road should be built, and I cannot understand, therefore, why it is that the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) should court opposition. I do not think he wants opposition, although in his speech he seemed to wish that somebody would really oppose it. For my own part I have always been in favor of extending a road through the Island of Cape Breton. It should have been done many years ago, and I am only too glad to congratulate the people of the Island of Cape Breton upon the fact that there does seem to be a prospect of the island receiving a railway at some day not in the very distant future. I shall have much pleasure in voting for the resolution.

Mr. KAULBACH. As I see the desire of this House is to shorten all debates, in order that the Session may close, and the representatives get to their respective homes as early as possible, I shall not prolong this discussion more than to offer a few words, especially as the subject has been so fully explained by the hon. members for King's and Richmond. I may say that I fully endorse the position the Government has assumed in complying with the wishes of the deserving people of Cape Breton for a railway from Canso to Louisburg or Sydney—a work most essential, but neglected, overlooked, or unfairly recognised, a request frequently made to other Governments but without anything being done. Now that it is about to assume some tangible shape, with the sure and certain hope of being carried to completion, we find hon. gentlemen opposite desirous as usual of offering obstructions. This road should not be characterised as a local work, when it really is not, but a part of our transcontinental road, an extension of that gigantic structure, the Canadian Pacific Railway, stretching from Burrard Inlet on the waters of the Pacific, in British Columbia—represented in part by our illustrious friends Homer and Shakespeare—to the waters of the Atlantic with Louisburg or Sydney as the extreme eastern terminus. This road, when completed—as was graphically described by the hon. member for King's—will materially shorten the route from the Old World to the United States, or across the continent by the Canadian Pacific Railway to China and Japan. Beside, the stowage capacity for coal, that would be used in a longer passage to New York or some other American port, can be occupied in freight, not only thereby affording a saving to the ship in the low price of coal at the pit's mouth, but a benefit to the miner or vendor of coal at the same time. As this paternal government is expending large grants of money, in the shape of subsidies, in the eastern part of the Province of Nova Scotia, I would remind them that not a dollar has been expended in the western part of that Province—none west of Halifax. Now there are roads in the west, already commenced, upon which large amounts of money have been expended, and passing over fine agricultural country, well timbered and abounding in minerals, both rich and abundant, but struggling for want of aid. There is, notably, the Nova Scotia Central Railway, formerly known as the Nova Scotia, Nictaux and Atlantic Central, which starts from Middleton, on the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, and terminates at Lunenburg, on the waters of the Atlantic. A memorial has been presented to the Government, this Session, strongly supported by my hon. friends from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, for aid to the Nova Scotia Central Railway, and I trust the Government will not be unmindful of our needs, but will give us the same privileges and benefits, in the shape of railway facilities and aid, as have been, and are now being, extended to the east. It is not only a privilege, but a right, to which we are equally entitled.

Mr. MILLS. I understood from the approval that the First Minister gave to the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Paint) that he, at all events, was of the opinion that there was but one route instead of two which could by any possibility occupy the attention of the Government. When the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Paint) declared that the eastern terminus of the road must be Louisburg and not Sydney, I understood that the First Minister approved of that opinion. He gave his assent to that opinion and, that being the case, I suppose we are to understand that in voting for this resolution we are to get a road upon one particular line. Surely the hon. gentleman is not going to be like the old hunter that bent his gun to shoot around a hill—surely he is not bending this railway route all around the Island of Cape Breton so as to catch votes in every constituency of that island. Surely the hon. gentleman has the courage of his convictions, and when he directs his colleague to come down and ask this House for an appropriation for a railway, he has first ascertained what are the merits of that road, its probable cost, the difficulties in the way and where he

ntends to build it. Surely the First Minister does not come and ask the House for an appropriation to build a road which is declared to be of national importance without knowing what particular road he is going to build. He certainly is not in that position, and I think it would be only proper, before the House is asked to approve of this resolution, that the hon. gentleman should leave us in no doubt upon that question. From the hasty inspection I have been able to give to the plan of the route and the reports of the surveyors, I see that the line of the two routes is common for four or five miles. I suppose the Government will hardly undertake to build those four or five miles before the elections, and leave the remainder of the route to be determined after the elections are over. I suppose they have determined already, and that the hon. First Minister will put the House in possession of their determination. I think that would be only candid on the part of the Government. It may be that this House has fallen to the condition of simply being a registering body to register the decrees of the Government; but after all, it would not be undignified on the part of the Government, notwithstanding the humble position which Parliament has assumed of late, if they would communicate to Parliament what their intentions are in this particular, and also if they would tell us when they expect this work will be begun, and what length of time will be occupied in completing it. We know that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have constructed an immense stretch of railway in a very short time. Surely the Government can push forward this work with some expedition, if not with the same expedition; surely the hon. the First Minister will not do the country, and that particular portion of it, an injury by unnecessarily protracting the period over which this work is to extend. I think, before we declare that resolution carried, which, I suppose, under existing circumstances is only a matter of form, the hon. gentleman should also go through the form of informing the House what the intentions of the Government are.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says that after the approval I showed of the speech of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Paint), I ought to make an explanation. I did not say a word that I am aware of, except when some gentlemen were interrupting a little, when I said in my humble way that he should have a hearing. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by speaking of the approbation I gave. But the hon. gentleman says we ought to declare where the terminus of this road will be before we ask the House to adopt the resolution. Well, I can look back and say, if the hon. gentleman can tell me what decision the late Government came to, when they asked us to vote money for the Canadian Pacific Railway, as to where the terminus of the railway should be, whether at Bute Inlet, Burrard Inlet, or somewhere between the two, or at Fort Simpson, then I can tell him what our decision is.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that on that occasion Parliament had entered into a contract with British Columbia, and had agreed to build a road within ten years to terminate somewhere on the Pacific Ocean. I am not aware that there was any such agreement in this case; there is no particular contract made for the construction of this road, and no arrangement with any Province that it shall be built as a condition of union. The hon. gentleman proposes to build this railway as a great commercial undertaking, with the view especially of promoting the interest of the people of Cape Breton, and also for the general advantage of Canada, as the terminus of a great international highway; because we are told it is to be a railway, not only for the people of Canada, but for the continent. Now, the hon. gentleman, having resolved to build a work of such importance, surely he knows where it is going to be built to. The Island of Cape Breton is not an unknown land as was the country extending from the Mattawan to the Pacific Ocean. There is no analogy between the case of this road and the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and the hon. gentleman will find that that is after all a very poor excuse for not giving the House the information it is entitled to with regard to this railway. The hon. gentleman says he did not approve of what the hon. member for Richmond said. The hon. gentleman was perhaps not aware of the extent to which he expressed his approbation; the approval he gave was quite marked; and I thought it was only fair to the House that that approval, which he expressed consciously or unconsciously, should be expressed publicly in the House; and, especially, would it be fair to the hon. members who are here from Cape Breton.

Resolution concurred in, and Committee rose and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the report be received now.

Mr. BLAKE. To-morrow. It is about $1,700,000, is it not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no money in it.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry there is no money in the railway, but we have to vote it for all that.

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (page 1445) respecting the subsidy to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. By this resolution the Government is not asking more money than was voted by Parliament during past Sessions, but ask power to distribute or adjust it in a different way. The intention of Parliament was, in previous legislation, that the Government should have a branch line of twenty miles built from Metapediac towards Paspebiac. The Government tried to have that executed in accordance with the vote of Parliament, and called for tenders, receiving three. The first was from a person named A. Picard, St. Roch, Quebec, for $295,000; the second was from McCarron & Cameron, $428,000; and the next was from R. P. Cook, Brockville, $450,000. The amount of money voted by Parliament was $300,000, so that the first tender was the only one that came within this tender. We made efforts to find Mr. Picard, but no such person was to be found, and as the other two tenderers were, one $128,000 over and above the amount voted, and the second $150,000 over the amount voted, neither of the tenders was accepted. The Baie des Chaleurs Company offered to the Government to undertake the construction of these twenty miles for the amount of the subsidy, $300,000, and with the understanding and agreement that they would, at the same time, undertake to build the balance of the eighty miles further, or 100 miles altogether. They would build the first twenty miles, receiving $300,000 voted by Parliament; and the $3,200 that had been voted previously by Parliament for the whole distance of 100 miles, to be applied to the eighty miles remaining, that is to say, that the $3,200 per mile which had been voted for the first twenty miles, were to be applied to the second twenty miles, with the $3,200 already applicable to them, making $6,400 per mile; and that the balance of sixty miles remaining would receive the vote of $3,200 per mile as fixed by the Act of Parliament.

The $300,000 for the twenty miles to be paid to the company as the work progressed, or every four or five miles as the work would be completed. Thus the Government, by those two agreements with the company, believe that they will secure, first, the construction of the first twenty miles for the amount voted by Parliament, $300,000, and at the same time the building of the eighty miles following. That is the object of this resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. When it was proposed to us on a former occasion to vote $15,000 a mile for the twenty miles of railway, that was voted upon the statement of the Minister that we should become proprietors of the road. With that $300,000, the cost of construction, we would own the road; it was to be a valuable feeder to the Intercolonial Railway, and the Minister stated, upon my enquiry, he was satisfied it could be built for the money. The hon. gentleman says he does not propose now to alter the condition of things by asking for any more money, but he proposes to give away the railway which we were to have for the money we voted. I presume the hon. gentleman will explain why.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first reason is we called for tenders and could not obtain tenderers who would build the road for the amount of money voted. On the contrary, the tenderers, McCarron & Cameron, asked $128,000 more or nearly 50 per cent., and the second tenderer asked exactly 50 per cent. or $150,000 more, while the Baie des Chaleurs Company are disposed to build it for the sum voted by Parliament, but they say the road must belong to them. The Government will, therefore, be relieved of keeping up the road and working it and of the expenses connected with it, and it will not deprive the country benefiting by that road to the extent that it will be a feeder of the Intercolonial Railway. Thus the Government will have the road built without the expense of keeping it in order, and have an additional 100 miles of railway as a feeder to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. The arguments vary according to the circumstances. When we were asked a little while ago to vote $15,000, we were told it was a very good thing we should own the railway. Now the Minister says: I cannot do that; I told you we could build the road at $15,000 per mile—I speak not of him personally, because it was the Minister of Railways who made the statements on behalf of the Government at that time—we told you it could be built for this money and it would be a good thing to hold it; but he says now: I was mistaken, I will give you a good reason—it cannot be built for this money; the only tender which was within the limit we have been so unfortunate as not to find, and the only tenders that could be found were beyond the parliamentary limit. He says there will be a great advantage in this because we will be relieved from the expense of running the road, so it appears that the railway we are assisting is not going to pay its running expenses, because he says it would cost us something to run it. The net result is that $6,200 a mile is to be given for the 100 miles.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $6,400 for the twenty miles, and then $3,200.

Mr. BLAKE. The aggregate is 100 miles—$300,000 plus $320,000, that is $620,000, and the road is 100 miles long, so I say that the net result is that we are to pay $6,200 a mile for that railway which is to be owned by the company. That is about double the subsidy according to the general rate which is given. Will the hon. gentleman explain the circumstances now differing, the Government being no longer the happy proprietors of this twenty miles of railway. The hon. gentleman smiles as if it was a most desirable thing to get rid of the railway. From what we have heard, I should almost have expected to see a respectable tear trickling down each side of his nose; but I forgot—his friends are going to have it after all; it will be all in the family, I mean the political family; the hon. gentleman—not as a Government, but the happy family opposite—will be the proprietors. They are to have $6,200 a mile, nearly twice as much as the other happy proprietors of other fortunate enterprises of this kind aided by the Government are to have. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain why double the normal subsidy of $3,200 is to be given to this road, and also who are the component parts of this railway company.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman should not have appeared so much astonished to-day about the amount of money for this railway, because I think he might remember that, when we proposed to give $300,000 for this branch road from Metapediac towards Paspebiac for twenty miles, he said: What is the use of asking $300,000 for these twenty miles? Why do you not at once apply them to the whole road, the 100 miles, because really that is the object; it cannot be anything else; it must be for the object of not only building twenty miles but extending it 100 miles, and thus giving a large feeder to the Intercolonial Railway. There was good reason in that. The hon. gentleman saw that by building twenty miles of this road we might secure 100 miles, and, though he did not tell us he approved of our policy—of course he would not—nevertheless there was something in his argument which showed we were right in asking $300,000 from Parliament for this branch, and to-day he should rejoice that really we are coming to what he thought in the beginning, that by this means we would secure 100 miles of a railway, not only twenty miles of a branch but a feeder of 100 miles to the Intercolonial Railway, and thus obtain the opening up of a large section of the country, benefiting not only that part of the country but the country at large, because it will be benefiting the Intercolonial Railway by that large feeder, without expending a dollar more than the money that was in the first instance voted for the road and in the second instance voted for the branch. Thus, we are not misapplying the money; we are not asking a dollar more; but, by remodelling the grants made by Parliament, we will secure the building of the 100 miles, and we hope the House will sanction the proposal we are making now to Parliament. The hon. gentleman asked me what are the component parts of the company. It is the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company. It is a company that is incorporated, that is chartered, and that is ready to go on with the building of the railway. I have no doubt that, if these resolutions are sanctioned by Parliament, the road will be built for the money and will be worked, and we shall have that company to work the road. A branch of twenty miles would not pay the Intercolonial Railway to work, but a railway of 100 miles may be worth the while of a company to work, and I think it is the best bargain, the best arrangement we could make. I have no doubt that, if these resolutions are adopted, we shall see the road built within two years.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman any account of who the stockholders are in the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, I have not the statement here.

Mr. BLAKE. But he has it, I suppose; there is such a statement?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think I could have it for the hon. gentleman before concurrence, or on the second reading.

Mr. BLAKE. As to what their subscriptions are and how much they have paid up?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, I will be able to say that.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood also that it was suggested to the hon. gentleman that the tenders and correspondence about the tenders were to be seen in this matter.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, if there is any correspondence, certainly I will bring it down.

Mr. BLAKE. I was written to to say there was some correspondence, and there are the tenders themselves. Of course, we have the company's tender.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, the tenders. I put the other documents before the House to-day.

Committee rose and reported.

THE FRANCHISE ACT.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 138) respecting the Electoral Franchise and the Dominion Elections Act, 1874.—(Mr. Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On the amendments.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Mr. WELDON. It seems to me that while, perhaps, there is no objection to the principle of this amendment, it should not be applied to the present revision. Some of these lists are nearly or quite completed, and we would require entirely new machinery for the purpose of carrying this out. I think it would be far better to let it remain as it is this year on the present qualification, and then adopt the principle of this amendment for future revisions. If we adopt it now it will create endless confusion and produce want of uniformity. In some of the electoral districts, the revision is almost completed.

Mr. McCARTHY. How is it in your county?.

Mr. WELDON. The judge has fixed the 28th June for the final revision.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the earliest court?

Mr. WELDON. No; it is the last, I think. If persons are to come in under these new sections we have got to have a new preliminary list, because surely you are not going to deprive a voter of the right to reject, he must have a certain time to give notice of rejection. We are now in the midst of the courts being held throughout the Dominion. My hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Irvine), says that in his county the final revision commenced on the 18th May, and will finish on the 1st June. Now, in these counties, parties will be deprived of the right of rejecting unless you re-open and revise, and extend the time for making the lists. I might suggest that with regard to certain classes who have been spoken of as the persons who would be deprived of their votes, such as ministers, bank clerks and schoolmasters, a very simple mode could be adopted by which these parties should not be deprived of their votes, that is by transferring them, by simple machinery, from the registry of the electoral district in which they are registered to the electoral district to which they may remove, by a certificate or a statutory declaration on their part that their residence has been changed. By these resolutions we are opening up entirely new classes of voters, and while it may be very proper to extend the franchise to these classes, the extension should not interfere with the present list, because, as I said before, not only will it create great confusion, but unless we substitute new machinery and open up the lists, it will require a new preliminary list to be published, or it will prevent parties from objecting and from saying that parties who are not entitled to vote should not go on the list. The result will be that persons who have not the requisite qualifications may, in many instances, get upon the list, and there is no way of getting their names removed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must confess that I am not surprised to find the Government coming back with an amendment to their Bill of last year. It will be recollected that I suggested at that time that we should simplify the whole Bill, simplify the working of it and reduce the expense and the trouble generally to a minimum, by adopting the simple rule of manhood suffrage. That, however, was not done, and I presume it would not be quite in order for me to make a proposition of that kind just now. At any rate it would be useless, after the opinions the Government have expressed, and after the staunch support they have received from the gentlemen behind them, who support them so faithfully and dutifully. But I think it will be in order for me to ask for some information from the Administration. I received to-day this interesting lot of documents concerning my own county. What I am to do with them I do not know.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read them.

Mr. MITCHELL. There are about 11 volumes of them, and I think it would take about two years to read them, so if the House will excuse me I will dispense with reading them just now. I simply brought them here to ask the Government what I shall do with them, for I do not know. It is utterly impossible for any man to go through them and do anything with them; it would take a man two years to study them up. I have simply brought them here as a practical illustration of the complete folly of that whole Electoral Franchise Bill.

Mr. EDGAR. I see the hon member for East Toronto (Mr. Small) is sitting beside the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who is introducing these clauses, and I see that he takes an active interest in carrying these amendments. Well, I am not surprised at that, if what I heard about two months ago is correct. I was informed in Toronto, about two months ago, that in the constituency of East Toronto a large number of tenants' names had been put on the preliminary list who had not been in possession a year before the 1st of last January, and when the revising officer's clerk was asked how it came that these names were left on, he said they were not qualified now, but that an Act was going to be introduced this Session which would qualify these men. Well, I do not know whether that is the case or not. I was told it two months ago, and if it were not the fact the person who told it had an extraordinarily good idea of what was going to be done this Session. If that be not the case I am sure the hon. member for East Toronto will be able to explain, and, if it is the case, I can understand his interest in the matter. But whether it be the case or not in that particular constituency, it is an exceedingly unfair thing to bring before the House a new qualification in the middle of the trials of those lists. The preliminary courts have all been held, and it is quite possible that a great many representations made to the hon. gentleman have been made by people who felt that they would prepare themselves at least for such an amendment, if it were introduced; but certainly no notice has been given to this side of the House before the amendments were put on the paper the other day, that any intention of doing this was in the hon. gentleman's mind. However proper it might be to apply these changes to the Franchise Act it should only be done when each party has the same opportunity as the other of taking advantage of the law. I quite agree that it is important that it should be done, if it is only done without having an *ex post facto* effect, but in the advanced position of the work of revision I am sure the hon. gentleman will see that it is exceedingly unfair to make these changes in the law as applied to 1886.

Mr. SMALL. The hon. gentleman has just made a statement which is entirely new to me. I knew nothing at all

about the matter as to which he has spoken. He seems to have a peculiar faculty of finding out things which nobody else knew anything about.

Mr. EDGAR. And proving them too.

Mr. BLAKE. I have heard of three different constituencies in which certain classes of voters were added, and allowed on preliminary revision, upon the statement that at this Session of Parliament these classes would be made legal voters, although they were not legal voters now. One of these constituencies was the constituency of East Toronto, where, as I have seen it stated, an officer connected with the association of the political party to which I belong, on enquiring how it came that a large number of persons had been added, who were not qualified under the law, and were allowed by the judge, was told by the judge's clerk that they would be made legal voters this Session, and were added accordingly. The practical result is, that they have been added on the side of that political party which controls the legislation of this country, because they were to be made legal, while the other party, which does not control the legislation, and has not access to the information which the hon. member for East Toronto thinks is the peculiar property of my hon. friend from West Ontario, not having proposed to put on persons who are not qualified under the existing law, are to be placed at a disadvantage under the proposed legislation. Even if there is time, as there is not in many cases, even if the final revision were postponed, even if a second revision was had, the process of having them put on at the final revision will be made more expensive and costly to them, while, as I have said, the other party have them put on at the preliminary revision, because they were to be put on by the legislation which is now before the House.

Mr. SMALL. Does the hon. gentleman think that the member for East Toronto is responsible for the revising officer?

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At any rate the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs is responsible for just such acts of infamous fraud.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not see why the hon. gentleman should use such language.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because it is so.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the facts were so, I do not think mere rumor justifies a member in his place in characterising the conduct of a gentleman as fraudulent, or characterising him as guilty of infamous fraud, because one or two members have heard such a rumor. So far as this is concerned, I think it is impossible that any such rumor can be true. I think it is quite impossible, in so far, at all events, as I am concerned—or in so far as I heard of any intention to make those changes at the date spoken of—that the revising officer was called on to decide whether these names should be put on the list. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw a statement which is certainly not calculated to do him credit, bearing in mind the position that these revising officers occupy. Now, I propose that we shall deal with this question irrespective of when it is to come into force; but my own notion about it is that it should go into force for the purpose of the present list, but without any advantage to one party more than another, and in such a way that all parties should have a fair and full opportunity of placing on the list, without opening up the whole of the lists, those who by this amendment will obtain the franchise. Now, I think that could be done in a very simple way. My proposition is that, if the amendments are adopted, some day, say at the middle or end of July, a court shall be held for the purpose of putting such persons upon the list—one court i each electoral division, where these persons, consisting mostly, as we have heard, of ministers of certain denominations, school teachers and others should be added to the final list. Now, if one such court is held and sufficient notice is given of the holding of that court no great injury will be done—no injury can be done to any political party or to any individual.

Mr. WELDON. How will you obtain the names?

Mr. McCARTHY. The same as now.

Mr. WELDON. There is no preliminary list.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not after this year, but any person taking an interest can easily find out the names.

Mr. WELDON. How can you find them out?

Mr. McCARTHY. How do you find them out now?

Mr. WELDON. By the preliminary list.

Mr. McCARTHY. Notice is given and is lodged with the revising officer.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). And he will not show it.

Mr. McCARTHY. He is bound to show it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I know cases where he does not show it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Do you mean to say that the notice given of the final list is not public property?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I know it has been refused.

Mr. McCARTHY. If this is the case there are means by which the revising officer's clerk can be compelled to show it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What clause of the Bill compels him to show it?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think it requires a clause. The very object of the notice is to afford information. That notice is undoubtedly public property and any person can go to the clerk and demand to see the notice and ascertain who requires to make application to be placed on the list. Now in a great majority of cases these courts have not yet been held. I had a notice to-day of one riding where the court is not to be held until the month of July, and where the preliminary list is not yet published; and I venture to say that is the case in many electoral divisions, though in some no doubt they are announced. In all those cases where there is yet time to give two weeks notice they can apply, but in others let there be one court held in each electoral division where application can be made.

Mr. WELDON. In some cases in our Province a man would have to go fifty miles to find out.

Mr. McCARTHY. It does not follow that a man would have to travel that distance to find out, and I do not think the hon. gentleman would recommend him to do so. He can write to some person interested at the chief office of the revising officer and ascertain in that way.

Mr. WELDON. He may live fifty miles away.

Mr. McCARTHY. That does not prevent his writing and enquiring. Of course if hon. gentlemen desire to prevent these classes, such as Methodist ministers and school teachers——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McCARTHY. If they desire to prevent these classes from being put on the list they can oppose it, but they must take the responsibility of doing so.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman knows very well that when the matter was discussed the other evening, the Opposition as a unit agreed that the principle was a good

one. The only discussion was about the application of the principle and the impossibility of doing fair, even-handed justice to both parties and to the public themselves, if this principle should be applied at the present revision. I speak of the present revision, because, although in the hon. gentleman's Province that revision may not have taken place, in the outlying Provinces those final revisions are now taking place. The hon. gentleman imagines that this whole Dominion consists of one or two Provinces of Ontario.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, only one.

Mr. DAVIES. He argued the whole question the other night from that standpoint. He imagines that if his proposition could be carried out in Ontario, it must, therefore, be acceptable to the whole Dominion. As to the Maritime Provinces, as I said before, while accepting the principle of his amendment, as we accepted it last year and urged that it should then be introduced into the Bill at the proper time, it would be unfair to attempt to enforce it now upon the county court judges when some of those revisions are in actual process of completion, and, as some of my hon. friends behind me say, are in some places actually completed. I have notices at the present moment from some of the ridings in the Maritime Provinces for these courts, and if the hon. gentleman looks at the newspapers of those Provinces he will find that the final revisions are being held now. Yet the hon. gentleman thinks it right to enfranchise a particular class at one end of the country and deny that right to the same class at the other end of the country. We would like to know what view the Government take of this measure. Are they prepared to disfranchise certain classes in the Maritime Provinces, while enfranchising them in Ontario to suit the hon. member for North Simcoe? While the principle is a fair one and while I hope to see it adopted, I trust it may not be carried out *quoad* the present revision, because, as I have said, in some cases, the revisions have taken place while in others they are now taking place or will take place in a few days. I think we should have a very clear and distinct statement from the Government on this point before the debate goes any further.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It will not do for the hon. member for North Simcoe and his friends to attempt to saddle upon the Opposition the responsibility of trying to exclude clergymen and school teachers from the franchise. We attempted to have those classes admitted to the franchise during the discussion last year, and if we did not succeed it was entirely owing to the hon. member for North Simcoe and his friends. The hon. gentleman cannot shirk that responsibility or shift it upon the shoulders of the Opposition. We always were and we still are in favor of Methodist ministers and other clergymen entitled to vote having the vote. We are in favor of farmers' sons and owners' sons and income voters having the franchise, and if any of them are excluded from the right to vote the responsibility must rest on the right shoulders and they are not ours. The hon. gentleman appears to think it is the simplest matter in the world to interfere with the electoral franchise just in the middle of the completion of the voters' list. In some counties they are completed, in others they will be completed long before the Bill becomes law, and in nearly all of them before the end of June. I always notice that when there is a purpose to be served, the hon. member for North Simcoe is ready to suggest the simplest remedy in the world. His suggestion is now that there should be another court of revision, mark you, held one in each electoral district, at which those who will be admitted to the franchise by this Bill shall be entered on the list. And the hon. gentleman thinks there is no difficulty, or work, or annoyance, or expense about that. We know that there are electoral districts over a hundred miles long. Will there be no trouble and expense if there is only one court held in such electoral districts—if men have to come, perhaps from the extreme end of a county to the revising officer to have their names put on the list? The hon. gentleman knows that the chances are ten to one that men living in outlying districts will not know anything of this law until the 15th of July is past. How are they to know that they are entitled to have their names entered on the list? We know now what this Franchise Act means. We predicted last Session that it would involve an enormous expense, not simply to the country, but to individual candidates, and to those who take an active part in elections. Our predictions have been verified. The Secretary of State was afraid the other might to tell us what the expense of printing was. Those of us who take part in politics know to our sorrow what labor, trouble, annoyance and expense to the candidates, or to the political organisations in the different districts, are caused by this measure. We know that every electoral district where the voters' list has been properly revised, is to be scanned, from farm to farm, from lot to lot, from concession to concession, before the information can be obtained on which to apply to have the names put on the preliminary list, or to have an appeal carried to the court of review. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite if they have not felt the burden, though perhaps not to the same extent as members on this side; and yet, with that experience before us, the hon. member for North Simcoe asks us to undergo the same labor and expense again. His amendment is not confined to clergymen and school teachers; if it were, the expense would be very small, because we could locate them pretty easily. But it applies also to the tenant, the income voter, the farmer's son, and owner's son; and it will be necessary for political parties to do all the work over again which they thought they had completed some time ago. Having undergone all that labor and expense, I at all events do not feel disposed to undergo it again or to ask my friends to undergo it again. It may be said that this labor and expense are not necessary. I say they are necessary. Under this proposition, if you want to get a tenant, a farmer's son, or an owner's son on the voters' list, you will have to undergo all the labor again. I know that in my own county there is not a single municipality, town or village in which the work already done will not require to be done again, unless the matter is to be left entirely to one political party. There is no scheme the hon. gentleman can devise that will make his amendment perfectly satisfactory in that respect. The odium and the responsibility of depriving some ministers and school teachers of the franchise must rest on the shoulders of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the hon. member for North Simcoe cannot shift that responsibility to members sitting on this side of the House. Now, I did suspect the other night that there was a political object in this proposition. My hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has indicated what the object is. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Small), simple, childlike, and bland, never heard of it. Such a thing could take place right under his eyes, and he never heard of it. Is that the only electoral district in which this has been done? By no means. Some hon. members opposite can afford to have this Bill passed because they know that they have most of the labor done. The revising officers have put those names on the list in the hope that this Parliament would so far forget what its duty is in a free country that it would legalise their act. If the motive was a proper and a good motive—I do not intend to impute any motives; but if the principle of this Bill is a sound principle, I would like to know how the hon. member for North Simcoe, who is always so alive to the public interest and so thoroughly patriotic, came to rest on his oars for three months without introducing it. I do not know any Session in which the hon. gentleman has been so regular in his

attendance as he has been during this Session; and yet for three months, while he has been thoroughly alive to the importance of giving clergymen and school teachers the right to vote, he did not move in the matter until the Minister of Justice introduced his Bill; and then the hon. member, pure patriot as he is, was actually impelled, in the interest of the ministers and the school teachers, to introduce this resolution in committee. But the hon. gentleman took care not to confine it to ministers and school teachers. He extended it to embrace large classes who ought to have the right to vote, and who ought to have it at the proper time, not at a time when large numbers must necessarily be deprived of it. It is the most one-sided legislation which the hon. member has ever introduced into this Parliament. I do trust that the Minister of Justice will do in this matter what is right and fair, irrespective of political parties, and that he will not lend the sanction of his authority to any proposition of this kind. It is desirable that these classes should have the vote. I go heart and soul with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) in saying that the only measure that is fair to both parties is one based on manhood suffrage, and I am satisfied we shall not live many years before we shall have that enactment on our Statute-book. If it is proper that these men should have the franchise, let them have it, not in the middle of the revision of the lists, when three-fourths of them have been completed, and before the great mass of the people can have any notice of this provision, but let the law be passed to take effect after this year. But unless you can convince Parliament that no political party or section will be at any disadvantage as compared with another, I say this proposition should not become law.

Mr. CHARLTON. In reference to the statement made by the hon. member for North Simcoe, that the public could have no intimation of the intention of the friends of the Government in introducing this provision, I may say that in the riding of North Norfolk a large number of names were placed upon the list of persons not entitled to be there for the want of a year's residence prior to the 1st January last. There are, I think, from 150 to 200 names on the list of such persons. Whether it was understood that steps would be taken here for the purpose of giving these people votes or not I am not in a position to say, but should this Administration pass the proposed resolutions, all the work that would require to be performed under it by the Conservative candidates has been performed while the Liberal candidates will be at a disadvantage of having to go through the lists and beginning practically all his work over again. We had placed on the lists none but those entitled to votes, and were prepared to appeal against the others; that appeal will be unnecessary and instead we will have to put ourselves to the trouble and incur the expense of going through all the lists again. The practical effect will be to give the Conservative party the advantage of having done all at once the work we will be required to do on two occasions. While I agree that the proposals in the amendment would have been quite proper if brought at the right time, as for instance last Session, yet I must oppose them now because this is not the time to bring them into operation. The lists are practically closed, the work is practically completed, and it will be a hardship and create confusion if the lists must be reopened and all the work done over again. The hon. gentleman says this will apply only to teachers and ministers. I deny it. It will apply to farmers' sons, tenants, income voters and others, who may have acquired a title within the six months, and the number added to the list will be very great. The practical operation of the amendment will entail a serious hardship and will be most unjust. I would be willing to make an exception in the case of ministers and teachers, but among the other classes a great number will be added to the lists, a great amount of labor will have to be undergone and confusion worse confounded will be the result. I hope the hon. gentleman will consent to the adoption of the measure to come into effect on or after the 1st of January next.

Mr. FAIRBANK. The proposition made under these resolutions, if submitted to any municipal meeting throughout the Dominion, would receive an emphatic answer in opposition. The work of revising the lists has been spoken of as being only in the middle, being only half done. It is not in the middle, it is far beyond the middle. It is just on the eve of being concluded. I find that the final revision in my riding commenced on the 28th June, and any appeals affecting that must be made in two weeks. Hence the work entailed under this amendment would have to be done within a few days, before this Bill could become law. This measure has been referred to as one affecting the school masters and clergymen, but neither is spoken of; neither is referred to by name; and the number of those who would go upon the lists would not be 10 per cent. Evidently these school masters and clergymen are simply referred to as a blind. Clergymen, as a class, do not take part in elections, and the number of school teachers who would be disfranchised under the existing law would be very small. The amendment will affect the entire position of the electors under the new franchise with the exception of land owners. Further, when you change the time of tenancy, you change the basis of the right to vote, so that this amendment if passed will disfranchise many who to day are good voters. It not only adds to the list, but strikes off many voters from the list who are now entitled to vote. As to the possibility of reaching the general electorate within the time, that is absurd. The people have become familiar with the law as it is, the work of filling the lists having been begun five months ago, and it is utterly impossible to make them familiar with the law, if changed, in the time proposed. I do not propose imputing motives, but we shall form our own opinions. But I say that this proposal to change the qualifications, after so much labor has been put upon the lists, is simply absurd.

Mr. McNEILL. It seems to me that really the question we have to decide is whether these people ought to be on the list or not?

Mr. MILLS. That is not the point.

Mr. McNEILL. It is very nearly the point at all events.

Mr. DAVIES. How would you deal with Carleton where the lists have already been revised.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. member for North Simcoe has said he would deal with that case by giving them the opportunity of having another court. Now, the question really is just this, I think. It seems to me, as far as I can gather from listening to what has passed on both sides of the House, that we are all agreed that these people should get the benefit of the franchise, and the question just now is whether it can be fairly and equitably arranged between both parties as to whether or not they can be put on the list this year. I think, if there be any way of arriving at a conclusion on that point, which would be so satisfactory to every member of this House, and so satisfactory to these people themselves, we ought to endeavor to arrive at it. The hon. member from Huron has talked about the odium which rests upon this side of the House, or upon that side of the House, in regard to excluding these people. I think that is a matter which we might leave out of consideration altogether.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. member for Simcoe started it.

Mr. McNEILL. I think we might drop that now. If we were to blame last Session, I think hon. gentlemen

opposite are to blame this Session. We might come to the question in a business-like and fair manner as between one side of the House and the other. We are all agreed that these people ought to be on the list, and it seems to me, if there be an opportunity given till the 15th July, to get them put upon the list, we ought in some way to be able to arrive at that result satisfactorily. I do not see why, with the political organisations which exist in every riding in this country, it should not be quite easy to give due notice to everyone. Hon. gentlemen opposite have talked about the trouble it would entail. Really, after all, the trouble would only amount to this—supposing each hon. member of this House writes to a few people in his constituency, the whole matter will be known in a few days, and it is only comparatively few, after all, of these men who ought to be electors who have been left off the list, whether you take it so far as the clergy and the school teachers are concerned, or in regard to the other classes, and they will be watching what we are doing here and will be ready to apply at once as soon as they know they have the opportunity of voting. I cannot for the life of me see why we could not arrange this perfectly satisfactorily. The hon. gentleman from Norfolk has spoken about so many names being put on in his constituency, and the hon. member for Huron has spoken about its being a plan, some deep-laid scheme, by which the Conservative party are to obtain some unfair advantage. So far as my own constituency is concerned, there has not been a whisper of anything of the kind. I can state that most conscientiously, and upon my word as a member of this House, and I am quite satisfied that nothing of the kind has ever been intended. We know there has been a petition sent down from some of those whom we wish to have put upon the list, begging that they should have an opportunity of voting, and I do not see why we should not fairly endeavor to meet their views if we can. I cannot see why by the 15th July this matter might not be arranged satisfactorily to all parties. I am satisfied that that is all my hon. friend wishes for, and all that we, on both sides of the House, wish for, and it is all that we ought to wish for. I do not see at all what the difficulty is. Here we are now on the 25th May, and, supposing we are to have till the 15th July to have this matter arranged, surely it can be arranged satisfactorily to all parties. I sincerely hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will try, if they can, to meet the views of my hon. friend with regard to this.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. I simply say so. If the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is incapable of receiving the suggestions in the spirit in which it is offered, I cannot help that.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) says—and of course we accept his statement—that nothing has been done in the matter in his constituency. I have no doubt that is true, because he says so, and I should have had no doubt that it was true if he had not said so, because we all know that his constituency was arranged by an Act of Parliament beforehand. It was quite unnecessary to adopt any further manœuvre in North Bruce than was adopted in the Gerrymander Act under the hon. gentleman's inspiration and advice before he became a member of this House.

Mr. McNEILL. I am glad the hon. gentleman withdraws a previous statement he made in regard to that.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no statement to withdraw whatever. The hon. gentleman says it was not done there, and he cannot see that there is any difficulty elsewhere. I have already stated that I have received information positively and peremptorily and decidedly, in reference to one constituency, and in reference to two other constituencies, that the political party with which the hon. gentleman is allied have taken the course of placing large bodies of these persons who are not now entitled to vote upon the lists, that they are there now, and that the political party with which I am associated, acting under the law as it stood has not placed the names of those persons on the list. The two parties are in this position—the names are on the list for the one and they are not on the list for the other, and it would certainly be a matter of great difficulty and hardship for that political party that was not inspired, that was not so happily inspired, to place those names on the list when it was unlawful to put them there, to have now to set to work to put them on the list. It seems to me, however, that we are engaged in a most desultory and unsatisfactory discussion. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) moved his clause, and said he was proposing to introduce some provision which has been the subject of oral discussion for an hour or so, as to a court to be held on some notice at some point in the division. We can never get to a satisfactory decision by considering the matter in that way. The proper course is, if the hon. gentleman is prepared, now in committee, when it is the proper time to consider the details, to give us the details in writing, to move his amendment, and to say what his plan is, we can consider it, and can see how it will answer. Then we will get nearer to the first basis upon which an agreement may be possible—that is, to know what the proposition really is, but to hope in this way, without that proposition before us, to accomplish that justice which the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is so anxious to have accomplished, that even-handed justice between parties is really out of the question. Let us see what the plan is; let us see what the date which the hon. member fixes is; let us see how it applies to some constituencies in which the final revision will have taken place, perhaps, entirely before that; and to others where the final revision will have taken place in half the districts before that date, leaving the other half still to be dealt with; let us understand the proposal by having it put in black and white, and moved and read at the Table, and then we shall know how to deal with it. That is one thing necessary to arriving at a basis. The next thing is this: This is a Government Bill which is now before us, and this is an amendment on a very important subject. Early in the Session, I enquired of the Government, and that enquiry, which I put on the paper in the usual way, was based on this very information which I had received, because I had received a letter categorically stating the result of an interview with the clerk of the revising officer, and the answer given by the clerk that a large mass of names had been placed on the list not because the judge thought they were those of lawful voters at that time, but because it was intended to make them lawful voters during this Session. For that reason I asked the question, and the answer I received was, as far as I recollect the words of the Minister of Justice, that amendments were under consideration but that it was not at present in contemplation to alter the qualification of voters. The amendment of the Franchise Act comes down in these last days of the Session, and does not contain any proposition to alter the qualification of voters. But as soon as we get to this stage of the Bill, the hon. member for North Simcoe brings forward a proposal to alter the qualification of the voters, which, by an extraordinary coincidence, admits the very class of men who, by this happy inspiration, have been put on in advance on the Conservative side.

Mr. McCALLUM. I would say to the hon. gentleman for North Simcoe, that I hope he has done his duty by bringing this amendment forward. For myself I do not want another court. I know they commence to-morrow the final revision in my county. I would say to him now that if this amendment is passed, I wish he would make it applic-

able to next year and not to this. That would be my idea; then throw the onus of disqualifying these classes on the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think that gentlemen on this side of the House are prepared to accept all the onus there is in the matter, because it is well known how they strove in favor of these classes last year—successfully on some points—and the country understands that very well. So far as I am concerned, whatever change might take place in the law, I would try to protect my interests and the interests of my county as well as I could. The hon. member who introduced these resolutions says he is not aware that some persons have surmised that local Conservative leaders have been informed that effect would be given to legislation such as this, and have taken advantage of it. If he did not know it before he knows it now. I think it might be a fair appeal to his sense of justice whether, having received that statement from a gentleman whose word he cannot doubt, it is now his duty to press the matter. It seems to me the Minister of Justice, who will attempt, I should judge, to maintain the attributes of justice in the House, at any rate, should not allow the amendments to pass in their present shape.

Mr. WALLACE (York). What class of voters does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The classes that have been spoken of so far have been clergymen and school teachers. Gentlemen on this side of the House could not certainly object to those classes, because the probability is that the large proportion of them vote for the Liberal candidates, as they are a highly intelligent and educated class. It, therefore, cannot be on any grounds of that kind that we object to these amendments. But there need not be any particular onus in this matter at all. All the member for North Simcoe has to do, in my judgment, is to move for a reconsideration of the amendments that were made in section 33 of the new Act of the Minister of Justice, where the word "January" was struck out and the word "June" was placed instead. All we need to do would be to reconsider that clause and strike out the word "June," leaving the Statute as it stood originally "the first day of January." By doing that the gentlemen that he proposes to enfranchise would have the right to vote at the next general election. That makes the Act applicable for the next year after the first January next. But don't let us make any mistake on that. If they cannot vote at the next general election it will be because the Ministry determine that they shall not do it. If the elections do not come on until the time that it is necessary that they should be on the list, there will be another revision of the list; it will be completed, and all these gentlemen's names will be on the printed list. Therefore the whole solution is to be found in making it applicable after the first day of Januany next, and all that is desired to be accomplished will be accomplished, and these gentlemen, whom we are all agreed ought to have the right to vote, can vote at the next election, provided it comes on at the time when it is contemplated in the constitution that, as a rule, a general election should come on. The hon. member for Carleton informs me that the final revision of the list in his county takes place next week, and in some other counties next month. If we adopt these amendments as they stand, no good can be accomplished, and harm might possibly arise.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. member for West Durham desires to know exactly what I proposed. He was not present on Friday night, when this matter was discussed at length, and when we had on both sides almost reached a conclusion, or he would have known more about it. Certainly the hon. member who last spoke has seen new light since Friday night. He was then inclined to adopt the suggestion which was then made, that if provision was made, and ample opportunity afforded to enable these classes of voters to be placed upon the list, both the hon. member for Brant and the hon. member for North Norfolk, who spoke very decidedly, seemed quite willing to accept the amendments.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not think I said that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly he was not so strongly opposed to it as he is to-night. However, I do not desire to press this against the will of the committee. At this late stage of the Session, if that is the opinion of the committee—and my hon. friend from Monck (Mr. McCallum), has expressed the opinion that it is not desirable to open up the list—why, I certainly cannot press it, and I will leave the responsibility upon those who are opposed to it. But, Sir, it is rather hard to find the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite using, in its issue of Saturday last, language of this kind in reference to these proposals:

"The Government show no disposition to remedy the Act's unfair discrimination against school teachers and Methodist ministers, and there may be a reason for the disfranchisement of these people which is not generally perceived by the public. The Methodist ministry and very many of the school teachers of the country are known to be strong supporters of the Scott Act, incensed by the Senate's schemes of mutilation, and disposed to resent the Government's persistent refusal to strengthen the law and undo the mischief wrought by the passage of the defunct Dominion License Act. Here, probably, is the secret of the attempt to deprive the ministers and school teachers of their legitimate weight in the councils of the country."

When the proposition seemed to include these gentlemen, then we have our hon. friends opposite, one and all, getting up and opposing it, on some imaginary theory that a wrong would be done. No person knows better than the hon. member for West Durham, that if time is allowed to enable these people—not very numerous, but still of considerable importance in the community, and who ought not to be disfranchised—to get upon the list, no injustice can be done to either party in any constituency. But, forsooth, my hon. friend who last addressed us—and I am not doubting any hon. member's word—says that because the hon. member for West Durham and one or two others, say they have heard so and so, therefore we ought to accept the rumors they have heard as actual proof of the fact. I know that, so far as I am concerned, I have a good deal to do about the Franchise Act, about the way it is working, and I have had a great deal of correspondence on the subject, and it is because of that correspondence I move in the matter. I am quite certain no idea was formed in my mind, nor so far as I know, in the mind of any other hon. member, to make any other change till long after the time had passed when the preliminary list for East Toronto was revised or, at all events, published. However, what I did propose before, and what I suggest now, is this: Let us deal with these amendments, and when we have dealt with them, let us then determine the time when they will be applicable. If the sense of the House is, as it appears to be, against making the amendments applicable to the present revision, I am not going to prolong the Session or prolong the discussion after the strong opinions expressed, and if hon. gentlemen are still of that view, let the matter stand over and let the responsibility rest on the proper shoulders. In the meantime I cannot very well place the resolution in the hands of the Chairman, because already there is a resolution before the committee. For my part I have not the slightest desire to press these provisions for the present. I think it is a pity that certain tenants will be excluded under the present Act, because we must all remember that tenants have to be in occupation before the 1st of last January or else they cannot vote; and the same provision applies to occupants and to income voters. The difference is this: The tenants who will be in occupation before, say 1st July, will be entitled to be enfranchised under the proposed amendment; occupants

will be in the same position and also income voters. Those are the parties who will be excluded if these amendments are not made applicable to the present revision; but it is better they should be made applicable to future revisions, as was said by the hon. member for South Brant.

Mr. VAIL. I am very glad to hear from the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), that he is not disposed to press the amendments. We had a rather extensive debate on the Franchise Bill last year, and it was thought we had obtained a perfect Act, from a Government point of view. It seems that the Act is not quite perfect after all. If I understood rightly, the Government in introducing the Bill last year gave as the reason for their action that they desired uniformity, that a person who had a qualification in Ontario and another person had the same qualification in the Maritime Provinces, they should both be entitled to vote for Dominion representatives. It has been said that in some of the ridings the final revision has already taken place; in some others it will take place in a week or ten days. So far as the riding I represent is concerned, the final revision will be completed by the 25th or 27th of June at the latest. In that district there are six places for holding the court. Now, if the hon. gentleman's amendment is adopted it is provided that one court shall be held in that riding, while the law already provides that six courts shall be held for the final revision in order to correct the present lists. It is quite impossible for our people to attend one court without travelling fifty or seventy-five miles to attend it. It is quite impossible, since the revising court is advertised for certain dates, to give the necessary notices that the amendments would require in order to enable the people to take advantage of the present revision, and it would be quite unjust and unfair to enact a new law that would permit the revising officer to hold but one court in that district. I know in Nova Scotia in a great many districts the final revision will take place before this Bill could be brought into force and acted upon, and I hope the Minister of Justice will consider this matter and not place us, in Nova Scotia, at a disadvantage by allowing this amendment to be carried.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) referred to two weeks; but the hon. gentleman forgets that the notice will be altogether insufficient. Take the mode in which the Act of last year provided.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not going to press it at present, so it is no use to discuss it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This is going to destroy the uniformity contained in the Act. In some districts we have courts already held; in other divisions they have not been held.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said I was going to make this applicable to next year, not to the present revision.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I want to speak as to the expense attending it. I think I can induce the member for West Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) to sympathise with the efforts I am making. If under this Bill hon. gentlemen opposite would allow every person residing in the country and whose names are upon the assessment roll to vote, it would have done away with the great expenditure now entailed on the country. The county of Simcoe has given nearly $1,000,000 to aid railways; Grey and Bruce have done about the same respectively. Here, however, we are increasing the debt and the expenditure of the people for no purpose whatever except that of perpetuating a party in power. If this sum were applied in reduction of the railway debt in Simcoe, Bruce or Grey there would be some tangible benefit. What benefit are we to derive from this Franchise Act? Hon. gentlemen opposite said we were to have uniformity. The operations of the Act are in no respect uniform; the conditions of the voters are different in different localities, as also has been the decisions of the courts. Uniformity has not been attained. A vast outlay will arise from its operations. In this year, what with printing, holding courts, revising officers, clerks and bailiffs, the cost will not be less than a $1,000,000. In the county of Simcoe it will cost something in the neighborhood of perhaps ——

An hon. MEMBER. Make it $10,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, $10,000. Would it not be much better and more to the credit of the hon. member for Simcoe were he to urge that this outrageous expenditure should be applied to the reduction of the debts of the people who have contributed to the railway? Would it not be much better if the hon. member for Bruce were to come down and state to the Government and the people of this country that the money would be much better applied in reducing the burdens of the people in North Bruce than in enforcing a Franchise Act of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. All this expenditure is unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Order. The hon. gentleman is going outside of the question before the Chair.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, if it is out of order to reduce the burdens of the people, then, of course, I am out of order. If by standing up here to advocate the reduction of the burdens of the people——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I claim that I am in order.

Mr. THOMPSON. A word of explanation with regard to what was said as to certain things which it was said were being done by the revising officers, in view of some confirmatory legislation. It is true that the hon. member for West Durham, on the 7th of April, asked this question —or rather, the member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) asked this question for him:

"Whether it is the intention of the Government to propose any amendment to the Franchise Act affecting the qualification of any class of voters, during the present Session of Parliament?"

The answer I made was that the Government were considering the matter of amendments to the Act, but that I was not able to say whether the amendments proposed would be of the kind to which the hon. gentleman referred in his question. It is due, however, to those who have brought forward this measure, and probably to the revising officers themselves, to say that not only was no intimation ever given of any change ratifying any act of theirs, by which persons who were not entitled to the franchise should be put on the list, but that no suggestion was made to the Government, as long ago as the time he states they were put on the list, that it was desirable that the Act should be altered in that particular.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman add to his statement what the view of the Government is as to the proposal now before the Chair?

Mr. THOMPSON. I did not add anything on that subject, because I thought it was disposed of. My own impression was, as I stated the other evening, that it was desirable that this should be adopted as a matter of principle, but that, as there were serious difficulties in bringing it into operation this year, I desired that the committee should then rise and the matter stand for further consideration. I am still of opinion that it would be attended with great inconvenience to bring it into operation this year, and I am glad the hon. gentleman has withdrawn his proposal, in so far as this year is concerned.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad to hear that statement, and I think if the Government had spoken earlier we would have saved an hour.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to say a word with reference to what the hon. member for West Durham was kind enough to remark as to my own constituency. The hon. gentleman did me the grace to say that these names had not been added to the list in North Bruce because it was unnecessary, thereby implying that we would have so added them if we had not thought we were strong enough without them. I think it was a somewhat gratuitous statement for the hon. gentleman to make. I do not think the spirit of the observations I addressed to the House was such as to call for a remark of that kind from him. I think I addressed the committee in a spirit which would have called for the manifestation of a different kind of spirit from the hon. gentleman. However, I suppose it only showed his nature. I do not suppose he meant anything by it. I suppose it was one of those little things, he cannot help, and that being the case, I am perfectly satisfied to pardon any little eccentricities of that kind on his part. I just wish to say with regard to his observations as to the constituency I have the honor to represent, that, when he talks of that constituency having been re-arranged by Act of Parliament, I suppose it was arranged by Act of Parliament just as all other constituencies in the country have been arranged by some Act of Parliament. I say here that the arrangement which was then made, leaving out political considerations altogether, so far as the geographical distribution of the ridings in the county are concerned, and so far as the population is concerned—if you take those two tests—was as good, if not the best, that could be made of the county. When it was to be divided into three ridings, it was the best possible to make, with one exception, and for that exception my hon. friend from Brant is responsible.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. McNEILL. I am perfectly justified when an obser vation of this kind has been made with reference to the constituency I have the honor to represent——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. McNEILL. I have a perfect right to put myself right in the matter though I leave the matter with the Chairman. I may just say in conclusion that there has been another division of that county made since——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. McNEILL—by an hon. gentleman who, we are sometimes told, is to be the leader of that side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. I would ask the hon. gentleman not to enter into that question.

Mr. McNEILL. I just wish to say that I challenge the hon. gentleman to compare these two divisions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As it has been intimated that the hon. gentleman is going to accept the common sense suggestion of the hon. member for Monck not to have his Bill apply to the present list, I do not intend to say a word on the merits of the case. I simply wish to reply to the taunt or the insinuation thrown out by the hon. member for North Simcoe that we on this side of the House were opposed to granting the franchise to those classes. I know the hon. member for North Simcoe was not present very much when the franchise debate was going on last summer. If he had been, or had read the debates and resolutions he must have known—and I think we may take it for granted that he does know—that gentlemen on this side talked for days and nights, and even for weeks, not only to extend the franchise to those parties, but to extend it much further. It comes with a very bad grace from him or from any gentleman on that side to taunt us with restricting the franchise. I notice that the hon. member for North Bruce is also a convert to the same view. I can only say it is a pity that he had not been converted a year sooner, for he might have been invaluable, with his great talents, in helping hon. gentlemen on this side just to secure those very rights he wishes to secure to-day. No, Sir, it is not the case that we are opposed to granting the franchise to those parties, because our action in the past has proved how anxious we were to have the franchise granted to them, but it is from another cause altogether. We read that once on a time, thousands of years ago, certain denizens of a brighter clime came to present themselves one day, and that an individual of another latitude came amongst them disguised, no doubt, as an angel of light. But the cloven hoof was there all the time, and it is because of this newborn zeal on the part of those hon. gentlemen that we fear something of the same kind and that we oppose this measure now. It is because we fear history is going to repeat itself. It is because we know the confusion it will cause and the impossibility, at the present stage of the Act, of accomplishing that which is the desire of all parties to have—a fair voters' list—that we have opposed this particular principle of the amendment.

Mr. EDGAR. Would it not be well for the hon. member for North Simcoe to state in what way he proposes to limit this provision to the future, because as it stands it applies to the Act to-day. Does the hon. member propose to say that it shall not apply to the voters' list of 1886?

Mr. McCARTHY. Something of that kind.

Mr. EDGAR. Would it not be well to state that in the section?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, it had better be put at the end of the Bill, where it can be stated that these clauses shall not come into force until a certain time.

On section 3, sub-section 5,

Mr. McCARTHY. This alters the Act only as to time; instead of saying for a year before the 1st of January, it says for a year before the application.

On section 3, sub section 6,

Mr. McCARTHY. There are two changes here. One change is as to money and money's worth, which provision has heretofore been applicable only to rural districts; it is proposed to make it applicable to cities and towns as well. The other change is, that the residence need not be in the particular electoral district; so long as it is anywhere in Canada, that is sufficient.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman considered the difficulty one revising officer has found in this clause, who points out that money or money's worth does not mean partly money and partly money's worth, and that therefore when the earnings are partly in money and partly in money's worth, there is no franchise? When the hon. gentleman is making the Act perfect, perhaps he had better remove that difficulty.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not heard of that difficulty before.

Mr. BLAKE. It has been stated in public.

Mr. McCARTHY. This might meet the case:

Earnings in money or partly in money or money's worth.

Mr. BLAKE. I am afraid that would not satisfy Judge Hughes, because if they were all in money's worth, he would decide there was no vote.

An hon. MEMBER. It is all right as it is.

Mr. BLAKE. Judge Hughes says it is all wrong, and unfortunately there is no appeal from him.

Mr. MILLS. We have cases rejected in the handwriting of the judge, in which the party was proved to have the

proper income partly in money and partly in money's worth. The words of the section were alternative; and he decided that it must be all of one or all of the other, not part of one and part of the other.

Mr. BLAKE. When you have perhaps 200 persons to construe the law, it is necessary to make it very plain, because, to adopt a phrase of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), eccentricity is not confined to members of Parliament, but sometimes extends to the judicial bench.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would propose to insert after the words "money's worth," the words "or partly in money or partly in money's worth."

Mr. BÉCHARD. It seems to me that this law will disfranchise some people who, under the old law, had a right to vote. In the Province of Quebec, in the rural districts, there is a class of farmers who, after some time, give up their property to one of their sons, receiving in return an income which is paid out of the products of the farm. The income, as a rule, runs from $100 to $200 a year, the latter being considered a large income. Under this law, these men will be disfranchised, although under our Quebec law they have a vote. I would appeal to the Secretary of State, who knows the circumstance, whether such is not the case.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The greatest number of them are occupants which would give them the right to vote under another clause.

Mr. BÉCHARD. Under the title of occupant, they must receive the benefit of the property they occupy. Suppose they live with their sons and are paid by the sons, they cannot be placed on the list under the title of occupants. Because they do not receive the profits of the farm.

Mr. McMULLEN. Supposing a school teacher lives on the borders of two ridings, and the revision is held at each riding at a different time, the Bill provides that the person should be a resident at the time of revision, so that the school teacher could move to either side of the line where the revision is being held, be registered on the list as a voter, and then when the revision is held on the other side move back again, and be again registered as voter on the other list.

Mr. McCARTHY. That intelligent school teacher ought to get two votes. Residents, the hon. member will understand, does not mean a man merely going across an imaginary line separating two ridings. It means *bond fide* residence and I don't think we should make a change on that account.

On section 7,

Mr. McCARTHY. This may be open to question and I would like to draw the attention of the committee to it. I have information from different parts of the country that farmers do not always live upon their farms, yet he and his sons are not entitled to be put upon the lists, although the farmer may live only upon the opposite side of the road. On the other side, it is held that too much laxity in this respect would permit a man, who is a farm owner and lives in the city and his sons live with him, to be entitled to be placed on the list.

Mr. MILLS. We discussed this subject last year and we provided for the sons of farmers and the sons of property owners. It seems to me that a clause might be framed providing for the sons of property owners generally without making an unnecessary distinction between farmers' sons and the sons of other owners of real estate. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to another provision of the law. He here provides that the party shall have a certain qualification in order to go upon the voters' list, but how about his qualification after he has been put on the voters' list? Supposing a farmer's son has been residing on the farm twelve months before he is put on the list, but not twelve months before he seeks to record his vote?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is provided for.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman intend to provide that it shall be continuous qualification?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Then that would not be sufficient as the clause stands.

Mr. McCARTHY. But there is another clause.

Mr. MILLS. It would be necessary to provide for it in the law, so that the oath might conform to the provisions of the law.

Mr. McCARTHY. So the oath does. The oath does provide for that. There is no change in that respect. The farmer's son and the owner's son must be living on the property at the time of the election.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I think the clause as it stood before was much better than that proposed. If a man resided in the city of Ottawa and had a farm in the county of Carleton, he would have a vote there himself, but, by this clause, the sons would also have a vote in the county, though owning no property. I think that would be unfair. The clause had better remain as it was.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I see no reason for confining the right of the farmer's son to vote to his living on the farm. The ownership of the property is what gives the right to vote, and I do not see why he should be deprived of the right because he is not living on the farm. I see also that there is no provision in this amendment for the temporary absence of sons.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I agree with my hon. friend on that point. Take a farmer who is living, perhaps, in a small village which is not incorporated, and his sons live with him, but work the farm a mile away from the place, to all intents and purposes they have the use of it, and, although they are not strictly living on the place, as the farmer can vote there is no reason why the sons should not vote.

Mr. WALLACE (York). They would have votes at home as owner's sons.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). They may not. They may live on a small place. The property may not be of sufficient value to qualify them, but they are cultivating the farm. Why should the farmer's son be deprived of the right to vote because for the time being he is not living on the place? There is no reason why he should be deprived of the franchise. I know of one or two cases of that kind, which came under my notice in preparation for the preliminary revision in my constituency. I was of opinion that they were not entitled to vote, and they were not put on the roll, though I could see the hardship of it. There were two or three cases where the farmer lived across the division line between the counties of Huron and Bruce in a comfortable house, but not enough to give all the sons a vote in the one county, but they worked the farm across the road in the other county. Still they were deprived of the vote, though the farmer voted on his house in my county. I think they should be entitled to vote as farmers' sons if they are actually working the farm, though not living on it.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I think in almost every case the house they live in will qualify the farmer and his sons too. It only requires a house and lot worth $450 to qualify the farmer and two sons, and I cannot understand a man owning a valuable farm living in a house not worth $450.

Mr. AUGER. Could not the hon. gentleman make a proviso to give the right to vote to that class that heretofore in the Province of Quebec were voters, the *rentiers*, spoken of by my hon. friend from Iberville (Mr. Béchard). By this Bill you are disfranchising several thousands of men who have opened this country, who have always lived here, and who, to encourage their sons to stay in the country and do their share in improving it, have given their farms to their sons on condition that the sons should pay them so much a year. Under this law they have no right to vote. An amendment could be put in saying that, if the son has a right to vote if he lives with his father, the father should have the right to vote if he lives with his son, and receives a certain amount of money or provisions during the year. In the Province of Quebec there are thousands of those persons who by this Bill will not have a right to vote who heretofore have possessed that right.

Mr. FAIRBANK. There is an addition in this clause:

"Is a farmer's son not otherwise qualified to vote in the electoral district in which his father's farm is situated."

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. Before, if the farmer's son had property in another riding, he could not vote as a farmer's son. The object is to allow him to vote as a farmer's son if his property is in another riding.

Mr. EDGAR. I think it extends the franchise to a class that ought to have it.

On section 8,

Mr. MILLS. In the Act as it now stands, step-son or son-in-law may be accounted as a farmer's son, and supposing the step-son or son-in-law is older than the farmer's son, as only one son can qualify, then the step-son or son-in-law will take precedence of the farmer's son. Is that the intention?

Mr. McCARTHY. That would be a hard case.

Mr. McMULLEN. This question was taken up last year and the First Minister promised to bring in a clause to provide for it, but unfortunately it was overlooked. I would suggest that you add a clause to this section that sons shall qualify in the following order. First, the son, second, the step-son, and third the son-in-law.

Mr. McCARTHY. You make no provision for the mother-in-law.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know a case in my own riding where a step-son actually cut the son out because he is the oldest, and under the law he may claim a vote.

Mr. EDGAR. I think there is a little change here. In the original Act the father was qualified to vote, and it is amended by saying the father must be qualified and be registered as a voter.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the same thing. A man has to be registered as a voter before he votes.

Mr. EDGAR. He may be qualified to be registered, and may not be registered. Under the Act as it now stands, the father need not be a registered voter; under the old Act he had to be a registered voter, because he could not vote unless he were registered. Now you say he must be qualified to be registered.

On sub-section *b*,

Mr. EDGAR. Does not the hon. gentleman intend to put in a proviso as was in the Act before, about six months' absence?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will put that in a separate clause.

Mr. EDGAR. But it is for all owners or farmer's sons. It is in reference to that.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thought of putting it in as a separate clause, as providing for residence.

On section 9,

Mr. DAWSON. With regard to this clause about fishermen, I do not see why they should require a greater qualification than other people. Now it says: "Is a fisherman, and is the owner of real property and boats, nets, fishing gear and tackle." Why should it not be, if he is owner of boats, nets, fishing gear and tackle, of an amount sufficient to qualify him? Why should he be compelled to be also an owner of real property along with this other property? I would suggest to the hon. member for South Simcoe that the words "real property, &c.," should be left out.

Mr. MILLS. If we are on the 9th clause, then we have passed through the provisions about a son having been continuously resident with his father after his father is dead?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. That is not in the law as it now stands. As it is now you say living on the property, it does not provide, as this does, to live with his dead father after he is dead. I do not see how the hon. gentleman is going to carry this law out, if his father is dead and he has been resident continuously with his father, and he has that twice in this Bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that is plain enough.

Mr. MILLS. I do not know whether he is like the Chinese of California, who sleep with their dead friends until they get an opportunity of sending them back to China.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think the hon. gentleman's criticism is warranted. It is intended to apply to a case in which the father has been alive during a portion of the year.

On section 9,

Mr. SPROULE. Is it understood that the proposal of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) changing "and" for "all" is to be adopted? It is important that that change should be made.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it would reduce the qualification too low. It would entitle a party to vote on $150 worth of personal property.

Mr. DAVIES. What change is made in this clause in relation to fishermen?

Mr. THOMPSON. A fisherman is allowed to compute shares in a ship.

Mr. DAVIES. I call attention to the absurdity of this clause. A man owning one dollar's worth of real property and $149 worth of boats and nets can qualify. But if he owns $5,000 worth of boats, nets and fishing gear he cannot qualify, for he is required to own one dollar's worth or fifty cents worth of real property. It will be better to strike out the property qualification altogether. It is absurd to have any provision in regard to owning real property unless a specific amount of real property is named.

Mr. MILLS. He may own a lot in a graveyard.

Mr. DAWSON. I have had several communications on this subject from fishermen in my district. They think it hard that they should be compelled to be owners of real property. If the word "occupant" were used instead of "owner" it might, perhaps, meet the case. Why should the Act be more stringent with regard to fishermen than other people?

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not want to go over the ground traversed last Session. I understood in the case of fishermen it was agreed that there should be a smaller qualifica-

tion as to real property than was applied to other owners of real property, but the principle was clearly established that a fisherman should not be allowed to qualify simply on $150 worth of personal property. I think if we establish any property qualification we are going a great deal too far in saying that a fisherman should qualify on $150 worth of personal property. To say that a man might own one dollar's worth of real property is an amusing illustration, but it is not a practical one, because no real estate is simply worth one dollar, although I have known real estate to be not worth a dollar. If a person is an owner or occupant of property coming within other sections he does not need to qualify under this clause.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The theory is that the means of the fishermen are invested, not in real estate, but in his boats, nets and tackle. Coupling with that a property qualification, without any limit as to the qualification, is a pure delusion. We know well, and it was pointed out last Session, that in many cases along the sea shore, a property qualification of $1 or 50 cents could be obtained. It would be more logical if we put the qualification on the ground that a fisherman's money is invested in boats, nets and tackle, and gave him a vote upon those. If a fisherman could not obtain a qualification without real property, it would be an easy thing to buy a barren piece of land and divide it between a number, and thus obtain a qualification. This part of the qualification would serve no good purpose, and therefore should not be retained in the law.

Mr. MULOCK. Supposing this fisherman should lose his boats or tackle, will he lose his vote? In fact, this applies to all these qualifications. Supposing a farmer's son ceases to live with his father, does he lose his vote?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think if his name is on the list he is entitled to vote.

Mr. McCARTHY. Except in the case of a farmer's son or an owner's son.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If a man has got the property qualification at the completion of the voters' list, and disposes of it the very next day, and an election takes place a month afterwards, he is still entitled to vote?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, under the Act as it stands at present.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think that is the meaning or spirit of the Act. The voters' list simply establishes that at the time it was settled the persons whose names are upon it possessed the qualification. That has been the general principle of our Election Acts. It has been a general principle in all our Election Acts that a man tendering his vote must have at that time the proper qualifications constituting him an elector, and unless you so provide the lists may be very defective. There is no great object in a man having his name registered; the object is that he should have the right to vote. Therefore, it seems to me that without interfering with the finality of the lists we should go a step further and carry on the qualification from the time of registration to the time of tendering the vote.

Mr. THOMPSON. At all events that does not touch the matter before us now, but if the hon. gentleman will look at sections 31 and 39 he will find I think that persons who are on the list as finally revised are the persons who are entitled to vote, without any question as to qualification. Before taking up the next section I wish to move a proviso as to sub-sections seven and eight as follows:—

Persons qualified under sub-sections 7 and 8 shall only be qualified to be registered in the electoral district in which they reside respectively.

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. McCARTHY. I had proposed to move the repeal of sub-sections 7 and 8, and the substitution of another clause, and perhaps the proviso which the Minister has just moved might be attached to it.

Mr. MILLS. I certainly think it would have been more convenient to have framed one section in place of sub-sections 7 and 8, for I do not see any reason for a distinction between farmers' sons and the sons of other owners. This is a distinction which we pointed out last year as being unnecessary, but it was continued, because no one in charge of the Bill seemed to have sufficient interest to frame a clause. I would ask the special attention of the Minister of Justice and the hon. gentleman in charge of these amendments to the uselessness of making a distinction between these classes. It would be far more convenient and would simplify matters much if they were all dealt with by one clause.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am inclined to agree with the hon. member. At the moment it strikes me that there is no object in keeping them separate. That might stand.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Suppose the father resides in one electoral district, and the son is a tenant in another, where must the son be registered?

Mr. THOMPSON. He must vote in the electoral district where he resides. The object of course is to have voters registered in one district only, and it appears to me that the place where they reside is the proper place for them to be registered. It is the place where they are known, and where they have to swear they reside.

Mr. EDGAR. Does the Minister of Justice mean that a son who is a tenant in one electoral district, and who resides with his father in another electoral district, cannot have a vote at all?

Mr. THOMPSON. No, I mean that he has a vote in one place only.

Mr. EDGAR. Then it must mean that the son must vote in an electoral district where he resides, and must vote on property which does not exist in that electoral district.

Mr. THOMPSON. Suppose you say he shall be registered in the district where the property is, then you enable him to be registered in every district where his father has property.

Mr. EDGAR. Unless you say he shall only vote in one.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is better to say that he shall vote where he resides, because there he is known, and he has to swear where he resides.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister will see that he is introducing a new principle. The rule we have already adopted in the law is that a party must be the owner of property before his son has a right to vote. You give the son a right to vote because he has a prospective interest in property which is for the time being the property of his father, and you have provided heretofore that the son must reside with the father on that property. Suppose the father is residing in one county and the property is in another, upon what property are you giving him a vote—upon property situated in a county where he has not a vote? You cannot give the son a vote unless you introduce a new principle and provide that the sons of tenants shall have votes.

Mr. WALLACE (York). The clause proposed by the Minister of Justice will bring the law back to where it was, that is, that a son shall have no right to vote in a constituency where he does not reside, and where his father has no property, or where he has no income.

Mr. MILLS. Suppose a man has property in the county of Russell and he lives in the city of London, where are you going to put him on the list? In the city of London? If

so, how is the revising officer to know whether he should be placed on the list or not? Is he to send to the county of Russell to make enquiry? Serious difficulties arise if you undertake to give the son a vote elsewhere than where the property is.

Mr. THOMPSON. We have already adopted that principle, and I am seeking to introduce some check. While it is open to some of the objections the hon. member for Bothwell has stated, it is open to less difficulty and abuse than any other check I can devise. A voter may be resident with his father in the city of Ottawa, and his father may have property qualification in five electoral districts, but he only votes where he resides.

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose to unite clause 8 with the proviso that the son must be at the time he votes resident in the electoral district.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then I will withdraw my amendment.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the meaning of the words "or portion of an electoral district?"

Mr. McCARTHY. The object of that is to meet cases like that of Algoma district, which is divided between two revising officers; it does not hurt the clause in any way.

On section 4,

Mr. EDGAR. This is a fancy clause, I think. It appears to be taken from the clause relating to tenancy.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is an extension of that.

Mr. EDGAR. Does it mean that if a man is a farmer's son part of the year, a tenant part of the year, and receives an income part of the year, he can run all these qualifications together?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is cumulative in that way. It cannot hurt.

Mr. DAVIES. It can hurt very much, because it will prevent any proper investigation of the vote. Suppose a man passed four or five different stages, would he have to set out: I was a farmer's son for the first four months; I then became a fisherman; I then got some income; I was afterwards the owner of an estate, and now I am a tenant? He then became a fisherman; he afterwards became the possessor of a certain income, and then a real estate owner. This would give rise to a heterogeneous qualification.

Mr. MILLS. There is always a certain number of persons who are entitled to go on the list and who are not on it. The lists will be completed in a few weeks, and it will be thirteen months before another list will be prepared. I do not see, therefore, that these parties, whom it is desired should be put upon the list, will be worse off than the large number who are not on the list as it is. Why undertake to deal with the very small percentage only of those who are entitled to go on the list and are not on it.

Mr. SPROULE. The clause will only lead to ambiguity and misunderstanding. There are a good many things in the Act which people cannot understand and this clause will only create additional difference of opinion.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well I will withdraw that clause and alter clause 4 to suit.

On section 7,

Mr. FAIRBANK. There seems to be an entire diversity of principle in this. In all other causes the evidence is taken where the party resides, here it is taken where an income is served, and it is not restricted to the point of registration, so that a party may be registered in any portion of the riding, and in some ridings the distances between the points of registration are very long. In Algoma the distance is 1,000 miles and in other counties it is 100 miles. There is no provision whatever for registration as far as income is concerned.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, where he earns his income. It is following out the provisions we have had heretofore in our Province. There the income has always been assessed against the person where he earns it, and there he has been entitled to vote. By the law as it stands he would lose that vote. The object is to put it in the same way as the Ontario law puts it.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I think we should leave that clause as it was in the Act of last year, and that the voter should vote on income where he resides. Take the case of railway conductors and mail clerks on a train. They earn their income in a dozen electoral districts, and it would be impossible to tell where they should be registered. There is another point in this which I think is of very considerable importance. The clause says that "a person qualified otherwise than in respect of income shall only be entitled to be registered as a voter in the polling district in which the real property in respect of which he is qualified is situate." In some polling districts where they are cutting out new streets, it is sometimes difficult to know exactly in what polling sub-division to place the voter, and, if the revising officer should make a mistake, the person would be deprived of his vote. I think, if the revising officer makes an unintentional mistake of that kind and places the voter in the wrong polling sub-division, it would be very wrong to deprive him of his right to vote.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon friend will see that in such a case the voter can elect which polling sub-division he desires to be registered in.

Mr. WALLACE (York). How can he do that if he is only put in one, and that not the polling division in which he is entitled to vote?

Mr. SPROULE. This clause would apply to a property owner's son as well, and the question has been settled that he should vote where his father resides.

Mr. McCARTHY. That only means the electoral district; it does not mean the particular polling division.

Mr. MILLS. I suppose the hon. gentleman intended that, where a party lives in a suburb outside of the corporation and earns his money in the city, he should be entitled to register in the city on his income and to vote on the property he may hold outside?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. How does he reconcile that with the provision that the party is a resident within the electoral district? There he provides that the party shall vote upon his income in the place where he resides. That is inconsistent with what he now proposes to provide for in this section.

Mr. WELDON. The old Act said persons qualified should only be registered as voters and vote where they resided at the time of the registration.

Mr. EDGAR. That is far safer.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the point taken by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is well taken. The object is what the hon. member supposed, and of course it only applies to cities. People live in suburbs and are entitled to vote on their property, but heretofore they have also had a vote on their income, and they are assessed where they earn their income. The object is not to disfranchise them or deprive them of what they now possess.

Mr. WELDON. Would a person who had his income in the city be assessed in the city if he resided outside?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. WELDON. We have the same provision whereby persons having an income in the city are considered inhabitants and vote on income in the city though they reside outside. I suppose the hon. gentleman desires to provide that?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what I was seeking to do, but, as the hon. member for Bothwell has said, it is inconsistent with the other clause.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Then if a man pays two dollars a month rent, he will have a vote on income also. I understood he was to have a vote on income only if he had not a vote otherwise.

Mr. EDGAR. There is an important change here from polling district to electoral district, so that an income voter at one end of the county might go the other end to vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would draw the attention of the House to a point in connection with occasional absence. It is provided that a young man attending college is entitled to vote though he is away the entire year. In my constituency a farmer has his younger son attending college, and his eldest son learning to be a blacksmith, the eldest son will be deprived of a vote because he is learning a trade, while the second son who is going to college will be entitled to vote. I think there should be some provision made that a young man learning a trade, although not continuously absent through the year from his father's home, should be entitled to be registered as a voter just as well as a young man attending school for the purpose of becoming a doctor or a lawyer.

Mr. MULOCK. I beg to move a further addition to this section as follows:—

No person shall be entitled to vote in an election unless, at the time of tendering his vote, he is possessed of such qualification as is required as aforesaid, in order to entitle him to be registered upon the voters' list.

I do not think that amendment can be objected to on principle. We have already agreed that the qualification must be possessed by the farmer's son or the owner's son at the time he tenders his vote, and I fail to see on what principle you can refuse to extend that provision to the case of every other father.

Mr. THOMPSON. I hope that will not be pressed, because it establishes another final revision, and that is to be held by the polling officer. I do not know how many votes can be got in if every voter's qualification is to be tried by the polling officer, I think it would be impossible to hold an election. If the hon. gentleman intends to contest a constituency in the next election he will not be able to know who the voters are until their votes are polled. The revising officer's list will afford him no information whatever.

Mr. MILLS. I think the Minister is mistaken in that view. The only effect of the amendment will be that if you have any doubts as to the right of any party to vote, you will simply swear him. His name is on the list, and no one except those whose names are on the list, can vote. But if he has lost his qualifications since his name was put on, and he takes the oath, he can vote.

Mr. THOMPSON. That test of the oath is not provided for here.

Mr. MILLS. Do you propose to insert in that oath something that you have not inserted in the Act.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. MILLS. The point is this: How are you to prevent parties who have lost their qualification, from voting? Take for instance, a farmer's son. He gets his name on the list, but the next day he may leave his father and go elsewhere, and there are no means of excluding him, if he has lost the qualification to go upon the voters' list, from voting at the poll except by an amendment such as this.

Mr. McCARTHY. I trust the committee will not adopt this amendment. I think it is most important that we should make this list final, not merely for the purpose of the election, but for the purpose of a contest after the election. There is no greater ordeal that a member can undergo than a scrutiny. An election trial is bad enough, but a scrutiny is almost fatal. Only the other day I read in the London *Times* of an unfortunate man who had to pay £1,500 pounds in a contest, because a question arose as to the right of people to vote, whether they were or were not aliens. I think we ought to settle the list, and then the people on that list are entitled to vote, and we know who they are. There can be no contest in the way of a scrutiny, and none of that trouble and cost that are entailed by a scrutiny.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not inclined to withdraw this amendment for any reasons that have been advanced. The hon. member for North Simcoe mentions a case in England which cost a party a large sum of money. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how many such cases there were in the last Dominion elections. Does he know of more than one? For my part I cannot think of more than one, and even that case did not involve a scrutiny, so that it is idle to say that in the past the non-finality of the list in Dominion elections has led to any such troubles as the hon. member refers to. I cannot see why the principle of the amendment should not be adopted. Is it right that a man should be entitled to vote who has not the qualification which the law says he shall have in order to be placed upon the register? Being placed on the register is not the only object, it is merely a means to an end, and if you admit the principle that a proper qualification is necessary you must admit that it should be possessed at the time the right is to be exercised. If we want any more argument in favor of this amendment, look at the principle that has been adopted in the manufacture of the voters' list in this Dominion. This is not a case of lists under a different system. Take the Ontario system, for example. I am not citing it as a perfect system, but it is made up by different classes of people, for a different purpose, and rests on a different foundation, and it is therefore not open to the suspicion to which the lists made up under this Act is open. In spite of all that can be said to the contrary there is no doubt that the revising officers have not taken that judicial view of their duties that they should have taken; but even if we do not impugn their motives there is this circumstance in connection with the work of the revising officer that convinces me that the lists to-day are absolutely unreliable. Some of the revising officers have placed upon the lists a vast number of names on no evidence whatever. They brought no personal knowledge to bear, they simply used hearsay evidence, evidence on information and belief, which amounted to nothing, and thus it is possible, and I believe it is the fact, that the lists to-day contain a vast number of names of persons as registered voters which are not in possession of any qualification under this Act. Was the object of this Act that men not possessed of any qualification should be registered? This Act says that men must be possessed of certain qualifications to be registered. If you admit there are names on the list not possessed of any qualification, should there not be a test of their qualifications before they come to the polls? The Minister of Justice declares that the lists should be final, otherwise it would be impossible to carry on an election. Does the hon. gentleman not know that ever since elections in Canada, at all events in Ontario, such was the law? Have not the elections there been held under the law we ask to have now?

Mr. WALLACE (York). No.

Mr. MULOCK. Then the hon. gentleman does not know what he is saying.

Mr. WALLACE (York). It is the hon. member for North York who does not know what he is saying.

Mr. MULOCK. What does the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. WALLACE (York). I say, that under the last election law of Ontario, a man having property and qualified to vote at the time of the final revision, selling that property afterwards, was entitled to vote.

Mr. MULOCK. I am aware of that. That is, however, only recent legislation. But the Dominion elections held in 1882 were not held under that law.

Mr. WALLACE (York). They were.

Mr. MULOCK. That was the first election held under them.

Mr. WALLACE (York). No; the election of 1878 was held under them.

Mr. MULOCK. I doubt that. At all events, we have had elections held in which the right to vote depended on the right of the person possessing the qualifications at the time he came with his vote. We never heard of elections being interfered with by an unnecessary amount of swearing. It is very unpopular to swear persons when they come to vote, and it is a privilege very rarely resorted to.

An hon. MEMBER. Often.

Mr. MULOCK. It may be with the hon. gentleman. I have had some opportunity of judging, and I have very seldom seen an oath administered to a person at the polls. I have never heard of electors being unable to get in their votes because of swearing being resorted to to any extent. There is no evidence sufficient to justify the committee in refusing to accept the amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman insists on one principle and loses sight of another. We adopt this principle, that the right of a voter should be ascertained at a certain day, and being then ascertained should be fixed and determined until another opportunity occurs for ascertaining and determining what the list of qualified voters should be. The amendment does away, to a very great extent, with this principle, and deprives us of all certainty as to who the persons entitled to vote are. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in his opinion that elections were ever run in Canada under any such law—at all events, since the system of registration was adopted. It may have been where manhood suffrage was used. Under the system of registration, which we had in existence for some time, the list of voters having been revised and established, there was the right to make the voters swear as to the qualifications they possessed. I admit that existed in many places, and for a long time. This section goes much further. Who is to determine as to the qualification of the voter? The Act says that a certain person shall have a right to vote if his name is on the list, and he takes a certain oath. But the amendment declares that a man shall loose his right to vote; and as no tribunal is provided, presumably the polling officer will try the question without there being any provision for witnesses, and afterwards the case will come up in the courts. There will be a very serious inconvenience, and one that never existed in any part of the country. In all parts where we have a system of registration, the lists are made final, as they are under the sections of this Act, subject only to the test of administering the oath to the voter.

Mr. CURRAN. There is another objection to the amendment. The qualification mentioned in the list might have ceased, and another qualification might exist in its place. That will occur more particularly in cities. Take Montreal East, my own constituency, or the constituency of the hon. member for Hochelaga. Perhaps one-third of our constituents remove on 1st May. They are on the lists as occupants for property on certain streets. These individuals no longer possess the qualification on which their votes were based. If the principle invoked by the hon. member who moved the amendment is put into force, a man removing from one tenancy to another would find himself deprived of his vote on coming to the polls, and this would be a most serious inconvenience.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the fall of the year is the time at which it is not uncommon to hold elections, and that this is the very time when farmers' sons are most likely to be temporarily absent, and thereby they will be deprived of their vote. This conflicts clearly with the principle the hon. gentleman has laid down, and I think conflicts with justice as well.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. LANGELIER. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to a great blunder which has taken place in the French translation and which I hope he will take steps to have rectified. I notice that the words "occasional absence" in this clause are translated "*l'absence accidentelle.*"

Mr. THOMPSON. I shall have it corrected.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I called the attention of the hon. gentleman before to the fact that some revising officers refused to give the opposite party any information or any notice of appeals which had been made. Now I think the revising officer should be compelled to give, at all reasonable times, to parties desiring to see it, copies of these appeals, or to allow them to make copies, or that he should, at all events, exhibit a notice of these appeals sent to him. I would therefore move:

The revising officer shall exhibit, to any person requiring an examination of the same, all notices of additions or objections deposited with or mailed to him under sections 19 and 26, or permit copies thereof to be made.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. When the Bill was up the other evening we changed the 1st of January to the 1st of June for the beginning of the revision in future years. Now the dates provided under the existing Act are those based upon the former date, and now that we make the revision begin on the 1st of June, we must alter the dates of posting up and of finally returning the lists of voters. I propose to change those dates to the 1st day of September and the 1st day of November, respectively, after the year 1886.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have one or two other clauses to move. One is to make provision that in case of the illness or necessary absence of the revising officer, the clerk may adjourn the sitting from day to day.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Why should he adjourn from day to day?

Mr. THOMPSON. We propose to allow him to adjourn the court from day to day in order that the revising officer may be enabled to appoint a deputy.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. I also propose the following:—

Any revising officer appointed under the Act hereby amended may, in case of the illness or necessary absence, after leave granted thereof by the Governor in Council, appoint a deputy revising officer to act for him during such illness or absence; such officer shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and shall have all the powers and be possessed of all the qualifications possessed by the revising officer by whom he is appointed, and if he be not a judge of any court in his

division, shall be subject to appeal as provided in the Act hereby amended.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. Some hon. members on both sides have requested me to consider the position of farmer's sons, being the sons of tenant farmers at long leases. They asked that the clause might be modified to read as follows:—

Farmer's son means and includes any male not otherwise qualified to vote, and being the son of the owner and actual occupant of a farm, or tenant and actual occupant thereof, under a lease for a term not less than ten years.

Mr. MILLS. Make it five years.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no objection to making it five years.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose to amend the other parts of the interpretation clause, so as to provide for the husband voting on his wife's property.

Mr. EDGAR. Is that *re* Howland ?

Mr. McCARTHY. It has been specially brought up in that case. When we dealt with the assessment rolls, where a woman's property was rated in her husband's name, he was entitled to vote, but now that the assessment rolls are not adhered to, the law does not permit a man to be placed on the list, no matter how well off his wife is, if he has no property of his own. Then I propose that the word "mother" should include grandmother, which it did not before, strange to say, though it included step-mother and mother-in-law.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not think we ought to be called upon to consider these amendments now, sprung as they are upon the House, without sufficient time for reflection.

Mr. MILLS. The last amendment which was adopted will require the recasting of several other clauses. I am satisfied we should make greater progress if the Minister of Justice, having heard the discussion and the suggestions that have been made, were to cast a new Bill and put it through committee again.

Mr. THOMPSON. I should like to reconsider the section about the tenant farmers' sons, and reserve it until the third reading of the Bill to see what other changes it requires.

Mr. MILLS. Some further consideration will be required of the 7th proposed section, which is inconsistent with clause 6, where parties are qualified upon income who reside immediately outside of cities. It is a question how far it is desirable to give more than one vote. This Legislature has adopted the principle of one man one vote. I think it will be possible to make a provision for voting in cities, as the hon. gentleman proposed, by a slight alteration in this section.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it will not be practicable to amalgamate the qualification clauses just now. It will take a good deal of time, and hon. gentlemen will see that they are only applied to future revisions. I would have had the sections revised to correspond with the amendments that we have adopted about tenant farmers, but it was only suggested this evening. However, we will leave the clause in, without asking the committee to reconsider it, and before the third reading of the Bill I will see what other changes have to be made. We allowed section 11 of the Bill to stand, and I think that it will be desirable to adopt that section. Perhaps I can add a few words of explanation, and I propose to add a few words to it which I think will improve its efficiency. It is true that in most of the electoral districts the sub-divisions have been made, in many of them it has not been made, and I think it will be convenient to apply to them the principle which the Bill has already adopted, of keeping the polling sub-divisions unchanged until the number reaches 300. The last part of section 11 was read the other evening as referring to the final revision of this year; I propose to say that it shall only refer to the preliminary list of this year, by adding these words:

In every case in which the revising officer has heretofore divided the electoral districts into polling districts, he may alter or amend his order making such division from time to time.

As already explained the other evening, a good deal of inconvenience was experienced by the revising officers being called on to make their sub-divisions before the final revision, the effect of which was that they were obliged in many cases to sub-divide where there were even less than 200. The object of this is to enable them to go back to the former sub-divisions and to keep them permanent, if they think it desirable to do so—at any rate to give them power to revise the sub-divisions, the business of sub-dividing which they have already done. They seemed to think they would not have that power unless it was expressly conferred.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman provide for the publication of an addenda giving the names erased from the list and the names added ?

Mr. THOMPSON. No, this clause is only for this year. It is only to revise what has been done.

Mr. EDGAR. Does not this clause dispense with the printing of the preliminary list altogether this year where it has not been done? In the present year whenever the preliminary list of voters does not contain more than 300 names, then they need not be printed. That applies to nearly all the cases. Section 24 directs the printing and distribution of the preliminary list. Where that has not been done this year this clause dispenses with it being done at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it only dispenses with the sub-division.

Mr. EDGAR. The very section which makes all the elaborate provisions for printing the preliminary list and distributing it, &c., you here dispense with altogether.

On schedule B,

Mr. McCARTHY. My experience in elections has been that men not particularly scrupulous take the oath without any difficulty, whether they are qualified or not. On the other hand, men who are old, infirm, or nervous, become alarmed at being called upon to take the oath, decline to do so and loose their votes. All the guarantee we should have is that the man is on the list. That is the proper time to fight the qualification, and not at the polls. I move to strike out the words, "and that I am entitled to vote at this election." When the man comes and swears that he is the person whose name is on the list, and makes an affidavit against bribing and so on, I do not see what more we want. The simpler the oath the better.

Mr. EDGAR. In Ontario the oath, as the hon. gentleman knows, has been a very detailed and elaborate one, setting out the particular property, the lot, the concession, the township and everything about it, and whether he is a tenant, occupant or owner, and very often there is some technical question about the description, and that frightens people away. But I really think that we should have some guarantee that the person is really entitled to vote, and he should be required to pledge his oath to it.

Mr. WALLACE (York). The oath would require him to say that he is entitled to vote in this election, and so on. The voter may not have read the Act, he may not be familiar with a single clause of it, he takes some other person's word that it is all right, and then you make him swear to something of which he has really no knowledge.

Mr. WELDON. The revising officer may have put the name on improperly.

Mr. CHARLTON. The fact that a man's name is on the list is not an absolute guarantee that he should be there. The revising officer may make mistakes, and I think we should impose some safeguard on the voter himself, as to whether his name is on properly or not. While I think the oath should not be embarrassing in its character, still it should involve some guarantee of the person being entitled to vote, and to the fact that there is nothing wrong in his being placed on the list.

Mr. McCARTHY. What does the oath mean when it says: "I am entitled to vote in this election?" Does it mean that he has the property qualification or not? Some polling agent says to a man: "Are you sure you are entitled to vote," and he replies: "All I know about it is that I am on the voters' list," and still he is asked to swear positively to what is really a question of both fact and law. I think the oath should be as simple as possible. I have known men with perfectly good votes go away from the poll without voting, and on being questioned say they did not know anything about it, while others who were not entitled to vote, but had more assurance, voted.

Mr. EDGAR. Surely a man's title to vote is a thing to which he should be able to pledge his oath, at one time or another. My hon. friend has been assuming that because there is a judge, a preliminary revision and a final revision, the voter has taken the oath as to his qualifications. But not in one case out of twenty will that be the case. Surely when a man comes to exercise his franchise the public is entitled to the guarantee that he shall pledge his oath in a general way as to the validity of his vote. A man may be nervous or a little uncomfortable, but we cannot have a doctor present to examine him in that respect.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the main object of an oath should be to prevent parties from voting who have not a right to vote, and to provide a punishment for those who violate that condition, in the shape of a prosecution for perjury. I think it is better that even a few should be deterred from voting, who are not satisfied that they are entitled to vote, than that unscrupulous persons who have no title to vote should be permitted to do so. Better leave the oath as it is than to remove that safeguard.

Mr. McCARTHY. I go this far, so far as to say that this list is a finality, and that every man on the list, if he is not bribed, ought to vote, and that there should not be any scrutiny afterwards.

Mr. EDGAR. The list is final in Ontario. You cannot go behind it by a scrutiny.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I have gone behind it.

Mr. EDGAR. Not in Ontario.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, the ballots can be turned up.

Mr. EDGAR. That is for identity.

Mr. McCARTHY. On any ground, and that is why I object to it. If the hon. gentleman will refer to a case in England, where the law is the same as ours with regard to that, he will find that a question of the alienage of the voter came up, and this man wrote in the London *Times* stating that he had been ruined although he had retained his seat.

Mr. McNEILL. It seems to me rather strange to ask a man to swear that the revising officer has done his duty.

Mr. EDGAR. But the case may not be tried at all.

Mr. McNEILL. Many of them are tried. I think if the oath is to be of any value it would be more logical to ask a man whether his name was upon the list.

Mr. MILLS. He does not swear that his legal qualification is absolute, and I do not see any objection at all in that particular. But it prevents personation. That was my reason for including it.

Mr. McCARTHY. If that is all what is wanted, when he swears that he is the person named, that prevents personation.

Mr. MILLS. A man may say, I am John Smith, and this name is John Smith, and he might be satisfied with that; but if he were personating someone else, he would not be willing to take the remainder of the oath.

Mr. EDGAR. If a man comes to vote, he knows perfectly well that he is improperly on the list, that he never had the property in his life, and there is nothing to prevent him taking the oath.

Mr. McCARTHY. I quite agree; but I am afraid a man who is guilty of that fraud will take the oath.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You could follow him.

Mr. McCARTHY. Who ever did follow such a man?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I did.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is singular, but I venture to say that the experience of every one of us is that in every election we have had frauds of that kind have occurred. For every fraudulent man stopped there are two honest men stopped.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman wants to leave the door wider open for fraud than it is now.

Amendment agreed to (yeas, 23; nays, 11).

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to move an amendment, the purport of which is that where voters are objected to, or seek to be put on the list, they should be compelled to attend, on getting notice, without being paid. I do not know any way in which voters are to be struck off if put on improperly, unless they are brought to the court to explain how they purport to have a qualification, and I do not think these voters ought to be paid in order to attend; but, of course, they ought to be paid if they are improperly brought there. I have copied it from the Ontario Statute.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the amendment mean that if a man does not attend, the judge may strike him off?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, if he does not attend after receiving proper notice.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is a question as to whether you must issue an original subpœna in every case. There ought to be no necessity for that; you ought to be able to put in any number of names in one subpœna.

Mr. McCARTHY. There ought to be no doubt about that.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is room for doubt, and I know one revising officer who takes that view. Under our old Statute you require an original subpœna on every appeal.

Mr. WELDON. Provided the voter does not attend, the judge may strike his name off the list. If he gets a notice, why do you want a subpœna besides?

Mr. McCARTHY. There may be difficulty about proving a notice or he may not get it. The notice may be sent in a registered letter and he may not receive it. A subpœna is better than a notice.

Mr. McCARTHY moved that the qualification sections should not come into force until 1st January, 1887.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I think the Act as it now stands should pass into law and go in force at once. Tenants who

went into occupation on the 1st April, 1885, are required by the Act of last year to reside the whole year in the electoral district. These names are now on the voters' lists, because they were copied from the Ontario lists, but many of them will be struck off if the operation of this Act is postponed till the 1st January next. It is the intention that these persons shall have the right to vote, but this clause will enable their names to be struck off. A large number of tenant farmers can be struck off in this way, and I cannot see any good to be accomplished by passing this clause.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

REPRESENTATION OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. EDGAR. I notice that a Bill in which Canada is interested has passed the English House of Lords, that is, the Bill authorising us to give representation to the North-West Territories. I see by a cable in yesterday's *Globe* that the Bill is going to be introduced into the English House of Commons. I do not know whether the Government think it necessary to keep this House here until that Bill has passed the English House of Commons, perhaps they can tell us.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think there is any such intention.

Mr. EDGAR. Because that Bill is to authorise this legislation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That was foreseen when this Bill was before the House here. The First Minister explained that power would be obtained from the Imperial Government to that effect, and that our legislation here would be sanctioned.

Mr. EDGAR. The First Minister did not explain that. But it may have been his intention.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 2.10 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 26th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ST. PETER'S HARBOR, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. McINTYRE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the construction of the breakwater at the mouth of St. Peter's Harbour, King's County, Prince Edward Island, which was abandoned by the contractor some time ago? If so, when do they propose doing so?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Under date of the 10th February, 1883, John D. Sinnott entered into a contract for the construction of a breakwater, 1,900 feet in length, on the eastern side of the entrance to St. Peter's Bay, King's County, Prince Edward Island, and agreed to complete the work on or before the 30th September, 1883, for the sum of $3,930. In September, 1883, the contractor wrote that he could not finish the works, and practically abandoned them, and the amount appropriated lapsed on the 30th September, 1883. In February, 1885, a revote of the lapsed balance for this work was asked, but was not granted. About 1,500 feet of the work was nearly completed by the contractor, but he left it in an unfinished state. It has received some damage during the two winters which have passed. I am not in a position to say now when we propose to ask Parliament for more money to finish this work.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that a number of proposed grants of land and money to different railway companies have been placed upon the Notice Paper. I presume that, before he moves the House into Committee on these grants, he will see that the petitions and correspondence in connection with them are laid on the Table.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will speak to the Minister of Railways, and of course we will have to do what we did last year. What is there besides the petitions?

Mr. BLAKE. The correspondence and other papers; the data and materials. Those have been furnished on former occasions.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. GRAHAM.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to ask, whether the First Minister has received from the Conservative members of the Bar of Halifax, through Mr. Daly, a protest against the appointment of Mr. Wallace Graham as legal agent of the Government at Halifax, on the ground that he was the partner of C. H. Tupper, M.P. for Pictou, and a participator in the profits, and suggesting that the Premier had not been well advised in making the appointment?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The First Minister is not here, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to be kind enough to give notice of this, so that the Minister may be in a position to answer it.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to call the attention of the Government—I see the Minister of Finance is not in his place, but of the hon. gentleman who is leading the Government—to this. I had understood that the Committee of Public Accounts had adjourned to to day for the purpose of hearing certain evidence on a matter referred to it, and on going there I found no committee was sitting. It is a matter of consequence to some members of this House, and some parties who are here, that that committee should be summoned at once, and if any accident prevented its being summoned to-day it should be summoned to-morrow without fail.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understood that the committee will be summoned to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was adjourned till to-day.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Most likely members went home so late that they could not come back in time for the committee.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to refer to a matter which I presume is a misunderstanding, but which, as it stands now, amounts to a denial of a statement made by myself. In the course of a speech on the timber limit question on May 4th, timber limits, coal leases and so forth, I gave the name of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) as an applicant for a coal lease. That gentleman answered: "No." I went on to say:

"The policy of the Government with regard to the coal lands of the North-West was not one in the interest of the settler. It was not to the interest of the settler that a coal-mining monopoly should be granted, and that the Government should second efforts to take the coal lands of the North-West and put them in a few hands who might monopolise the business of mining and compel the people to pay so much more for their fuel, which is so necessary in a cold climate like that.

"Mr. McCARTHY. Does the hon. gentleman say these were granted?

"Mr. CHARLTON. I did not. I say they were applications.

"Mr. BOWELL. How could they be monopolies?

"Mr. CHARLTON. No return has been brought down in reference to coal leases subsequent to 1883, and what number of these applications were favorably acted upon I am unable to say, but I give the applications.

"Mr. HAGGART. There is no application from me, anyway.

"Mr. McCARTHY. Nor from me."

I had, previous to this, made statements in regard to applications, and stated that some members had made a number of applications; and I had not stated that members in these cases had made applications in their own behalf, but was treating of applications in general. The hon. member for North Simcoe has denied that he was an applicant for a coal lease. I feel it incumbent on me, therefore, to present the following correspondence:—

"HOUSE OF COMMONS,
"OTTAWA, 13th May, 1882.

"SIR,—May I draw your attention to the application made by Mr. Sanders for a coal license. I should very much like to know if this application has been entertained, and that the lease is to issue therefor.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"DALTON McCARTHY."

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
"OTTAWA, May 23rd, 1882.

"SIR,—I have the honor, by the direction of the Minister of the Interior, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 13th instant, re the application of Mr. Sanders, and to reply that up to the present time none of the coal applications have been entertained.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"L. A. HAMILTON."

Another application:

"TORONTO, November 11th, 1882.

"SIR,—I beg to enclose you herewith Mr Robert Cassidy's application for a coal-mining limit, to be composed of the east half of section 36, township 20, range 21, North-West Territory, as shown on the accompanying map, and I shall be very glad to hear that his application has been favorably entertained.

"Yours truly,
"DALTON McCARTHY."

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
"OTTAWA, 21st November, 1882.

"SIR,—I have the honor, by direction of the Minister of the Interior, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th instant, recommending the application of Mr. Robert Cassidy for a coal-mining limit, to be composed of the east half of section 36, township 20, range 21, North-West Territory, and in reply beg leave to inform you that the ground in question is covered by a prior application.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"A. RUSSELL."

I have also, in reference to a statement made by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Dickinson), in which I understand he claims that the license granted to him was granted before his election as a member of this House, to present the official record here.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I have no desire to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I would like to have your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on this point: Whether it is competent for any hon. member, having made a speech in Parliament and the debate being closed, afterwards, at any time he may think proper, when the Orders of the Day are called, to supplement his first speech by giving what he may consider evidence of the statements he then made, at a time when debate on those statements is impossible. No further debate can take place, and it seems to me to be a most irregular proceeding.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not see very clearly how this can be a personal explanation. The hon. gentleman made a contradiction at the time the question was before the House, and now that the hon. gentleman from North Simcoe is not in his place, seems to me another reason why we should not go into a matter which may lead to a debate. The hon. gentleman ought to take some other opportunity, as when going into Supply, of supplementing his statement, or when there is a motion before the Chair. I do not know that the hon. gentleman's statement has been impugned in any way which calls upon him to make a personal explanation. I think the practice is irregular to make a speech on such an occasion.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may be allowed, in justification of the course I took, to say that the statement was denied, and upon that occasion I promised I would procure the proofs which I had not then. It was impossible for me to present them then, and I do so now, as it seemed to be a convenient opportunity of presenting to the House the evidence upon which the statement was made—not to make a speech upon the matter, by any means.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will see that that may call for a contradiction and lead to a debate.

Mr. BLAKE. On going into Committee of Supply, then.

LIGHTHOUSE AT PENETANGUISHENE.

Mr. COOK asked, Is the Government aware that the lighthouse on wharf at the entrance of the harbor of Penetanguishene is in a precarious condition by the foundation having given way, and the building likely to collapse at any time? Has the Government received any communication from the lighthouse-keeper on this subject? If so, do they intend to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates to repair this damage at an early date?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government is aware that the pier at the entrance of Penetanguishene Harbor, on which a small lighthouse stands, is in a state of decay, and the Department of Marine has been in communication with the light-keeper on the subject. As the wharf in question is not Government property, and as the general interests of navigation are now served by a light lately erected on Whiskey Island, within half a mile of the light on Reformatory Pier, the Department does not propose to take any steps to put the pier in a state of repair, and if from the failure of the foundation the light building, which is a small and inexpensive structure, should be destroyed, it would be more economical to replace it by a pole light than to build a new and expensive foundation to carry the present building.

RAILWAY FROM CANSO TO LOUISBURG.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the resolution from Committee of the Whole, respecting the construction of a railway from a point on the Straits of Canso to Louisburg or Sydney, be read the second time.

Resolution concurred in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN introduced Bill (No. 143) to authorise the construction of a railway to the Straits of Canso as a public work.

Bill read the first time.

BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved, that the resolution from Committee of the Whole, respecting the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company, be read the second time.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman was to let us have some papers in connection with this, the specifications respecting the original plan of the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understood that the hon. gentleman wanted the contracts and specifications which were laid upon the Table. He also asked for the names of the shareholders, the amount subscribed and the amount paid. Those I have here, and I will send them across to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman also asked for the tenders that were received for this work. The tenders

are A, B and C; the first tender was from A. Picard, and, as I stated before, that man could not be found. On the 10th December, 1884, the following letter was sent to Mr. A. Picard:—

"I am directed by the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals to return you the enclosed cheque which accompanied your tender for the construction of the Metapediac branch."

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
"A. P. BRADLEY,
"*Secretary.*"

This was returned after awhile by the Dead Letter Office to the Department; the party could not be found. The Department then sent to the Merchants' Bank of Canada, at Quebec, the cheque of A. Picard for $14,800, which was supposed to be accepted by the bank, as marked here on the cheque. The manager of the bank returned the cheque with this letter:

"QUEBEC, 30th April, 1885.

"The Hon. the Minister of Railways, Ottawa.

"SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge your letter, No. 23,080, of 28th inst., enquiring if we knew the address of one Mr. A. Picard, whose cheque for $14,800 drawn on this branch of the bank, had been deposited as security for a contract for which he tendered. In reply, we cannot ascertain who he is or where he lives; he never had any funds at his credit with this branch, that I am aware of. I notice the following persons of the name in our directory:"

He gives the names of four persons of the same name.

"I have made several enquiries without avail. This is the second time recently that my attention has been called to the fact of persons drawing cheques upon banks where they had no funds to deposit as security. It is requisite to know that they represent money. It would be well in all cases to refer to the bank upon which they are drawn.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant."

Signed by the name of the manager. This is a cheque for $14,800 which was sent to the Department, and it is evident that the mark on the cheque as the acceptance of the bank must have been a forgery. Of course, we could not find who the party was, and the Department of Railways had to put that tender aside. The two other tenders were those of R. P. Cooke and C. McCarron and J. D. Cameron. The tender of McCarron & Cameron was for $428,000, or $128,000 more than the amount voted by Parliament. The tender of R. P. Cooke was for $450,000, or $150,000 more than the amount voted by Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. Do the specifications accompany the tenders; because, of course, the tenders are useless without the specifications?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The specifications were deposited at the different places where the plans were to be seen, and tenders were sent without the specifications but with a schedule of prices. That schedule is the basis on which the extension took place by the officers of the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will bring down the conditions and specifications on which the tenders are based.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe the hon. gentleman, in reply to my request to bring down a statement of the shareholders and the amount paid on their stock, has partially complied with my request, and the names of the principal shareholders are as follows:—Hon. Theodore Robitaille, 500 shares, $25,000; Hon. Thos. McGreevy, 1,000 shares, $50,000; Hon. Louis Robitaille, 1,000 shares, $50,000; Robt. H. McGreevy, 500 shares, $25,000; L. J. Riopel, 1,000 shares, $50,000; L. A. Robitaille, 980 shares, $49,000; and a few others. The hon. gentleman's statement, however, does not comprise the other important part of my question, which was a statement as to how much was paid on the stock.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The capital was $3,000,000; the amount subscribed, $300,000, that is, 10 per cent., and 10 per cent. is paid up.

Resolution concurred in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN introduced Bill (No. 144) respecting certain subsidies to a railway from Metapediac, on the Intercolonial, to Paspebiac.

Bill read the first time.

REAL PROPERTY IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 10) respecting real property in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Thompson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 13,

Mr. WELDON. Though this Bill—and particularly this clause—makes some very radical changes in the principles upon which we have heretofore proceeded with regard to transfers of real property, I do not intend to oppose its passage, or to discuss it at this stage of the Session. Having been a member of the special committee to whom the Bill was referred, and knowing that a majority of the committee were in favor of its principles, I do not propose to move an amendment. It is only fair for me to say that, in the course of discussion, the Minister of Justice stated the fact that out of a large number of cases brought under the operation of the Torrens system in Australia, there had been only one or two cases in which any difficulty had arisen, which is certainly a very cogent reason in favor of the efficacy of the system.

Mr. THOMPSON. I quite appreciate the difficulty the hon. gentleman has on some of the features of this measure, and I also appreciate his disposition to allow the Bill to pass, notwithstanding his views with regard to it, because of the full consideration which was given to the matter in committee. I may explain that since we investigated this matter in committee, upon looking at the North-West Lands Act I find that this section is precisely the same as one in the existing law, so that, although the principle seems somewhat novel, we are not introducing it afresh.

On section 93,

Mr. MILLS. There is no provision in the law as to how an estate shall be distributed. You have in general terms the provision in the common law in force in the North-West Territories, as to how property shall be distributed, but there is no provision showing what steps are to be taken, and how each party's share is to be registered. For instance, a man dies and leaves a wife and three children. The property passes, not into the hands of the heirs, but into the hands of the realty representative. He undertakes to carry out the law and give it effect. What is he to do? There is no provision. There is a provision for carrying out the old law, but that does not apply to the steps necessary to be taken under this Bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. The realty representative will be in the position of a trustee; that is, as a trustee is to be under this Act. He becomes, as far as the right of disposing of the property is concerned, the absolute owner, and the trusts with which he is vested by virtue of the will are enforceable only in the ordinary courts.

Mr. MILLS. Supposing he were to make a disposition of the property and issue a certificate of title, I suppose that, being the legal holder of the property and capable of making that distribution, his act could not be called in question.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, the validity of the act could not.

Mr. MILLS. Suppose he were to make a wholly different distribution, the validity of the Act could not be called in question.

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. MILLS. He might under some law be liable to punishment for violation of trust, but not under the provisions of this Bill. There is no provision in this Bill showing what steps he is to take to carry into effect his legal duties.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not quite understand the hon. gentleman's objection yet, but I understand the statement of the case as he puts it. The executor appointed under the law is vested with the absolute ownership of the property. He has the power, under this Act, to commit a breach of trust by conveying it otherwise than as the law directs, but notwithstanding that the title passes effectually, and he is liable for a breach of trust in the same way as a trustee of shares in a ship would be. That follows as the logical consequence of our abolition of the notices of trust of every kind, and our conversion of real estate into personalty.

Mr. MILLS. That rule applies just as well to the case of a mortgagee or an ordinary transferee as to that of any other party. The operation of the law is absolute, and does not depend on the steps taken by those parties undertaking to mortgage or transfer. But the hon. gentleman has made directory provisions as to how the property may be mortgaged and how the transfer may be made, without making any corresponding directory provisions for the purpose of giving effect to the distribution of the estate in case the realty representative, as it must be presumed, is undertaking honestly to carry out the law. The law does not cover the whole ground for the purpose of giving effect to its provisions.

Mr. THOMPSON. I see the hon. gentleman is turning his attention to the apparent want of a provision to enable the executor to execute trusts. That is provided for in the Bill passed in relation to the North-West Territories because probate jurisdiction is given to the judges appointed under that Act. It strikes me that, if a will is made devising the real estate to three children, under this Bill and under the North West Judiciary Bill, taken together, the judge could direct the executor to make a partition of the property and a transfer in accordance with the will.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that the probate jurisdiction would not apply to real estate, and besides, that the provisions of the Imperial law, as they stood in 1870, which are brought into operation in the North West Territories, are provisions for dealing with real estate altogether different from what the hon. gentleman has undertaken to bring into operation in the North-West Territories. It would be necessary, from my point of view, at all events, and as I understand the effect of the hon. gentleman's Bill, to go further and to legislate in accordance with the spirit and policy of this Act with reference to that matter, and not leave it as a mere matter of procedure with the court in giving effect to its jurisdiction under the Supreme Court Act, which we carried through the House yesterday.

Mr. THOMPSON. It strikes me that the probate jurisdiction would operate on the matter, inasmuch as we have abolished the distinction between real and personal estate by this Act, and furthermore, if not, it would come under the general jurisdiction given to these judges. The executor would, in point of fact, be turned into a trustee under this Bill, a trustee with the power of sale, and it would be competent for the judges under the Judiciary Act to order that he should execute his trusts.

Mr. DAVIES. I think there is something in my hon. friend's contention deserving the consideration of the Minister of Justice. Suppose a man dies leaving property and having five children. His property goes to his children under the will. The real estate is vested in an executor. Some of the children may be willing to have a division of the real estate, and some may not be willing, and the executor has no means of carrying out the division, the court cannot enforce it, and the executor is compelled to sell and divide the proceeds. Suppose four of the children were willing to have a division without sale in accordance with the will; there is no means by which those four, by applying to the court, could compel the fifth to acquiesce in a fair division or in carrying out the directions of the will.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will look at the point carefully, but I am strongly of the opinion that the clause giving jurisdiction to the courts does give that power to the judges. I move that the committee rise and report progress, and, unless there is some objection, I will move the money clauses after dinner.

Mr. BLAKE. The resolutions respecting salaries?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Committee rose and reported progress.

PUBLIC PRINTING AND STATIONERY.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved the second reading of Bill (No. 132) respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery. He said: Mr. Speaker, although the principle of this measure must be known to every member of this House, although it is not a novel idea, yet as the measure, as a practical measure, comes now for the first time before Parliament, I think it is necessary for me to make a few observations on the object, the purpose and the practical results of this measure. The object in view is not to establish the Government either as a manufacturer or as a trader. It is a well-known principle that a Government should not be a trader, should not be a producer, and it is a principle of English legislation that the initiation of such measures should be left to private enterprise. But I think there is here a question of opportunity, a question of economy. It would not be right that the Government should have a manufactory of its own. This principle is applicable even to railways. Railways have been built and administered by Governments, but it is now a well-settled point that unless it is a necessity, except in the case of some great highways necessary for the development of the resources of the country, the working of a railway by a Government is not a policy that should be encouraged. But the Government require stationery and printing every day. The Government, in that respect, is essentially a consumer; and the rule of action in this case, the Government being the consumer, should be to get the best article at the least possible price. This is the object of the Bill, and to this there are objections raised which I will state and answer. I cannot but admit that, as a general rule, a private individual can work a printing office at less expense than a Government. But we must not forget that this economy of the private individual constitutes his profit; the more economical the greater the profit. We are giving him the profit obtained by his economy, and of everything that enters into the work he is doing, besides his economy. The question, therefore, presents itself for our consideration, shall we continue the present system, knowing, as we do, that a private individual can work at less expense than a Government; or shall we not take upon ourselves the task of securing that economy for ourselves, by diminishing the prices we would have to pay; or, if we want to go further, shall we not, taking the economy as if not realised, undertake to do our own printing, so as to secure what is required—uniformity, quality, superiority of work, better security for the efficiency of the work, and secrecy, which is one of the necessities of Government printing? I

think I can say, without being exposed to an action for damages for slander, that the Government printing is not what it should be. I am sure I am not slandering anybody in saying that if our blue-books were exhibited at an international exposition of public documents, we would not compare favorably either with our neighbors or with England, not even with most of the British colonies. There is a great lack in that respect. What is the cause of it? We shall see in a moment. Those whom we employ would answer promptly: We cannot give you better work for the price we receive. If this is a good reason for the contractors who undertake to do that work, it is not a good reason why we should not take advantage of the position of the printers who, with their pretended small profits and comparatively indifferent work, succeed in realising profits averaging from 20 to 80 per cent. This average of profits has been established, I must say, to our loss, in a case which was decided not many months ago against the Government for printing done outside of the Government contracts between the years 1874-75 and 1878-79. I refer to the judgment obtained before the Exchequer Court and confirmed by the Supreme Court. In that case some of the profits alleged and proved to have been realised reached the figure of 79 per cent. It will be said that we pay low prices for our work, and that it will be impossible for the Government to do the work at those prices. I do not admit that; on the contrary, I deny it. I think a Government printing office should do the work at no higher cost, and I say that, knowing what I am saying, because a fact is worth more than an argument, and it is a fact that Government contractors do not impoverish themselves by the contracts they accept from Parliament. It is true that the prices are apparently low. Are they low in fact? People who have studied the question carefully, will answer, no. Numerous are the devices of skilful printers, of good tradespeople, to make as much profit as possible, and although their contracts are taken at apparently low prices, they prove good paying bargains. A change in the quality of paper might be an ingredient in the indirect profits, overcharge for extra hours, overcharge for work hurried beyond the time implied by the terms of the contract; the type remaining standing for days and days, each day counting as an impression for which the matter remains standing. Last year, for instance, during our long sitting and during a period of about, I think, two months, when we were discussing a single measure in this Parliament, the same matter in the pages of our Orders remained standing for weeks and months, and still it was paid for every day as if the print had been re-set every day. That is something which cannot be avoided; it cannot be provided against in a contract, as the printer might be obliged, in performing the work of the House, to renew the matter every day. It is true that contractors have realised, and are realising advantages which accrue every time new contracts are awarded. But there are difficulties with contracts. A short contract would necessarily imply a higher price, and naturally so. On the other hand, contracts for long periods will necessarily imply a loss to the Government by the fluctuations of the market in the price of labor and other circumstances of that kind. It is true that opponents of this measure may say that there may be corresponding gains owing to fluctuations in the other direction. Well, I do not say that the case has presented itself lately, but we know that while on the one hand the Government may lose by the falling off of the price of labor, if these changes should be against the employers of labor and should result either in the failure of the contractor or great loss to him, the contractor always finds that the public are indulgent with him in such cases. I speak of the public generally, and I make no difference as between parties or Governments. In all such cases the public would be indulgent to the contractor who suffers loss in the performance of work for the public. Another difficulty we meet with in contracts is this, that a large contract must necessarily be awarded to a first-class office. If it is not, you are exposed either to see your work very badly done, to see it subject to interruption and delay, and it will result in having the work performed by others, outside of the contract price, and consequently at a heavy loss. And who is to tell which is a first-class printing office and which is a second-class one? Who will tell us that a second or third-class printing office should not have the advantage of a low tender if, for instance, the proper security is given as a guarantee of the contract? Nobody can tell; and the result is that recriminations will be made, as they have been made. I have already stated that delays in the execution of such work constitute an evil which it would be well to cure, and which can be cured by the establishment of a Government printing office. Changes are frequently made in departmental work, or in work for the House, and these changes always give rise to extra charges, which are not, and which cannot be, covered by the stipulations of a contract. I cannot do better, to illustrate this point, than to quote a short extract from the evidence of a practical man, who was examined at an investigation, held in 1885, at Wellington, New Zealand, into this very question of a Government printing office. The witness was one who had himself been in a Government printing office, and at the time of his examination he was at the head of a large firm of printers, and therefore one who was eminently qualified to speak on the question of the desirability of having a Government printing office, and whether the maintenance of such an institution would be profitable to the country. The witness is asked:

"Q. The one definite point which this committee is appointed to enquire into is, as to the advisability or otherwise of executing by private contract any part of the Government printing. Will you give the committee your opinion upon that point?—A. Speaking candidly, I do not think that the private printer could successfully compete with the Government printing office; for the private printer would naturally expect to make a profit upon his work, and it appears to me that that profit is now made or saved by the Government printer for the Government.

"Q. Then you think the colony gets the benefit?—A. Yes, I feel quite sure that it does."

"Q. Is it necessary that there should be a Government printing office?—A. I think so. I think that the Government printing office is a great safeguard to the Government on matters of expenditure on printing, because all printing done outside the Government printing office for the Government is, I understand, checked by the Government printer, who is able to say whether the work has been properly performed or not. He is likewise able to report as to the charge for it, whether it be moderate or otherwise."

"Q. Can you illustrate, by any experience of your own, the practical effect of the two systems—that is, printing in the Government office, as contrasted with printing in private offices?—A. In the matter of uniformity, I consider the Government gain largely by having the work done in their own office. The printing done in the Government office possesses uniformity. The work is classified, and one uniform style adhered to. If given to different offices the style would vary very much. There is another important matter in connection with the Government office. Everything is very much condensed, and brought into the smallest compass possible with due regard to utility; but in a private office the natural disposition is to make what the printers call 'fat'—that is, to make everything as white and open as possible. I remember having seen, some years ago, a number of Bills and Estimates which had been printed for one of the Provincial Governments. The sight of that work astounded me. I noticed that what are termed 'pica whites' had been run between the lines of the Bills. That simply meant that the work would cost the Government double the contract price, because the matter which should honestly form but one page had been, by the introduction of blank spaces between the lines, made into two pages. That is, what the Government printer would put into one page the private printers would make two pages of."

The witness goes on to give a full explanation of his reasons for believing such an establishment could be worked profitably for the Government, and why such a plan was better than that of having the printing of the Government done at private offices. But there are some other reason

which should militate in favor of a Government printing office. There are things which should be done which are not done, because of their cost. We have not thought yet of collecting and printing our national archives. I must say a good deal has been done lately in that direction; but we have to go far back in our history for that work. With so remarkable a past as ours, we have, in our history, events which may compare with those in the history of other nations—not only souvenirs, but facts which are instructive in the study of the history of the country, and which are all, if not lost, at least scattered in such a way that they are useful only to a very few, whereas the public should benefit by the collection of those historical monuments. Our archives have been collected, but I think we should not leave them exposed to the danger of a conflagration. It has already happened in our country that important and most precious documents have been so sacrificed. That cannot be helped, because everything cannot be printed and scattered all over the world, but I think a portion of our archives should be compiled, classified and put in order, and printed. Other countries, smaller countries than ours, are doing this. New Zealand last year or the year before decided to have a compilation of all their debates from 1854 to 1866. While the political history of Canada is most astonishing and most useful to study, we have not a *résume* or record of the deliberations of the most important periods of our political history. We have had the *Hansard* for only a few years. We have had in some of the Provinces a collection of the debates; but for the most interesting period of our history, we have not anything but the reports which are scattered in the different newspapers that existed at the time. I think it would not be a bad idea if, acting with prudence, and with *discernement*, the beginning of a compilation of those debates as we find them in the different newspapers, were entrusted to somebody, to form the basis of national political archives. This could be done at a moderate cost if the Government had a printing office. Everybody knows that work done at leisure, in "slack" times, as they are termed, can be done at a great deal less than the usual cost. In the compilation of those archives, we could employ during the slack times of the year the staff which must necessarily be kept in an establishment of the character of a Government printing office. Then there are the statistics, the need of which is very much felt. Though we have a number of departmental returns and reports, these are not sufficiently classified. The information is there, it is true, but the business man cannot easily find in those documents the statistics which are so necessary for the commercial community, and which are so desirable in the work of immigration. It would be easy, with a Government printing office, during the course of the year, by keeping standing the type which is used for those reports, to collect parts of the different returns and publish them, as is done in the United States, as a quarterly compendium of statistics. Such a compendium of statistics, I do not hesitate so say, would be as useful, and perhaps more useful for the general instruction of the public, and for those interested in such statistics, than the dozen or more of bulky volumes which we publish every year as Sessional Papers. At all events, those compendiums could be published easily and cheaply. As those papers are prepared by the different Departments, those collections could easily be made. The type would not be kept idle, and would serve ultimately for the publication of the official documents of the House. I have stated, *en passant*, that another consideration is the necessity for having the confidential work done in an establishment belonging to, and under the direct and absolute control of the Government. It is one of the characteristics of the constitution that all documents remain as the private and confidential property of the Government until their official promulgation. This has been felt in other countries to be one of the great reasons for the establishment and maintenance of a Government printing office. I think that England, that hot-bed of traditional conservatism—England, where good things are to be found, but when once obtained are with great difficulty reformed and changed—is the only large country where a Government printing office is not now in existence; and still, even with the contract system they have in England, one might consider the Government contractors for printing as constituting, in a certain sense, a Government printing office in another form, with the bad feature preserved of high prices for the work. Messrs. Eyre & Spottiswoode, Mr. Hansard and other Government printing contractors form portions of the Government printing establishment, but at a cost which is certainly not to be commended to this Parliament. In Europe, we see that Paris, St. Petersburg and Berlin have their national printing offices. In those countries, not less than here, people are apt to look carefully into matters of expense, to examine with the scrutiny of experience the working of such a system, and in no case has a change been proposed, in spite of all the efforts which have been made by contending contractors or private individuals, to have the system changed. In fact, since the time when the great Minister, Pitt, took into his hands to reform the system in England of giving out contracts for stationery, and on every occasion in England when an effort has been made to put into the hands of the Government the control of the supplying of stationery and printing, the same opposition arose of private interest against public interest, prejudice against progress, routine against reform. In France committees have sat on several occasions to examine into the system, and change the method followed by that country, and the last committee's report in 1886 shows that, although it had been stated that the Imprimerie Nationale was the most costly, the facts proved the contrary. During the Geneva arbitration, when important and bulky documents had to be printed in the greatest haste and in the best possible style, they were sent to the Imprimerie Nationale, and the work was most admirably executed. It has been proved in France, as reported by the committee, that the establishment of a national printing office was in the interest of the community at large. In the United States, where also it was for a long time contended that the public would not gain by a change of system, it has been proved by different committees of investigation that the profits realised from the estate, under the Government system, averaged 40 per cent., being that much saved on the old plan of giving out contracts. In the annual report of the Public Printer, who is the officer we would call Queen's Printer, I find the following figures, showing the difference of cost in publishing the Debates of Congress by contract and under the Government system:—From 1871 to 1873, when the publishing of the Debates was done by contract, the number of pages printed was 1,283, the number of ems 12,830,000, and the cost of printing, reporting and binding $554,731. Then from 1877 to 1879, when the work was done by the Government printing office, the number of pages was increased to 1,907, the number of ems to 19,075,000, yet still the whole cost is reduced to $348,745. In the same report we find the comparison made between the cost of Government printing from 1853 to 1860 under the private contract system, and its cost from 1871 to 1878 under the official system. For the seven years, from 1853 to 1860, the cost of printing was $5,201,459, the number of pages printed 301,633, and the cost per page $1.76, the average price of labor being at that time $2.75 per day; yet under the official system, in the seven years, from 1871 to 1878, when the average price of labor was $3.75 per day, and when the number of pages was 617,097, the cost was but $1,370,309, the cost per page being reduced to 75 cents, making a difference in cost of

printing in favor of the official system of $831,149, when the average price of labor was 40 per cent. higher and the number of pages double. A similar result is shown in the other statistics found in the same report. In 1866 the United States Government paid $1,519 per week for 21 copies each of 201 patents. Everyone knows that the printing of patents is a large item in public expenditure with our neighbors. Under the Government printing system, in 1878, only $905 per week were paid for 150 copies of 252 patents, an increase of 143 pages or 39,000 words more than in 1866. Not only have the Governments of Europe and the Government of the United States, but now the Australian group of British colonies have established official printing offices. Wellington, Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane, Adelaide and Hobart, capitals of the several colonies, have adopted the system of Government printing offices. After long investigation and careful research, they concluded it was in the interests of the public that Government printing should be done by Government printing offices. The New Zealand Commission, in 1885, reported as follows:—

"First, that they have examined seven witnesses, all of whom, by reason of their experience and standing in the trade, are entitled to speak with authority on the points submitted to the committee for investigation. All agree that for the purpose of executing the printing required by the Government there must be a Government printing office. To the question whether any part of the Government printing could be done cheaper by private contract than at the Government printing office, five witnesses answered positively 'no.' Two were of opinion that 'some of it might.' Questioned further as to the particular class of work which, in their opinion, might with advantage to the colony be submitted to tender, these two witnesses, both newspaper proprietors, selected certain 'stock' work which it would pay them to take at low prices in slack times when their machines were idle? To this position there appeared to the committee to be the irrefutable answer that, if it be advantageous to private offices to be provided with 'stock' work in slack times, which, in the case of the private offices, come at more or less uncertain periods, it must be of some considerably more importance to provide 'stock' work for the Government printing office which has a definite and annually recurring slack time, during which the large and expensive plant of the office would lie idle and unproductive if its 'stock' work were taken from it to be given to private offices."

Mr. MILLS. Has the hon. gentleman the figures showing the cost of the Queen's printing office in Canada, year by year, when it existed here under Desbarats and Derbishire?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have not. I have endeavored to get the figures; but when Mr. Geo. Desbarats conducted the Government printing work here, as the hon. gentlemen knows, the system was a mixed one. It was exceedingly costly during the time of Mr. Desbarats, particularly after his establishment was burnt. It was a mixed system, part being done as Government work and part as contract work. At all events, these statistics would show, if hon. gentlemen had taken the trouble to get them, that the prices paid will compare with disadvantage with the contract prices we pay at the present moment. The contract prices at present are the lowest we can find in looking in the statistics of the past, and I must say, if it were not for the reasons I have already given and intend giving in the course of my remarks, that the prices of the contractors at present, the prices *primâ facie* charged in the contract, are certainly low. For departmental work they are what all other printers would call starving prices, but, for the reasons and considerations I have given, in spite of those starving prices, easy work and large profits are accruing to the Government printers. In Jamaica, where the question was studied with care and with a great deal of opposition, also, in the way, we find this, and I submit here the statistics of the cost of printing in Jamaica. The comparison is between the cost of printing by the Government printing office and the cost of the same work at the actual market prices. This statement is to be found in the Jamaica hand-book of 1885. In 1880 the cost of printing for the Government was £7,689. That was the first year of their experience. The same work at market prices would have cost £6,805, a slight fraction under what it cost the Government. In 1881 the cost to the Government was £8,341; the same at the market price calculated in the investigation would have been £10,414. In 1882, £7,141 was the price paid by the Government, as against £10,375, which was the market value of the same work. In 1883 the difference was in the comparison as to £5,887 against £8,852; in 1884, £5,898, which it cost the Government, and £8,814, which it would have cost, taking the market value of the same work performed. I was stating a moment ago that even in France, where the work is done, I might say, without sparing cost, for the perfection of the work, I find in the report of 1886 the following extract:—

(*Translation.*)

"It follows from the above that the appropriations which are necessary to the working of the national printing office does not constitute a charge to be added to those of the other governmental services. On the contrary, this vote amounts to a profit which is entered among the various receipts of the Budget; and besides, it furnishes the various Departments with the means of lightening their charges, by diminishing the amount of their printing expenditure. In fact, the national printing office, owing to the plant at is disposal and to the forms which it is enabled to keep, can do the printing of the State at rates which would be particularly onerous if the work was to be done outside of this establishment."

I saw in a newspaper called *L'Imprimerie*, of the month of December, 1885, a report coming to the same conclusion, in which it is said:

(*Translation.*)

"If we take the average of the results for the fiscal years of 1882, 1883 and 1884, we find that besides the profit of 80,000 francs for the Departments and the Administrations, from the lowering of the rates agreed to in 1882, the Treasury has found in the operations of the national printing office a bonus of 374,010 francs 63 for each of these three fiscal years and the State has found an increase of its capital (plant and collections) of 269,511 francs 94. To these results it is proper to add the work done gratis, such as the *Bulletin des Lois*, *le Bulletin des Arrêts de la Cour de Cassation*, and various other gratuitous printing authorised by the Select Committee.

"It follows from these facts, Mr. President of the Council, that the working of the national printing office is in a normal state of progress. The new reduction of rates, which you were pleased to sanction for 1885, in favor of State Administrations, and which will give them a benefit of about 115,000 francs on the previous tariff, is thus justified."

It will be said, all this is very well, but the great objection is this, how can a Government secure those savings? That answer, I think, is to be found in the precedents. The answer is that what other Governments have done I do not see why we should not do, and the precedents are so numerous and varied that I think we can say there is no danger for us in making the experiment. The great necessity is a head to preside over that new Department. I do not see why we should say that it is impossible for the Government to get a good officer, and if a good officer is found the economy is realised. I can cite you a precedent. Those who have read the reports submitted to this House from year to year must have observed that in the stationery department, although it has been limited, and although I must say not enough control has been given to the chief clerk of the stationery, still, an important economy has been realised. The best test is to ask the opinion of the stationers who have supplied the stationery office, and the answer will be that the officer presiding over that Department has shown himself, perhaps, too anxious to save the public money and not sufficiently alive to the public convenience, or, at all events, what those in the trade would call the public interest. The position of Queen's Printer and controller of stationery will be a very important one. It will take a man of great ability and great integrity for this position, but such a man can be found here, as has been found elsewhere. The question is to find a man whose interest it will be to watch the interest of the public, and I think he can easily be found. We have recently passed a law, known as the Franchise Act, and I may say that the printing of the lists of the electors could be done with an immense

saving by a Government printing office. I know that in saying this I shall not have the sympathy of the printers generally. The delay which is given between the beginning of the revision of the lists and the final revision, with the facilities of communication we now have, would allow us to print the revised lists and send them back to the revising officers for the final revision. With the new process of stereotyping, the forms would be kept from year to year without any heavy cost. At the time of revision, these lists would be sent to every one of the revisers and they would make the amendments on the lists sent, and those new lists, containing the addition of each year, would be sent to the central office, and would be printed there. In this way we would have uniformity in the printing of those lists, a uniformity which it is so desirable to obtain. In the future those lists would constitute a valuable directory of the Dominion, a work which is so much required by the commercial community.

Mr. MILLS. What has it cost, so far, to print the electoral lists?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When the Estimates are before the House we will discuss that point. I may say, however, that they have cost an immense amount of money, and the saving of another year over this cannot yet be calculated. I know it has cost an enormous sum, a frightful sum, I may say, but it could not be helped. A new system must be both laborious and costly. But I will not discuss that question now.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman mentioned the electoral lists, and I thought perhaps he would have no objection to give us the figures.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The fact is we do not know yet. I have enquired from the Auditor General, whose testimony my hon. friend will not doubt, and he has been unable to tell me, although an average has been given, which it is not a part of my duty at the present moment to give to the House. At all events, it will be brought before the House. I was saying that the item of printing the electoral lists alone would justify the establishment of a Government printing office. I have mentioned the defects of printing by contract. If we consider only the cost of composition of all these blue books and all these reports, I would say that in the cost of composition alone a great saving could be effected. Let us consider the enormous quantity of paper which is used in the printing of public documents. For instance, in publishing a little pamphlet, say, of 40 pages, the cost of composition would be only between $12 and $16, but if 20,000 copies of that document is published, the paper alone would cost very near $400. Every space that is lost, everything upon which the contractor tries to make a profit from the Government printing, in running between the lines of his contract, and in trying to show that more has been done than has actually been done—all that is a loss to the Government, and when you multiply it by hundreds of thousands of copies, the number of pages averages over a million each year, the House can realise the immense amount of money that is wasted in this way. It is evident that an immense saving might be made to the public Treasury if this work was condensed, and it would be to the interest of the Government printing officer to condense it. In addition to the printing provided for in this Bill, we provide for the concentration in the hands of a single head of all the stationery which is supplied to the different Departments and to both Houses of Parliament. I may here mention the fact that both Houses of Parliament are very jealous of their control over the stationery that is supplied to the members and officials of Parliament. I understand that now the stationery of the Commons is supplied from the Government stationery office; but in the other House, for one reason or other which I do not know, the good reform has been abandoned after one year's experience. In England efforts have been made year after year, and success has crowned those efforts, to have the whole control of the stationery for both Houses of Parliament and for all the Departments and for the outside service, the army, navy and different offices in colonies concentrated in one hand. The object of this Bill is to assimilate our system here to the English system that has worked admirably of late years. When we think that we, with our comparatively small Government, expend on stationery to supply the different departments and Parliament over $200,000 a year, it is obvious how important it is to concentrate the responsibility and endeavor to secure as great economy as possible. One of the reforms contemplated is that the distribution and sale of the public documents, papers and Statutes should be brought under one control, so as to curtail the waste which prevails to-day. In England where much liberality is shown, and where the spirit of the constitution is that the laws shall be made as public as possible, and spread among the whole reading population, hon. members will be surprised to learn that in that country, with over 30,000,000 of people, there are fewer public documents distributed gratis than there are in this Dominion with something over 4,000,000. We distribute over 26,500 copies of the Statutes; not more than 340 are sold every year and those reserved do not exceed 400, leaving about 26,000 thrown broadcast over the country with other public documents which are not distributed in a very judicious manner. It is also proposed that the sale of public documents shall be entrusted to one head, to the same officer, to the comptroller of stationery. This will not prevent or interfere with the power that this House possesses to decide as to what number of documents shall be distributed. Neither will it prevent the House from ordering by its committees the printing of documents of special importance in larger quantities when the wants of the people and the wishes of their representatives require them. So there will be no interference with the ordinary powers of Parliament. Moreover, all public documents should be offered for sale at a price attractive to everyone, as is the case in England, where some of the documents are sold at the bare cost of paper and others at the actual cost of composition and press work. I need not enter into details as to what might be done in the way of reform in this matter. The progress towards economy which has gone on during last year is the best evidence I can give of the working of the system, and at the same time the best evidence of the activity and zeal of the officer who presides over the stationery department, an officer to whom I must on this occasion pay that tribute of praise which he deserves, I mean the chief of the Government stationery office, Mr. Young. But with all those good reasons, with the experience of others in favor of the system which will be carried out if the measure presented to the House is accepted, the question arises: What are the ways and means? How much will it cost? What is the calculation that the Government have made, and what will be the practical result taking the most favorable aspect of it, or taking, if you like, the pessimist aspect of the question? I think this can be answered very easily, and that I can convince this House, without entering into very minute details, that economy must necessarily accrue to the State if the system proposed by this measure is carried into effect. It will be asked at the outset what will be the cost of that Government establishment? Let us see what the cost of the administration of such an establishment would be. If I am told that the Government generally pay pretty high salaries to officers, I answer this: We will secure economy in this way. We have the staff of the Queen's Printer, and we have the staff of the stationery office. We pay, in the Queen's Printer's office, salaries to the amount of $8,997.50; the staff comprises the

Queen's Printer, seven officers and some messengers. In connection with the stationery office we pay, as salaries to officers, according to the civil government list, $9,341. Mr. Young is chief clerk; Mr. Robertson, assistant clerk; and there are eight different clerks and four messengers. Then there are the officers of Parliament employed in the stationery in both Houses. It would not be proper to take as profits the whole of those salaries so paid, because a certain portion of the work will still be left to them in connection with orders to be given, in the control of what is delivered to them, and in the distribution of those papers. But I was deducting from the different salaries paid in the Senate and House of Commons for those services, $1,000 from the Senate and $2,300 in the House of Commons, and you arrive, by adding the salaries for the Queen's Printer's office, the stationery office and the distribution of public documents, to a total of $22,739. I give these figures to show that, with a staff attached to such an office such as is attached to a regular commercial establishment of the same kind, it will be easy for a man who understands his work to have the service properly performed within the amount which we already pay for those services, without having any profits from them. Those are expenditures which we already pay, and which will not be increased by the establishment of a Government printing and stationery office; so that we can take it for granted that the cost of the staff of the new office will not exceed what we are paying at the present moment for the different officers of the Government and Parliament for a similar service. Then what would be the next expenditure? There will be the expenditure for erecting a proper building for a printing office and stationery department. What will be the cost of that building? We all know that for such an establishment a costly, magnificent, fine looking building, a monument of architecture, is not what is necessary. We have the example of other countries, we have the example of the United States, and we know that what is necessary for a good printing office is a large, well ventilated, well lighted, plain, brick building with a solid foundation on account of the heavy machinery and plant which is to be put there, and with just that neatness and simplicity which, while avoiding a large expenditure, will meet the requirements of such an establishment. I have taken the trouble of ascertaining what was the cost of the establishment of one of the largest firms in Ontario, the firm of Hunter, Rose & Co., which is doing the work for the Ontario Government. There they have a large, plain building in the shape of an oblong square, I believe, 160 by 40 feet and four stories high. In so far as I could ascertain—though I do not vouch for the absolute accuracy of the figures—the cost of that building was in the neighborhood of $22,000. Now it is not within the purpose of my observations here to minimise the cost of what such a building should be, and although the ground upon which it may be erected might be selected on some Government property here, I take its value into consideration, and I put the cost at say $50,000, which may be more than is necessary for a building which would be sufficient for its purpose, and creditable alike to the establishment and to the Government. As to the cost of plant and material which it would be necessary to put in that establishment for printing and binding, it has been calculated at the largest possible margin, so that we may not be afterwards obliged to add to the approximate estimate. I have taken the trouble of asking people who certainly were not interested in putting down the cost, but, if interested at all, in showing that the cost would be large, but who, I am sure, have given an honest estimate. The cost of the plant required for such a printing office would be sub-divided as follows: Press room, $44,150, made up of eight double royal Hoe presses, $28,800; six single royal presses, $7,200; three medium Gordon presses, and the other requisite printing and cutting machinery, making an aggregate of $44,150. The plant of the parliamentary composing room would cost, according to that estimate, $33,825. The job room plant will cost $9,444, or in case we included what is called a Web press we would add $20,000, making the cost of the whole of the printing establishment, so far as plant is concerned, $107,419. The plant for the Government bindery, taking also the liberal estimate which I have been following in these other figures, would cost $20,347.

Mr. MILLS. I do not see any provision in the Bill to restrain the Government from getting their printing done outside, so I suppose that practice would still continue?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. At the proper time, I shall explain that system, which is not a new one, which existed when my hon. friend introduced the system of contracts; or else I will give another expression of opinion, which would perhaps be more satisfactory to the hon. gentleman.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When the sitting was suspended I was stating to the House what the cost of establishing a Government printing office would be. I stated that the estimate I had procured was about 20 or 25 per cent. over what I really believed would be the actual cost. I stated that that exaggerated figure would be about $127,000. The expenditure for the staff would be about the same as now; but under the management of a first-class man with good experience it might be reduced. I come now to the question of economy realised. To arrive at a safe conclusion let us see what amount of work will be done. I have here statements made up from the public documents of the last two years, the details of which, with the permission of the House, I will put in the hands of the reporter:—

STATEMENT of cost of printing and binding and stationery for Parliament and the Government.

Printing and binding:		
For Parliament		$ 64,097
" Departmental work, including outside service.		96,979
" the *Canada Gazette*		2,243
" the Statutes		4,775
" supplementary		37
		$168,129
Stationery:		
For Parliament	$ 17,972	
" Civil Service	103,286	
		120,258
		$288,387

STATEMENT of cost of ordinary printing and other papers used in printing and binding work for the public service.

Parliamentary		$25,127
Departmental—ascertained	$50,277	
" estimated	20,000	
		70,277
Canada Gazette	$1,404	
Statutes	3,028	
		4,432
		$99,836

UNDER NEW SYSTEM—Expenditure apart from staff, wages and plant—probable.

For printing branch proper		$168,129
For stationery branch:		
For printing and binding	$ 99,836	
" other purposes	120,258	
		220,094
		$388,223

We may safely say that expenditure for printing, binding and stationery will average yearly an expenditure of about $400,000, a little more than half of which is for paper, and the balance for printing; in round figures, let us say about $200,000 for each. Now, let us estimate what economy will be realised. I can say unhesitatingly that the profits, according to the best calculation, would not be less than 20 per cent. I do not mean that this is what is made by the printer; his profits are larger; but it is the economy which we can realise with a proper administration of the printing branch. Putting the printing at $200,000, and reducing the estimated economy to 15 per cent., or putting it at $150,000 and estimating the economy at 20 per cent., the result will be the same; we would have an average saving of $30,000 a year. I have estimated the saving in the stationery at only 5 per cent.; the economy already realised does not justify me in placing it at a higher figure. On $200,000 we would have $10,000 saving, making a total average economy, which I am sure we could realise, of $40,000 a year. The estimate that I have given of the cost of the building and the cost of the plant is about $175,000, or, let us say, in round figures, $200,000. The interest on that, I will not say at 4 per cent., but at 5 per cent., would represent an annual expenditure on the total cost of establishing a Government printing office, of $10,000. Deduct that from the $40,000 estimated profit, and you have a net saving of $30,000 a year. I have stated that the experience of the American Government—and I do not think that Government has a better reputation than ours, I do not think there exists there less temptation in the way of what is commonly called jobs than here—has proved that the economy realised, through the printing being done by the Government office, is between 30 and 40 per cent. of the trade rates which were paid before the establishment of that office. In my estimate, I do not count the cost of heating and lighting the building, for the simple reason that these expenses are at present included in the estimates that the printer makes when tendering for a contract, and they do not prevent his making the profit I have mentioned. When a tenderer sends in his tender for Government work, he is obliged in his calculation to count the interest on the cost of the purchase of new plant, for nobody can undertake such a large work as a contract for Government printing without having to expend a large sum of money in securing the necessary plant. Thus in the profits the cost of the plant is counted, as I count it now. Therefore, taking into consideration all expenses, the new system I estimate would leave a margin of $30,000, which can be safely reckoned upon, perhaps not the first year, but surely after the new system is well in operation. I cannot resist giving the statistics of prices paid during the last ten years, and I find they have ranged according to the following scale:—In 1869, the departmental prices for composition were 12½ cents per 1,000 ems; in 1874, they were 16 cents; and 1879, when the new contract under the present Government was entered into, they were reduced to 10 cents. The present contract for Statute work 30 cents per page; in 1869 it was 30 cents; in 1874 it was 50 cents. The present contract for the *Gazette* is 18 cents per 1,000 ems; in 1869 it was 0 cents; and in 1874 it was 20 cents. The other prices vary according to the different dates in the same proportion. I am not quoting these figures for the purpose of finding fault with my hon. friends opposite, and I must charitably presume that the higher rates paid during their Administration are attributable to the current market value of labor at the time. I simply state the facts as they are before me. I was forgetting to mention one item among others, which shows the enormous economies that might be realised under the new system. We are obliged to print all public documents in French and in English. The highest rates for work are for tabular work, those rates being two or three times greater than the rates for ordinary composition. For that tabular work we cannot make a difference in the contracts between what is done in French and what is done in English, although a large portion of the work is simply a transfer from one sheet to the other. All the names, for instance, are the same, and the figures are the same, and the tabular mechanical work is the same, but still you cannot, in a contract, make a difference, and the same prices must go for both. There are other instances where profits can be made. The *Canada Gazette*, for instance, is printed both in English and in French in every number. Four-fifths of those numbers are addressed to people to whom it is not only indifferent, but useless to have the matter printed in French. Why could we not ascertain the number of subscribers, and have only one composition and one expenditure of paper in printing what is destined for the English readers in English, and the other part in French. I could enlarge a great deal on the remarks I have made, but I do not wish to detain the House any longer. I may refer hon. members to very interesting documents which they might consult on the subject. There is the report of the joint committee of both Houses of England, 1st of July, 1881, the recommendations of which apply with full force to the present case. I wish also to refer to the Treasury minute of the British Government of the 19th March, 1855, in which most valuable information is given and suggestions are made, with regard to economy in the working of a portion of the system I now propose. I now come to the *exposé* of the measure itself which hon. members must have read. The Bill is very simple. The constitution of the Department is mentioned in a simple and comprehensive manner. The Queen's Printer will be a deputy head of the Department at the head of the printing establishment and the stationery branch, and his title will be "Queen's Printer and Comptroller of Stationery." Three sub-chiefs will be appointed, namely, a superintendent of printing, a superintendent of stationery, and an accountant. The three branches controlling one another and the first two being controlled by the accountant. Those officers must be skilled men, completely *au fait* in their work. The balance of the Bill is the reproduction of clauses of the former Acts, adapted to the new system. I now come to the clause, which did not escape the attention of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), clause 6, which says:

6. The Governor in Council may, from time to time, for special seasons to be stated in the Orders in Council, authorise printing and binding for the public service to be done elsewhere than at the Government printing establishment; and such Orders in Council and the expenditure under them shall be laid before Parliament at its then next Session.

This is word for word the clause which exists at the present moment, which is in the Act for the *Canada Gazette* printing establishment, and the giving of printing by contract. It is obvious why this clause should exist. Because certain emergencies might arise, accidents might arise, a sudden pressure of business might arise, which would force the Government to have some work done, and, with a stringent rule and a stringent application of the audit of the accounts, it would be found very difficult to obtain the payment for such work. In the American Statute the same clause exists. At the same time, it cannot be the intention of the Government to have that clause interpreted as allowing the giving of work outside, unless in cases of pressing urgency. I might state here that that clause would not be operative now, and could not be operative, at least for all departmental work, before the 1st December, 1887. I do not mention it to satisfy my hon. friends on the other side, who predict every day that between now and the end of each year, the administration of the country will not be in the unworthy hands in which it is now, in which case the application of that clause will be left entirely at the discretion of my hon. friends. Up to that time the Government is bound

by a strict contract for the departmental work. I can announce to the House that a few days ago the extension of the contract was signed by the present contractors, at the actual current prices and that we have escaped what unfortunately was not escaped after my hon. friends left the administration in 1878. We know that we shall be obliged to vote in the Estimates of this year, a sum of over $4,500 for interest on the $70,000 awarded the contractors for damages for work that was done outside of the contract during the period between 1874 and 1879. I am glad to announce to the House that the contract, without any indemnity whatever, has been signed, and all claims for damages of whatsoever kind have been waived by the contractors; that is to say, that the Government have insisted and have obtained that no indemnity, no claim for damages would be preferred against them or against their successors so that no such legacy would be left, if we had to leave office, to be settled by our friends as we have been obliged to settle theirs. I trust that the House will forgive me for having kept hon. members so long listening to my observations. I have tried to obtain all the information possible to lay before the House. I trust the House will take this measure in good part, and will see that in presenting it the Government have nothing in view but the economy that can be realised and, besides economy, the uniformity of the service, the efficiency of the service, and the perfection, if it is possible to obtain it, in the printing, binding and other working connected with the public documents and Statutes. This is the measure, and I leave it to the favorable consideration of the members of this House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). There is no doubt whatever in my mind that this is an important Bill which is brought before the House by the Secretary of State, but I think it would have been much better in the public interest had a measure of this importance been brought down to Parliament before the last few days of the Session. It is a measure that will require very considerable discussion; it is one that is very important in very many respects, and I fancy that the hon. the Secretary of State would have done better, would have done more justice to himself, more justice to this House, and more justice to the country, had he not followed the usual practice which has been followed in former Sessions since this Government came into power, and brought this important measure down at this late stage of the Session. We are informed by the hon. gentleman that the proposed expenditure for the Printing Bureau will amount in the aggregate to $177,766, and he says that he thinks this is a high estimate. I do not know what experience he may have had in the establishment of printing bureaus under governments, but I fancy that his estimate, instead of being found to be above the mark, will, when the expenditure takes place, be found to be very much beneath the mark. He calculates that on this expenditure, and by assuming the establishment of this bureau, the Government is going to save to this country the enormous sum of $30,000 annually. If this Government is anxious to save this country $30,000 of the expenditure yearly on printing, they can do so without establishing a printing bureau. They can do so by administering the affairs of this country with regard to printing in an honest and straightforward manner, by giving all the work to the contractor, who has contracted for all the printing that is required for this Government, instead of farming it out to favorite newspaper men all through the country. They can save more than $30,000 a year by doing this without establishing their bureau at all. The Secretary of State admits that private enterprise can perform work of this kind cheaper than governments. I think he was correct in making this statement, and I question whether it is the duty of a government to interfere with the legitimate business of private individuals of the country in this way. We all know that a great deal has been said, not only in this House but in the Local Legislatures, with regard to money being expended for the establishment of prisons where industries are started which compete with the legitimate tradesmen of the country. We know that fault has been found in this House with the establishment of such branches of industry in prisons, and why should not the printers of this country be protected from the Government taking up their trade in the way that is proposed by the hon. the Secretary of State? If the Government is desirous of saving money in this printing line, why do they not go into other branches of the service in the same way? I understand, and believe it is a fact, that the heating of the buildings here at Ottawa costs some $30,000 a year. Why do they not go into the establishment of themselves as coal and wood merchants? Why do they not import the coal themselves, and save the duty by bringing it in for the Government, and why do they not buy the wood, and thereby save the profits of the wood merchant? If it is legitimate work for the Government to undertake the printing of the country, it is legitimate work for them to undertake the supply of the fuel for the Government buildings at Ottawa. Then if they are going to economise in all directions, they might, as was suggested by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), in a discussion on the Estimates—they might start a livery stable. They have been paying exorbitant sums for cab-hire for the accommodation of Ministers and their deputies, and why not establish a livery stable, with a head and a deputy head, and a man as administrator, who understands horses and buggies, and a veterinary surgeon? Then if they are going to economise in this way, they might also establish a laundry and do their own washing, as was suggested by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. McCraney). There are various other industries in connection with the administration of Government in this country that might just as well be taken under the paternal care of the Government as the printing of the country. Moreover, if they are going to undertake the printing, why not start a paper mill and make their own paper? There are excellent facilities in the vicinity of Ottawa, with unlimited water power, for the establishment of a paper mill, and as wood is largely used in the manufacture of paper, that also may be found in abundance not far away. I have no doubt that in this large city they could also afford to use a very large supply of rags, which is one of the best ingredients of which to make paper. The Secretary of State claims that the Government has lost by the fluctuation in prices. Now I think he is altogether wrong. I know from my experience as a printer of nearly forty years' standing, that the tendency during that time has always been in the direction of an increase of wages, and they are much larger to-day than they have been in years gone by. The tendency has, and always will be, to increase; and why should it not be, Mr. Speaker, if this Government is determined to make this a dear country to live in, if this Government is determined to protect everything to the highest point, and thus prevent the workingman getting good value for his money. Therefore, I think it is very much out of place for this Government to assume that they have lost anything by the fluctuation of wages since they came into power, when we consider that wages have always been on the increase. With regard to printers' plant, there is no fluctuation with regard to the price of that either, for this Government have made printers' plant more expensive since they came into office than it ever was before. They have laid a duty of 25 per cent. on type, and there is a heavy duty on printing presses and consequently it is more expensive for printers to get the material they require in their work than it ever was

before. I, for one, must say that I think it was very ill-advised of this Government to put a heavy duty on printers' material and presses because knowledge——

Mr. BOWELL. How much on presses?

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). As the Minister of Customs knows, they ought not to be taxed. Newspapers and books ought to be free to the people so that they may become educated.

Mr. BOWELL. What is the duty on presses?

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I know it is a large duty; perhaps you will tell me.

Mr. BOWELL. I wanted to see if you knew as much about them as about the duty on type.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Will you tell me the duty on presses?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, by-and-bye.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I know there is a heavy duty on presses, and there ought not to be any, for the simple reason that there are no presses manufactured in the country. With regard to the fluctuation in the price of paper, if the Government has lost some in that respect within the last few years, it is because paper has been cheaper in consequence of the material of which it is made costing less to the manufacturer than formerly. Now, I could understand how this printing bureau would be a benefit to the country if I were satisfied in my mind, and if the Secretary of State could satisfy the country as I fear he will not be able to do, that the business of this bureau will be conducted on business principles. I think the Bill itself shows that the Government has no intention of carrying on this printing bureau on strictly business principles, as I shall show later on. He claims that the Government would save the profits of the contractors. Well, that is just possible, if the Government managed their business as well as the contractors manage theirs. But the Secretary of Satate admits that the Government will not do so, because he says that the Government cannot manage a business of this kind as well as private individuals. I will admit that better work might possibly be done by a Government bureau than the work we are getting now. But there is a reason why the work we are getting now is not as good as it should be, and I think that reason can be overcome if the Government will take the advice of every practical man with regard to letting the contract. The reason the Government does not get extra good work now is because the contract is for too short a term of years. If the contract was let, say for ten years, the contractor would have some guarantee that he would be reimbursed for his outlay in buying such plant as would enable him to do the work in first-class style. That could be done if the contract was let for ten years instead of five, as was formerly done.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The experience of 1879 does not show that if the contract of 1874 had been prolonged for ten years, we would have paid over 30 per cent. more than we paid after changing it at the end of five years.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I understand the contract has been renewed ever since I have been a member of this House, at the same prices.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In 1874 the contract was for five years, and according to the theory of my hon. friend, if it had been for ten years, we would have lost over 33 per cent. of the contract price, because the contract price of 1879 was more than 33 per cent. under the contract price of 1874.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Well, I have not got the figures and cannot verify the statement, but I have figures which show that the composition, in 1869, was 12½ cents; in 1874, 16 cents; in 1879, 10 cents, and it is 10 cents now. There is not such a great difference between 10 cents and 12½. I agree with the Secretary of State in saying there would be some economy in the management of a printing bureau in cutting away what printers call the "fat" which is put in all the blue-books, and that can be accomplished if a clause is put in the tender forbidding the contractor to make too much fat matter in the pamphlets or books he prints. Furthermore, I will state, with regard to the quality of the work, that it has a good deal to do with the quality of the paper, and if the Government would furnish the present contractor with first-class paper, he would do nearer first-class work than he does now. Now the Secretary of State said that the profits of the contractors ran all the way from 20 to 79 per cent. He said their contract prices were low in appearance, but not in fact. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Government were anxious to administer the public printing in an honest and judicious way, they would not have followed the practice they have adopted for the last few years. I find that in 1883-84 they gave outside work, including printing and paper, to the amount of $150,500, and of this amount $109,000 was paid for agricultural pamphlets alone. In 1884-85 they paid for outside printing, $97,286, and of this amount the Agricultural Department paid over $80,000; and this is altogether outside of the patronage which has been given in the shape of advertising to newspapers which support the Government, amounting to $54,000 in 1883-84 and $51,800 in 1884-85. I do not intend to weary the House with details as to the exorbitant prices paid for this outside printing, because I entered fully into that matter last year and clearly established the statements I made beyond contradiction, notwithstanding it has been said in this House, when I happened to be absent, that:

"A price is fixed by the Queen's Printer for all this kind of printing—a fair, commercial price, which is considered so low that some of the printers, who desire to obtain work, refused to accept those prices. I am told by persons of experience that offices could not take printing at those prices, were it not for the purpose of keeping their offices open and employed."

I suppose I am hardly in order in quoting, from a former debate, the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture; but I refer to it, in order to show the inaccuracy of the statement made on that occasion. I did not happen to be in the House that night on account of sickness, and I could not therefore, at that time, contradict the statement then made. It will be in the recollection of the House that, last year, I called attention to this matter, and I then proved, beyond doubt, that the prices for this outside Government printing work, were, in all cases, from three and a half to fourteen times more than the contractors' prices for the same work. I am glad to say that the Government have not erred so greatly in this regard, in 1885-86. They have not given the same work to an office half a dozen times, so that it could charge half a dozen times for the same composition. I suppose the lesson learned last year checked the Government and led them to draw in their reins and not give out work so unjustly as they did previously. This year, in every case, when the expenditure was over $80,000 for agricultural printing, there was paid three and a-half times the price for composition more than the work would have been obliged to have been done by the contractors; that is to say, that the Government paid 35 cents per 1,000 ems for composition, whereas the parliamentary contractors cannot charge more than 10 cents. Furthermore, they have paid for press work six times the price which the contractors would have charged in every case where they have given out this class of work; and not only have they paid six times the price but they have allowed the parties who did the work to charge double the quantity of work in every case. The

result has been to double the amount of press work done in every case by any of the persons who have been favored with pamphlet work; and so the price for the press work has been increased sixfold above the contractors' regular price. In order to give the House and the country an idea of the injustice which was done by the Minister of Agriculture, in explaining this matter to the House the other evening, when he said that printers would not take the work because it would not pay them, I will state some further facts, and I will excuse the hon. Minister, for I think the words he said must have been put in his mouth and he was unaware of their inaccuracy. If the hon. gentleman had consulted some of his colleagues who know something about the question he would have learned that the statement was altogether inaccurate. I can prove the inaccuracy by referring to an expenditure made in 1883-84, as an illustration. The amount of $6,871.65 was paid to the Prescott *Messenger* for work done which could have been performed for $1,800, as I proved on the authority of German printers in Berlin, who would be willing to do that work for the price I have named. The Government thus paid this man in Prescott $5,071.65 more than they should have paid on a job which amounted only to $6,871.65, and yet we are told by a Minister of the Crown, and he is backed up by other Ministers of the Crown, that this work is not given out at extravagant prices. I appeal to every hon. member if the statement which I made last year with respect to this one single job, which is an illustration of all the other work given out by the Government in connection with the Agricultural Department, has ever been contradicted. I defy any man in this House or out of it to contradict it, because it is the truth and nothing but the truth. I say that statement has gone uncontradicted either by a Minister or by any member outside of the Government, or by any newspaper; they have never attacked the figures which I gave during last Session. My statement having been proved to be correct, the Minister of Agriculture should have thought twice before he rose in his place and stated that this work was given out at reasonable and fair rates. If the Government can afford to give over $6,800 for work which is only worth $1,800, and can give this enormous bonus outside of the legitimate profits, enough to buy a steam engine and presses and all the necessary furnishings for a printing office—if the Government can afford to give that profit on a single job, it is not right for any hon. member to rise in his place and try to make the country believe that this work is given out at reasonable prices. I say this is a fair illustration of the immense and enormous profits being made daily by the newspapers which support the Government all through Ontario in doing outside printing for the Government. If this is the case, and I say it is the case, and I have proved it to be the case, I say the printer who publishes a newspaper, and is doing this Government printing, is in a much better position than a member of Parliament who gets timber limits, coal land leases or railway subsidies. I would rather have a steady printing contract for outside work given to me by the Government at the enormous rates which have been paid on those printing contracts during the last two years, than even have the railway contract which has been talked about so much, and with which the member for West Toronto, the "boy," has had so much to do. This printing job would be a dead sure thing, and a man would make a large profit continuously; whereas, in the other case, the holder may have to divide up the swag among the other directors, who, I understand, are all members of this House. But in the case of outside printing, the profits would go on continuously day after day, week after week, and year after year, piling up at the rate of $5,000 every two or three weeks. I say, therefore, that rather than have a coal land lease or a timber limit, if I were in that line of business—but you know the Opposition members of this House are not in that line; they did not do that kind of thing even when they sat on the Government benches; they did not indulge in that kind of jobbery—but I say that if I were in that line of business, I would rather have a contract for the outside printing than any of these favors which have been so liberally dispensed by this Government to their favorites inside this House. Now the hon. the Secretary of State talks about the necessity of having a certain clause in this Bill, in order that confidential work may be done. Well, I suppose it is necessary occasionally for the Government to have confidential printing executed, but although I have been a member of this House for four years I have never seen any printing done which might not have been done in the contractors' office, and a good deal has been done since I have been a member of this House. Take, for instance, the report of the Canadian Pacific Railway Commission, which was given to the Messrs. Stephenson, of Chatham, who never touched the work at all, but who farmed it out to the Government contractors at Ottawa. They never set a type of the work, they never printed a page of it, but they were favorites of the Government, and they had to get a slice of the pap which was going, so they were favored with this confidential printing, and they were enabled, as I told the House on a former occasion, and as was proved before the Public Accounts Committee, to pocket no less than $3,000 for this confidential job, given to them by the Government and which they never so much as touched. Then the Secretary of State says he has had some experience in the printing business. Well, I do not know whether he is a stockholder or a shareholder in the *Minerve*, but I have been told that he is interested in that paper, which receives a good deal of patronage from this Government. They have printed two editions of the Chinese report, and they printed it at the same exorbitant, confidential rates. Well now, what was confidential about the Chinese report?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I suppose he intends saying something, but he leads the House into error, inasmuch as that volume was not done at confidential rates. There was only the report, and there were reasons for that, as my hon. friend must know.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Well, if not at confidential rates it was done at much higher prices than they ought to have received—so much so that the Auditor General refused to pay the account, and brought it under the attention of the Treasury Board. The fact that the Auditor General, who is not a printer, discovered that the prices were much larger than they ought to have been is, I think, satisfactory evidence that the prices, if not confidential, were at least an enormous advance on those which the Government would have had to pay to the contractor if they had got the work here, and there was no reason why they should not have got it here. Then the Secretary of State has other favorites. You will remember the printing of the civil service list which he gave to the St. Hyacinthe *Courier*. He not only gave that work outside of the contractor, but he actually paid out for type over $5,000 to enable his friend down in St. Hyacinthe to do the work. This same practice was followed by the Minister of Militia with regard to the printing of the militia list.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If this remark of the hon. gentleman is not intended to be political but personal, I must tell him that his insinuation against me is totally unfounded. I had nothing to do personally with the giving of that work, and did not even know that the work was given, as it was at a time when I was ill and was absent from Ottawa. If his remark is intended to be political, I, of course, have to take my share of the responsibility. If it is personal, I tell him again that he is saying that which is not warranted by the facts and that which is not true.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I understand that the Secretary of State is a member of this Government; I under-

stand that, being a member of the Government, he is responsible for the acts of the Government. I have nothing against him personally as Secretary of State. I am not in the secrets of the Government; I do not know whether the Secretary of State ordered this work or not. But I do know that the Government ordered it; I know that the Government is responsible, and that the Secretary of State is responsible as a member of the Government, and consequently he cannot shirk that responsibility. If he is ashamed of the job now, I am glad of it, and I am glad to hear him repudiating the acts of his own Government. I am glad to know that he is getting his eyes opened, and is beginning to see that he cannot endorse everything that his Government authorises to be done in the way of giving outside printing. I hope also to hear the Minister of Militia—if he were in his place—endorsing the Secretary of State and saying that he was not personally responsible——

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend is not honest with regard to my personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Well, I will use another expression, and say that he is not fair. The hon. gentleman said the Secretary of State had another paper. He mentioned a paper in which he said I had a personal, pecuniary interest. He said I had another paper and had given a job to this other paper. I got up and said frankly, as was my duty, and I asked him to follow me in that same fair way of exposing the facts—I said I was politically responsible for that contract—I do not call it a job; I do not know the details; but if he insinuated anything against me personally, he was wrong in telling a thing which was not true.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Well, Sir, I cannot fathom such very close reasoning on the part of the hon. gentleman. He does not deny that he has a personal interest in the other matter.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I explained it, and if the hon. gentleman does not understand, I cannot supply that which is necessary to understand anything.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I understand that he is personally interested in the *Minerve* newspaper. I am glad, however, to know that he did not personally send this contract to the *Minerve* newspaper, but I say that I hold him responsible, as I hold the Government responsible, for his share in perpetrating that job. I think he is to blame for that. He wisely—if he was personally interested in the newspaper—refused to be the medium of sending it to his own newspaper. I think that was an act of wisdom on his part, and I think he is entitled to credit for his discretion in that regard. I was going on to say that the Minister of Militia also had favorites, and that he, like the Government—I will not say like the Secretary of State—purchased the type for his friend in Quebec, Mr. Foote, to print the militia list, and afterwards he had it reprinted by the Government contractors here at extra expense, so that there could be no excuse whatever for the expenditure of that money. The amount paid for the purchase of the type and the work executed was thrown away, because he afterwards got the same work executed in the contractors' office at Ottawa. Now I can understand why all the Conservative newspapers of the country are not cordially endorsing the action of the Secretary of State in bringing in this Bill. But I fancy if the Secretary of State had forwarded to each newspaper office a copy of it, so that the proprietors would have been able to read the 6th clause, they would have had no difficulty in endorsing the whole Bill. I will read that clause for the benefit of the House:

"The Governor in Council may, from time to time, for special reasons to be stated in the Orders in Council, authorise printing and binding for the public service to be done elsewhere than at the Government printing establishment; and such Orders in Council and the expenditure under them shall be laid before Parliament at its then next Session."

If this clause is retained in the Bill, this House ought not to entertain the proposition to pass it for a single moment. I have no doubt many members of this House on both sides have been thoroughly scandalised with the manner in which the Government have been paying exorbitant prices to their newspaper supporters all over the country for outside printing; and I fancy there are many honest men on both sides who would be glad to see a stop put to this system of patronage. But with this clause in the Bill there is no chance of amendment in that respect on the part of the Government. There would always be special reasons if the Government wanted to favor the Montreal *Gazette*, the Hamilton *Spectator*, the Toronto *Mail*, the London *Free Press* or the Prescott *Messenger*. I have no doubt even the hon. Minister of the Interior will have no compunction about supporting this Bill. The Montreal *Gazette*, during the past two years, has drawn large sums of money from the public chest for printing—over $19,000 in one year, and $23,000 in the other, including the Royal Society's report, which I think it is proper to include. The Hamilton *Spectator* receives from $10,000 to $18,000, the London *Free Press* from $10,000 to $12,000 a year, and the Ottawa *Citizen* gets, I suppose, just about as much as it likes to ask, because whenever it becomes hard up, it comes to the Government and gets a check in advance for work that is under way or that has not been done. If the hon. Secretary of State would expunge this clause from the Bill, I would not have so much difficulty in supporting it, because I think in some respects it would be an improvement to have the printing done in this way. Now, the Secretary of State says that fewer public documents are distributed in England than in Canada. That leads me to the consideration of a subject to which I called the attention of the House last Session; but the statement I then made does not seem to have had any effect. Any member of this House can verify the statement I make, that from the commencement of the Session to the close large numbers of the members of this House are busily engaged day after day and week after week in sending immigration pamphlets to their constituents. If this printing, which this country pays such an enormous amount for annually, is intended to be of service to the public, in inducing immigrants to come and settle in the country, it ought not to be distributed in the way it is done by the members of this House to their constituents. Everybody knows that tons upon tons of these pamphlets are sent out from this House every Session. Now, I would like to know what good it is to send these immigration pamphlets into Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Ontario, and even into Manitoba, where I have known a great deal of this literature to go. I say this ought to be put a stop to; it is a wilful waste of public money, and a misappropriation of the funds which Parliament votes every year to the Minister of Agriculture for the purpose of promoting immigration. If this enormous waste were stopped, the bills which are sent in for the printing of these pamphlets by the organs of the Government would be very much smaller than they are. I fancy very little of this literature ever reaches intending immigrants in England, Ireland, Scotland, or any other part of Europe. One idea was expressed by the hon. Secretary of State which was the most amusing of all, and he did say some very amusing things. He said that if he got this printing bureau established, he would undertake to print all the voters' lists in the Dominion. I do not wish to offend the Secretary of State, but I never heard such downright twaddle and nonsense talked in this House during the four years that I have been here, as he talked when he made that statement. Any man who knows anything at all

about publishing the voters' lists knows that it would be utterly impossible for the Government to print them in the city of Ottawa, if they had a bureau established to-morrow. It cannot be done. If it were undertaken, the voters' lists would not be got out in two years. How would the proofs be read? As my hon. friend from South Brant suggests, they could give it out under section 6 of the Bill, and that probably was the idea in inserting that clause. A great many Conservative newspapers throughout the country have felt considerable annoyance during the last six months because some of the revising officers had the audacity to disobey the orders of the Government, that this work should be given to their special favorites. I know one county at least, where the revising officer was instructed by the Government to give the work to the Conservative newspaper, and to no other. The revising officer had the backbone to say that he was the revising officer there, and he would not be dictated to. So he took tenders for the work, and allowed the Reform newspaper in the place to have a show, contrary to the expressed orders of the Government. I have no doubt this clause 6 would apply very well to the voters' lists, and that the printing of those lists would be added to the profits which are made by the newspapers supporting the Government all over the country. In that way no doubt it might be practicable, but it could not be done at a bureau in the city of Ottawa. Now, I do not intend to detain the House with any further remarks on this measure, but I trust that the Government will see fit to induce the Secretary of State to withdraw it. It is a very important measure, and this House ought to have ample opportunity to discuss its various provisions; and at this late stage of the Session it is utterly impossible for the House to do justice to the Bill. Therefore I think the Secretary of State would be acting in the interest of the country, and I was going to say in the interest of the Government, if he withdrew the Bill. If he is bound to have a printing bureau established in the city of Ottawa to do the Government printing, I think he ought to bring the measure down early next Session when the members will have an ample opportunity to discuss it in all its details, as its importance requires.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I trust the Government will consider this matter a little. It is very inconvenient that a measure should be brought down at this time which requires a speech of two hours by the Secretary of State to explain its details. The measure is a complicated one; in practice, there is not the slightest doubt it will involve large expenditure at a very inconvenient time. The Minister of Finance has declared there will be a heavy deficit this year, and there is too much reason to fear that, under present circumstances, there will be a heavy deficit next year. In any case, it is a measure which ought most undoubtedly to be carefully considered by us. All our experience goes to show it is very difficult for a Government, no matter how excellent may be their intentions, to conduct manufacturing operations of this kind as profitably and as well as private individuals can; and, no doubt, the hon. gentleman will find, when he goes into the matter, that it will create a great deal more difficulty and involve a great deal more expense and trouble than he at first contemplated. In any case, the contract has been extended to December, 1887, so that there is a year and a half, at any rate, before it will be necessary or possible for this printing bureau to commence operations, and I must say that, as the Government has told us we may expect to close in a few days, I fail to understand how they can deem it conducive to the public interest to introduce this measure for serious discussion now. If, as has often been done heretofore, their desire is to lay it before the country and give the House an opportunity of reflecting upon it, that object will be very well attained, after the exhaustive statements made by the Secretary of State. I therefore trust, in view of the enormous mass of business yet to be transacted, and the desire of members on both sides, at this advanced period, not to be detained unnecessarily, that the Government will not insist upon taking more than the second reading.

Mr. INNES. I think the Secretary of State would do well to follow the advice given by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). I do not wish to take up the time of the House, but I would just refer to one or two points that the hon. member for North Brant has not referred to in connection with this subject. Before doing so, I might say that the Government seem to have taken a long time before making up their mind as to the policy they would pursue on this subject. It is now three years since the first intimation was given to the Printing Committee that the Government intended to bring in a measure for the establishment of a printing bureau. We heard no more of it that Session. The next Session the subject seemed to have been dropped, for instructions were given, I suppose to those who had the management of business in connection with the Printing Committee, to give out tenders, and a sub-committee was appointed to examine carefully into the tenders. In consequence, tenders were asked for, and sent in this Session. However, since they were brought in, we were informed that the Government had now settled on a policy with regard to this subject, and would bring down a measure this Session, which measure we have now before us. The Bill is one of great importance, involving a very large expenditure; and cannot at this late hour be properly considered, as it ought to be, in all its provisions. The Secretary of State, in his long and exhaustive speech on the subject, referred to some of the defects in the present contract, but my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville) explained how many of these defects arose. He said they were in a great measure due to the short date the contract had to run. Now the sub-committee last year recommended that if a further contract was made it should be for ten years, as if that time were allowed there would be some inducement for the contractors to put in proper plant, and do the work as it ought to be done. The hon. gentleman also referred to the inferior quality of the paper, which has much to do with the character of the work produced, but, of course, the Government printers have no control of that, the paper being furnished by the Government, and consequently we can find no fault with them on that score. I think that, on the whole, at least during the time the present contract has been in force, the work has been fairly and satisfactorily done, and there has been very little, indeed, scarcely any, complaint about delays in having the work properly and expeditiously executed. I was rather surprised that the Secretary of State, in his speech, did not refer to the report that was printed some two years ago, I think, and which was then circulated through the House, a report made by two gentlemen, Messrs. Chamberlin and Blackburn, who were appointed to proceed to the United States and make all necessary enquiries there with the view of establishing a printing bureau here. They also extended their enquiries as to the nature, the expense and the character of the work done in other countries, and, I think, when I read some extracts from that report the House will see the reason why the Secretary of State refrained from saying anything about it. With respect to the Bill itself, there may be something said in favor of the establishment of a printing bureau, but there is also a great deal to be said against it. In order to show the opinions of these gentlemen who were sent to enquire into this subject, I will read a few extracts from their report. Mr. Chamberlin, in speaking of the establishment of a bureau, refers to the one point of economy, and he draws his comparison from the working of the establishment at Washington. Of course

hat establishment is on a much larger scale than would be required here, still the same rule would govern in both cases. He speaks in a very qualified manner on the score of economy:

"At Washington all parties seem to be satisfied that, if not for economy alone, yet for all purposes, the present arrangement is satisfactory, and should be maintained. The claim is made, indeed, that as much as 40 per cent. has been saved in the cost of printing, but I have not been able to procure the figures on which the comparison is based. I can understand that, as against four or five separate offices turning out larger or smaller portions of the work, an office well organised, with everything concentrated under one efficient management, would certainly effect a large saving. Yet, so far as I have been able to make a comparison, the prices paid are higher than (under the contract system) at any of the State capitals or in Canada. But besides this, I learn that rent and taxes are not allowed as part of the cost at Washington; no interest on capital account is brought into the calculation, and the cost of renewal or improvement of plant, or wear and tear, not estimated."

This is the deliberate opinion of Mr. Chamberlin after having gone to the United States, where he got all the information he could on the subject, and after having weighed the matter thoroughly; and this opinion was before the Government before they brought in this Bill. Mr. Chamberlin goes on to argue this matter out, and he gives us statistics with respect to the cost of the several establishments. Of course these are large estimates compared to what we would require here, but I am sure, if the Bill is passed and if the bureau goes into practical operation, the figures given by the Secretary of State will be far below the actual cost. Mr. Chamberlin goes on to say that the plant in Washington cost $600,000, and that over $3,000,000 is each year expended in keeping up that plant and producing the required work. In Paris the cost of the printing establishment is $800,000, and in Berlin it is over $500,000. The calculation made by the Secretary of State was that a printing bureau here would cost, at the outside figure, about $200,000, and that the value of the work to be produced would be about $200,000, confining it to the printing branch. Mr. Chamberlin goes on to refer to the cost and to the comparative amount of the work produced, and he shows here—it is too long to give the whole quotation—that, though our establishment will be necessarily much smaller than the one in Washington or in any of the large capitals of the older countries, the expenses of our establishment would be proportionately higher, that we would require to keep a large quantity of material on hand, and a large staff of hands employed, so as to get out work in a hurry during an emergency, and consequently the saving that the Secretary of State calculated on would be much smaller than what he gave just on that account, because, in a place like Ottawa, where there are no large printing offices, where we would depend entirely upon the Government printing office to do the Government printing, we would require to keep a larger staff of men and a larger plant to do that work, and the profits would be proportionately less. Now, I would refer to the sixth clause, which has been already referred to by the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), who has also spoken of the evils that would flow from the operation of this clause. We have already seen, as has been detailed to us to night, how much abuse and corruption have gone into the system of giving out a large portion of the public printing at much larger prices than the Government printers were bound to do that work for. If this clause is passed, and the Bill goes into operation, then the Government can give out as much as they like. They may have a large staff in the Government office, they may have a very large plant, they may have a very large building, but they can give out half the work, for that matter, and keep all the papers supporting the Government employed at large prices and large profits. I wish to call the attention of the House to the remarks of Mr. Chamberlin on this point, and he speaks rather emphatically on it. He says:

"The danger from political partonage is again not altogether imaginary. It may either lead to the employment of indifferent workmen, or, as in Paris, to the giving work away from the Government office to outside printers."

You see he hits the nail on the head.—

"This latter course has not been without its effect here in the past."

He knows very well the little inner history of the giving out of a great deal of the printing that ought to have been given to the Government printers:

"Is there no cause to apprehend that the tendency towards it will be increased, not diminished, by the Government becoming its own printer? Nothing could be more damaging to the experiment. To secure a speedy execution of the work both machinery and workmen must be kept up a little above rather than under the absolute daily routine requirements. To make the working pay, staff and machinery must not be idle; and every job of work taken away from the establishment tends to lessen the chance of economy. And hitherto here (contrary to the claim of the partisan department) such work has been done at increased, not lower prices, thus adding to the cost of the printing as a whole.

Surely the hon. Secretary of State never saw this paragraph, or at least entirely forgot it when he introduced the sixth section in this Bill; for here we find the Government officer, the gentleman who was sent down specially to report upon the possibility and advantages of establishing a bureau of this character, speaks directly and emphatically against a clause of this kind. Mr. Chamberlin, after continuing pretty much in the same fashion—I will not quote him in full—winds up as follows:—

"In view of all these grounds for doubt"——

He mentions a great many doubts and fears with respect to one abuse and another that are liable to creep in.—

"In view of all these grounds for doubt, I cannot see my way clear to recommend the establishment of a Government printing office on the ground of economy, as likely in fact to secure the production of the work for less money than is now paid."

Here is a distinct disapproval of the principle of the Bill and of the Bill as a whole. Mr. Blackburn, perhaps, is not so emphatic, but his testimony is rather against the Bill than in favor of it. He says in winding up:

"If properly"——

There are a great many "ifs" and "buts" about these reports, I must tell the House.—

"If properly built and equipped and furnished, there is little doubt that a printing office conducted as a department of Government might be made of great service. But very much would naturally rest upon the administration of it."

Here is the whole secret.—

"If it is to be feebly or inefficiently administered, it might not result in all that could be hoped for, though it is difficult to conceive how it would be possible to produce printing of so inferior quality as that now had. Under the prevailing system, it is only natural that the contractors, whether for paper or for printing, should seek to make as much profit as possible out of their transactions, while if a departmental officer were to be employed, his endeavor undoubtedly would be to turn out the work as creditably and as cheaply as possible. No doubt each method of procedure has its drawbacks, but it may be said of the plan of a public printing office that it would be the want of due supervision which would alone make it inefficient or needlessly expensive"

There is very little comfort, I think, in either of these reports. There is no encouragement whatever for us to go on with the Bill, and, if we establish this printing bureau, of course there will be a large staff of men employed; and there is another danger that we have good reason for suspecting, considering the past and present policy of the Government, with respect to their political patronage—there is great reason to fear that, if the Bill becomes law, the bureau will be a sort of political hospital and refuge for political favorites, printers, officers, and other employees who will get positions by favor and patronage; and the establishment would be run, I believe, at a greater expense

than under the present system, and I fear with no greater efficiency, as far as the character of the work is concerned.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have been pleased to hear the moderate, practical remarks of my hon. friend who has just sat down, which must have struck the House as a marked contrast to those of the hon. gentleman who pretended to speak for the other side of the House on this question. Before the House is called to read the Bill a second time, I must say a word in answer to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville). He concluded his remarks by stating that the Secretary of State, among other very amusing ideas expressed in his long speech, had one idea which the hon. gentleman has qualified with a number of exceedingly choice expressions with which his manual *de bon ton* may supply him, but which my plain language does not possess. The hon. gentleman made the exceedingly charitable supposition that the idea I had expressed, and which he characterised as absurd and ridiculous, was mine. Well, I am not a practical man in these matters, but the idea is one of a man who stands, I am sure, a good deal above the hon. gentleman as a practical printer, a man who has, in the working of the Electoral Act, saved the country this year, in the estimation of the Auditor General, over $100,000, and this is the man who has given me that most absurd and ridiculous idea of printing the electoral lists at a Government bureau.

Mr. MILLS. Name.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Romaine. But there is more than that. The hon. gentleman has been violent in denouncing the *jobs*, as he calls them, given to friendly printers. I suppose that my hon. friend, by the severe criticism he has made of this plan, is a printer himself—I gathered as much from the great disappointment he has expressed, the great spite he betrayed, *à propos* of those favors which he supposes the Government are giving to some of their friends. My hon. friend, perhaps, forgets that during the Administration of his friends, exactly the same, if not worse—if it is bad—was done. He has quoted the quantity of work that has been given to other than the regular contractors. Well, according to the judgment of the court, the quantity of work given in violation of the contract, from 1874 to 1879, during the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, must have been at least to the amount of $280,000, since the profits, calculated at an average of 25 per cent., amounted to $71,000.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). One year of that was under this Government, and the greater portion of the work was done that year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend will see by the judgment of the court that his statement is not more correct than the other statements made by him.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Last year I obtained a transcript of the judgment, and that stated that one year was under this Government.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There was not one year, and besides, that year does not represent the proportion which the hon. member has stated. But to come to the printing of the electoral lists by the Government printing office, my hon. friend probably does not know that in the Australian colonies the electoral lists are printed by a Government bureau. I am sure that when the suggestion is put into practice, it will effect a great saving by having these lists printed at a central bureau. The hon. gentleman spoke against my plan, but he found nothing to say against the practical sense of the American plan, he could not speak against the good sense, the great economy, of the French nation, he could not speak against the operation of the system pursued at Berlin, where the saving in printing has been reduced to an art, and the Government system of printing has worked to the satisfaction of all. My hon. friend did not speak of that, but he attempted to ventilate some political grievances. He was kind enough to refer to me personally, saying that he was glad to see that I was repudiating the act of the Government. I never said anything of the kind. I am not in the habit of shirking any responsibility that devolves upon me, and I am not in the habit of doing what the hon. gentleman accused me of doing. He has said something which is worse than a slander, he made an insinuation, though not in actual words, but it has got to be understood in a different sense, and in that sense it is an insinuation worse than a slander. He stated that the Secretary of State had certain interests in a newspaper, and that I had given work to that paper at outrageously low rates, which he mentioned. The hon. gentleman mentioned thirteen times the rate of the contract. I challenge him to prove what he says, and I tell him plainly that his statement was incorrect. It was an insinuation which was worse than incorrect when he said that the report of the Chinese Commission, that large volume which we have seen, and which hon. gentlemen opposite stated was creditable enough to have been issued from a first-class Government printing office—the hon. gentleman gave the House to understand that the printing of that volume had been done at confidential rates, whereas not one eighth part of it had been so done. The only part which was paid as confidential work, was the report of the commissioners, which constitutes the first part of the volume. The secretary and the two commissioners who were doing the work of that report, sent in not less than three, four, or five different corrections, and the work was done in such a manner that it was impossible for any printer not to make the charges that were made. I tell the hon. gentleman that three-fourths of the book were printed at the contract prices paid by the Government of Ontario for similar work. My hon. friend added that the Secretary of State had another paper in which he was interested, that he had sent a job of work to that paper. Well, Sir, I am not ashamed of taking the political responsibility which devolves upon me for the acts of my colleagues, but as a personal insinuation against myself was made by the hon. gentleman, I must state that I was absent from the country, on account of illness, on the 23rd of May, 1883. All this work had been ordered and done during my illness and absence from the country, and personally I had absolutely nothing to do with it; so the insinuation of the hon. gentleman was not only incorrect but unfair. I desire to mention in answer to the appeal made to me by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) who said that the best evidence that this measure was one that the House did not expect to pass was that I occupied an hour and a half or two hours in explaining its details, that this statement is not exactly correct. I have taken a great deal of time in quoting precedents for this measure from the experience of other countries. The provisions of the Bill are as simple as they can be; there is no need for discussing them for any length of time. The Government can have this work economically done, using the most ordinary prudence—I do not say the very special prudence which a private individual would use in his own private affairs, but with ordinary prudence and with the greatest liberality in regard to the management—and the Government could actually realise the advantages desired, perfection of work, regularity of system, uniformity of work and the desired secrecy Such results will be worth a great deal of money by themselves. The hon. gentleman who last spoke mentioned a report that had been presented three years ago. It is very true that three years ago a recommendation was made to this effect, and

every one has since then been looking round to see what has been done elsewhere. It was only in 1885 that the House of Commons in England, on a joint recommendation of the House of Commons and House of Lords, agreed that if a Government printing office were established in the same manner and on a similar basis as the stationery office, good results would follow. It is in the Public Printer's report of 1885 that I found that the American Government ascertained that the profits from the Government printing office were between 30 and 40 per cent., and they have as much jobbery there as here, I presume, without wishing to be disparaging against our neighbors. It is only last year that in New Zealand a special investigation was made into the subject. We have all these precedents to guide us, and it was in referring to that information and those experiences, that I occupied the time of the House. There are no long details in this measure, none whatever. A report, signed by Mr. Chamberlin, the Queen's Printer, a year or two ago, has been quoted. I must admit that the opinion of the Queen's Printer last year, was somewhat different from his opinion this year. The Queen's Printer has done like others; he has obtained the necessary information, and I must say it in credit to him, that the information I have given to the House, is in a large measure the work of that officer.

Mr. INNES. We have no report from Mr. Chamberlin this year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have one. Moreover, we have had last year the report of Mr. Blackburn. In Mr. Chamberlin's report it was stated that if there was a good superintendence the position would be different, and that both economy and efficiency would be realised. That was the sense of the conclusion at which Mr. Chamberlin arrived, though he said that his impression was, and his conviction was, that a Government printing office might not result in economy. Mr. Blackburn's conclusions were that such establishments result in both increased efficiency and economy. We had also another report last year, the report of Mr. Romaine, the active, intelligent and practical gentleman connected with the stationery office of this House, and that report was contradicted in a certain degree by Mr. Chamberlin; but Mr. Romaine's report was conclusively in favor of the establishment of a Government printing office, and his opinions have not changed. It has been said that the printing contract having been extended to December, 1887, there is no need for this measure this Session. But a Government printing office cannot be established in one week or one month. It is necessary for the Government to have at least one year for preparation, and, if we do not agree to this measure, we shall not be more advanced next year than we are this year; and I may say that the contract has been extended to December, 1887, in order to give the Government time to establish a Government printing office on conditions that will be advantageous to the country. We will be obliged to see that the building is a suitable structure; that it is made of the best possible material; that the plant is the best, and that the whole of the work is done properly, economically, and with due regard to all the conditions necessary for such an establishment; and in order to secure this, at least fifteen months will be occupied. But this House will reflect upon this, that after the expiration of the contract, which has been extended to December, 1887, the House will have to give another extension or have a new contract for five or ten years. It is said that long contracts are more economical, and I think the Government printing office being established forever is a good reason why its existence will prove economical. There is nothing so very extraordinary in this measure as to consider it as being outside the range of the ordinary knowledge of members. Next year their knowledge would not be much increased in this respect; and instead of postponing the measure for another year we should now deal with it, and in establishing a Government printing office we should endeavor to be as cautious, economical and prudent as other Governments have been.

Mr. MILLS. The two speeches which the hon. gentleman has delivered to the House are rather of an extraordinary character. The hon. gentleman tells us that the Government is really considering the extraordinary expenditure connected with printing the voters' list, and if the House will incur an expenditure of something like $200,000 in the first instance, and a very large expenditure every year, the Government will be able to undertake the printing of the voters' list, and a very considerable expense that has been incurred by the unnecessary legislation of last year will be charged to another measure, which will be a part of the very unnecessary legislation of this year. The policy of the hon. gentleman reminds me of a story I heard an American gentleman tell. A dog thrust its head into a pitcher, and he cut the dog's head off, because the animal could not get it out; and he then broke the pitcher for the purpose of taking it out after it was cut off. The hon. gentleman proposes to get rid of the extraordinary expense connected with printing the voters' list by charging that extraordinary expenditure to a printing establishment under Government management and conducted at the Government's expense. The hon. gentleman also made another very extraordinary assertion. He told us that those gentlemen who were sent by the Government as a commission, a year or two ago, for the purpose of enquiring into the management of those printing establishments which were under Government control, had reported against the propriety of establishing such an institution here. The Queen's Printer, after he had made enquiry, having gone out to Washington and visited the different States in the American Union, enquiring into the mode of doing this business on behalf of their respective Governments, came back and told the Government that the system was not a good one; that they had better rely on having the printing done by public tender. The hon. gentleman now tells us that at the time the Queen's Printer made that report he had not sufficient information; that he has more light since; that he has now changed his mind, and that a superior and more reliable guide has been afforded to us by the speech which the hon. gentleman has just made. Now, it seems to me that we may correct the mistakes that have been made; we may improve the condition of things; we may increase the efficiency of this branch of the public service by making some alteration in the policy heretofore adopted by the Government. The hon. gentleman tells us that a large portion of that printing has been done outside of the public contracts. My hon. friend read a statement and showed that the outside printing amounted to as much as $150,000 a year. Now, I venture to say that nineteen-twentieths of this printing, over which this expenditure has been incurred, ought to have been done by the public printers; that it is wholly unnecessary that it should have been done elsewhere; that it was done for the purpose of conferring favors on particular supporters of the Government, and that in this undertaking the Government had incurred an expenditure four or five fold greater than would have been incurred had this printing been done under the public contracts. The hon. gentleman failed to inform the House of one thing which is not without significance, and that is that when these hon. gentlemen entered into a contract with the public printers, they stipulated with those gentlemen that they should not have any action against the Government if the Government chose to divert a portion of that printing, which ought to be done by the public printers, into the hands of their friends throughout the country. And what has been the effect of that provision? Why, Sir, that those men tendering on an uncertain quantity, not knowing how far the generosity or the necessities of the Government

might compel it to withdraw printing which ought to go to the public printers and bestow it on their friends, are obliged to ask more, when they tender for the performance of this work than they would do if they were absolutely certain that all the public printing that requires to be done would be done by them under the terms of the contract. Now the hon. gentleman can do the public very much greater service by putting an end to that system of jobbery, and allowing the public printers to do the work that they are better qualified to do, and have better facilities for doing, than any other class of the community, rather than proposing to create an additional Department here for the purpose of doing work which he himself admits is done in England by public contract and not in a Department of this sort—a system which is more suited to the genius of our system of government and our institutions than the one he proposes to establish. The hon. gentleman knows that he cannot do what Prince Bismark does; he knows that he cannot control his supporters in exactly the same way that he does, and that he is obliged to have recourse to other measures. Why, the printing done at the *Gazette* office, at the office of the London *Free Press*, and the Toronto *Mail*, shows that the hon. gentleman is obliged to have recourse to other measures outside of the moral and material influences without which it could not long subsist. He is obliged to have recourse to other measures than those which are necessary on the part of the Prime Minister of Prussia. So that the hon. gentleman need not have travelled so far away from the country for the purpose of finding precedents for the policy which he proposes to adopt. There are simpler means of cheapening the cost of this branch of the public service, and increasing its efficiency, without the experiment of this costly and cumbrous institution which the hon. gentleman proposes to establish. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the printing of the voters' lists. How are those lists to be revised and corrected if the printing is done here? Let me suppose that the revising officer in the district of Cariboo, nearly 4,000 miles away from here, is obliged to send his voters' list to the capital for the purpose of being printed, to be returned there to be corrected, and then to be returned here to be printed after correction. I apprehend the whole period of a Parliament would expire and a new list would be necessary before the hon. gentleman could place his list in the hands of the revising officer as finally corrected. The hon. gentleman has introduced this Bill for our consideration—when? Why, at the beginning of the fourth month of the Session. In England, where they have sessions of seven months, there has not been, for the past fifty years, an important measure introduced and carried through Parliament that was not introduced in the first month of the seven months of the Session. Still the hon. gentleman proposes here, in the fourth month of the Session, while he is trying to convince his supporters that the Session is to come to an end in a few days, an important measure, which, if the House were to do its duty, would involve a fortnight's discussion. I am not in favor of running away from my post—anxious as I am to leave here—I am not in favor of permitting this Bill to go through this House, and the committees of this House, without careful consideration. When I feel that I cannot give to any measure, no matter at what period it is introduced, that public attention which it requires, I shall resign my seat and give some other person, who has more leisure, an opportunity of taking my place. I protest against the hon. gentleman wasting the time of the members of this House by the introduction of measures of this sort at this late period. Why did the hon. gentleman wait until the fourth month of the Session before bringing this Bill up for a second reading? Is it because hon. gentlemen are not prepared to go on with the necessary public business? How is it that this House has scarcely been in Committee of Supply for the past three weeks? How is it that the hon. gentleman has wasted the whole of this day when he knows that those sitting behind him are anxious to get through with the public business and bring the Session to a close? How is it that he has wasted the whole of to-day in the consideration of a measure which he knows he cannot get through this House, if it received a fair consideration, at this period of the Session? What is happening? Are not the Government agreed about the subsidies they have proposed? Are their friends disputing the fairness of the distribution of the public funds which have been proposed to be made to some railways? Have they been further considered and further revised? What is the reason? Let the hon. gentleman be frank with the House and tell us why we have spent the whole day in the discussion of this measure, which the organ of the Minister of the Interior announced was not to be pressed this Session. The Government must have some reason for this course, and I think it is in the public interest that they should on this occasion take the House into their confidence, and tell us why a measure which was reported against by their own commission last year is brought forward in the fourth month of the Session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

REAL PROPERTY IN NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved,—That the salaries of registrars, deputy registrars and other necessary officers, and such incidental expenses of carrying the Act respecting real property in the North-West Territories into effect, as are sanctioned by the Governor in Council, shall be paid out of moneys to be provided by Parliament for the purpose.

2. Resolved,—That a proper building may, under orders of the Governor in Council, be provided and maintained at the public expense in each registration district for the deposit and safe-keeping of documents connected with the registration of titles under the Act.

3. Resolved,—That the Governor in Council may, from time to time, provide the necessary books and forms, provide any additional forms he deems necessary, and make such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry into effect the provisions of the said Act, and make such rules and regulations as to him appear necessary for giving effect to the Act, in cases unprovided for, according to its true intent and purpose.

4. Resolved,—That all fees payable under the said Act or in connection therewith shall be such as are settled by tariff made by the Governor in Council, together with one-fifth of one per cent. on the value of the real property registered, if such value amounts to or is less than $5,000, and one-tenth of one per cent. on the additional value when the value exceeds that sum; and twenty per cent. of such gross fees shall be applied to the formation of a land assurance fund for the purposes in the said Bill set forth. The value shall be ascertained by the oath or solemn affirmation of the applicant, owner or person acquiring such land. If the registrar be not satisfied as to the correctness of the value so affirmed or sworn to, it shall be lawful for him to require such applicant, owner or person acquiring such land to produce a certificate of such value under the hand of a sworn valuator appointed by a judge, which certificate shall be received as conclusive evidence of such value for the purpose aforesaid.

5. Resolved,—That the registrar may demand and receive the fees so settled, and perform the duties for which they are made payable, on payment thereof, and shall keep a correct account of all moneys received by him under the said Act and pay over the same to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, as shall be directed by the Governor in Council.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman give us some explanation of the amount of public charge which he expects to be involved.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not know that I can make any very full explanation as to the amount of charge that this will involve. We propose to have four registrars; the present registrars are to continue in office, and it is almost

impossible to state definitely what the allowance to these officers should be, because I take it that the work which they are to perform will be on the increase as settlement advances. Up to about a year ago, I think the fees averaged about $400 or $500 for each registrar. It is proposed to continue the present salaries of the registrars, who, I think, are paid $500 each, with the exception of one, who receives $1,200.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the general scheme to be that the fees shall pay the expenses of the offices?

Mr. THOMPSON. The fees, I think, will be more than sufficient to pay all the expenses, but they will not be at all sufficient to form a guarantee fund. It is proposed that the assurance fund shall be formed not only by the fees, but by a tax of one-fifth of one per cent. of the value of the real property registered, if such value is less than $5,000, and one-tenth of one per cent. upon the additional value when the value exceeds that sum, and 20 per cent. of such gross fees shall be applied to the formation of a land assurance fund. We propose to make the same provision that exists in Ontario, as to ascertaining the value when there is any doubt. That is, that there shall be an oath or affirmation of the applicant, and if the registrar is not satisfied, there shall be a valuation by a sworn appraiser appointed by a judge.

Committee rose and reported.

SUPPLY—INCH ARRAN HOTEL.

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

Mr. DAVIES. I desire to take advantage of the present motion to make a short statement with respect to the Inch Arran Hotel, and the highly undesirable relations which have existed and still continue to exist between a number of Government officials and that hotel. I think it is desirable that the facts, as proved before the Committee of Public Accounts, should be given in such form that the House and the country may understand them. I propose to summarise the facts, and I think that when I have finished I will have satisfied hon. members on both sides that the examination of witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee resulted in bringing to light facts which it would be beneficial to the public to know. The newspapers in the Maritime Provinces, last autumn and in the beginning of the present year, made charges to the effect that the Inch Arran Hotel, although ostensibly belonging to private individuals, was really a Government hotel. They charged that, if not owned by the Government as a Government, it was standing in the names or name of one or more Government officials; they charged that the Chief Engineer of Government railways, that the Chief Superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway and other officials, high in office, were directly interested in the hotel; they charged that concessions, advantages and privileges were granted to that hotel which were not granted to other private institutions; they charged that tickets were given to tourists and servants going to that hotel for nothing.

Mr. FARROW. It is proved to be false.

Mr. DAVIES. When I read the evidence or certain portions of it, I will undertake to say that the hon. gentleman dare not rise in his seat and take the responsibility of the statement he has made.

Mr. FARROW. Yes, I dare.

Mr. DAVIES. They charged, further, that the materials which entered into the construction of that hotel were carried to the hotel for nothing; they charged that the public and the country were defrauded in the amount of freight which ought to have been charged on those materials; they charged further that when the owner, the person who owned the hotel originally, sold his or her interests to the Government, or rather to the Chief Engineer of the Government Railways, it was made a part of the consideration which she received for her interest in the hotel that her husband should be employed at the public expense; and I now propose very shortly to see whether or not these allegations have been proved by the evidence. The building of that hotel was begun in 1883 by Mrs. Grant. She stated that she had reason to expect she would receive Government aid in the construction of the hotel; she stated she had been promised by Sir Charles Tupper that she would get such aid, but that he met with difficulties in obtaining the consent of the Council, and therefore she did not get it directly. Mrs. Grant proceeded during the summer of 1883 with the construction of that hotel. In the spring of 1884, the Government officials appeared upon the scene, and Mr. Sherwood Tupper Hillson, the inspector of Government buildings upon the Intercolonial Railway, proceeded to Dalhousie, saw Mrs. Grant and spoke to her about the completion of the hotel. Mr. Hillson, in his capacity of inspector of buildings on the Intercolonial Railway, took Mrs. Grant to the firm of Rhodes, Currie & Co., Amherst, and introduced her to that firm. They stated to him they would not contract with Mrs. Grant for the completion of the hotel unless the amount of their contract was guaranteed by some responsible person, and Mr. Hillson gave them the guarantee of Mr. Schreiber, Engineer in Chief of Government Railways. I will trouble you for one moment while I read Mr. Hillson's statement upon that point:

Q. Had you received any instructions from any of your superior officers to attend to the construction of that hotel? A.—After Mrs. Grant had commenced the house—she commenced it in 1883—in 1884, she made a contract with Rhodes & Currie. At least I introduced her at Amherst to Rhodes & Currie, myself, and she made a contract with them to complete the house, and Mr. Schreiber, as I understood from her at the time, was advancing her some $4,000 or $5,000 to complete the house. Rhodes & Currie would not take her for the amount, and Mr. Schreiber paid the amount to Rhodes & Currie."

So we find that, in the beginning of the year 1884, Mr. Schreiber, the Chief Engineer of Railways, undertakes to pay Rhodes & Currie the full amount of a contract they were about to enter into for the construction of this private hotel. Who are Rhodes & Currie? Rhodes, Currie & Co. may not be known generally to the members of this House, but they are well known in the Maritime Provinces. They are gentlemen who have large contracts with the Intercolonial Railway; they are gentlemen who supplied all the wooden materials which entered into the construction of the station at St. John; they are gentlemen who supply to the Intercolonial Railway all the materials which enter into the repairs and construction of the buildings along the line of railway, they are very convenient gentlemen at many times, and to these gentlemen the inspector of buildings takes Mrs. Grant, and Mr. Schreiber, the Chief Engineer, guarantees the payment, and subsequently pays the $4,500, being the amount of the contract which they entered into for the construction of that hotel. Now, I am anxious that the House should recollect the position which Rhodes & Currie hold towards the Intercolonial Railway, because it will explain the gross irregularities which subsequently occurred, by which the Government of the country was defrauded of the freight upon the carriage of these materials to Dalhousie. Rhodes & Currie, as I have stated, supply the materials which enter into the construction and repairs of the Government buildings on the Intercolonial Railway. Those materials are sent along the railway to the care of Mr. Chas. Tupper Hillson, the inspector of buildings, and, of course, when they are for the construction of Government buildings, they do not pay any freight, and when Messrs. Rhodes, Currie & Co., entered into this private

contract with Mrs. Grant for the completion of this private hotel, they seem to have adopted the same rule for the carriage of the materials which entered into the construction of that hotel as they adopt with reference to the carriage of the materials which enter into the construction of ordinary Government buildings, namely, that no freight should be paid. I find Mr. Hillson says on that point:

"Rhodes & Currie consigned a good deal of stuff for repairs along the road which, when the consigned it, if I had ordered the stuff, was consigned to me for the repairs on the different stations."

That, of course, would be all right. In the case of Government buildings, no freight would be paid upon those materials, but, when Rhodes & Currie were sending forward the materials to construct the Inch Arran Hotel, they sent those materials consigned to the Intercolonial Railway and to the care of Charles Tupper Hillson, inspector of buildings, and thus evaded the payment of the freight. Now, it may be said, and it has been said, that it is a very small amount. I do not know, I have not been able to ascertain from the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee, what that freight would amount to. Nobody can tell. The facts were proved as I have stated them, and as I will show by referring to the evidence a little further on; and Mr. Bruce, the auditor of the Intercolonial Railway was brought here and asked to give evidence with respect to this matter. He produced a number of way-bills —memo. bills he called them—which he said were copies of the original bills forwarded by Rhodes & Currie to Hillson's care. The originals, he told us, were lost. They had been destroyed in the fire at Dalhousie, so he told us, and I have no reason to doubt the gentleman's statement at all; I do not wish to throw the slightest doubt on that part of it. How he got the copies I do not know. I was about one half through the gentleman's examination; he promised to remain till the next meeting; when the next meeting came, the gentleman had gone home; I was not able to pursue my examination, and the other witnesses could not tell me anything about it. But, from those copies which he did produce, I find the following to be the facts, which I will just read to the House. I had better read Mr. Bruce's statement upon that point.

"Q. What I want to ask you is whether you have any returns with reference to lumber sent from Amherst?—A. Yes; I have them. Here are copies of the bills. Of course, the originals are filed away.

"Q. Where are the originals?—A. They were filed at Dalhousie station, but the station was burned down and they were destroyed.

"Q. Well, take one in your hand—that is a way-bill?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Who is the consignor?—A. James Caird, senior.

"Q. Who is the person to whom it is consigned?—A. Chas. T. Hillson.

"Q. Who is Charles T. Hillson?—A. He is the inspector of buildings on the Intercolonial Railway.

"Q. This lumber was consigned to Chas. T. Hillson, the inspector of buildings?—A. Yes, Sir.

"Q. What had he to do with the building of Inch Arran Hotel?—A. I cannot answer that question.

"Q. Will you look at the next one?—A. That is the same consignee. I think they are pretty much all the same.

"Q. So that all the way-bills you produce of supplies for this hotel, were consigned to Hillson, at Dalhousie?—A. There may be an exceptional bill consigned to proprietor.

"Q. There is one, I see, Intercolonial Railway care of McLellan?—A. That was consigned to the trackmaster and was material for the hotel which was charged for.

"Q. So that where it is not consigned to Hillson, it is to another official of the road?—A. Well, there are two Hillsons, and this one is the trackmaster.

"Q. Where did this lumber come from?—A. The lumber was sent to the inspector of buildings.

"Q. From whom?—A. Well, the bills themselves should give the shipper, but I believe, to the best of my knowledge, that the most of the lumber was shipped by Rhodes, Currie & Co.

"Q. But as a matter of fact the name of the sender is left blank?—A. There is no design in that.

"Q. I don't say there was any design, but as matter of fact it was consigned from Rhodes, Currie & Co., was it?—A. I know nothing more than that, except that they carry on a general manufacturing business at Amherst.

"Q. You know that they have a contract with the Government for supplying material for St. John Station?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. So that the contractor for supplying the material for the St. John Station forwarded the lumber for the construction of this hotel, and forwarded it to Chas. T Hillson, inspector of buildings of the Intercolonial Railway. Will you tell me what Hillson had to do with the construction of that building if it was a private enterprise?—A. I cannot answer that.

"Q. As far as the freight is concerned, I understand you to say that it was paid?—A. It is all paid for.

"Q. Was it all paid for at the time?—A. It was not all paid for at the time.

"Q. Why was it not all paid for at the time?—A. Because they had a running account.

"Q. Who had the running account, Charles T. Hillson, or the inspector, or Inch Arran House?—A. Inch Arran House.

"Q But the consignee was Hillson, one of the employees of the road?—A. Yes.

"Q. Who was liable for it?—A. Inch Arran House.

"Q. That is not a corporation?—A. Well, I never troubled myself much about it."

So the gentleman left just when I was in the middle of his examination, and I never had the pleasure of continuing my examination of him and bringing out from his own lips the facts I myself was informed of and hoped to prove. Now let me read to the House an abstract of those way bills:

"On the 14th May, 1885, consignor, Rhodes, Currie & Co., consignee, Intercolonial Railway, care C. T. Hillson, 1 car lumber freight $26."

That was the first way-bill. Attached to that there is a slip in which that freight of $26 is marked, "To pay, $5." Now I want that to be noticed by the House, because Mr. Pottinger, when he gave his evidence and read letters he had submitted to his chief about this railway, stated that there were three concessions which the Government had made to the road, and which they were accustomed to make to hotels situated similarly to Inch Arran. The first concession was that all materials used in the construction and equipment would be charged at half rate; second, the free transfer for all the workmen engaged in the construction; and third, half rates for all servants. Now, some members of the committee took up considerable time to show that this system was in vogue on other railways, and I wish it to be understood that I am not attacking that at all. It may or may not be right, but that is not the question before the country. It may be right, and I dare say it is, to give inducements to those who construct these summer hotels along the railway, but the question is not whether it is prudent or right to give these concessions, but whether those who are concerned in the construction of that hotel attempted to pay one-half rates, or whether they attempted to defraud the Government by not paying one-tenth rate, and whether the principle of allowing officials to be concerned in this way, does not open wide the door to frauds. Now, the following is the whole number of bills, arranged in tabular form:—

Date.	Consignor.	Consignee.	Material.	Freight.
1885.		I. C. R.		
May 14.	Rhodes, Currie & Co.,	Care C. T. Hillson,	1 car lumber,	$26.00
	Attached is copy, but freight is marked only $5.			
		I. C. R.		
" 15.	Rhodes, Currie & Co.,	Care C. T. Hillson,	1 car lumber,	$26.00
	Attached is slip reducing freight to $5.			
		I. C. R.		
" 15.	Rhodes, Currie & Co.,	Care C. T. Hillson,	1 car lumber,	$26.00
	Attached is slip reducing freight to $5.			
		I. C. R.		
May 18.	Blank.....	Care C. T. Hillson,	8 casks lime 3 brls. C. plaster	Free.
" 26.	do	C. T. Hillson	lot lumber,	O.K. S.
" 27.	do	do	do	None.
		I. C. R.		
" 30.	do	Care C. T. Hillson,	2 bdls. sheating, 2 bdls. moulding 2 boxes.	Free.
		I. C. R.		
June 3.	Rhodes, Currie & Co.,	Care C. T. Hillson,	23 rolls tar paper 1 barrel, 1 box goods, 1 keg.	Free.

Date.	Consignor.	Consignee.	Material.	Freight.
		I. C. R.		
" 13.	Rhodes, Currie & Co.,	Care C. T. Hillson,	3 bdls. boards, 1 door, 1 frame, 2 bowling alleys	} Free.
" 19.	Blank	C. T. Hillson	1 bdl. pine,	None.

Now, Mr. Speaker, from the way-bills produced by this gentleman himself, it appears that nearly all these materials were carried free of freight contrary to the concession which Mr. Pottinger said was made to the road, in violation of the law of the land, and depriving the country of the freight which should have been paid into the coffers of the Intercolonial Railway. But, says Mr. Bruce, that freight is paid? I charge that the statement was a disingenuous one. It is paid, but when? The *Moncton Transcript* made charges similar to those that I am repeating here, to the effect that the Intercolonial Railway had been made use of to carry the material of this private hotel for nothing. But in the month of March, after this House was in Session, and when it was known that these charges were to be made and an examination to be had, then we find that an investigation was gone through, and the sum of $67 is paid into the coffers of the railway which should have been paid the previous year, on the second day of March, months after the charges had been made, and when it was known they were to come up in this House. In September, 1884, the general superintendent, Mr. Pottinger, writes to the station agent at Dalhousie respecting the freight. The letter is dated on the 14th September:

"J. & J. McLeod, Dalhousie.

"Do Rhodes & Curry owe you anything? Were the materials they brought up this year for improvements at Inch Arran consigned to them, or to whom, and were they way-billed, prepaid or to pay.

"D. POTTINGER."

He follows that up with another letter:

"Dear Sir,—I presume that all the freight that came to Inch Arran House for use there, was properly way-billed and charged, if not let me know, so that it may be properly charged. See that no materials have come consigned to C. T. Hillson free of charge.

"I have telegraphed you to-day asking if Rhodes, Curry & Co. owe any bill for freight, and if their freight came properly way-billed and whether prepaid or to pay.

"Answer this to-morrow, as I leave for the west Tuesday night.

"Yours truly,

"D. POTTINGER."

This is Mr. McLeod's answer:

"Rhodes & Curry do not owe me anything, most of material came on memo. bills to C. T. Hillson. There is a small balance due me by Wm. Watson, who put water pipes in at Inch Arran House, and C. T. Hillson owes me a small balance on goods, &c., that came to him for Inch Arran House.

"J. J. McLEOD."

Then follows some further correspondence enlarging upon this matter, but as a matter of fact, not a dollar was paid, nor was the amount settled until the second day of March, and these goods were carried in the month of May and the beginning of June, 1885. I call the attention of the House to the evidence which Mr. Pottinger gave upon this matter, and the House will think it is very remarkable that although Mr. Pottinger admitted the existence of those gross irregularities, yet when I had asked him if he had taken means to ascertain whom the culprits were, so as to punish them by dismissal, he said he had taken no means. There was a rather remarkable episode during the examining of the witnesses to which I wish to call the attention of the House, and it is this: That the man who, above all others, would know about the transaction, was J. J. McLeod, station master at Dalhousie. The station had been burnt down, and the written evidence had been lost; but McLeod was there, and I was about to summon him. I did not mention his name at first for very obvious reasons. After examining the first two witnesses I was about sending for McLeod, when I received a telegram saying he had skipped to the United States.

Mr. McCALLUM. Why did he go?

Mr. DAVIES. Is the hon. gentleman very anxious to know? He went, I believe, as Mr. Pottinger says, because there were irregularities in his accounts.

Mr. FARROW. Had he written a letter saying so?

An hon. MEMBER. Read it.

Mr. DAVIES. I will if the hon. member wishes it. I want to read the evidence of Mr. Pottinger on that question of that freight for the hotel. It will be found on page 9 of the manuscript report in Mr. Pottinger's evidence:

"Q. Your statement leads me to ask a good many questions. You say the materials for building the house were to be carried at half rate, and that the ordinary supplies were not so to be carried?—A. Yes, certainly.

"Q. And that any official who were privy or party to the carrying of them free were guilty of breaches of their duty?—A. Decidedly.

"Q. Well, now in reference to this particular item to which you referred, you seem to have had some idea or suspicion when you wrote to the station master at Dalhousie, about it. Was he also instructed that a deposit had been made with the treasurer, at Moncton, to cover the amount?—A. He may have been, and I have no doubt he was, because I paid the balance out of money belonging to Mr. Schreiber that I had in my hands.

"Q. Then you have no doubt at all from the fact that you paid the balance, that there was gross irregularity. Who was the man that was guilty of that?—A. I do not know.

"Q. Did you ever take steps to ascertain who it was, and punish him?—A. I have not yet.

Q. Was it not a serious breach of the regulations for any official to carry stuff over the road and smuggle it free, when it should have been paid for?—A. Yes, but still there is no doubt about getting it back because I had the matter in my hands.

Q. But if you had not discovered it the public would have been defrauded?—A. Certainly, they might have been

Q. Certainly they would have been, it was owing to you finding it out that the public did not lose the money; who is the station master at Dalhousie?—A. Mr. J. J. McLeod.

"Q. What has happened to him since this investigation was opened?—A. I think he has gone to the United States.

"Q. He was not in the United States when this investigation opened?—A. When I left he was not.

"Q. But since you left he has gone?—A. Yes.

"Q. He is the man who would know a good deal about it?—A. He may know something.

"Q. Being the station master he must know. I take it that the station master at Dalhousie would know what freight came there improperly?—A. He tells me in that letter what freight came improperly

"Q. That is not my question. I want to know as a matter of fact whether or not he would know?—A. Certainly.

"Q. But he is not to be had?—A. No, but I can account for his absence. I do not want to do the man any injury, but I can account for his absence outside of the hotel altogether."

Here is a gross irregularity, as the result of which the Government lost quite a respectable sum of money; and Mr. Pottinger is aware of that fact, and yet he takes no steps to discover who the official is, in order that he may be dismissed; but a poor unfortunate fellow, Cormier, takes a glass of grog and he is hoisted out and dismissed at once. He produced the letter which Mr. McLeod wrote to one of the officials, stating that he found his money short and he had skipped out on that account. I think I have proved to the satisfaction of the House, despite the contradictions with which my opening remarks were met by hon. gentlemen opposite, that there were gross irregularities which should not have been countenanced, and which resulted in the loss of quite a respectable sum of money, all owing to the fact that the officials connected with the Intercolonial Railway were allowed to have connection privately with this private hotel, and to the fact that Mr. Charles Tupper Hillson, the inspector of buildings, was allowed to have material which entered into the construction of the hotel consigned to him; and it was because, as I have proved, Messrs. Rhodes, Currie & Co. were in the habit of having Government material sent to him on which no freight was paid, and they sent material to the hotel in the same way, and thus avoided payment. That was not all. Mr. C. T. Hillson is in the Government employ, and it was proved during the investigation that

part of the time he was supposed to superintend the construction of Government buildings was spent by him in superintending the construction of this private hotel. Was that fair or right? It was unjust and unfair. Mr. Pottinger, in his evidence on that point, says on page 17:

"Q. Who was the inspector of Government buildings on your road?—A. Mr. C. T. Hillson.
"Q. He is inspector of what?—A. Inspector of buildings, of the repairs of buildings chiefly.
"Q. When was he appointed?—A I cannot remember that.
"Q. About when?—A. Several years ago.
"Q. Four or five years ago?—A. I should think so.
"Q. Well, did Mr. Hillson spend any of his time inspecting the Inch Arran House?—A. He did spend some time there in 1884.
"Q. How much of it?—A. I do not know how much.
"Q. Two months?—A. Well, he was travelling about over the line. It would be difficult to state where his work lies.
"Q. It may have been about two months?—A. I cannot state that
"Q. Have you no reasonable idea that you can state?—A. I know he spent some time there by my orders.
"Q. Inspecting the hotel?—A. Yes; inspecting the hotel and hastening the completion."

It is too bad that an official, who is paid out of the public Treasury for inspecting public buildings should be employed by Mr. Pottinger in inspecting a private building owned by the Chief Engineer of the Government Railways in his private capacity. If the Government officials are taken from their work and sent to superintend private buildings belonging to the Superintendent of the Railway, it is a gross wrong. Now, Mr. Hillson was examined himself with respect to the time he spent there, and I will just trouble the House with a short statement from him, corroborating—if need for corroboration existed—Mr. Pottinger's evidence upon that point:

"Q. I want you to speak with reference to the Dalhousie investigation. When did you go there? You know the Inch Arran Hotel?—A. I do.
"Q. When did you first go to inspect the construction of that building?—A. I cannot say that ever I went there particularly at any time to inspect the Inch Arran Hotel. I was at Dalhousie at the time of the construction of the branch, and the buildings, and the wharf, almost every week, and at different times I went down to this hotel.
"Q. Had you received any instructions from any of your superior officers to attend to the construction of that hotel?—A. After Mrs. Grant had commenced the house—she commenced the house, I think, in 1883—in 1884, after she had commenced the house she made a contract with Rhodes & Currie—at least I introduced her at Amherst to Rhodes & Currie and she made a contract with them to complete the house, and Mr. Schreiber, as I understood from her at the time, was advancing her some $4,000 or $5,000 to complete the house. Rhodes & Currie would not take her for the amount, and Mr. Schreiber paid the amount to Rhodes & Currie.
"Q. What amount to Rhodes & Currie?—A. The amount of their contract, $4,000 or $5,000—$4,500 I think it was. Mr. Pottinger asked me when I was there to take a run down to the house and see if the work was being carried out right, and I did.
"Q. Then it was under Mr. Pottinger's instructions that you saw the work was carried out right?—A. Yes.

So we have here, from the mouth of Mr. Pottinger, corroborative of the evidence of Mr. Hillson, the fact that this man, whose time should have been devoted to the public service, was devoting his time to the construction of a private hotel owned by Mr. Schreiber. Not only so but he was employed in disposing of the accounts and bills of the hotel. We find him saying at page 11 of his evidence:

"Q. You can give no idea of the length of time you were inspecting that hotel, as it was at different intervals? You kept no memorandum of it?—A. No; I kept no memorandum of it.
"Q. Did you pay any of the bills?—A. Yes.
"Q. How many of the bills did you pay?—A. I cannot tell you exactly, now, but it was quite a large amount.
"Q. Quite a large amount means anything or nothing?—A. Well, it means, say, $1,000; that is quite a large amount."

Then we come to another point; when the hotel was finally purchased from Mrs. Grant, what considerations were paid to her for her interest? Let us turn to the evidence on that point.

Mr. McLELAN. Up to that time was it Mrs. Grant's; or when did it become Mr. Schreiber's? I think it was subsequent to that period.

Mr. DAVIES.

Mr. DAVIES. In June, 1884, I think, it become Mr. Schreiber's. Mr. Schreiber paid $4,500 to Rhodes & Currie for the construction, and when the hotel was constructed he bought it up.

Mr. McLELAN. He advanced her that amount on mortgage, and she directed Rhodes & Currie I suppose. But during all that time it was Mrs. Grant's private property?

Mr. DAVIES. It was not running at all at that time. By the evidence of Mr. Pottinger, on page 21, we will see how this hotel passed from Mrs. Grant's hands into the hands of Mr. Schreiber:

"Q. What I meant to ask is this: When Mr. Schreiber took this hotel off the hands of Mrs. Grant, were you party or privy to the arrangement?—A. I knew something about the arrangement, but I did not make the arrangement
"Q. Were you there?—A. No, I was not there.
"Q. You did not see Mrs. Grant personally?—A. No, I did not at that time.
"Q. At what time did you see her?—A. I was in the hotel some weeks before.
"Q. With reference to her leaving, and Mr. Schrieber taking possession of it?—A. Yes, I spoke to her.
"Q. You went there for that purpose?—A. No, I did not. I went there and found everything in confusion. The people talked of leaving the house. I talked to Mrs. Grant, and asked her if she would not sell out to Mr. Schreiber.
"Q. Without having consulted Mr. Schreiber?—A. Yes.
"Q. That seems singular to me?—A. She demurred strongly to it. We had only five minutes conversation, or perhaps less
"Q. You suggested that she should give up the hotel to Mr. Schreiber and she demurred?—A. Yes, she demurred."

So that Mrs. Grant did not want to sell, and Mr. Pottinger wanted her to sell. Then we have Mr. Hillson's testimony on that point, who says he was present at the arrangement. He says, at page 13 of his evidence:

"Q. You were not present when Mrs. Grant and Mr. Harrison made the agreement together?—A. I was there mostly all the time when the arrangement was made between Harrison and Mrs. Grant.
"Q. Do I understand you to deny or affirm that Mrs. Grant did insist upon her husband getting employment as a consideration for giving up the hotel?—A. I heard nothing of the kind, with the exception of what I told you, that Harrison said Mrs. Grant wanted employment for her husband if she signed the agreement."

The agreement was an agreement surrendering her interest in the hotel to Mr. Schreiber. Now we have here an hotel alleged to be owned by Mrs. Grant; we have Mr. Pottinger telling her that he wanted her to sell the hotel to Mr. Schreiber; we have Mr. Schreiber and Mr. Pottinger sending to the law agent of the Dominion Government for New Brunswick, who goes to Dalhousie and negotiates for the purchase of the hotel, and, as a consideration for her giving up her interest, the law agent of the Government signs a document that her husband shall get employment in the public service. Mrs. Grant was called and gave evidence, some of which was amusing and some instructive. I shall read those parts which refer to this point:

"Q. Had you been running the hotel up to the time you sold out?—A. Yes.
"Q. Had you sole control of it up to that time; had you any assistance in running it?—A. What do you mean by that?
"Q. Any assistance from any of the Government officials?—A. Not any assistance from Government officials. There was a clerk in the house.
"Q. Who was that?—A. George Sangster.
"Q. Who was he?—A. He keeps the restaurant at Moncton. He was sent over to help me to open the books, and in keeping the house."

So Mr. Charles Tupper Hillson introduces a gentleman to Mrs. Grant who goes there and works for nothing, and this House is asked to believe that he was not paid by the Government of this country.

Mr. BOWELL. Was he in the employ of the Government?

Mr. DAVIES. I do not know by whom he was employed, but a Government employee put him there.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman must know, because it is in the evidence.

Mr. DAVIES. Who paid him?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know, but the fact was brought out that he was not in the employ of the Government and never had been, and that the Government had nothing to do with the selection. Why did you not tell the House that?

Mr. DAVIES. I am remarking on the extraordinary fact that at the time the Government alleged that neither they nor their officials owned this hotel at all. Their inspector of buildings goes to Moncton and takes a gentleman from Moncton and puts him there to keep the accounts and run the hotel for no salary at all. I am asking who paid him? The hon. gentleman must give the answer, for I cannot.

Mr. McLELAN. Did you ask Mrs. Grant?

Mr. DAVIES. I have read what I asked her. The testimony goes on:

"Q. Who sent him?—A. Mr. Hillson brought him there and introduced him to me. He was paid no salary as the man to open the books and assist me in keeping the house.

"Q. He was paid no salary by you?—A. No, sir; it was a distinct understanding that he was to be paid no salary."

A distinct understanding with whom? With the Government inspector of buildings? I will go on and read the agreement she made with Mr. Schreiber, which she at first refused to produce, but which she produced subsequently. It was signed simultaneously with the signing by her of a conveyance to Mr. Schreiber, and it was drawn by the Government law agent in New Brunswick, the gentleman sent by Mr. Pottinger to carry this agreement out:

"DALHOUSIE, 28th July, 1884.

"MRS. ELLEN G. GRANT.

"DEAR MADAM,—It is the intention of the Railway Department to employ Mr. Grant at once temporarily, to be followed as soon as practicable with permanent employment at a suitable remuneration.

(Signed) "L. R. HARRISON."

I suppose the Government had something to do with that.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no evidence that they had.

Mr. DAVIES. There is evidence that Mr. Pottinger, the Government Superintendent of Railways, sent this law agent to draw the agreement conveying Mrs. Grant's interest to Mr. Schreiber, and that gentleman gave this undertaking saying that it was the intention of the Department to appoint Mr. Grant, and he has been in the service of the Government ever since.

Mr. BOWELL. My hon. friend is laying down the principle that because a lawyer is a Government agent in a certain city, if he is employed by anybody else, he must be employed by the Government.

Mr. DAVIES. It is not by anybody else; here is where the hon. gentleman is astray. Mr. Harrison was employed by Mr. Pottinger, the General Superintendent of the Government Railway.

Mr. BOWELL. Has he no right to have business with anyone else but with the Government?

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman should not defend this transaction. He should condemn it.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not trying to defend anything. I am trying to set you right, so that you will not mislead the House.

Mr. DAVIES. Not only did he pledge to Mrs. Grant that the Department would employ her husband. Mrs. Grant was asked this question:

"Q. This was given to you at the time you passed the hotel over to Mr. Schreiber?—A. It was. It was the result of three years' lobbying in the House of Commons.

"Q. It is dated 28th July, 1884?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. That is the time you sold the hotel to Mr. Schreiber?—A. Yes.

"Q. Did you insist upon getting this document before giving up possession?—A. It was given to me by Mr. Harrison. I do not know how much my insisting would have had any effect.

"Q. Did you insist?—A. I did not say that I insisted, but my husband was ill at the time, and it was part and parcel—Mr. Schreiber knew very well that the hotel was all I had to support my family at the time, and it was done as a personal thing for me.

"Q. It was part and parcel of what?—A. Nothing; you asked me if I got the document.

"Q. Was it part and parcel of your agreement?—A. The only objection I had to giving up the hotel, was that I would be thrown out on the world with my children, who were too young to labor."

She was asked further:

"Q. Do I understand you to say that you would not give up the hotel unless you got employment for your husband?—A. I got that when I sold the hotel.

"Q. Was that a condition of your giving up the hotel?—A. Did not you tell me that it was, yourself?

"Q. Was it a condition of your giving up the hotel that you should have this agreement?—A. It was talked of at the time, but there is no legal document. If they chose to dispute it it is not worth that

"Q. Was it a condition of your giving up the hotel?—A. I am not going to answer any more questions. You have the document and what more can you have.

"Q. You must answer that question?—A. Well, I won't."

And she did not answer it. But I think any man of common sense and practical experience must know why she would not answer; he knows the only answer she could give. Now, just one word in conclusion. There was a further charge that certain tickets had been issued improperly. Mr. Pottinger explained that it was the custom to grant tickets at half fares. The evidence shows that the custom was violated in this case—that in 1884 no fare was charged at all.

Mr. FARROW. How many tickets?

Mr. DAVIES. We have knowledge of five which were proved to have been issued in 1884, for which nothing was paid at all until the day after the charge was made in the Moncton *Transcript* on 3rd March, 1886. Then, I want to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that after the conclusion of the season of 1884, the superintendent of passengers and freight, Mr. Busby, wrote to Mr. Pottinger a letter, stating that that letter would be his authority for sending a report of all the free tickets he had issued to the Inch Arran Hotel that year. In the face of that letter, it is beyond dispute that it never was the intention, until these charges were made in the public press that one dollar of the money should be refunded; but when the charges were openly made in the public press, these men, for shame's sake, were driven to refund the money they should have paid two years before. In 1885, twenty to twenty-five tickets were issued free, and Mr. Cormier, clerk in the Department, who checked Mr. Robinson's account, found in the return sent to the Department that he had marked in the column for payments the word *nil*.

An hon. MEMBER. What does that mean?

Mr. DAVIES. Ordinary people understood it to mean nothing, but we were astonished to hear Mr. Robinson explain it was meant to be accounted for hereafter. On the 27th October, 1885, Mr. Cormier was dismissed, and on the 23rd November Mr. Busby wrote to Mr. Robinson, the agent at Montreal, who issued tickets, that the chief superintendent decided on charging half fares; on the 28th the accounts for tickets was sent in, and on the 22nd September they were paid for, so that I do not think, in the face of that evidence, it would be proper for me to have kept back from the country the facts proved by the railway officials themselves. These men were not adverse to the interests of the railway, they were railway employees, and the facts

they proved show a degree of irregularity and impropriety to have existed between the officials of the railway and the hotel, which deserves severe condemnation, and I hope the investigation will be a warning to other officials not to mix up their duties with their private business. It is to be deplored that any official should attempt to use his position to further his own private interests, and it is deeply to be deplored that when the matter is exposed, instead of meeting the condemnation of both sides, it meets with the approval of a good many hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not say all of them by any means. The charge I made has been substantially proved. With regard to the tickets issued in 1885, the charge made was proved conclusively, but we have Mr. Robinson's statement that the word *nil* meant that the tickets were to be accounted for, and we must take the statement for what it is worth; but as regards the tickets issued in 1884, they were not accounted for and were not expected to be accounted for.

Mr. McLELAN. I want to know if this evidence, from which the hon. gentleman has read such extracts as suited himself, is in a position to be made public.

Mr. DAVIES. The document is the evidence reported to this House by the committee, and I hope it will be published in full.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will be published.

Mr. McLELAN. I will not detain the House with observations. I am satisfied, when the evidence is published, the public will be satisfied these gentlemen did nothing more than what it was in their right to do to promote traffic.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As the hon. gentleman assumes the responsibility we are content.

SETTLERS IN SAUGEEN PENINSULA.

Mr. ALLEN. There is a matter I would like to bring before the House, in reference to the settlers in the Indian Saugeen Peninsula. They have been called upon by the Department to pay up the money due with interest to the 1st November on their lands, or else the lands will be resold. The state of these settlers is not very comfortable, and a great deal of dissatisfaction exists among them at present. The lands were originally sold in 1857, at a time when produce was very high, and the country was excited over land. These lands were sold by auction, and people foolishly purchased them at a great deal more than their actual value. In the course of a few years, the farmers who secured good lots were able to pay for them and got their deeds. A large number of these settlers purchased farms at from $2 to $10 per acre. Some of those farmers found when they cleared the land that it was nothing but solid rock, perhaps seventy-five acres of rock out of 100. It was worthless for farming purposes. A great many of the settlers have been trying to eke out a subsistence for the past twenty years on these farms, and have not been able to pay for them. Some of them have from $300 to $1,200 against them, and I do not think a purchaser could be found for some of the land at $50 per 100 acres. I hope the Department will not carry out their threats of making these men pay for the land by the 1st of November.

Mr. McNEILL. I did not quite catch what the hon. gentleman has said. What are the settlers called upon to do?

Mr. ALLEN. I understand some of them have been notified to pay for their lands before the 1st of November —the amount of purchase money and the interest due to that date.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman is mistaken with regard to that. There was such an order last year but none this year.

Mr. ALLEN. I know what I am talking about. Gentlemen living in that section have told me and have written to me that the Government have ordered them to pay up, and I believe the gentlemen. If they do sell, the Indian Department will lose by the transaction. If the land is taken and put up by auction they will not sell for one-half what is due, or for one-tenth in some cases. I know land in that neighborhood which was sold for $50 an acre, and there is over $50 an acre due to the Government on these lots on the west side of Brook, and I do not know anyone who would give over $20 or $25 an acre for that land. If those lands are sold, the Indian Department will lose by them, and the settlers will be forced to move from these lands and to go to the free grant lands on the other side of the Georgian Bay or to the North-West, where they can get lands for nothing. They will be put to these hardships, and the Indian Department will not receive the benefit. Then is it fair to insist on these settlers paying at the present time, with wheat selling at Owen Sound for 70 cents a bushel, and wool selling yesterday for 17 cents and 18 cents a pound. Cattle and horses are almost unsaleable in that part of the country at the present time. I am afraid they are not much better here. These men's crops last year were very poor. I do not believe the crops of wheat in our county last year averaged more than eight or ten bushels to the acre, and at 70 cents a bushel, that did not average over one-half the expense of raising the crop. I hope, under these circumstances, the Government will not press this year the payment for these lands. In the township of Keppel and other parts of the peninsula, saw mills have been put up, and I know there has been a great deal of trouble this winter. Mill men have been accustomed to purchase lands in the township of Keppel for fifteen years past, and these men have been allowed, when they purchased and paid for the lands, to take the timber off the lands and use it for lumber purposes, but lately, when in other townships they have cut out these logs for the mills, the Government agent was sent up there and the logs were seized, although the lumbermen made application to the Department and asked the Department to name any price for the lands they thought fair and they would pay it, and would pay any amount of dues that was fair and right for the logs. The Indians were anxious to get the mill-owners to take these logs away, because they said if they remained there much longer, fires would pass through the country and burn them up, as they had in other parts of the country; but agents were sent up and notice was given that these men would be arrested. One of them came here and told me he was under arrest, and he was afraid that other actions would be taken. His logs are under seizure and work stopped, while he had offered to pay any amount demanded, although he had purchased the lands. This is not treating the settlers fairly, and I hope the Government will make some arrangements by which those mill-owners can get those locations and get the timber, and will settle the matter satisfactorily and will also extend the time they want to enable them to pay for the lands. In doing that, I believe the country will be better off, the Indian Department will receive more money, the settlers will feel more satisfied, and the country generally in that part will feel relieved. You may depend that, if the threat is carried out of making them pay, it will cause a disturbance in that part of the country which will not be easily quelled.

Mr. McNEILL. I hope my hon. friend did not misunderstand me when I interrupted him a moment ago. I am in perfect sympathy with his views in reference to this matter, but I thought he was uninformed with regard to an alteration which had been made with reference to these regulations, and I simply wished to inform him what the state of affairs really was. There was an intention to compel the settlers to pay up in full in the Saugeen Penin-

sula by the 1st November last, but that intention on the part of the Deputy Minister was thwarted by the action of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, who, as soon as he learnt what the intention was, interfered and prevented its being carried out. I am now speaking as to the arrangements which have been made in my own constituency, and perhaps it may not be so in the constituency which my hon. friend represents. However, that proposal was, as I have said, interfered with by the Prime Minister, who stepped in on behalf of the settlers, and made an arrangement that they should be called upon to pay only by instalments, and he went so far as to say that those who were specially poor, those who were reported by the local agent to be unable to do so, should not be called upon even to pay one instalment by the 1st November, but should get time until their circumstances improved. That was the arrangement made so far as the settlers were concerned in the north riding of Bruce. I must say that I agree with the hon. gentleman in what he says, that to call upon these men to pay up in full at that time was a harsh and an unwise proceeding.

Mr. ALLEN. Was the same arrangement made for the county of Grey as for the county of Bruce?

Mr. McNEILL. I do not know, I am only speaking in regard to my own constituency. I do not know what has been done for the north riding of Grey, but this has been done in the north riding of Bruce. I can only say that, if the settlers in the north riding of Grey are being in any degree oppressed in this matter, I shall be only too glad to co-operate with my hon friend in any way possible to obtain for them the same advantages that the people in North Bruce have got. With regard to the millmen: I must admit that what the hon. gentleman has said is correct, and that they have been subjected, in my opinion, by the Deputy Minister of Indian Affairs, to the very greatest hardship and injustice. However, so far as they also are concerned, the right hon. gentleman has entered into an arrangement, and has given instructions to his deputy within the last few days which I hope will be satisfactory to all parties concerned. While I say I think these men have been treated with harshness and injustice, it is only right that I should also say that I believe this has been done, so far as the millmen are concerned, by the Indian Department for the benefit of the Indians. I believe that the action taken by the Department has been taken because the Deputy Minister believed that these men were injuriously lumbering, were injuriously affecting the property of the Indians. He believed that these men were robbing the Indians of their timber, and he thought it was necessary to take certain strong measures to prevent this timber stealing going on. I think that he overstepped his duty and acted harshly and unwisely for the Indians themselves, because I think he not only injured the millmen, but the settlers to whom the Indians must look for the purchase money of their lands. But I am quit satisfied that he acted in good faith, and in the belief that it was his duty, as a guardian of the Indians, to take steps to protect their property. There can be no doubt that timber stealing was going on, and that something had to be done to stop it. The action taken so far as these millmen are concerned, has, I believe, been dealt with by the Prime Minister in such a way as is likely to give satisfaction to all parties concerned; I hope, at all events, that will be the result. I believe that the hon. gentleman has only done his duty in bringing this matter before the House, because there is no doubt that these men have suffered grievously from the action that has been taken in the past.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sure that the House must feel infinitely obliged to my hon. friend who has just sat down, for the amount of light he has thrown on the internal working of the Department of Indian Affairs. We knew tolerably well the sort of supervision which the First Minister exercises over any department which is unfortunate enough to be confided to his care. Now, I have always held that it is a serious mistake for the Prime Minister of this Dominion to charge himself with the care of an important Department, but the candid statement which my hon. friend has just made, and which shows how that Department is run by his subordinates, and the amount of attention that is bestowed upon it by its nominal head, cannot fail to satisfy the House that not merely as regards the unfortunate settlers in the county of Grey, but as regards a great many other persons who are under the control of the Indian Department, and of whom we have heard a great deal too much, and for whom this country has been called on to pay a great deal too much in blood and treasure, for that we are indebted a great deal to the fact that the head of the Indian Department is a purely nominal head, and exercises no effective supervision over his officials, either here or in the North-West.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong about the First Minister's administration of that Department. The First Minister has applied himself and has succeeded in mastering the affairs connected with that Department, I must say that he has saved repeatedly large sums of money that were due to the Indians. Of course, we know perfectly well that everyone except the Minister, and probably the officers of the Department, is against the Indians, and do not want them to get their due, but always postpone the amount that becomes due to the Indians, thus depriving them of their means of support. I know by experience, that in relation to some of these lands the settlers have refused, year after year, to pay the Indians. As the hon. gentleman who brought this matter up has stated, there are some of these settlers who owe eight, nine, ten or twelve hundred dollars on their land. The hon. gentleman says the lands are very bad, and he would not give $5 an acre for them. Well, if they are so bad, why did they remain there after doing so much as they did on the lands?

Mr. ALLEN. Because they could not raise enough money to leave?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. But the hon. gentleman knows that when these men first went there they saw the quality of the land, that it was only rock, as he said, and why did they choose to remain? Because they found their living there, because they could cut timber, which they had no right to cut, and which did not belong to them. The hon. gentleman says that a number of these settlers have cut timber, and that it was seized by the officers of this Department. Why? Because that timber did not belong to these settlers; and why should the Indians, for whom the Government are merely trustees, be deprived of what belongs to them? Because they are Indians, and because they cannot defend themselves? I think that is not fair. Of course I am in favor of the settlers as much as any man in this House, but on the other hand we ought to look after the interests of the Indians. We are here for that purpose, and we should not allow them to be robbed. The hon. gentleman says they were called upon to pay, and unless they paid by the 1st November they were to be sold out. I wonder how many of these settlers were ever sold out. The hon. gentleman could not give a single instance of an eviction. The Department have been obliged to call upon these settlers to pay within a certain time in order to bring them to a sense of justice. Now, all we claim against these settlers has been settled by the regulation the hon. gentleman spoke of, and they are to pay by instalments. If they had taken that course from the beginning, nobody would have called upon them to pay everything on the 1st November. But I am

sure that if these settlers only applied to the Department and said: "We are ready to pay by instalments, they would be allowed to do so. It is only because they refuse to pay what is due to the Indians. These Indians are starving. Why should they starve while the money is there, while the timber is there? This timber is cut by men who have no license to cut, and they wish to deprive the Indians of the stumpage, and the money they pay on that timber. I think we are not here for that purpose. We must protect the settler, but we have to protect the Indian as well. I think it is unfair to say that the First Minister does not give his attention to this Department. I know personally how careful he has been to have justice done to these Indians, I know that he has looked after that Department at the expense of his health and he would not be in the condition he is to-day if he had not given so much time to the Department under his control.

Mr. ALLEN. I rise to an explanation. The timber is burned off the land that is sold to the settlers. The mill men purchased the logs and are willing to pay for them any price the Government may ask. I would recommend that the matter be left to a revaluation. Let the Government send up some person to revalue the property and then charge the settlers that value.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have received several communications in reference to the grievance of the settlers on the peninsula, and as this matter is now before the House I think it is my duty to present these communications so that some action may be taken by the Government in order to remove the grievances that press so heavily on many classes of the community on the Indian Peninsula. I have heard that the regulations which the Department have in force have had the result of closing up some of the mills, and have had the result of preventing the municipalities, in one or two instances, being able to collect the taxes, owing to the Government cancelling the sales of land. I have received a letter from one who has lived there for some time, and as it sets forth the case very clearly, I will read it to the House. He says:

"I may say that there are two mills in the immediate neighborhood of Wiarton shut down, one owned by Mr. James Sills, of this place, and situated in Wiarton, the other owned by Mr. David Porter, and situated at Colpoy's Bay, a distance of three miles from this village—the latter being purchased by Mr. Porter at a sheriff's sale, the former owners evidently failed for want of proper timber supply. In the case of James Sills, he bought and paid for a block of timber lands on the peninsula, in the township of St. Edmund's; he built his mill in Wiarton, with the expectation of using his timber, but the Dominion Government cancelled the sale, and as a natural consequence his mill is standing idle. I might also quote cases in the different parts of the peninsula where, owing to the unfair and oppressive policy of the Indian Department, mill-owners have either failed completely and become bankrupt, or were forced to leave this section and take their money and interest with them. John Inkestter, of Barrow Bay, failed, and his mill stood idle for more than a year. Thomas Currie, of Golden Valley, brother of Mr. Nathaniel Currie, of Glencoe, ex-M.P.P., failed completely; his mill was afterwards burned, but that did not account for his failure, as he failed before the fire, and in addition to that the mill loss was covered with insurance. One of the grievances of the settlers is that in the townships of Albermarle and Eastnor, lots which were taken up by settlers and others, and assessed and taxed, were cancelled by the Indian Department, and the loss to the two townships was, Albermarle about $700, and Eastnor $800—money they would have received, but when they were cancelled by the Department the townships had no claim, and of course the parties who had taken the said lots out of the Government land office could not be forced to pay taxes on property the Government had sold, and afterwards—say two years or so—cancelled the said sale. Another grievance the settlers have to complain of is that they are not allowed to cut the timber on the farms they have taken up from the Government, as it seems the Government prefer the fire to consume the timber rather than allow the settlers to derive any advantage from the timber. This, as you are aware, is a very rough section (of our noble Dominion), it takes about on an average of four or five hundred acres to secure one hundred of arable land. This will, therefore, never make a good agricultural section and as the settlers depend on timber more than agriculture, the policy pursued by the Department for the past two years has been one of constant bother and trouble, and a policy if pursued in the future as in the past will undoubtedly drive a great many of the settlers from this section. A sale was advertised by the Department, signed by Vankoughnet, for the 16th January, 1886, but was adjourned indefinitely offering for sale the timber on the farms of settlers who had a clearance of from 15 to 20 acres on their respective farms, so that you can see that the pioneers have great difficulties to contend with a tyrannical Government who are always harassing by cancellation, and then if they restore it to its proper owner of course political obligation to the crowd in power is supposed to follow. To sum the whole matter up what the settlers on the Indian Peninsula require is the timber and the use of it as well as the lands."

I think this letter will give the Government an idea of the condition in which the settlers are placed by reason of the regulations and of the management of the Indian Department in that portion of the peninsula. I have also a letter from a reverend gentlemen who has been residing in that section for a number of years and is intimately acquainted with the wants and privations of the settlers. He understands the difficulties they have had to contend with by reason of those regulations. And he intimates that unless a different policy is pursued in that section it will effectually close all the mills and drive out many of the settlers who now depend on the lumber business. I have here a letter from one engaged in the business for some time up there, and he says:

"It is really hard that we must not use even any of the dead timber that is yet left here, except where the land is cleared or clearing. As there is so little land here worth clearing, that the law as it now stands is likely to drive out all local millmen, the only enterprise on the peninsula of any benefit to the settlers here, as it is the only means they have to help themselves by putting in and selling their sawlogs to the mills, and if the millowners cannot get a sufficient supply to keep their mills going, they must leave here. It is a strange way, indeed, of encouraging home manufactures or settling the land here, so far from markets, without roads. As it is the roads are nearly impassable and the Government can do nothing for us in making roads. It seems to me that now the Government is going to protect the timber when all the valuable timber is gone. They say they have nothing to do with us, only to take all the money they can get from the poor settlers and give it to the Indians. It seems poor policy."

It really does seem poor policy, and the people in the peninsula are being badly treated. I hope the Government will look into the causes of the grievances, and I think means could be devised, if the wants and requirements of the people were understood, whereby the difficulties under which they labor might be removed. I hope this will be done so that the settlers will not be driven out of the country by being kept from using the resources of the country which they might utilise to the public advantage.

Mr. SPROULE. I have had a number of letters in the same direction as those read by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, but I think the trouble is not of recent date. Under the late Government timber lands there were leased to H. H. Cook & Co., and at that time the settlers were not allowed to cut any timber except on the three or five acres of land they cleared, although the terms of sale were such that after having that land for three years and clearing up a reasonable quantity they became possessed of the timber, but when the lumberers found that the time was nearly up, when the settler became possessed of the timber, they cut it down and drew it off the farm lest the settlers should get it. At that time petitions were sent to the Department asking that the lease be cancelled, and subsequently it was cancelled; but troubles were increasing and were transferred from this firm of outsiders to the local men of the district. Those men who went there and built mills found it convenient to purchase the right of the settlers to the land. A great quantity of the land was bought for about 50 cents an acre, on account of it being of inferior quality, it being only valuable for the timber. The Department found that the Indians were losing what of right belonged to them, by these millowners cutting and using timber on Indian lands not bought, and they stopped that being done, and parties cutting timber were compelled to pay double stumpage dues. This was continued for some time and then a claim was set up that through some misunderstanding of the agent he had sold a large amount of the land there—ostensibly for timber and not for settlement. The Department

held that the regulations were such that a person purchasing a farm was compelled to settle on it and do settlement duties within a specified time, and the millowner contended, on the other hand, that it was purchased only for timber. A conflict arose between the Department and the timber men, and, I believe, it has been going on ever since. Last year, I believe, the Government thought it advisable to send an inspector to that part of the country to ascertain what portion of the land was unfit for settlement, and to sell the timber so as to realise as much as possible for the Indians. But, unfortunately, there happened to be included in the land set apart for sale a number of lots of land claimed to be owned by parties said to be homesteaders there, but through the action of gentlemen who interested themselves on behalf of the settlers, that was stopped for a time. I may say that the experience of those who have lived in the district seems to be generally in one line, and that is to the effect that the timber men and the millowners were really pirating the country taking timber which belonged to the Indians for their mills and nothing was given in return. It was taken from the settlers as well as from the Indians, and while it resulted in some good by keeping the mills running and, perhaps, giving employment to some men in the district, there was not that amount of money realised for the Indians that there should have been, and the Government had to go in and stop it. It was a matter of there being some authority or no authority in the district, and if the Department did, perhaps, deal with rather a severe hand at the time, they were, I think, in a measure justified. There were, however, isolated cases where the result was a hardship to the settlers. I am glad, however, to know that the Department is taking steps to remedy the grievance, and for that reason I believe that no *bonâ fide* settler will be disturbed who shows himself desirous of paying up his arrears. Another source of trouble was that land belonging to the Indians lay alongside of that sold by the Government under the Crown land regulations. Those regulations were somewhat similar to the regulations in the Indian Department, that is, on a basis of actual settlement, and the payment, under stipulated terms, within a certain number of years. Still the Crown Lands Department never exacted those conditions; and those settling on the Indian lands, who were asked to pay up, looked upon it as a hardship that they should have to do so while their neighbors alongside of them on the Crown lands were not asked. I think the regulations of the Department, allowing these amounts to be paid up in several instalments, is in the right direction. I do not see anything wrong in the settlers being asked to pay for their lands, but I think it would be in the interests of the Indians that the land should be divided—those portions fit for settlement being kept for settlement, while as to those which are valuable for timber, the timber should be sold, and the proceeds of that sale kept for the benefit of the Indians.

Mr. DAWSON. I am not particularly familiar with the position of matters in the Saugeen Peninsula as regards the Indians, but there are a great many Indians in my own district, and I merely speak on this subject with reference to some remarks which fell from an hon. gentleman in regard to the management of the Indian Department. I can say that there is no Department of the Government with which I am brought so much in contact as the Indian Department, from having so many Indians in my constituency, and that there is no Department of the Government where more care and attention is paid to everything which is brought before it. The officers of that Department are careful. All cases which I have brought up they have investigated most thoroughly, and I must say they generally come to a just and reasonable decision upon cases arising between white men and Indians. There are not many such disputes in my district. But the Indians have a great many matters to bring forward themselves, and I must say that the head of that Department is exceedingly careful to do what is right and proper with regard to the Indians. I must also say for his deputy that he is an exceedingly careful and industrious officer.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Before going into committee, I wish to make a short personal explanation in behalf of a clergyman resident in Inverness, whose name has been mentioned in a notice of motion given some time ago by the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk). It is impossible to reach that motion now. It is dated the 20th April and is as follows:——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot anticipate a notice of motion on the paper.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). What I would ask is——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). What I would ask is that the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) should be allowed to make his motion. I think it is very easy for me to put myself in order if hon. gentleman will insist on my doing so. I do not think a person should be prevented from making a personal explanation with regard to a person who is not here to do it for himself.

Mr. MILLS. That is not a personal explanation. He must get elected to Parliament first.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). But there is a person elected to Parliament for him who can put himself in order. It is only a reference to a personal matter, and as the name of the clergyman has been mentioned I think it is due to the hon. member for Guysboro', to myself, and to the clergyman, that some explanation should be made, with the consent of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is hardly a personal explanation, but I am sure that if it is only a word or two the House will hear the hon. gentleman. But he cannot go into discussion of a notice of motion.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I have no intention of going into a discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Are you going to say something which will cause a reply by the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk)?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). It is simply to enable the hon. member for Guysboro' to make an explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is anticipating a notice on the paper.

Mr. BOWELL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had better defer this matter until some motion is made to adjourn the House, and then he can make an explanation, though I do not think it is at all necessary. I have carefully read the letter to whom the hon. gentleman refers, and I can say on behalf of the clergyman who wrote it that there is nothing in it of which he need be ashamed. It is simply a plea by a clergyman on behalf of his parishioner that the Customs Department should not fine him too severely.

Mr. KIRK. I may say the fact that I have asked for that letter is not intended to cast any reflections on the reverend gentleman who wrote it.

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

(In the Committee.)

Fishery expenses..... $215,500.00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cause of the increase of $2,000 for Ontario?

Mr. FOSTER. Two inspectors and fishery overseers have been appointed, chiefly for the northern and north-western districts of Ontario. That section having been opened up by the Canadian Pacific Railway, overseers are necessary. The increase is chiefly due to that, and also to ordinary increases in the salaries of efficient officers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that the Department spent more than the Minister asked for in 1885. Does he expect to confine himself to the $16,000 ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think so.

Mr. McMULLEN. Have any inspectors been appointed in the northern parts of the counties of Grey and Wellington ?

Mr. FOSTER. No. Some of the inspectors in these northern districts have had very large areas, and it has been impossible for them to overtake the work, so that the services formerly performed by one have had to be divided between two and sometimes among three.

Mr. LANGELIER. What is the reason for the decrease of $1,000 in Quebec ?

Mr. FOSTER. That is due to dispensing with the services of some overseers by the salmon angling having been taken over by the Local Government. The increase of $1,000 in the vote for Nova Scotia is due largely to the extension of the close season in smelts.

Mr. WELDON What breeding establishment have we in New Brunswick, and what rivers is it proposed to put salmon fry in this year ?

Mr. FOSTER. The same fish-breeding establishments that have been in existence for the last three years in New Brunswick are to be kept up; there is no increase.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What quantity of spawn do you propose to put in ?

Mr. FOSTER. It is estimated at 112,000,000. Last year the quantity was 86,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know from the Minister in what way this $100,000 for maintenance and repairs of fishery protection steamers and vessels is intended to be expended; how many vessels he expects to employ; how those vessels are armed; where they are likely to be stationed, and what the general policy of the Government is with respect to this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. The committee will see that $50,000 was voted for 1885-86, and $100,000 is asked for 1886-87. The fishery policy will be carried on after much the same plan as it was carried on in 1869, 1870 and 1871. We have *La Canadienne*, which will be engaged almost wholly in the protection of the fisheries along the coasts of Quebec, the Magdalen Islands and Labrador. We have the steamer *Lansdowne*, which will be employed for nearly all the season in waters contiguous to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Then, we have chartered six schooners, one of which is now being fitted out, and which will be employed around Gaspé and along the Bay of Chaleurs and the northern shores of New Brunswick. One is being fitted out in Prince Edward Island, and will be employed about the coast of that island. There are four being fitted out or already at sea in Nova Scotia. Two have already gone to sea, one yesterday and one to-day; one from Halifax and one from St. John. The two others are being equipped as rapidly as possible and will probably be on the coast this week.

Mr. WELDON. What vessel is at St. John ?

Mr. FOSTER. The *General Middleton* has left St. John and is cruising around Grand Manan, Campo Bello and the southern coast of Charlotte county. The *Terror* is being fitted out, and will be ready for sailing the latter part of the week.

Mr. WELDON. Who are the masters ?

Mr. FOSTER. *General Middleton*, Captain James McLean; and the *Terror* will be commanded by Captain Quigley.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. Minister prepared to give further information as to the instructions given to these officers.

Mr. FOSTER. Only generally, for reasons my hon. friend knows well. They are to cruise around the coasts of which I have spoken, to protect our inshore fisheries from the encroachements of foreign vessels, especially those of the United States which frequent those coasts more than any others. They are to do their work with as great caution, as much courtesy, and as much firmness as possible.

Mr. KIRK. How many schooners ?

Mr. FOSTER. Six and two steamers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think no harm would accrue to the public interest if the hon. gentleman would give us some further information on this very important question, and in particular as to whether due conference has been had with the Imperial authorities as to the means to be adopted.

Mr. FOSTER. In the beginning of our proceedings, negotiations were immediately opened with the home Government, and have been continued since and are now being continued.

Mr. KIRK. What vessels are to be employed besides the two named.

Mr. FOSTER. The *General Middleton* and the *Terror* have been or are being fitted out in St. John. The *Owlet* and the *Conrad* have been or are being fitted out in Halifax. The *Prince Edward Island* and the *Maggie Lindsay* are being fitted out in Quebec.

Mr. KIRK. Who are the parties employed in connection with the distribution of the fishing bounty and collection of statistics, to pay whom $5,000 is asked ?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not a memorandum of the persons employed just at present. On page 394 of the Auditor General's report, my hon. friend will find the names of the extra clerks employed last year; a portion of these are employed still, but the number employed is not so large as the number in 1884-85, whose names are found in the report.

Mr. LANGELIER. What is the proceeding followed for obtaining payment of those fishing bounties.

Mr. FOSTER. The parties have first to make application, getting their blanks from the fishery inspectors and collectors of Customs. These applications are certified to by these officers and sent to the Department. In the Department, they are checked off. If the claims are satisfactory, they are accepted; if not, they are sent back for further enquiry. The cheques are issued and sent for distribution to the collector of Customs, who charges a small fee for the trouble of certifying the claims and distributing the cheques. The number of claims filed last year was 12,562, of which 915 were for vessels, and the checks issued were 36,280, which will account for the number of clerks we require really to get through this work. The amount allowed for the past two years was twenty-five cents for each vessel claim and fifteen cents for each boat claim made through the officers. In New Brunswick and Nova Scotia the claims are paid by cheque on the Bank of Montreal.

Mr. WELDON. How much in each Province ?

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to say our report has been delayed, not through any fault of the Department, but for other reasons, and I have only some of the advanced sheets here. I have not the schedules of the different Provinces.

Mr. KIRK. It is a pity that the report of the Fisheries Department should not be brought down before the Estimates are discussed. I do not think we have ever had the report until Parliament prorogued.

Mr. McLELAN. Some years you have had.

Mr. KIRK. Very seldom. I do not see why we should not have the report, as well as other reports, earlier in the Session. I notice that Albert Ogden drew a large sum from the Treasury on account of this item, $1,993, of which $833.31 were paid for ten months' salary from 1st April, 1885. Is he still in the employ of the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. I am as sorry as the hon. gentleman that the report is not down in time. It is recollected this report goes up to 31st December, and is therefore in a different position from the generality of reports.

Mr. KIRK. I thought there must be some reason, as it is always late.

Mr. FOSTER. It is in a different position from the ordinary reports, and, after the Session has commenced, when we require it, our printing arrangements are not the most rapid in the world, and that accounts for it. We will try to have that remedied another year. As to the fishing bounties, I have the statement of the amount paid in 1884, but I suppose that is not what the hon. gentleman wanted?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No.

Mr. FOSTER. It was 1885?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Alfred Ogden is not now in the employ of the Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With reference to this fishery protection, it is not possible for us, certainly, without information as to the instructions given, to discuss the wisdom of the Government's policy, but I gathered one thing from the statement made by the hon. gentleman, and that was that apparently these instructions has been issued before a definite agreement had been come to with the Imperial authorities, and, if I am correct in that, I think it is seriously to be regretted in a matter of so grave importance that instructions should have been issued until we clearly understood how we were with the Imperial authorities. That is what I gathered from the hon. gentleman's statement. He mentioned that negotiations were still going on with the Imperial Government, but apparently that a conclusion had not been reached with them.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman drew that from the remarks I made, he must be responsible for drawing that. My remarks were not, I think, couched in a way from which that could fairly be drawn. Of course, negotiations are going on because new phases of the question are brought up as each week goes by. They are kept fully informed of everything that takes place here and despatches pass to and fro with reference to the points as they are brought up. Of course, our way, as my hon. friend will see, is a little clearer now than it was in 1870 and 1871, for the negotiation which took place, the instructions which were promulgated then and which were sanctioned by the British Government, and the different discussions of the questions which arose then, questions almost entirely similar to those which arise now, have made the way far clearer than it was in 1869 and 1870.

Geological Survey..... $41,600 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does this decrease come about? What are the services you expect to perform for the $41,600?

Mr. McLELAN. It was intended, when this estimate was made, that the field work should not be so expensive and extensive this year as last, but it has been subsequently found that there are arrears of account, and that the whole sum should have been asked for, or nearly so, and it will have to be supplemented in the Supplementary Estimates, so that, although there is an appearance of decrease here in the expense of the year, in the payment of old arrears, there will not be actually that decrease.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What work is intended to be done in the ensuing year? That must be pretty well mapped out by this time.

Mr. McLELAN. The Minister of Interior is not here now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you had better let the item stand.

Collection of Revenues—Excise..... $324,432.50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is a large increase in the item of $245,432.50, for salaries of officers and inspectors.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is an increase due to importance of position. Our divisions are classified all over the country, and, by our regulations, according to the increase of business, the divisions are graded.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many officers are affected by this, and which?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The inspectors, collectors and deputy collectors are the only ones. All the excisemen are affected by their class and not by the classification of the divisions at all, but the salaries of the collectors and deputy collectors are regulated by the division in which they serve. Then there are increases as the result of examinations, $1,880.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is provided for in a separate item. There is a vote of $2,000 for increases dependent on the result of excise examinations. That, I suppose, is the $1,800 the hon. gentleman alludes to.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman will take the $2,000 and the first item together, it will give $236,125 as the expenditure for last year. These are the examinations which take place during the current year from time to time. The regular increases are due to the percentage, they are not affected by examinations at all. One class of officers get $50, and the excisemen gets $30 of an annual increase. While it might appear to have a tendency to a rapid increase of salaries, the third class of excisemen goes in at $500 on probation, and serves six months before he gets $600, which is regarded as the minimum of that class. After that, he must serve three years before he can get this $30 increase, and then he is entitled to $30 a year afterwards. The new appointments amount to $6,000, less salaries of those whom they replace, $2,600. In the travelling expenses there is a reduction of $10,000. In the preventive service there is an increase of $2,000, which is necessary to make the service more efficient. So that for the Excise service there is an increase of only $2,307.

To provide for the cost of obtaining stamps..... $60,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to this reduction of $10,000 I observe that in the Public Works Department there are made new charges to the extent of $33,000 for various expenditures heretofore defrayed by the Departments. I supposed that this $10,000 of nominal reduction here really represents a proportion of the $40,000 or thereabouts, charged in Public Works?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not all together, because we expect to make a portion of that reduction by a saving in the matter of stamps. We get the stamps cheaper, and for a number of years we have been improving in that direction, both as to the cost of the stamps, and the cost of handling them.

Preventive service..... $7,000 00

Mr. COSTIGAN. This increase of $2,000 is absolutely necessary. The actual expenditure last year was about $5,000, but we propose to put the service on a different footing this year. The intention is to take experienced excisemen, men who have a thorough knowledge of the law, and who are acquainted with the Excise duty. There are some good men among them whom we propose to utilise as preventive officers, and bring in new men to serve in the Excise department.

To pay Cullers..... $13,000 00

Mr. COSTIGAN. This decrease arises out of the legislation of last Session. By an amendment to the Culler's Act, a reduction of the staff was provided for, and I am bringing that Act into operation now.

Mr. LANGELIER. I have received a letter from Quebec stating that it is rumored that four cullers have been taken off, three from the deal list, and one from the square timber list. It seems that every one of these men taken off is a Liberal. Last year the Minister promised to the member for Portneuf (Mr. De St. Georges) that if any superannuations took place they would be made without regard to the political proclivities of the parties. Up to this moment, from the information I have, and which I believe is correct, as it comes from a reliable person, not one man taken off the list is a Conservative. I would like to know whether the information sent me is correct.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is a very serious charge, but I am happy to state for the information of the hon. gentleman that however reliable the gentleman may be who has given him the information, he is laboring under a misapprehension. I stated last year when the Bill was passing through the House, that I would endeavor, in making this reduction, to do it as fairly as possible. I gave assurance privately to some gentlemen who made enquiry, that I would not put any man off on account of his politics. That has to be done by Order in Council, and the change has not taken effect yet. I know, however, that as to nationality, the number will be evenly divided. Take the number of cullers for staves, deal, and timber altogether, as they existed last year, and the hon. gentleman will find—I stand subject to his correction—that when the permanent list is made, comparing that with the number put on last year, he will find a larger number of Conservatives gone off than of Liberals. Some years ago another Bill was passed to reduce the number of timber cullers, and a reduction did take place when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and at that time they made a clean sweep of all the Conservative cullers.

Mr. LANGELIER. According to the Bill of last Session, fourteen cullers must come out. There are only two square timber cullers; will more than one be removed?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know. I tell the hon. gentleman that no one has been taken off yet.

Mr. LANGELIER. I asked will there be more than one taken off?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Bill speaks for itself, and authorises me to reduce the staff to a certain number. Pursuant to that power, I submitted a proposition, which I cannot at present particularise, but respecting which the hon. gentleman will know in a few days; and I give him the assurance that as to nationality, they will be equally divided; as to politics, he will find that the Liberal party is being very fairly dealt with, and will have no reason to complain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that the total revenue is about $33,000, which is much less than it was formerly, and I am afraid we will be out of pocket in spite of the reduction. There is a large balance remaining uncollected, $43,800.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am going to try and meet that, by cutting down the number of cullers.

Mr. LANGELIER. I think the hon. gentleman received a petition from a certain number of cullers three or four months ago, asking an increase of the amount granted to retired cullers. I think the present annuity is only $200, and they complain that they cannot live on that sum. Has any action been taken in regard to the matter?

Mr. COSTIGAN. When I introduced the Bill providing for a reduction of the number of cullers and the retiring of those who would have to be taken off the list, I thought $200 was a small annuity. There had already been some put on the retired list at $200 by hon. gentlemen opposite. I could not, therefore, propose to give those whom I was about to retire $300 while those already retired received $200. I did intend to ask the House to place the retiring allowances at $300, but I found there was strong feeling in the House against it. The argument used was that it would take a large sum of money to meet that expenditure, and I could not recommend an increased amount beyond that already granted to those already retired. If we have increased receipts and the saving arising from the reduction, the House will be better disposed next year to increase the amount.

Mr. LANGELIER. The expenditure would not appear large if the revenue was collected.

Mr. GILLMOR. I should like to know the necessity for the Government appointing cullers and paying them in order to inspect timber that is being exported from the country. We do a large lumber business in New Brunswick. The authorities appoint qualified surveyors, but they have nothing to do with paying them. It is true the Dominion Government obtain a return of a certain amount of the money expended, but where is the necessity for dealing with the matter at all?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I could not undertake to answer that question, because the hon. gentleman and myself come from the same Province. We found on entering Confederation this state of things existing, and we had to carry it out. We should lose nothing by it, and the revenue should be collected. If that were done, the service would cost but little to the Government.

Mr. GILLMOR. So there is no good reason for maintaining this service except that we found it in force when we entered Confederation.

Mr. KIRK. Where is the necessity of superannuating those occupants? Are they old or young men?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not a question of age but of precedence. The Cullers' Act provides for the superannuation of officers that are retired.

Mr. McLELAN. Do they contribute anything to the superannuation fund?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Weights and Measures and Gas $83,750 00

Mr. LANDERKIN. What are the salaries of the assistant inspectors of gas?

Mr. COSTIGAN. When the law was first passed the salaries of the inspectors were fixed at about $1,000 and the assistants at a minimum of about $500. That has been pretty strictly adhered to since the law was brought into operation. With regard to the inspectors I think there are only three or four places where larger salaries have been allowed, these places being, I believe, Toronto, Hamilton, Montreal, Ottawa and Halifax, where they have

$1,200. As this is a law in which there is a deficit, the inspectors in some of the larger places, where large amounts are collected and they do a great deal of work, complain that they are underpaid, and I think myself that they are not paid in the same proportion as other officers. With regard to the assistants, my endeavor has been to put them on the same footing as third class excisemen and to bring them up to about $600. When I came in I found a good many of them at $800, but, as I say, I have tried to bring them to $600, where the divisions are large enough to justify it. Of course there are some divisions where $500 is ample for the work they perform.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Are they obliged to pass an examination?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How often are they obliged to make an inspection?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Once or twice a year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Have the fees they collect been modified?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not lately; but they were a few years ago.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do you think it is judicious to continue those fees upon the parties who use the scales, seeing that the Act is supposed to be in the public interest?

Mr. COSTIGAN. People differ on that point, as on others, but the intention is that the trade shall pay a certain proportion and the public the balance. If we made the fees self-sustaining, the amount would be much higher than it is now.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Are the fees sufficient in large counties to meet the outlay?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In some—but very few.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think there should be a complete change in this system. In my own section of the country, when it is known that the inspector is coming round, many who are expecting to be called upon to pay the fees put their scales aside and hide them. Besides that, there are many scales which never reach the inspector's eye, as he will not go off the roads into sideways to try and inspect them. Now it is just as much in the interest of the buyer that the scales should be correct as the seller, and, for the reasons I have stated, I believe the present system is objectionable. Another reason is that I believe, in many cases, fees are collected which never reach the Dominion Treasury. The inspector gives a receipt for so much money, and that is all you know about it. I would like to know what check the Department keep upon these officers.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Just as in many other cases, it is impossible to keep a thorough check upon them. My own recollection of the Act is, that for some time it remained a dead letter. It then became unpopular in the country, and the loss upon its administration was about double what it is now. The people were very much dissatisfied with the administration of the law, but now I think there is a great difference. It may be that the officers are better acquainted with their work, and that the people are becoming accustomed to them and to the work.

Mr. FISHER. I am sorry I cannot quite agree with the Minister with regard to the working of this law. I am fully aware of the difficulties of carrying out such a law, where the inspectors have to go round the country, and the Department has to depend entirely on their honesty. At present I think there is a good deal of complaint with regard to the system. I know one instance where a large grain dealer in my district informed me that the inspector came to his store, but had not weights sufficient to test his large platform scales. After a good deal of trouble he eventually went away and would not give the certificate, but the dealer said that the scales were there to be tested, and he insisted on having a certificate. The result was that the inspector gave him one without testing the scales at all. On the other hand I know that a good many people use scales without a test. I do not mean such merchants as people who sell throughout the country largely by weight. I understand that the inspector is obliged to give notice when he will be in a certain place, so that people will bring in their scales there to have them inspected and tested. In my neighborhood, and so far as I have been able to gather in the townships generally, I do not think anybody does bring in the scales he uses around the country. The merchants are visited by the inspector, but being notified beforehand when he comes, it is very easy for them, if they use false scales or weights, to have them corrected, or to substitute correct ones for them. In fact, I think this system is no protection for the public at large. It seems to me the only excuse for this expenditure, amounting to between $30,000 and $35,000 a year, is to have a real safeguard for the public against the use of false weights and measures; but I do not think this is attained, while at the same time I do not know that honest merchants who wish to have their scales tested, and wish to use just weights and measures, are vexed by the Act, and have to pay a tax for the inspection. I do not know what can be done to remedy this state of affairs. I do not wish to blame the Department for what has been done in the past, but if these things are pointed out, perhaps the Department can inaugurate a system by which the public shall be guarded against false weights and measures, or the trading community shall not be vexed by a useless tax.

Mr. HESSON. I have heard no complaint of the Act in the county I represent. I think the work is very satisfactorily done indeed, and I cannot agree with the hon. member for North Wellington when he says that business men are in the habit of hiding their weights and measures, in order that they may not be inspected. I think that is very uncomplimentary to the class to which the hon. gentleman himself belongs, and which is above suspicion in that regard. They want it known that they are doing business according to the law, and want to give satisfaction to their customers; and as an old business man I must disagree with him.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite certain of the statement I made. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has not been accustomed to deal so largely in goods requiring scales as other people. He has not made very extensive enquiries, or he would have found out the facts as I have stated them. I most decidely object to the present system; I believe it is a great injustice to dealers generally. If it is to be continued, I would suggest that there ought to be a schedule of charges printed on the back of the certificate, which the deputy inspector would be obliged to show the merchant, when he goes to inspect his scales. Then the merchant would see whether the deputy inspector was collecting the proper amount or not. At present, the merchant has to depend entirely on the honesty of the deputy inspector. It is because, in many cases, it is considered objectionable that people have evaded the inspection to which all scales should be subjected. I hold that it is as much to the interest of the buyer as to the seller that scales should be inspected, and that being the case, the inspection should be made free.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no doubt the hon. member for North Wellington is speaking from experience, because he is a business man himself. But I can assure him it is not the experience in my section of the country. In some instances, when one of the parties thought he was not

getting fair play, the inspector was notified; sometimes it was the dealer, and sometimes the buyer; and the result has been to establish confidence between the buyer and the seller. It has also done away with a class of scales that were usually kept, and could be made use of by the merchant to the disadvantage of the buyer. There was a moving weight on a beam that could be shifted without the buyer knowing it. I think it is the duty of the inspector to go anywhere where scales are used, and I do not think he has refused to go anywhere where he has received notice that there is any suspicion of unfair weights. As to the question of cost, there is a great difference in favor of the present system over the old. I know that at the first inspection made in our village, the inspector brought a man with him to fix the scales, and he charged from $5 to $8 for fixing them in addition to the inspection.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Did that go into the Government revenue?

Mr. SPROULE. No, it did not; the inspector kept it for the purpose of paying the mechanic.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Do the Government pay for that work now?

Mr. SPROULE. No, that was amended when the present Government came into power. In the village where I live there was collected for the inspection of scales in a few shops, $140. They can be inspected in the same place now for $10. So that eventually there cannot be a very heavy expense for that purpose, and I must say, generally, the present system is giving a great deal of satisfaction. No doubt if some amendment were made in the direction mentioned by the hon. member for North Wellington, as to putting on a scale of prices that would be a good amendment, but I think there is an indication on the certificate as to what the charges are already. If any man looks up the schedule of prices he can tell what the prices are.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). If I may be allowed to speak for the locality I am best acquainted with, the experience is that the Act works well, if it can be said it acts at all, simply because we never see the inspector. He lives in an adjoining county, and if I exclude the city of London I am safe in saying not one inspector lives in the county of Middlesex. Under the old Act there was an inspector for each riding, it may have been that was more expensive but my impression is it was not. We have one inspector now at $1,000 a year, and sub-inspectors who each receive as much as the inspector for ridings did. If the Act is to be of any service at all, it is in the direction mentioned by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) admits that under it an honest dealer must be placed at a disadvantage, when he says from his own knowledge, that there were improper weights being used under circumstances such as he cited. I am quite prepared to admit that the Act is just to a fair dealer, and if properly administered, I believe a fair dealer will give it countenance. But if the inspector is seen as seldom as he is in the county of Middlesex, there is no advantage in the Act. We only know of it by the expense it entails.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It should be possible to devise a system of bookkeeping whereby a check could be kept of the inspector quite as well as it is kept in the Post Office Department. When the inspector, instead of returning fees into the public revenue, appropriates them to his own interest, there ought to be a check of some kind.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is one now.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understood you to say there was no way of keeping check.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman was stating that a man might overcharge on the fees, and I said it was very hard to deal with that in any Department, but the checks issued and the certificates he grants and the moneys he collects, he is accountable for just as the postmaster is for postage stamps.

Mr. LANDERKIN. A postmaster cannot charge more for postage than is marked on the face of the stamp. If the fees were made known on the stamps there could be no question of overcharge. Is it in the interest of the public to have the scales inspected? The Act will not make men honest or prevent them from defrauding their customers. Is this Act a benefit to the public? If so, the whole public should defray the cost, and the cost should not be thrown entirely on the dealers. It looks like class legislation, and the time is arrived when we should consider whether the public should not entirely bear the burden.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). There is one thing peculiar in this discussion, and that is that the only people who find fault with the Act are the dishonest traders. In my district, and I have had an inspector living there three or four years, there are three or four villages with from 1,500 to 2,500 people in each, so that there is a considerable amount of business done in each place, and every proprietor is anxious to have his scales inspected and so publicly and openly stamped that their customers will know they have not been cheated. As far as collecting fees is concerned, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is under a misapprehension. The inspectors are charged with the stamps, and certain prices are fixed for inspection, and when an inspector gives a certificate he places the stamps on and cancels them. The dealer, if he chooses, can get the inspector to make some mechanical arrangement, for which the inspector will make an extra charge, but that is a matter of private arrangement.

Mr. McMULLEN. He may inspect the scales and not use the certificate at all. In my section, the inspector inspected the scales first and afterwards made up the certificates.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). If he did, there was something wrong about the procedure.

Mr. McMULLEN. On the face of the certificate you cannot make any calculation as to whether the inspector charged too much or too little. If you would make a schedule of prices on the back of the certificates, that would be a tariff satisfactory to those who have to submit to the operation of the Act.

Mr. FISHER. I have not yet seen it proved that this weights and measure inspection is a safeguard to the public.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are only discussing the salaries and not the Act itself.

Mr. FISHER. The question whether salaries will be paid to the men is entirely dependent on the utility of their work. If the public service is not to the benefit of the public, it is in our right to discuss the question as to whether we should vote this or not. It is an important argument whether the public service is benefited by this service or not. With all deference to your ruling, I think it is a very important question to see whether this vote is of use in the public service, and I do not think it has been shown that the inspection itself is a benefit to the public interest. If it was a safeguard against dishonest traders, it would be, and I should be in favor of it, but, until it is shown that it is a safeguard against dishonesty, I do not see the utility of it. The complaints I have had addressed to me have been on the part of honest traders who felt they were obliged to pay a tax for the inspection of their scales, while anyone who is dishonest might pay the same tax but

would escape the result by afterwards falsifying his scales in such a way that the public were not protected at all. Although the nominal cost to the country is $30,000 or $35,000, the community really have to pay the fees too. Whether the traders pay them or make their customers pay them, does not matter, and this might fairly be said to cost the country about $65,000. I do not believe that the results to the community are at all commensurate with that expenditure.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). The hon. gentleman is asking too much of the Act. The Act was intended to make the scale honest; he must trust to the Sunday school to make the trader honest.

Mr. HICKEY. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) proceeds on the assumption that every man who tries to defraud the public is in trade, and that each dishonest trader will have two sets of weights, that he will parade the good ones when the inspector is around and will use the short ones when he is not. He must assume that, because, if the trader is intending to defraud the revenue, he must supply himself with the articles to do it with. Unless he does that, he must have but the one set, and in that case it will be inspected. I believe this is a protection against fraud.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman cannot know much about scales or he would know that anyone with a mechanical turn can very quickly change a platform scale by the twist of a screw or any balanced scale by taking out the leaden plummet at the bottom and paring it and putting it back again.

Mr. HICKEY. A rascal can do anything.

Mr. FISHER. Precisely. I have been informed by manufacturers of scales that there is no check whatever upon the scales after they go out of their hands.

Adulteration of Food..... $21,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this increase of $1,500 required by increased operations, or what?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Last year's legislation added to that branch of the service the subject of the fertilisers of the country, and that is taking up perhaps more of the time of the office here than the former work under the Adulteration of Food Act, so that we would require an additional officer here. We propose to have eight analysts altogether. They have a retaining fee of $200, an allowance for rent of $100, and an allowance for laboratory of $100. The chief analyst receives $2,000, and we find it necessary to employ an assistant analyst. It is really a very small increase in proportion to the additional labor.

Collection of Slides and Boom dues..... $21,650 00

Mr. DAVIES. Why are you increasing the salary of the Crown timber agent?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The present incumbent was appointed at $2,400 and we give him $200 more to bring himself to the salary of his predecessor.

Batteries, and Cavalry and Infantry Schools.... $435,700 00

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That item was left over the other night.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I think the Minister ought to allow this to stand over, for the reason that the report in connection with the operations in the North-West, has not yet been distributed. I enquired yesterday at the distribution office, and was told that the report had not yet reached that office.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think that is a very bad reason for delay. This item has nothing to do with the report of the North-West troubles. The operations in the North-West are altogether distinct from this vote. I wish the item to be passed now, but on concurrence, if there is any question which any hon. gentleman wishes to discuss, I shall be glad to discuss it as fully as it would have been on the present occasion. This vote is the ordinary vote which has been granted for several years past. I would ask, however, in this item, to strike out the word "London" after "Toronto," from the fact that in consequence of the barracks not being ready for the school of infantry in London, which has been sanctioned by a vote of Parliament, I have not estimated this year for the organisation of that school. But outside that one item, the vote is absolutely the same as that which has been agreed to by Parliament for several years past. If any question can arise out of that vote, certainly it cannot arise from the non-production of the North-West report, which will be distributed to-morrow, I hope, or the day after. The copy which I placed upon the Table was an advance copy, and was full of errors which had to be corrected. Therefore, I hope the hon. gentleman will make no objection to this vote.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). This vote is asked for our permanent military service; a portion of the force were out in the North-West, and we ought to be possessed of all the information that the Minister has in reference to the operations of that force, before this vote is asked for. When the militia estimates were up before, I enquired whether any portion of a similar expense to this had been included under the head of the North-West expenditure, and I was told that the cost of the permanent force in the North-West was not charged against the North-West expenditure, but the pay and maintenance of these forces were paid out of the appropriation made last year. I have not been able to make that tally with such facts as I have been able to gather from the Auditor General's report. There are some who think that the expenditure that is made towards the formation of a permanent force, is not in the highest interest of the volunteer force in this country, and there are those who think that the militia vote which is appropriated to the 500 or 600 men who are permanently organised, is not the most judicious expenditure that could be made of the million or so dollars that are appropriated yearly for militia. I know that decided exception is taken to the disposition shown by the Department to squeeze out, as it were, the volunteer force, the ordinary enrolled force, and benefit the permanent force at the expense of the volunteer force.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my hon. friend's point is well taken, and that we ought to have that report in our hands before discussing this item. But I would like to call the Minister's attention to an item on which he can give information at concurrence, with respect to the military college. I have been informed that a sum of $100 was exacted from some of the cadets who received commissions in the royal service. Was that the case? Or was it uniformly exacted?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It was, and all have paid. There was no exception whatever.

Post Office..... $2,841,946 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. These increases are enormous. We are almost up to three millions for this service, and there must be a deficit of a million dollars a year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The increase for Ontario is $111,000. Of that sum $54,000 is for the Canadian Pacific Railway. This is to pay for one daily service each way, Ottawa to Rat Portage, and a second daily service each way to Pembroke.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you paying $54,000 for that service? It seems an enormous sum.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is according to law. There is a tariff of charges established.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not understand that the post office is obliged whenever a railway runs to pay for service of mails by it. The population served is quite insignificant. It is an enormous additional charge for such a service.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The mails that now go by the Canadian Pacific Railway formerly went through the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What did you then pay?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Our mails were carried there, and this is an increase on account of the service on the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Americans carried our mails and we carried theirs, therefore nothing was charged on either side. But we now have to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway for carrying our mails, as we pay the Grand Trunk Railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do we get any compensation now for carrying the Americans mails? If not, we are at a dead loss of $54,000 a year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Now that we have a railway through our own territory we cannot carry our mails through the United States but through our own territory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that $54,000 for this service, taking into consideration the number of people served and the whole circumstances, is a very extravagant charge.

Mr. CARLING. It is not for people along the line only but to carry the through mails.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The people's money is being thrown away for such a service. It is a gross abuse that $110,000 are to be paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the service they can do. Can they serve 150,000 people? The other great railways serve about 3,000,000. And we paid them only about $155,000. It appears to be an entirely extravagant charge, and if the law requires us to pay it, I think the law should be altered.

Mr. CARLING. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have to run their mail cars whether the mails go by them or not, and I think the people are anxious that their mails should be carried through their own territory, instead of by Chicago. If heavier mails should be carried, no further charge would be made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is important that the post office should be well served, but the people's money should not be wasted. I am of the opinion that the service of the post office is disgracefully extravagant. We reduced our rates from five cents to three, and for a time we sustained a loss, and then we gradually made it up, and this extravagance has been particularly remarked since the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carling) was in charge of the post office, since which time the expenditure has gone by leaps and bounds from $1,700,000, at which it stood only some five or six years ago, to $2,846,000, and this very year the Government are asking an increase of $188,000. This appears to be the most extravagant department of a most extravagant general service.

Mr. CARLING. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that it is anything but an extravagant department, and that no department is managed so economically. We have an immense stretch of country in the North-West, and people settling in these various distant points demand mails, and I think it is the desire of the people that they should be supplied with mails.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It may be the fact that the Minister, coming from a Department where there is some little endeavor made to make the revenue meet the expenditure, and coming to a Department where it is all revenue and no expenditure, may have some ground for assuming that the one is very cheaply run as compared with the other. It is a fact, however, that the cost of the Post Office Department has increased very largely. I saw a statement in a Montreal paper the other day that the cost of running a train from Montreal to Winnipeg was $1,000, and if that is the case, we are really paying one-third of that cost for the carriage of the mails alone, a charge which the country scarcely expected when they assumed the responsibility of building that road.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman spoke of economy, but I notice that London is a remarkable instance of economy, because I find that no less than 26 letter carriers are employed there. London is an interesting and thriving point, but if six are enough to do the business in Kingston I cannot see that twenty-six are required in London.

Mr. CARLING. Kingston is small in area compared with London.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know the population of the two places.

Mr. CARLING. What are they?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The population of London was reported to me a few weeks ago by citizens of that place as being rather less than it was a few years ago—not exceeding 30,000.

Mr. CARLING. I think the total population served by the Post Office Department is about 30,000. But London East and London South have been added for post office purposes, and these make a very large district.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In Kingston we have between 16,000 and 17,000, and if six carriers are enough there London should not require twenty-six. I find that the same rule prevails elsewhere. Hamilton, which is considerable larger, has only one more. Ottawa is about as large; it used to have nineteen and now it is raised to twenty-one. London has a proud pre-eminence in this matter. The hon. gentleman will hardly say that Quebec is a smaller city than London, and still twenty-one did the work for the ancient capital. Montreal, which is a little larger than London, had sixty-six employed, and seventy-three are asked for. Now, surely in proportion Montreal with its 140,000 or 150,000—and I think it has suburbs besides—would require more than seventy-three if twenty-six are required in London.

Mr. CARLING. In Montreal, in addition to the Canadian Pacific Railway, additional mails are delivered in it and other large cities, so an additional number is required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But you ask for a greater number in proportion in London than in Montreal which, as the hon. gentleman says, has a great many mails to distribute. I see that in St. John fifteen are held to be enough and St. John used to contain as large a population as London. Halifax has sixteen and the Minister of Finance can tell us whether or not Halifax is as large as London.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Can the hon. gentleman tell me the intention of the Department with regard to providing letter carriers for Brantford ?

Mr. CARLING. It was provided for, but I suppose nothing has been done owing to the illness of the Post master General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this increase in Quebec necessary? I find that in the ordinary land conveyances $10,000 additional are asked for which seems a large increase, the railroad remaining the same.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The reasons for this addition are precisely the same as those given for the increase in the Province of Ontario.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was it to balance accounts ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; this is to meet the cost of mail service of new post offices, increase of service upon existing mail routes, and increased cost in reletting mail contracts, of which there are in the Province 1,752, ranging from $20 to $2,000 per annum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The relative increase is twice as great in Quebec as in Ontario, and I do not think there have been a large number of additional offices opened in Quebec.

Mr. CARLING. I suppose it is caused by new colonisation roads being opened, and three mails a week being now sent where there was formerly only one.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But that does not appear from the report to have been the case. There is also a considerable increase in New Brunswick, particularly in steamboat and sailing crafts, in which the amount has increased from $8,000 to $14,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The extension of the mail service from the railway at Fredericton to Woodstock, and other extensions in the counties of Carleton, Victoria and Charlotte, have rendered it necessary to add $5,000. To the vote for railway mail service, and the improved service established between the mainland and the Island of Grand Manan and Campo Bello, has added to the cost some $6,000 annually.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not quite understand how that can be the case, because we vote special sums for this service under the head of mail subsidies.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am informed that the mail subsidy only covers a portion of this service, and that this covers the balance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman should inform us on concurrence how this increase occurs. If this is in the nature of a subsidy, as I understand from his explanation, it appears to me that it would be better put under the heading of mail subsidies and steamship subventions.

Mr. DAVIES. I understood the hon. member for Charlotte, the other day, to say that he was desirous of having an increase of only $1,000 for that service.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About that increase. I was not able to speak to the Postmaster General before he left for England. But as to this $6,000 I shall have the information on concurrence.

Mr. DAVIES. I am aware that $10,000 of the decrease of $13,450 for Prince Edward Island is a mere cross entry; but it is very curious that while there are increases in every other part of the Dominion, there should be a decrease there.

Mr. McLELAN. That is all for summer and winter communication, which is now transferred to the Fishery Department.

Mr. DAVIES. Last year on ordinary land conveyance there is a reduction of $1,000.

Mr. McLELAN. The ice-boat service, which is transferred to the Marine Department, includes the land conveyance; so that there is an increase.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What causes the increase in British Columbia ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A portion of that is to provide for the future opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway which we will use for the conveyance of mails.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But there is a very large increase in salaries also.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We will require railway mail clerks and other officers in connection with the new service, of course.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention to change the main route for carrying mails from Prince Albert to Battleford. I understood the Government intended doing so. The mails are now carried from Qu'Appelle to Battleford and from Swift Current to Battleford, and it is said the route is to be changed by making it from Regina to Saskatoon and from Saskatoon to Battleford and Prince Albert.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The report is not yet in, so the Department have come to no decision.

Mr. WATSON. If a change is made, will new tenders be asked for ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt; the law requires that, unless the amount be a small one, under $200.

Mr. WATSON. I understood the mails can be carried $5,000 or $6,000 less by the new route. The new route is from Regina to Saskatoon, there branching to Prince Albert and Battleford, instead of from Swift Current to Battleford and Qu'Appelle to Battleford. If such change be made new tenders will be asked ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Certainly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask a question with reference to the savings banks deposits in the post office. The head of a friendly society has written to me that that society wanted to make a deposit in the post office savings bank of $5,000 or $10,000, I cannot remember which, and could not succeed in doing so. He called my attention to the fact that $10,000 was received from a similar society in 1884, and complains of the unfairness of denying to one society a privilege which was given to another. There is no doubt that in the first case the privilege was given. It was given to the Independent Order of Foresters, and I have the journal here which states the fact and gives a letter from the secretary of the society acknowledging that the deposit had been accepted. The letter is dated 16th October, 1884. The society to which I refer and which had been refused permission to make a deposit of $5,000 or $10,000 is the Canadian Order of Foresters, and I would like to have some satisfactory explanation to give to the gentleman who wrote me on the subject.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have taken a note of the hon. gentleman's statement, and on concurrence, if he will

renew the question I will be able to answer him. No doubt everything will be satisfactory, but if there is an error, of course it will be rectified.

Dominion Lands—Chargeable to Collection of Revenue..... $161,633 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many colonisation companies remain to be inspected?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). They are all being inspected with the view of closing up some of them. None of them have been closed yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many companies remain of those that were created and which the inspector inspects.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). From memory, I think eighteen companies are on the list.

Mr. WATSON. How many will remain after the inspector has got through?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I am inclined to think very few, half a dozen at the most.

Mr. DAVIES. Is it intended to continue the inspector for those at $3,000 a year.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not know whether we will, or inspect them through our ordinary homestead inspectors, but the inspector will be required the greater part of this year at any rate.

Mr. WATSON. What time will the lands be thrown open for settlement?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The lands in the colonisation tracts are open for settlement now through the North-West. They never have been closed. The even numbered sections are in the same position as they are everywhere else. The odd numbers are reserved.

Mr. WATSON. What time will the colonisation companies be wiped out with the exception of three or four?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). This season.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it the intention to continue on the six homestead inspectors?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, they are the most valuable officers we have in the North-West.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). In the report of 1885, it is said that "the land guides' service, at least in its present state, is becoming less apparent." Is it still intended to continue that?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, I think so. My own experience is, from the enquiries I have made, that it is rather an advantageous service. As immigrants go in, it is of decided advantage to have guides.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this item of $5,000 for special services supposed to represent?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). A part of that has been for expenses in connection with immigration matters, so far as the Department of the Interior deals with them. It is connected to some extent with the land guide system, and sometimes temporary clerks are required for special service for a short time. The amount is reduced from what it was last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the Crown timber agent at Winnipeg?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Mr. E. J. Stephenson.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Any relation of our old friend?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He is a son of Mr. Rufus Stephenson. He is an officer that I am afraid we are going to lose. I am doing all I can possibly to retain him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is going the right way to work, by increasing his salary $400.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If the hon. gentleman knew him, and knew his work as well as I do, he would think exactly as I do in regard to him.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Is it intended to continue the forest rangers at the same strength as before?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I am not quite sure about that. It is just a question whether we may not, in some cases, be able to attach the forest rangers' work to the Crown timber agents' work, but I am taking the vote with a view to make further enquiries in regard to it.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Is the full number for which a vote was taken last year still employed?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Were there any changes?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, there was a Mr. Moore, removed from southern Manitoba. He is no longer in the service and has been replaced. Mr. Montgomery was moved from Prince Albert to Battleford, and Mr. O'Connor from Battleford to Prince Albert. They made an exchange. I think those were all the changes.

Committee rose and reported.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending the 30th June, 1886, and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

LANSDOWNE.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 26th May, 1886.

Mr. McLELAN moved that His Excellency's Message with the Estimates be referred to Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman no estimates for 1887?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is a pleasure to come.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 2:50 a. m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 27th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:

To the Moncton and Buctouche Railway Company, for thirty miles of their railway, from a point at or near Moncton, to Buctouche, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $96,000.

For a railway from Ingersoll *via* London to Chatham, in the Province of Ontario, eighty miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $256,000.

To the Northern and Western Railway Company, for ten miles of their railway, intervening between the termini of the portions of their railway for which subsidies are already granted, the one from Fredericton and the other from Indiantown, and an extension of two miles down to deep waters at Chatham, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $32,000.

To the Caraquet Railway Company, for ten miles of their railway from the end of the present subsidised portion at Lower Caraquet to Shippegan, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $32,000.

To the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company, for thirty-seven miles of their railway from Windsor to Leamington, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $118,400.

To the Thunder Bay Colonisation Railway Company, for fifty-six miles of their railway, from the end of the present subsidised section to a point near Crooked Lake, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $179,200.

To the Parry Sound Colonisation Railway Company, for forty miles of their railway, from the village of Parry Sound to the village of Sandridge, on the line of the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $128,000.

For a railway from New Glasgow to Montcalm, in the Province of Quebec, eighteen miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $57,600.

For a railway from Hereford to the International Railway, in the Township of Eaton, in the Province of Quebec, thirty-four miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $108,800.

For a railway from St. Felix to Lake Maskinongé, Parish of St. Gabriel, in the Province of Quebec, ten miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $32,000.

For a railway from Glenannan to Wingham, in the Province of Ontario, five miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $16,000.

For a railway from a point at or near the McCann Station on the Intercolonial Railway, to the Joggins, on Cumberland Basin, in the Province of Nova Scotia, twelve miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $38,400.

For a railway from L'Assomption to L'Epiphanie, in the Province of Quebec, three miles and a half, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $11,200.

To the Montreal and Western Railway Company, for seventy miles of their railway from St. Jérôme, north-westerly towards Desert, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy of $5,161 per mile in lieu of the subsidies granted by 46 Victoria, chapter 25, and 47 Victoria, chapter 8, a subsidy of $361,270.

For a railway from St. Andrews to the Canadian Pacific Railway at, or at any point east of the Town of Lachute, in the County of Argenteuil, in the Province of Quebec, seven miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 47 Victoria, chapter 8, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $22,400.

To the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, for twelve miles of their railway from Clark's Island to Valleyfield and from Lacolle, in the Province of Quebec, to the International Boundary, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $38,400.

For a railway from Truro to Newport, in the Province of Nova Scotia, forty-nine miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $156,800.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for ninety-five miles of their railway from a point 50 miles north of St. Raymond to Lake St. John, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $1,961 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole (in addition to the subsidy granted by 45 Victoria, chapter 14, and 46 Victoria, chapter 25, of $3,200 per mile), $186,295.

To the Cap Rouge and St. Lawrence Railway Company, for twelve miles of their railway from Lorette *viâ* Cap Rouge to Quebec, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $38,400.

For the construction of wharves and landing stages on the line on the railway from Long Sault to the foot of Lake Temiscamingue, a subsidy of $6,000.

To the Gananoque, Perth and James Bay Railway Company, seventeen miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $54,400.

For a railway from St. Eustache to St. Placide, County of Two Mountains, eighteen miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $57,600.

For a railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway through the Stewiacke Valley, on a line which will afford facilities of communication with the Iron Mines, Spring Side, Upper Stewiacke, and Musquodoboit settlements, twenty-five miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $80,000.

For a railway from Yamaska to the River St Francis, in the Province of Quebec, ten miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $32,000.

For a railway from Perth Centre Station on the New Brunswick Railway, to a point near Plaister Rock Island, in the Province of New Brunswick, twenty-eight miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $89,600.

For a railway from Fredericton to the Village of Prince William, in the Province of New Brunswick, twenty-two miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $70,400.

For a railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway near Newcastle to Douglastown, in the Province of New Brunswick, six miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $19,200.

For a railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Eganville, in the Province of Ontario, twenty-two miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $70,400.

To the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company, for seven miles of their railway from the Village of Madoc to the Junction with the Central Ontario Railway at Eldorado, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy (in addition to the subsidy of $1,500 per mile granted by 48-49 Victoria, chapter 59) not exceeding $1,700 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $11,900.

To the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, for sixteen miles of their railway from Tamworth towards Tweed, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 48-49 Victoria, chapter 59, a subsidy of $70,000.

To the Albert Railway Company, for their railway from Salisbury to Hopewell, in the Province of New Brunswick, which is a feeder to the Intercolonial Railway, in the form of a loan, repayable at such time and secured in such manner as the Governor in Council determines, a subsidy of $15,000.

2. The subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose, shall be granted to such companies, respectively. The other subsidies shall be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively. All the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August next and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years, to be fixed by Order in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the Government, and which the Government is hereby empowered to make; the location, also, of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and all the said subsidies, respectively, shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, by instalments on the completion of each section of the railway of not less than ten miles, proportionate to the value of the portion so completed in comparison with that of the whole work undertaken, to be established by the report of the said Minister:

Provided always, that the granting of such subsidies to the companies mentioned, respectively, shall be subject to such conditions for securing such running powers or traffic arrangements and other rights, as will afford all reasonable facilities and equal mileage rates to all railways connected with those so subsidized, as the Governor in Council may determine.

Motion agreed to.

LAND SUBSIDIES TO MANITOBA RAILWAYS.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved that, to-morrow, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company Dominion lands to the extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the company's branch railway, from a point on the main line of that railway at or near Todburn to the Assiniboine River, near the town of Shellmouth, about twenty-six miles.

2. That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the North West Central Railway Company, or to such other com-

pany as may be incorporated for the construction of the railway, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the company's railway from its commencement at Brandon station, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to Battleford, about 450 miles.

3. That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the company's railway from its commencement at or near a point in township number four, in range number thirty, west of the second principal meridian, to the point where it will join the Manitoba and North-Western Railway, about 240 miles.

Motion agreed to.

SALARIES OF REGISTRARS IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole on certain resolutions respecting the salaries of registrars and other officers in the North-West Territories, be now read the second time. He said: Before that question is put, I wish to correct a statement I made yesterday evening when I was asked to state the expenditure in connection with the system of registration. I thought I had the information in my hands, but I had not, and was obliged to state them from memory, and I find I did not do so correctly. There are at present five registrars in the North-West Territories; the Bill only provides for the services of four under the Torrens system, and there will still be a registrar in respect of the Territories not included in the Torrens system. I will state the salaries that are now paid to those officers: Three of them receive $1,200 each, one of them receives $1,000, and one receives $2,000. The officer who receives $2,000 is the registrar for all that portion of the Territories which is not included in one or other of the Provincial registration districts which have been so far erected, and his salary is larger than the others on account of his having held the office of Registrar-General of the North-West Territories.

Motion agreed to, and resolutions concurred in.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 10) respecting real property in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Thompson.)

PUBLIC PRINTING AND STATIONERY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 132) respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. MILLS. What officers does the hon. gentleman propose to employ in connection with this branch of the public service? Are all the printers to be counted as officers of Parliament and permanently included in the Department?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The officers, as I stated before, will be a superintendent of printing, a superintendent of stationery, and an accountant. The head of the branch will be the Queen's Printer and controller of stationery. Those officers will be officers in the civil service without examination, because they are technical or special officers, and will have the rank of chief clerks of the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. I notice that there occurs several times in the Bill provisions for audit. I do not, of course, object to a provision, particularly in a matter of this kind, for a departmental audit, but I wish to understand whether it is intended to be implied that there shall not be the same audit by the Auditor General which takes place with reference to other expenditures and accounts. Are his powers to be as wide as to this Department as to other branches of the service?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is intended that they shall be as wide, and he shall have additional powers as to ascertaining the amount of stock on hand at his discretion. His powers will not be limited in any way.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman would find it better to amplify the clause with regard to the Auditor General, so as to make it clear that this other audit is merely a departmental audit.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection, when we come to the clause.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to make a few observations with reference to the course to be taken in the future with reference to Government advertising. I see this clause gives the Secretary of State power to deal with all the advertising that is required.

The CHAIRMAN. That does not come in now.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, it is included in this clause.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, I have not got a copy of the Bill, but I thought I heard you read something with regard to advertising.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I find the hon. gentleman is right.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, Sir, I am glad that under your ruling I am right for once.

The CHAIRMAN. I am always sorry when the hon. gentleman is wrong.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think, then, this is a proper time to raise the question as to how the advertising of the Government shall be distributed. I believe it has been the custom, not only with this Government, but with Governments generally, to confine the advertising to the papers that support them—to the thick-and-thin fellows—to the chaps who always find them right and never find them wrong, and who never criticise them. But an independent paper such as I have the honor to be connected with——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL—a paper that speaks its mind, a paper that does not hesitate to find fault with the Government or the Opposition when it finds them wrong—that paper has got to be ignored, and it has been practically ignored. Now, it does appear to me that it is unfair to the public, unfair to the independent press of this country, that the Government of the day should take power from this House to distribute their patronage simply to the papers which support them. It is unfair to the public for this reason, that everybody knows that people take very little interest in the papers that support the Administration or the Opposition, as the case may be, for purely party purposes. An independent paper which speaks out its mind, which deals with questions on their merits, and does not fear to point out the faults of either side, must, forsooth, according to the practice which prevails, be ignored. I do not know whether there are other independent papers or not in that position, but the one of which I know something is practically ignored in this respect, and I suppose my hon. friends opposite, when they come in, as they say they expect to come in after the elections, will pursue the same course, and will ignore the independent organ with which I am supposed to be connected.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. Now, I think it is time to ascertain the sentiments of this House on this question. What seems to me to be right and fair is that they should select certain of the leading papers. Take, for instance, a city like Montreal. We know that a certain class of people there do not read the party papers; they want an independent paper, and yet papers of that class are deprived of the opportunity of giving their readers the information which such advertisements are the means of distributing to the public; and I think it is high time, in the interests of fair play to the public, in the interests of the cultivation of an independent sentiment throughout the community, that that should be put a stop to. I call attention to the matter for the purpose of ascertaining from the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill, whether he intends to pursue the same course and ostracise that portion of the press which has the courage to speak out its sentiments, or whether he intends to pursue a different course. There have been some notable exceptions to the usual course which has been pursued by this Government. When Sir Charles Tupper was at the head of the Department of Railways and Canals, I recollect seeing some of the advertisements of the Government, in relation to the Intercolonial Railway and other Government railways, published in some of the Halifax papers, and notably in the *Morning Chronicle*, a paper which is violently opposed to him, and I was proud to hear that gentleman state—when I mentioned the matter to him on one occasion, and told him that he was pursuing a course different from that which is generally pursued,—he said, Yes, I think it is only fair to the public that the means of communication between the Government and the public should not be confined to the party papers. This is a sentiment which ought to receive the support of this House, and it is a course which, if pursued by the Government, would be justified by the people of this country. I would like to know whether the Secretary of State intends to adhere strictly to the course which has been followed in the past, or whether he intends to depart from it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As to the policy of the Government, I do not suppose my hon. friend would like the Government to change their policy and try to disturb that quietude which results from his complete independence of the Government, for if the patronage were dispensed in the manner he proposes, it might perhaps alter his independence. I suppose that the little patronage under the control of the Government will be given in the future in the manner in which it has always been given by whatever Government has held the reins of administration.

Mr. BLAKE. I think all Governments ought to do this with their advertising, at any rate, that is, take care that their advertisements are published, not where they will do the most good in a party sense, but where they will secure the greatest amount of publication. There is a large amount of advertising which is, for all the purposes of advertising, pure waste. It is not given in the expectation that a single individual who wants to know will learn, but it is given just as an additional party subsidy. That, I say, is wholly indefensible. We ought to advertise so that the public who are interested will be reached, and, therefore, I think the whole constituency of the country ought to be consulted. That is the only business way. I have no doubt preference will be given, as it must in the nature of things be given, to party newspapers; but there ought to be some decent observance of what the object of advertising is. I have a complaint to make of the conduct of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). He has declared that his is an independent newspaper which always criticises both sides of this House, and finds fault wherever fault is to be found; but my hon. friend forgot for a moment that there are three sides to this House, and I have never observed any criticism of the third side in that paper.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is quite unnecessary for an independent paper to criticise the third party, the Independent party, in this House, because it has pursued such a course that I think my hon. friend, at any rate, ought not particularly to object to it, unless it is an occasional article that appears against himself now and then.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not objecting to that.

Mr. MITCHELL. On the other hand, there is no need; for the servile Government organs do not hesitate to criticise the leader of the Independent party, and often in a very unfair manner. Now, the hon. Secretary of State has replied that it might interfere with the independence of a paper to get Government advertisements. The hon. gentleman knows that that is not the case—that there is no amount of patronage which the Government can give, no amount of influence which they can bring to bear in any way, that can in the slightest degree affect the independent expression of the *Herald*. I can assure him that he need not at all fear on that score to do what he ought to do, and to get out of the narrow rut which he has himself described. It is beneath a Government to say that they will put their advertisements where they will do the greatest party good, ignoring the purpose for which advertising is done. If, as the hon. gentleman has announced, they intend to pursue the same narrow course that they have pursued in the past, all I can say is that it will not meet with the approval of the country.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I admit that there is perhaps some room for reform in some manner in the expensive mode of advertising. But people must not conclude that all the Government advertisements in newspapers are official and paid advertisements. The Queen's Printer in my Department every week receives accounts by dozens which are not paid, because advertisements can be inserted only on a written order previously given; so that numbers of public notices which appear in the papers as Government advertisements, are not, and have not been paid.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not alluding to those advertisements which are inserted without authority. I was alluding to the damning record which is found in the Public Accounts.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. member for Northumberland referred to the Halifax *Chronicle*, in which he said he had often noticed Government advertisements. By the Auditor General's report I find that the Halifax *Chronicle* received last year $176.94, while the Halifax *Herald*, which, as my hon. friend knows, supports the present Government, received over $1,000. While on this subject, I would say to the hon. Secretary of State that very often papers that are of very little importance indeed, receive large amounts for public advertising, and not only print the advertisement once, but print them twice. I saw in an eastern paper the other day a notice of this mode of doing business, and I cut out the paragraph, which I will read to the House:—

"Our readers, with very few exceptions, are probably unaware that the Yarmouth *Times* publishes, as an adjunct to that paper, a ridiculous little sheet yclept the *News*. The Government advertisements published in the *Times* are transferred to the adjunct, with enough other matter transferred from the same paper to fill its columns. The history of the origin of the *News* was given in the *Telegram* something less than a year ago. The inducement for the continuance of the *News* to this time with so little circulation will, we presume, be disclosed when the Dominion Public Accounts for the current year are published. The amount of Government pap, lavish as it is, bestowed on the Tory papers, does not satisfy the *Times*; it wants more; hence the adjunct, which reproduces the Government advertisements, including that for 'Tenders for the Welland Canal Enlargement,' and other official advertisements equally important to the citizens of Yarmouth. After being a few weeks in operation, new light broke upon the *Times*, and it then reduced the

sise of the adjunct, which would save trouble and cost of paper, and enable it to publish the Government advertisements all the same. We have not time to enlarge on this matter to-day. How it may strike members of Parliament, when the facts, with samples of the adjunct, are laid before them—as probably they will be—will be of some interest. If this kind of thing is sustained there will inevitably be a great boom in the Tory newspaper adjunct business throughout the Dominion—while the present Government remains in power.'

I think the House will see that this is carrying the joke a little too far. It is quite enough for the Yarmouth *Times* to get the Government advertisements, without printing a separate little sheet for the purpose of printing them and charging for them a second time.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I certainly think there might be a great improvement in the mode of dispensing the patronage of the Government in the way of advertising. I do not know what the rule is in the Departments with regard to giving out advertisements to the various papers throughout the country. I am satisfied, however, that one rule is rigidly enforced, and that is that no Government advertisements shall be put in any papers which do not support the Government. You may search through all the papers published in the Dominion, and I venture to say you will not find one Government advertisement in any Opposition paper. My idea with regard to the conduct of public business may be somewhat crude and different from the ideas of the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches, but if this branch of the public service is to be honestly administered, it must be administered in a different way. Last year we expended $51,800 in advertising alone, and the previous year $54,000. I am satisfied that all the objects of this advertising could have been attained by the expenditure of not more than one-fifth the amount spent in each year, if the advertising had been done judiciously, as business men would do it. I do not see what object there can be in the Government advertising for tenders for improvements on the Welland Canal, away down in Nova Scotia, and for improvements in British Columbia, all through the Province of Ontario. I cannot see what is to be gained by advertising for the construction of lighthouses in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, in the papers of Ontario, British Columbia and Manitoba, as is done continually. It requires closer supervision on the part of the Secretary of State, if he is going to undertake the management of this department, than has been given to it in the past, so that public moneys may not be wasted. If any business man wished to transact business in this direction, he would seek out the newspapers likely to reach the public he wished to reach. I do not care what Government is in office, I will always maintain that its business should be conducted on business principles. It is sheer dishonesty for the Government to spend public money in subsidising newspapers by giving them advertising in a way that does not benefit the public service, and is of service only to hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches by securing to them, through their dispensing this patronage, the support of a large number of Conservative papers all through the Dominion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman has made a sweeping charge against the Government, and I must say that charge must be specially directed against my Department and the Department of Railways, as those Departments, with the Department of Interior, have the largest amount of advertisements to publish. But I must say this, that in so far—and I am pretty sure it is the same thing for the other Departments—as my Department is concerned, the notices put in the papers are always put with a view of obtaining the largest circulation amongst the people who can give us tenders. The hon. gentleman asks why, if you have a work to be done in Nova Scotia, you advertise in Ontario and Quebec. The answer is that when it is a small work I do not advertise at a very long distance, but when it is a large work I advertise largely, and I can give many proofs to support that position. The other day, for instance, we had what is called the Tormentine breakwater or pier to construct, at an estimated cost of between $125,000 and $175,000. I did not confine the advertising to the Province of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, but also advertised in the papers of Ontario and Quebec, and I may say to the hon. gentleman that not only the lowest tender but several of the lowest tenders were from the Province of Ontario. The contract was given to an Ontario contractor, so that the advertising, though it may have cost us $200 or $300 more, has benefited us largely, because the tender we accepted was much lower than any from New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. I will give you another example. Last week we advertised for tenders for work at the London custom house. That advertisement was put in a large portion of the papers of Ontario, and in this region and in Montreal. The result was that the lowest tender by far was by a man from Ottawa; so that, though we may have paid $100 or $200 more in advertising than we would have if we had limited it to the small region where London is situated, we have saved probably twenty times the cost of the advertisement. The hon. gentleman is therefore mistaken. The advertisements are limited when the work is small. When it is large we advertise largely, because it is the interests of the country to have a larger number of tenderers. I may say to the hon. gentleman that it is surprising, after all, how small the number of tenderers you will find for Government work. They are not numerous even for large works. For the work at Tormentine we had twenty-five or twenty-six tenders, and if we had limited our advertising to Nova Scotia we would have paid probably $30,000 or $40,000 more than we do. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken in his view of advertising.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I judge, from the remarks of the Minister of Public Works and the Secretary of State, that the Government must imagine the contractors in the Dominion are confined exclusively to their supporters. There are contractors who do not profess to hold allegiance to the present Government, who are not supporters of the present Government; and why should they not have an opportunity, with the supporters of the Government, to tender for public works? I agree with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), that these advertisements, in the interests of the public service, should be inserted, not only in the leading papers of the Conservative party, but also in the leading papers of the Reform party and the Independent press. If the Government exercised a little more judiciousness in inserting their advertisements in papers which have large circulations, and which would be likely to be read by the class of people interested in tendering for public works, it would be of great service to the public at large, and no doubt the Minister of Public Works, if he would only allow the abominable Grits all through the country to have an opportunity of tendering for public works, would save a large sum of money to the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. And perhaps convert some of them.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Perhaps so. At all events, I think in the interest of the public the advertisements ought not to be confined to strictly ministerial papers. I think the public service would be best served by advertising in the papers having the largest circulation, which would reach the class of people intended to be reached by the insertion of advertisements of this description. I do not think the Government are serving the public interest by the way in which they are dealing with this patronage.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. the Minister of Public Works is laboring under some delusion in imagining that these adver-

tisements are only inserted in papers having a considerable circulation. There is a paper published occasionally, by fits and starts, in this city called the *Orange Lily*. I have seen a large number of advertisements from the Department of the hon. gentleman in that paper. It does not often appear, but it appears, I suppose, as often as necessary in order to secure payment for the insertion of those advertisements. I remember looking at a few numbers of that paper, extending over a period of several months, though I think not very many papers appeared during the time, and I saw no advertisements other than those in relation to the Department of the hon. gentleman. There is another little paper which I have noticed, a paper that is smaller than the sheet we have before us as the Orders of the Day. It is called the *North-West Star*, published at Rat Portage, not now, but it was published there a few years ago when Rat Portage was a less important place than it is to-day, and I noticed a large number of advertisements, considering the size of the paper, published in the *North-West Star*, from the Department of the hon. the Minister of Public Works. I remember that some of those advertisements had reference to improvements which were being made on the Welland Canal. Whether there were any parties amongst the hunters and half-breeds who were then settled in that particular locality who wished to tender for public works on the Welland Canal, I do not know, but, at all events, I found the advertisements of the hon. the Minister of Public Works in the *North-West Star*. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I read the paper, I had a copy of it sent to me.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will observe that canals are under the control of my colleague the Minister of Railways.

Mr. MILLS. At all events, it was in the Government. It may not have been the Department of the hon. gentleman, but, at all events, it was done by the Government. I remember in the last Parliament bringing before the House a list of papers and the amounts paid to them for advertising for tenders for supplies to the Indian Department, and there were 144 newspapers in which that advertisement appeared. The amount of supplies, I think, was about $62,000 or $63,000, and the amount of the advertising bills was over $14,800. It seemed to me that that was a very profuse expenditure by way of precaution to see that the public were generally informed that supplies of this sort would be required, and to take care that the Government did not pay too much for them. For the purpose of purchasing less than $70,000 of supplies for the Indian Department, nearly $15,000 was spent on Government organs by way of advertising, in order to see that the Department was not overcharged and the public interests were protected.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is somewhat poetic in his prose. He states that a very large sum of money has been paid for advertisements, for a particular advertisement on a particular occasion. I should like to get the dates and to know all about that, and I fancy the hon. gentleman will find he is rather mistaken.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, he has been mistaken before, and he may be mistaken again. I know very well—I have every day proof of it—the anxiety of papers, without reference to political proclivities, to get advertisements, and great numbers of them put in the advertisements on chance. It does not at all follow because you see an advertisement in a newspaper that that advertisement is paid for. Sometimes it is; sometimes it is not. I should like very much to get the date of the particular advertisement for supplies which amounted to $70,000, while the cost of advertising amounted to $15,000. That is the hon. gentleman's statement, and we will hold him to it.

Mr. MILLS. I had the list of the papers here. I took it from the Public Accounts. I told the hon. gentleman that I would read the list to the House. I commenced to read it, and when I had read the names of twenty-five or thirty papers he told the House that he would accept my statement with regard to the list, and I need not read it. I will send and get the report.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If you please.

Mr. MILLS. I shall be happy to furnish the hon. gentleman with the information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As to the advertisement in the *Orange Lily*, I suppose we may take that as proof of the perfectly Catholic benevolence of the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no doubt about my benevolence, or about my Catholicity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not yours—your colleagues.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) referred to the *North-West Star* as a very small paper, and one that it was not proper to insert Government advertisements in. Are the merits of newspapers to be judged by their size? I can tell the hon. gentleman that the Rat Portage *Star*, published in those days, was just as good a paper as some papers which are published in the vicinity which the hon. gentleman hails from. It was a very able paper and a very nice paper, and I think it was a very good paper to give an advertisement to. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has said that independent papers should get advertisements, and he seemed very indignant that they were not supplied with advertisements. Here is a case in point. The Rat Portage *Star* was an independent paper. Like some papers which are very much larger, it was sometimes on one side and sometimes on another, and surely that was being independent.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then it must have been very unlike the paper to which the hon. gentleman refers as being one with which I am connected. No one will say that it is sometimes on one side and sometimes on the other. It pursues the straight course, criticising freely both the great parties and dealing with them fairly on their merits.

Mr. CURRAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) says "ha, ha," and laughs. He may laugh on the other side of his mouth at the criticisms of the *Herald*. It has not paid very much attention to him so far, but it may pay more attention to him before many months are over, and then he may laugh the other way.

Mr. McMULLEN. I ask the Minister of Public Works to notice that advertisements for tenders are given for the purpose of securing tenders from parties who are likely to undertake the construction of work or provide material. I have a paper here which is printed in my own town, which contains an advertisement for the supply of pine timber and oak timber to the Welland Canal for some improvements to locks. In that locality there is not a pine tree or an oak tree within twenty miles that could be possibly made to suit for any such work, but, in order to strengthen the backbone of this Conservative organ which has been lately started in my town this advertisement is given to it, and I have noticed, in every issue since, advertisements for certain materials, some of them in the North

West. In one case, they have advertised for supplies to the Indians in the North-West, as well as timber in connection with the Welland Canal. Of course the hon. gentleman repudiates being responsible for advertisements for canal purposes, but I presume the Minister over that particular Department will not take the ground that that advertisement was put in that sheet for the purpose of getting tenders from that particular section.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It does not matter whether there is timber where the hon. gentleman lives or not. The object is to attract the attention of the men who can furnish the timber, or can do the work, that is all. That man may be found exactly at the place where the hon. gentleman lives, although he may not have timber there. I have no doubt the place where the hon. gentleman lives is a very pretty place. The hon. gentleman may, nevertheless, have in his place a man who has large forests elsewhere, or who may be able to furnish the timber from another place. Therefore that is not a reason why we should not advertise in that paper. There may be some enterprising man there who would undertake to furnish the supplies for the Indians, also. The hon. gentleman would be the first to complain if the Indian Department did not advertise in Ontario to obtain supplies for the North-West; he would say that the Government were not giving a chance to the Ontario people, and when we do give them a chance the hon. gentleman complains. Well, he may convince us that we should give fewer advertisements in his region.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was not aware that there were any in the past.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I think the statement made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) bears the impress of exaggeration on the face of it. He stated that 144 newspapers received for publishing one advertisement the sum of $14,800. Now, that would be $102.75 for each newspaper for one advertisement. Newspapers cannot get beyond certain advertising rates, and cannot charge the Government any more, and their rates are criticised by the Auditor General very carefully. So that sum could not have been paid to each paper for one advertisement, because the Auditor would not have passed the item.

Mr. WELDON. The Auditor General's account shows that the St. John's *Sun* gets $1,800 for publishing advertisements, while the *Telegraph*, which has as large a circulation, only gets $900. The Intercolonial Railway timetable is something that should be published in papers, irrespective of politics, because the whole public has a direct interest in seeing it. I find, also, that the St. John's *Trade Reporter* received $97, and I don't think there is any hon. gentleman here from New Brunswick who knows anything about that paper.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say, in reference to the statement of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Mc Mullen), that he must know very little about the country where he lives, because he ought to remember that only a few years ago there was a considerable quantity of pine timber taken out of that country. I have spoken to men working in the township of Bentinck and in the town of Durham in reference to timber in that section of the country, and I am told that it supplies very fine timber, both pine and rock elm. I do not know whether there is any oak or not, but there is a good deal of pine throughout that country, although it may be scattered.

Mr. McMULLEN. I still insist upon the statement I made, that there is no timber in my section suitable for the purpose mentioned in this advertisement. With regard to the statement of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), I was not aware of the intention of the Government in these advertisings until he spoke. It is quite evident that they intended to reach the ears of those who had timber limits, so that, if the hon. gentleman has a timber limit, he might supply the Government himself. There is no person near my section who has a timber limit, unless it is the hon. member for Grey himself.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no timber limits whatever, but I think I have a better acquaintance with the locality in which I live than the hon. gentleman has, or I would not have dared to make such a statement.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We have a number of local papers in my riding with a very large circulation. The difficulty is that the Minister of Public Works has not seen fit to make known the requirements of this country in those papers, and the consequence is that many enterprising men in that locality have not been able to tender for the supplies required in the North-West and elsewhere. Now that I have drawn the attention of the Minister to these papers, I hope he will see fit to make a judicious expenditure of the public money by giving them some of the Government advertisements.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I notice in the Auditor General's report some interesting facts in connection with Government advertisements. I do not propose to take up the time of the committee in reading the list through; it covers three pages, showing a total of $51,822.75 spent in advertising. But there are some curiosities worth referring to. One hon. gentleman referred to the *Orange Lily*, of Ottawa. Well, in regard to these small papers published semi-occasionally in Ottawa, there is another illustrious journal in Ottawa which we see once or twice every Session, called the *Investigator*.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I happened to see one copy last Session, and I happened to see another copy this Session. I do not think that paper is published more than once a year. I never see it, at all events, more that once a year. It is impossible to find it anywhere in the city. You cannot find it in the news depots, you cannot buy it from the boys on the street, nor is it filed in the reading room. But occasionally a stray copy will find its way to a member of Parliament just about the time the House opens. Now this little *Investigator* received last year no less than $208.45 for advertising, nearly as much as my hon. friend's paper in Montreal, the *Herald*, which received $226.06. Perhaps he was not aware that it received anything, but the Public Accounts show that it did.

Mr. MITCHELL. O yes, it received something when it was tolerably quiet and civil, but as soon as it showed its horns a little, the advertisements were stopped.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Then I understand from the hon. gentleman that the Montreal *Herald* is not receiving any Government patronage now; if so, I must congratulate him on the fact, because during the last four or five months the Montreal *Herald* has worked its way forward amongst the newspapers of the Dominion more rapidly, probably, than any other newspaper in the country.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

The CHAIRMAN. Question, question.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). This is the question. I was going to say——

The CHAIRMAN. The question before the House is not whether the Montreal *Herald* is receiving Government patronage.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Chairman don't like you to compliment the *Herald*.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). The question is about Government advertising, and I was going to say that it has been a great advantage to the Montreal *Herald* not to have Government advertising, and I fancy it would add, probably, to the independence of some Government organs very materially if they were not fed so much on Government pap. Now, there is the Montreal *Gazette*, in contrast with the *Herald*. I do not know about the circulation of these papers, but I fancy the *Herald* holds its own with the *Gazette*.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think so.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). The *Gazette* got $900.47 Then there is another paper in Montreal called the *Share holder*. I have an indistinct idea that that paper has some thing to do with the Montreal *Gazette* also, but I speak subject to correction.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is on the same side of politics, that is all.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). The *Shareholder* got $799.70. Well, the Ottawa *Citizen* got $763.86. Now, everybody knows that the Ottawa *Free Press* has a much larger circulation than the *Citizen*, and the *Free Press* only got $58.40.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It ought not to have got that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). If the Government intended that the money should be placed where it would do the most good to the country, they would advertise in the papers that have the largest circulation. I notice in the city of Hamilton, with which I am somewhat acquainted, the Hamilton *Spectator* is selected for Government favors, not only with regard to advertising, but with regard to job printing. Last year that journal got $581.01. But I fail to find the Hamilton *Times* mentioned in the statement at all, although everybody acquainted with that portion of the country knows perfectly well that the Hamilton *Times* has a much larger circulation than the Hamilton *Spectator*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hard *Times*.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). It has a very much larger number of readers. The Government certainly ought to exercise a little more care in distributing their patronage if they want to do good service to the public in that regard. I might go over those papers by the hundred mentioned in the Auditor General's report, and point out where the Government had thrown away public money, not for the benefit of the public service, but for the sole and only reason that they desire to subsidise the organs which support them in place and power. There can be no doubt that the advertising patronage is dispensed by the Government with that object, and that object alone.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman did not properly appreciate the merits of the *Investigator*. I also have seen that paper occasionally. It seems it comes out once or twice a year, and I myself have noticed its merits. It is a small sheet. It does not appear to have any circulation, so far as one can judge, but then we have to look at the quality of the papers, as the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) pointed out. For instance, the issue I saw amply justified the course of the Government in subsidising it. There were two things; one was a fulsome laudation of the First Minister, and the other was a violent vituperation of the leader of the Opposition; and all the rest was Government advertisements. *Post hoc et propter hoc.* As the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has said, it is quite true the *Herald* did get some advertising when it was, to quote the hon. gentleman's words, "tolerably quiet and civil," but it has not done so since it became intolerably noisy and abusive.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Since the matter has been referred to, a copy of the *Investigator* has been placed on my desk. I see its motto is "Our country's welfare paramount." I do not think it contains as many Government advertisements as usual. Here is a notice to contractors with reference to the Custom house at London. Here is an advertisement announcing that the Queen's Printer has for sale the Statutes of Canada. I suppose everyone knows that without advertising it. It is, no doubt, a standing advertisement. Here is another one, a notice to contractors from the Department of Public Works. That is the Department which exercises so much discretion in publishing advertisements and placing them where they will do the most good. This advertisement has reference to receiving tenders for the construction of a wharf at Cape Tormentine, Westmoreland County, New Brunswick. It announces that the time for receiving tenders will expire on 8th May.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the date of the paper?

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). 15th May, a week after the expiration of the time. We have Intercolonial Railway advertisements here. There is one from Mr. Pottinger, who has added to his notoriety so much this Session by the evidence he gave in the Public Accounts Committee with respect to the Intercolonial Railway and its management. It is an extensive advertisement from the Intercolonial. Then we have another advertisement from the Department of Public Works—tenders for the completion of additions to the Custom house at London. We have an advertisement signed by the Deputy Minister of the Interior, asking for tenders for the right to cut timber in the District of Alberta, N.W.T. Then we have an advertisement from the Ottawa coffee house. It might be a good thing for the Government to advertise the restaurant and bar in this building, so that the public might be aware that there is an unlicensed bar—I mean a bar carried on in the House of Commons under the particular direction of a Minister of the Crown who has been famous in times past for his advocacy of total abstinence. I congratulate the Minister of Marine on the fact that he is now running a saloon of his own in the House of Commons.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I may be out of order, but it is a fact, nevertheless.

Mr. WALLACE (York). The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) has told us that the sole and only reason why printing and advertisements are given to Conservative papers is to subsidise and support party organs. If that is the case with regard to the Dominion Government, I suppose he will acknowledge that the same rule will apply to the Ontario Government. What do we find there?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is the hon. gentleman in order?

The CHAIRMAN. I could not hear what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. WALLACE (York). To a Brantford paper the Ontario Government paid, in 1883, $2,005.

Mr. MULOCK. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman, I believe, is proposing to discuss the practice of another Government as to how it distributed its printing patronage. Is it in order to discuss that?

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman has not yet gone sufficiently far to enable me to judge as to what his argument will be.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I am making a comparison and endeavoring to ascertain if the same rule will apply to the Ontario Government which hon. gentlemen opposite are anxious to apply to the Dominion Government. I said that a Brantford paper received, in 1883, $2,005 for printing from the Ontario Government. The London *Advertiser*, in which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has an interest, received last year $206. The Hamilton *Times*, $652; Brantford *Expositor*, $1,047; Guelph *Mercury*, owned by Innes & Davidson——

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

Mr. WALLACE (York). You rose to that point of order before and were put down.

Mr. MULOCK. When I took that point of order before you, Mr. Chairman, intimated that the hon. member had not gone sufficiently far in his remarks. Now you have the evidence on which I took the point of order. I need not repeat the point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. MULOCK. Chair! I am addressing the Chair. I ask for your protection, Mr. Chairman, and I will have it. I will allow no man to put me down when I am in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Order, order.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to be in order. There is no man in this House who has more respect for the Chair than I have, but I say——

The CHAIRMAN. Order, order.

Mr. MULOCK. I shall not allow any man to interfere with me in the exercise of my rights.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Order. The hon. gentleman is referring to transactions which bear upon the practice of Governments in advertising. If the discussion is to continue, as it has been allowed heretofore, on the practice of Governments in their systems of advertising, I think he has liberty to show how it is done elsewhere. I think he is entitled to go that far.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I agree with your ruling, Sir, but I wish to say——

The CHAIRMAN. Order. The hon. member for York has the floor.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I am sorry the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), and the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), do not conduct themselves with more propriety.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The CHAIRMAN. Order. The hon. gentleman will please keep to the point.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I was referring to the fact that the firm of Innes & Davidson, proprietors of the Guelph *Mercury*, one of the firm, I believe, being a member of the Dominion Parliament, have received for advertising in the *Mercury* during the past year $844 from the Ontario Government, and, if it was a corrupt act on the part of the Dominion Government to give advertising to certain newspapers, it must have been still more corrupt for the Ontario Government to give it to a private firm, and to men who are members of Parliament. With regard to the member for North Brant, who is so anxious to air his eloquence in this matter, we find that the Ontario Government is now without a Government printer, and it is understood that the paper which abuses this Government to the greatest extent shall have the largest share of the public patronage to this printing.

Mr. INNES. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down alluded to the paper with which I am connected, and stated that that paper had received the sum of over $800 in one year for advertising. I wish to say that the statement he has made is not correct. The money was not paid for advertising, but nine-tenths of it and more was paid for printing, covering nearly two years.

Mr. WALLACE (York). Did you get the money?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. INNES. Nine-tenths of it was paid for necessary printing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. INNES. The hon. gentlemen will please wait till I am through. It was paid for necessary printing in connection with the agricultural college, and more than that, it was done at regular business prices—the same prices that we charge for printing to merchants and other business men. The Ontario Government are not in the habit of paying the prices that this Government pay either for printing or advertising. So far as my experience goes they criticise every item and they cut down every item if it is an over-charge. We know perfectly well——

Mr. WALLACE (York). Will the hon gentleman permit me to ask a question?

Some hon MEMBERS. Order; sit down.

Mr. INNES. The account was an honest one, and not like many sent into this Government for printing and advertising, and was paid in full.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Did you (Mr. Wallace) get a timber limit?

The CHAIRMAN. I ask hon. gentlemen not to call across the House in this way. It is very irregular and likely to lead to confusion.

Mr. INNES. I cannot, of course, answer for the other papers which the hon. gentleman mentioned, but I am perfectly satisfied that there was good value given for the money, or else the Ontario Government would not have paid the accounts. On the subject which has given rise to this discussion, I believe, notwithstanding what the leader of the Government has said with respect to the payment of only such advertisements as are ordered—I believe that whether ordered or not, they are paid for in nearly all cases. Any person who has given any attention to the matter will bear out what has been said by the leader of the Opposition, by the hon. member for North Brant and others, with reference to this matter, notwithstanding what the Minister of Public Works said as to the judicious manner in which he has given out advertising. Some time ago, out of curiosity, I had occasion to look through some of these Government advertisements inserted in different papers, and I found that, contrary to what the Minister of Public Works has said, those advertisements were not given only to influential papers with a fair circulation, but were given to many of the most obscure sheets in the country. For instance, the advertisement for tenders for the graving docks in British Columbia was given to many papers of not more than 400 or 500 circulation. They could answer no earthly purpose whatever, but they were simply subsidies to those papers to keep them in existence, and the same remark applies with regard to advertisements in connection with the Welland Canal and the public works of the Lower Provinces. Not only so, but we have many instances, as have been mentioned by several hon. members, in regard to some papers which seem to be

the special pets of the Government, such as the Regina *Leader* and others, which are almost entirely kept up by the money they receive for these Government advertisements. I notice, too, that some papers nearer home had advertisements of the Intercolonial Railway and other Government advertising. I have here a copy of *Le Canada* in which I find an advertisement of the Intercolonial Railway. Now there is a reprint of that paper published under the name of *La Vallée de L'Ottawa*, and I find that the same advertisements are repeated in that paper and no doubt separately charged for, although the two are virtually but one paper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We all know that it has been the habit of Governments to favor the press that usually support them. Hon. gentlemen opposite did so when they were in power, and I have no doubt they will do so when they are in again when that time comes, or otherwise they will change the practice which was followed when they were in possession of these benches before. The only question really is, whether there has been an excessive patronage by one party or the other. I think, Sir, on looking back, from my recollection of similar discussions on this subject when we were on the other side, that it was substantially proved that the hon. gentlemen opposite were very generous in their patronage, and that they helped their friends. Well, we will make a new start if they like. It will be understood that under no circumstances shall these advertisements be sent to the papers that support either Government. We will make that bargain. Well, I do not know that that would be a fair bargain, because they are not in now and we intend to remain in, and hon. gentlemen may make the promise and be perfectly safe in making such an arrangement. One hon. gentleman opposite objected very much to an advertisement about timber being put in a newspaper because there was no timber in its locality; and he read the *Investigator*, and quoted an advertisement which actually appeared in that Ottawa paper for tenders for constructing a wharf at Cape Tormentine. Now, I think the hon. gentleman will withdraw all he said when I tell him that in all probability that newspaper was the cause of the party who got the contract getting it. It was an Ottawa firm that got the contract, and I have no doubt the *Investigator* called the attention of that Ottawa firm to the advertisement.

Mr. BLAKE. But it was the *Investigator* of the 15th of May which announced to this intending contractor that the time had been extended to the 8th of May.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that that advertisement was in there before the 8th of May.

Mr. BLAKE. No, I do not see it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman takes the paper?

Mr. BLAKE. No, I do not take it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, the hon. member who produced it said nobody saw it but himself, and it appears that the leader of the party saw it, and he valued it. So ably was that paper conducted that the hon. gentleman read it from beginning to end, and he said there was a glowing account in it both of himself and myself.

Mr. BLAKE. But glowing with different fires.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I am too modest to admit that I read it if I did.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). If the hon. leader of the Government will explain when the number previous to this number was published, we shall be able to decide whether the advertisement in that paper had any effect in securing the contract for an Ottawa man. I do not think the *Investigator* appeared, previous to this issue, short of a year ago, so that I cannot understand how this paper could have influenced the letting of the contract.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman himself is of a very enquiring mind, and I think he would make a better investigator than myself. He considers it a hardy annual, and it should be encouraged.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Since I have referred to this *Investigator*, I have investigated a little, and I find that it is printed at the Ottawa *Citizen* office, and no doubt the hon. member for Ottawa will be able to explain what little share he has in the profits on the Government advertisements in that paper.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As you have opened up the whole question of the Ontario printing, and that is now under discussion——

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman is in order when he says I opened up the discussion. I did not open it up. That is not the way to address the Chair.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I take that back. I meant to say, and supposed I had said, that you had permitted the discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, I permit on one side just what I permit on the other.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course, we can expect nothing else. It will then be proper in the present discussion to refer to the statement made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) in reference to the Ontario Government contract. We know that hon. gentleman is such a guileless soul that he was imposed upon on one occasion when he took bogus telegrams to be genuine, which other people knew to be bogus; because we cannot suppose he used them in the House knowing that they were genuine. Therefore, being such a guileless soul, we have a right to view with some suspicion any statement he makes, and we do not know whether his present statement is genuine or bogus. Therefore it would be as well for some hon. gentleman on the other side to satisfy himself that it is correct. I suppose it is correct. He has instituted a parallel between the extravagant rates paid for advertisements by this Government and a payment which he says was made by the Ontario Government, whether for printing and advertising I do not know. If his statement relates to printing, it is totally irrevelant to this discussion, because we are not talking about printing, but about sums paid for Government advertising. He instanced the Brantford *Expositor*, and stated that some large amounts had been paid by the Ontario Government to that paper. Are we to understand that the Brantford *Expositor* got that amount for advertising?

Mr. WALLACE (York). I will tell you all about it presently.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think it would have been as well had he told us before. Does he state that the rate which was paid for that printing was beyond a proper rate? He brings forward a statement about printing that had to be done at some office, without bringing forward any shadow of proof that it was done at any more than ordinary rates. He says he will give us further information. Can he then tell us whether the amount was paid for Government advertisements or for other work?

Mr. WALLACE (York). The hon. member for South Brant, on every occasion when he alludes to me, has to refer to certain telegrams which he characterises as bogus telegrams.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, until you take it back.

Mr. WALLACE (York). Well, I do not propose to take it back; so the hon. gentleman can keep on with it. I will just inform the hon. gentleman that I read those statements openly in this House.

The CHAIRMAN. Keep to the question.

Mr. WALLACE (York). He has alluded to them twice; surely I have a right to reply. On both occasions he attempted to run down my character, because I read certain telegrams in this House. I read them before the gentlemen interested as being quoted from newspapers. I said they were said to have passed; I never read them as actual telegrams that had passed, but as the substance of the correspondence that had passed between those gentlemen.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Say that they are bogus, and we will not refer to them again.

Mr. WALLACE (York). The hon. member for South Brant has resorted to this because to-day he is without a policy. He hesitated this Session to get up in this House and denounce the Government on account of the sugar duties; that charge has failed this year. He is also afraid to attack the National Policy. So he has adopted the policy of the party—personal abuse. Now, the hon. member asks whether it was printing or advertising for which this money was paid to the Brantford *Expositor*. Well, I presume it was advertising, for this reason. The contract between the Ontario Government and their Government printers has this specification in it:

"This specification is meant and understood to cover the whole of the public printing, binding, &c., of the Government and Legislature of the Province of Ontario, as well as all the Departments thereof."

Well, I presume that the Ontario Government and the Government printers have carried out in good faith that provision of their agreement. And consequently that this printing we have here is for advertising and not job printing.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do you say that?

Mr. WALLACE (York). I presume they have carried out the letter of the contract.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I do not get up and characterise them as dishonest and evading their contract, but I say that they have carried out the spirit of their contract in good faith, and if they have then these are charges for advertisements in the newspaper; if not, then it is for job printing, and I should say there was a job connected with it. The hon. gentleman says the Government of Ontario get good value for their printing. Have they charged that the Government of the Dominion have not received good value for their printing?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Of course. Prove it.

Mr. WALLACE (York). It never has been proven that they have not. More than that, we have in the Dominion an auditor who examines every account sent in, and sees that it is correct and that value has been received, and he refuses to pay many of them when they are wrong; while the Ontario Government have no auditor, but the accounts are sent in and paid, whether there is a job or not, as a matter of course. Did the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Innes) get paid the whole of his account he sent in?

Mr. INNES. Would you like to know?

Mr. WALLACE (York). Yes, I would. The hon. gentleman is afraid to answer.

Mr. INNES. Our accounts, unlike a good many of the accounts sent into this Government, are honest.

Mr. WALLACE (York). We must presume from that he got paid the whole amount of his account, and that there was no Auditor General there to criticise. The whole amount was $844.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has referred to the fact that the Auditor General is a useful officer who discharges his duties faithfully. No doubt he does, and more faithfully than some of the printers who receive jobs from this Government would desire he should. Because we find, not only in this year's report of the Auditor General, but in last year's and ever since his attention has been drawn to the fact that exorbitant prices have been paid for outside work, that he has tried his best to put a stop to it, by reporting against paying those accounts. He deducted over $2,000 from one account, which, in the aggregate, amounted to $6,000. He urged the position he took, and refused to certify to these accounts, until the Treasury Board, composed of five members of the Government, met together and decided they would overrule his audit and compel the people's money to be wasted in this way.

Mr. BOWELL. Is that for advertising?

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). They compelled the Auditor General to allow the accounts to be paid, when he knew and certified that thousands of dollars were being spent for this work which ought not to have been spent by the Government. Every member of the Government knows that to be a fact; the hon. member for West York knows it to be a fact; every member of the House knows it to be a fact, and I do not see what the hon. gentleman expected to make out of quoting the Auditor General as an officer who checked the accounts, when his rulings are overruled by the Treasury Board whenever it suits the Government to pay exorbitant prices to their organs for printing.

Mr. MULOCK. It is to some extent in the public interest there should be some control different from what exists to-day over printing given out. Some hon. members have referred to grievances and abuses, let me refer to another abuse. It appears by the Public Accounts that a considerable amount of printing is given annually to a newspaper in which a member of the Government is interested. I refer to the Montreal *Gazette*. When you look to the particular class of printing at present given to that newspaper, you will find it is especially objectionable that that system should be continued. I understand that for some years the Geological Survey report has been given to the Montreal *Gazette* to be printed. The Geological Survey is under the control of the Department of the Interior, and the printing of its report therefore under the control of the Minister of the Interior. When the Bill for printing is presented to the Government, to whom is it presented for audit? It is presented to the Minister of the Interior, who, as the head of that Department, is bound to investigate the account and see that the country is not overcharged. How can he well do the duty when he has an interest adverse to his duty as a Minister of the Crown. I do not care whether his interest in what comes out of that contract be great or small, if he has however small an interest in the profit he is not in a proper position to investigate the account. Fancy a bill being presented to the Minister of the Interior, and the person representing the claimant being the individual, Thomas White, one of the joint proprietors of the Montreal *Gazette*. It is true that the individual does not appear because the account is in the name of a corporation of which he is only a silent partner, but if we strip the transaction of the shield thrown over it by the Act of incorporation, what appears? The proprietors of the *Gazette*, including Thomas White, present an account to Thomas White, Minister of the Interior, and ask for payment out of the public moneys. I am not going to

say he would pass an account that was improper, but he cannot fill two such inconsistent positions at the same time and do justice to both. In my opinion it is an absolutely false position for any hon. gentlemen to put himself in, to have an interest adverse to that he is bound to protect. If I chose, I could point out organs in which men controlling the public purse have an interest, it is said. I will not speak with a great deal of confidence of it, but it is said generally that there are members of the Cabinet who are interested as proprietors of organs that are creditors of the Government. If that is to be done away with by the new system, well and good. If there is no other escape than this, let us adopt the proposed remedy, but under any circumstances I submit that the interests of the country are not being properly served when a creditor, as has been shown, is the one who audits the payment to himself.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to know from the Secretary of State what the meaning of the phrase, which has given rise to this interesting discussion, is:

"The proper officer of the Department shall also superintend and execute the purchase and distribution, &c., the procuring of all advertising required for the public service."

This officer is to be, I suppose, from what the hon. gentleman explained, the superintendent of printing?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I was going to remark that, but unfortunately I was prevented by the interesting discussion we have had on public advertising, which has nothing to do with this measure. I think that the clause does not read well, because the procuring of advertisements cannot be put into the hands of the State Department. Instead of procuring all advertising, it should read "the auditing of all accounts for the advertising required for the public service."

Mr. BLAKE. Then it is not intended that this single Department or any officer of it shall have any control over the discretion of the different Ministers, as now existing, to order advertisements where they deem it necessary in respect to the matters appertaining to their own Departments?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not think it could be worked. It is not the intention. Each Department gives a written order. This order has to go to the Department of the Queen's Printer where every account has to be audited and paid, and no account is accepted unless the written order of the Department which issued the advertisement is given with the account, and it is not intended to change that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Would the Minister kindly give us a little more information as to the method adopted at the present time with regard to the dispensing of the advertising patronage.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Each Minister may give a written order if he wishes to send an advertisement to a newspaper. He must give the order in writing. No newspaper has a right, as used to be done in times past, it appears, to take an advertisement and then send the account to be paid at the discretion of the Department. For instance, the Department of the Interior sends an advertisement, the accounts are audited and paid by the Department of the Queen's Printer, and no account is paid without a written order for the advertisement.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Then I understand that the patronage now is not dispensed by the Queen's Printer? Each head of a Department orders the advertisement to be sent to certain papers each time?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. INNES. How is a check kept with regard to the newspapers which insert the advertisement on an order and those who insert it without an order? How is the Department or the Auditor General to know?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The auditor does not certify an account unless it is accompanied by the written order of the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. I would also like to understand what the precise meaning of another part of this section is:

"The proper officer of the Department shall also superintend and execute the purchase and distribution of all paper, books and all other articles of stationery of whatsoever kind, and the distribution and sale of all books or publications issued by order of either or both Houses of Parliament or any Department of the Government of Canada."

Referring to the first two lines which I have just read—

"The proper officer of the Department shall also superintend and execute the purchase and distribution of all paper, books and all other articles of stationery of whatsoever kind—"

Does that mean books and stationery which are required for the Departments?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. For the Departments and for Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but it includes that required for the Departments?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. For the Departments.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, if a book was wanted, if a particular Department wanted a book of reference, the course would be to issue a requisition upon or an order to this Department, and this Department would execute the purchase?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, as it is done in England.

Mr. INNES. What relation would the present Stationery Department of the House hold to the bureau if it was established?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This Department is almost completed, and I must say very well organised, and it is intended that the present chief clerk of stationery shall be the superintendent of stationery. There is no need of a new officer for that Department, which will be continued.

Mr. INNES. Then this Department would be in a sense subsidiary to the bureau?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, it would be a part of it.

On section 4,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to call the attention of the House to this clause. I perceive that apparently there is an intention of creating an officer with the rank and title of deputy head. It appears to me that we have created a great many more deputy heads than the service calls for. Hon. gentlemen may think it matters very little whether you call an officer a deputy head or not, but in practice it will be found to amount to a good deal, and in practice it will be found that this Department will be worked a good deal more expensively than it need be. What, after all, has this Department to do? It will have to supervise the expenditure of some $200,000 or $300,000 of the public money. It appears to me that to create a deputy head for the purpose of supervising an expenditure of that amount is making altogether too much of it, and is creating an office very unnecessarily expensive. We have created two or three distinct deputy heads in two or three Departments of late, and I think there is not sufficient ground for making an officer with the rank of deputy head, which ought to represent a very much more important service than this, it appears to me, can be.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In that Department, there are practically now two deputy heads, the Under Secretary of State and the Deputy Registrar General. I am not one of those who desire to multiply offices, and I have already in my

Department done my fair share in that respect. There is no great change, because the Queen's Printer is now a special officer with a special commission. The increase of salary will be of no consequence, and it is the intention of the Government that there shall be only the Under Secretary and one other deputy head, who will be the Queen's Printer, the registry branch of the Department may be merged, in the interval before the coming into force of this Act, into one of the other branches of this Department.

Mr. BLAKE. But that would require an alteration of the Statute, I presume? Is not the deputy registrar now a deputy by Statute?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He is the Deputy Registrar General by Statute.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it would require an Act of Parliament to effect the reform.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It would require an Act of Parliament, but this is not practically going to take effect before the 1st December, 1887, and we hope in the meantime it will be possible to make the change so that there will be only two deputy heads.

Mr. BLAKE. It is intended, however, that the Queen's Printer will be a deputy head, and we are in fact by this clause creating a new deputy headship?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We are.

Mr. BLAKE. Which the hon. gentleman intends shall not in the end increase the gross number of deputy heads, because he takes one away from somewhere else. I suppose the Queen's Printer will have the usual emoluments of a deputy head under the law?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He will.

Mr. BLAKE. What are the present emoluments, and what will be the increase?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The present salary of the Queen's printer is $2,400, and his salary will be increased by $400.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then he will be paid very much under the other deputy heads, who receive on an average $3,200, and to a certainty this inequality will so press upon his mind that we shall be called upon to pay him $3,200 in a very short time. Now I do not understand that there are two deputy heads in the Department of the Secretary of State, because in the estimates submitted to us a few days ago, I see the chief clerk and the deputy registrar who is the nearest approach I can make out to a deputy head, are to receive $2,400 for 1887, similarly to the Queen's Printer.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The second deputy head does not receive the salary of a deputy head.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is nobody put down as a deputy head except the Under Secretary, so that there are not at the present moment, two deputy heads, though there are chief clerks.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I mean that the Deputy Registrar General, like the Under Secretary, is Deputy Minister in his branch, but the deputy head who is called the Deputy Registrar General does not receive the salary of a deputy head.

Mr. BLAKE. For the reason that he is not a deputy head.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I admit my expression was not in conformity with the word of the Statute. He is Deputy Minister, but he is not a deputy head.

Mr. BLAKE. Under the Civil Service Act there is a salary assigned, I think, within certain limits, to the deputy head.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, $3,200.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the effect of this clause is to create a new deputy headship, and, under the general Act of Parliament, creating a new deputy headship involves an increase of public charges, as the Minister has explained, of $400, and it seems to me that this ought to be initiated in committee.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think we might say that the salary of that deputy head shall not exceed the present salary of the Queen's Printer. I have no intention to increase the salary beyond the present salary of the Queen's Printer.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman said a little while ago there would be an increase of $400.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection to leave him with his present salary. We will add and make it read as follows: —"Shall be the deputy head of the Department with the present salary of the Queen's Printer."

Mr. BLAKE. The clause, in so far as it gives power to the officer, appears to be too wide, in the 17th and part of 18th lines. It not merely requires him to perform such duties but provides that he shall have such powers as are assigned to him by any Order in Council, or the Minister. That would give the Minister, practically, entirely indefinite powers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Well, we will strike out the words "or by the Minister," in the 18th line.

Mr. BLAKE. Sub-section 2 covers the case of the present officer, I suppose.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It does.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I would like the Minister to explain this a little more fully. That may mean a great deal. A man may be employed in a publishing house, and still not be acquainted with the details of printing.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We have put it as an additional guarantee. We are not supposed to take, as Queen's Printer, a man who has not a knowledge of the business. I have copied the terms of the American Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It should read a printing establishment in place of a publishing establishment. I do not know what the legal signification might be, but I should suppose service in a publishing establishment might be construed to mean service in a mere bookseller's establishment.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Let us say "printing."

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). For instance Dawson Bros., Montreal, are publishers, but they are not printers. It is well known they receive orders for printing, but they have nothing to do with the printing, which they get done at the *Gazette* office, or some other place, so that a man might be employed in the publishing house of Dawson Bros. for years and know nothing about printing.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We will strike out the word "publishing" and insert the word "printing" in lieu thereof.

Mr. BLAKE. The next sub-section ought to have been initiated in committee. It provides that these officers shall have the rank and emoluments of a chief clerk.

Mr. BOWELL. Is it absolutely necessary that it should be originated in committee when it declares that an officer, when appointed, shall hold that rank? I think if you look

at the Civil Service Act you will find that the Government is empowered, for certain reasons therein stated, to make appointments. The power is already vested in the Government to appoint clerks of any grade under certain circumstances, and I take it that a grant in the Estimates would always cover any appointment made in this way.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know whether the clause should be inserted—I suppose it is necessary, because we find it here. We have to deal with it as it is here, and being here, it ought to have been initiated in committee.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I said nothing about whether the clause ought to be here or not. What I said was that I did not think it necessary that this clause should originate in committee, for the reasons I stated. I gave no opinion as to whether the clause should be in the Bill or not.

Mr. BLAKE. My position is that a clause which prescribes that public officers shall have certain emoluments, which emoluments are, we know, fixed by the general law, is, in effect, providing for a salary, and should be initiated in committee.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We provide that the superintendent of stationery, the superintendent of printing and the accountant shall be the chief clerks, and not subject to examination. I do not think it is necessary to change the wording of the section.

Mr. BLAKE. If the words are not necessary, we should omit "emolument." If they are necessary, they should be introduced in Committee of the Whole. Either it is necessary to take this power to pay those particular emoluments or it is not. We presume it to be necessary as the words appear in the Bill. If they are not necessary, let the words be struck out.

Section amended by striking out the word "emolument."

Mr. BLAKE. Is it thought necessary to have a superintendent of printing, a superintendent of stationery and an accountant.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes. In a large printing establishment of this kind there must be a superintendent of printing, who will be the practical head of the establishment; there must also be a controller of stationery and a special accountant.

Mr. INNES. We have already a superintendent of stationery. Is it intended to appoint two new officers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No. There will be three heads in that Department, one controlling the other, the controller of stationery will have something to do with the printing. The auditor will be a kind of controller, and it was thought desirable to give the same rank in the service to each of them. It will add something to the present salaries, and this has been calculated so that the addition will not in the bulk increase the whole amount of the salaries of the Department, as it now stands.

Mr. VAIL. Why is it necessary that an accountant should have had five years' experience in the measurement and auditing of printing accounts. He will be a mere accountant.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The work could not be done by an ordinary accountant, no matter how clever he might be. He must have a special knowledge with respect to auditing accounts of a printing or publishing department.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I entirely agree that it would be utterly impossible for an ordinary accountant to discharge the duties required of that officer. I see that in section 5 provision is made for lithographing, but in the statement made by the Secretary of State as to the cost of this department he made no provision for the purchase of lithographic plant.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is not intended at present to have lithographing done, but it is put in in case it may be found necessary in future.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Are we to understand from the second sub-section that every apprentice or journeyman who secures work in this establishment has to be approved by the Secretary of State?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That provision was certainly not put in for my pleasure, and if there is any objection to it I will strike it out. While, of course, some one has to be responsible for the Department, it is understood that the establishment shall be carried on so that these men shall be engaged and be under the control of the officer who is practically acquainted with the work. I, therefore, move that that portion of the sub-section be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. I think you will find that the efficiency of a department of this kind in the employment of hands will largely depend on its being expressly recognised that the absolute responsibility for the choice of those hands is with the superintendent, and that the hands may feel that they are dependent on him and his good will alone, and not upon political or outside influence of any kind, as to whether they remain there or not. I saw the advantage of this system in what was a somewhat analogous instance, when I had the misfortune to be Minister of Justice. I think you will find that many of the difficulties which have occurred in one of our penitentiaries has been largely due to a disregard of that principle. The law is good enough, for it expressly provides, as to a number of minor officers of the penitentiaries, that they shall be appointed by the warden, and shall be dismissed or removable by the permanent officer. I found when I took charge of the office that the warden was in the habit of referring to the Minister with reference to these appointments. I declined to give any advice or suggestion in the matter, and I pointed out to him that the responsibility properly lay with him, that I should hold him responsible for appointing good men, and in order that that responsibility might be effective he must have absolute freedom of choice. Now, if you want this Department to work well, you will draw a clause based upon that principle, to show that the superintendent of printing has real freedom of choice, and that the men may feel they look to him, and to him alone, and that according to the favor and good opinion they deserve and receive from him, they will get in and stay in.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and if I would speak for myself personally, if enquiries were made at the Department over which I preside, it would be found that that system has been practised. In all practical matters requiring special knowledge, of which the Minister has no technical knowledge, such work is left to the control of the officer. I have no objection to have a provision of that kind inserted.

Mr. BLAKE. I would submit whether the 3rd and 4th sub-sections are not money clauses, which would originate in committee.

On section, 6.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There has been an expression of opinion on the other side of the House, and I may say on this side also, giving to this clause a different interpretation from that which I gave in my explanations of the Bill, when I said it was not intended to give the Government the right to undo the work proposed to be done by this Act, but practically to leave the law as it is now in that respect. The present Statute states that no printing shall be done except

by contract, and yet another clause states that the Government may for special reasons order work to be done elsewhere than at the Government printing office. But owing to the misunderstanding which this clause might create, I move that it be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

On section 7,

Mr. BLAKE. Are the moneys referred to in this clause moneys received from the Treasury for the purpose of making payments, or moneys which are to be received as the price of documents and books which are to be sold ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They are moneys received from the public by the sale of documents and books.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I observe that this clause provides that the superintendent of stationery shall, under the direction of the Minister, have charge of the purchase of supplies. Are we to understend from that that the system heretofore practised of asking for tenders is to be done away with ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, it is to be continued. The same clause is in the old Act.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). But I see that it is at the option of the Minister to ask for tenders or not, as he pleases. I think in so important a matter as stationery it would be well to provide that it shall be bought by public competition.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. All stationery is not bought by public tender. We obtain tenders from the principal houses in the country for a part of it, and the same rule will be followed in the future.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Formerly it was the practice to ask for tenders for the supply of printing paper. I understand that the contract has been held by Mr. Barber, of Georgetown, for a number of years.

Mr. BOWELL. That is for parliamentary printing paper.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We have discontinued the system of having public tenders for a number of years. It was found not to work to the advantage of the Government and the public, because we cannot by that way follow the prices of the market. and it is most desirable to buy for a year or six months to supply the amount necessary for the service.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I understand that, and approve of that change in the method of applying for tenders, but, at the same time, the Government still ask for tenders for the supply of paper. In this Bill, it might be provided that all printing paper for the use, either of the House or the Departments, should be purchased in this way by tender, and not leave it to the option of the Minister to purchase it as he pleases.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Young, at the head of the Department, has found that, for some paper, it is better to purchase direct, but for printing paper it has always been the rule to ask for tenders. The system has worked well for all interests concerned.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). That is the reason I want it continued.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is continued.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It would be well to make provision that tenders should invariably be asked for, for printing paper. You would have the competition of all the paper makers in the country, and you would get better paper.

M. INNES. If the supply is given by private tenders now, I can see no objection to introducing the clause suggested by my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAKE. The difficulty about the proposal here is that we are now going to insert a principle or rather an option expressly by Act of Parliament to do that which the Minister says he does not intend to do with regard to the printing paper. The provision is that all purchases shall be made on requisition or in accordance with contracts after tenders have been called for, so that we are expressly giving the option to adopt either plan. My opinion is that, except under exceptional circumstances, the principle of tender should be applied. I do not understand how there may be cases, but it is possible there may be some, in which it is better not to ask for tenders, and I should suppose in a class of goods we use very largely and which can be supplied by numerous houses, it would be easy to make out a schedule and call for tenders. That would be better for the Government and the country.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection, so as to continue the practice followed, to say that in the case of printing paper for the use of Parliament and for the printing of all public documents, purchases should be made in accordance with contracts entered into after tenders have been asked.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). That includes departmental work.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is for Statutes and for the printing of documents for the House; for other work the paper might be required in small quantities.

Mr. BLAKE. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman is good as far as it goes, but it seems to recognise the principle that hereafter, in all other cases, the principle of tendering is inapplicable. I do not see why tenders should not be called for in all cases.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When the power is left in the hands of the head of the stationery department, he will necessarily follow the commercial rule and ask for tenders when the necessity or opportunity presents itself. I have no objection to say that the rule now followed should be applied, and that in the case of printing paper for parliamentary printing it should be purchased by tender. If we say paper for printing, that would include all kinds, and there is printing done on different sorts of paper. "Printing paper" means what is employed in Statutes and reports.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I do not see why foolscap should not be included in the tender. The tender recently accepted by the Printing Committee was for double royal and foolscap also. In fact I cannot see why all the paper and stationery required by the Government should not be bought by tender. It is only right that all the parties who deal in stationery and printing paper should have the opportunity of getting the Government contract. It amounts to a large sum in the year, and we have in this country men who deal largely in stationery as well as men who are large manufacturers of printing paper. I do not see what difficulty there would be in the Government making provision that not only printing paper but all kinds of paper required should be purchased by tender. It would be in the interest of the public, and would do justice to the various manufacturers and dealers. The variety of stationery we get for our use is not very extensive; year after year it is the same. Why not ask for tenders for stationery, as well as for printing paper ? I do not want to cast reflections

upon any officer of the Government, because the stationery department is managed as well as it is possible for any branch of the public service to be managed, but we might, by adopting the principle of tender, save money and possibly save jobbery. And, at the same time, I think it is just as well to put it out of the reach, out of the possibility of any officer of the Government to do wrong in the purchase of goods for the use of this House and of the Departments. Therefore I think the tender system is the right one to have enforced with regard to the purchase not only of printing paper, but of all stationery required for the use of this House and of the Departments, and I cannot see why there can be any difficulty at all in following this practice.

Mr. HESSON. What is the meaning of sub-section 4 of section 7? It says:

"All purchases made under the authority of this section shall be so made upon requisition approved by the Minister or the Queen's Printer, or in accordance with contracts entered into with the like approval after tenders have been called for."

It appears that tenders are absolutely required, if I understand the sub-section.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). That is at the option.

Mr. HESSON. No, it does not leave it optional, I may be wrong, but that is my understanding of it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I think if the member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) will read the section and take the meaning along with him, he will easily understand that it is at the option of the Minister whether he shall ask for tenders or purchase from whom he pleases without tenders. The section reads:

"All purchases made under the authority of this section shall be so made upon requisition approved by the Minister or the Queen's Printer"——

That is one proposition——

or in accordance with contracts entered into with the like approval after tenders have been called for."

That is that the Minister is to have the option of asking for tenders or purchasing as he pleases without tenders.

Mr. TROW. I approve of the suggestions made by the member for Brant (Mr. Somerville). I think it is unquestionably the most desirable plan to adopt the principle of tender, for various reasons. In the first place there are seven established firms in this country manufacturing paper, and consequently there is great competition. I noticed that, in the tenders that were opened here a few days ago—I happened to be a member of the committee—for 6,000 reams of paper, quite a small quantity, there was a difference in the tenders of $3,600, showing conclusively that it is the most desirable plan, where there are such establishments, to offer it to competition.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I can go, I think, as far as the hon. gentleman wants, though not the whole length, because I have no objection at all to continuing the present system. I propose to amend this clause by saying:

"And in the case of printing papers for the printing of the laws of Parliament, departmental reports, and the *Canada Gazette*."

These are the bulk of what is bought, and for these we always ask for tenders. I do not at all want to change the rule; on the contrary, I want to make it more strict than before.

Mr. BLAKE. So far, that is well. I do not object to that change; but I would point out that the effect of that is still more expressly than before to leave it entirely optional with the Minister to adopt or not to adopt the tender principle as to all other purchases which are made under the authority of this section. And what my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville) and my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Trow) are pointing out, and I think with justice, is that no reason has been given to us why the system of tender should not be applied generally, unless, if you please, you can point out that there are some cases in which it is impossible to apply it. In those cases, perhaps, some dispensing power might be given to the Minister or to the Government by Order in Council, if it is impossible to apply the tender principle to them. I do not know why the tender principle should not be applied to all. The hon. gentleman said he was desirous to carry out in this Bill the principle of the English rule, where he finds the object has been to leave the control in the hands of the permanent official charged with it, and not to meddle with him in his business management of the Department. Does he suppose that one of the Cabinet Ministers of the Imperial Government would allow himself to be approached by a manufacturer of stationery, and talked to on the subject of whether he should get the order for the public printing or someone else? The state of things is quite different there from what it is here. We must have regard to the difference of conditions, and it is just in order to secure that same business method of conducting business in this country which obtains at home that we are obliged to put some restrictions here, which is not necessary to put in the Mother Country.

Mr. BOWELL. There are cases, as a moment's reflection will show, where you cannot well apply the tender principle. Take, for instance, the paper used in the printing of the Geological Report. That is of a much superior quality to that which is used in any other report, and to ask for tenders for a sufficient quantity to print that one book alone would scarcely be applicable. The Post Office Guide is another case. These are the only exceptions that suggest themselves to my mind. There should be some little latitude left, I do not say with the Minister, but with the head of the stationery branch, so that, when paper is necessary to print, for instance, the Geological Report, he should have the power to procure it without asking for tenders. My hon. friend the Secretary of State is prepared to go the full length to which the principle of tender is carried at present in regard to paper for parliamentary and departmental printing. These Orders of the Day might not come under the head of parliamentary paper for reports. This paper is advertised for by the printing committee, and is called foolscap. The tendering principle might be extended to all classes of paper of this character.

Mr. BLAKE. As I understand, from what one hon. gentleman has said, there are seven or eight firms concerned in the production of paper. We know what we want from year to year for the Geological Report, and I fail to see the very great difficulty in sending out a circular to these firms with a sample page of the paper required, and asking tenders, and so with regard to the Postal Guide. I do not see that it will cause any expense or any inconvenience. The postage is nothing, and a sheet of note paper with a caligraph will give you the letter in fifteen minutes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I think the suggestion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) meets all the objections which have been offered in regard to the Geological Report and the Postal Guide, and, as far as I can judge of the quality of paper we accepted the other day for the contract for the next year, I think the Geological Report, if printed on that paper, would be quite good enough. The sample that was sent in this year with the tender which has been accepted, is much superior to the paper we have been in the habit of getting. At all events, I think the suggestion made by the member for West Durham does away with any objection in this regard, because it is simply carrying out the plan now adopted to get tenders for the ordinary printing paper. As I understand it, the clerk sends a circular letter to the different manufacturing firms in the country, and he receives tenders without advertising for them at all, and this can be done for a small quantity as well as for a large quantity. I would, at the

same time, urge upon the Minister the justice of not only including all the classes of printing paper required, but also the stationery required for the Departments and for the use of the members of this House. We have large wholesale houses in Toronto, Montreal, Hamilton, London, and other cities of the Dominion, which are perfectly competent to furnish all the stationery required, and I do think it is nothing but right that the purchasing of the stationery should be taken out of the hands of an individual and should be subjected to competition. I think that all the men engaged in this line of business in the country should have an opportunity of tendering for this class of paper, and I am satisfied that, if tenders were solicited, we would get a much better class of stationery, and at a much cheaper rate than is now paid for it. I would, therefore, urge upon the Minister the adoption of the plan of asking for tenders, as they are now asked for printing paper, for all the stationery required by the Government.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman will remember that much of the ordinary stationery required is not manufactured in this country at all. It has been bought from Scotch firms down to this time, almost exclusively. The only effect, therefore, of insisting upon tenders for that class of stationery would be to induce wholesale merchants in Canada to tender for the supply of material which they would get from the same persons from whom we have been getting it in the past. There is a large part of our stationery that cannot be got in the country, but must be imported by wholesale firms. The hon. gentleman says, what we all know, that there has never been a difficulty, so far as the stationery department is concerned, in the supplies furnished to the Departments and to Parliament. That stationery department is exceedingly free from any hint of wrong-doing or favoritism. The paper is obtained from these English manufacturers direct. I agree with what has been said by the member for West Durham that, as regards any special printing paper required, such for instance, as for the Geological Reports or the Postal Guide, which is manufactured in the country, the rewould be no difficulty in sending a circular to the chief manufacturers in Canada—there are only seven or eight of them—and obtaining from them an offer, with samples for the necessary quantity of paper. If we simply declare that all paper required for parliamentary and departmental printing shall be obtained by tender, and leave the officers in charge of the stationery department to do what they have been doing in the past, I think we will have accomplished everything that can be done, otherwise we might so hamper them that, instead of getting things more cheaply, they may cost more. I believe that such things as job lots have been often obtained very cheap, when there was no tender. A merchant has a lot of paper that he is willing to sell, and there have been cases where it has been obtained at a very reasonable price. I know that in an ordinary business establishment they never would think it was desirable to have tenders in all cases; they think it better to be open to obtain job lots, and I think we should leave a similar discretion in the hands of the officers of the stationery department.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I am aware that the seat of Government is often visited by gentlemen engaged in the sale of foolscap and other papers in the wholesale line in this country. From as far west as Hamilton, travellers have come to sell foolscap, and post, and other papers to the Government. There is scarcely a Session passes that I do not see a traveller from a wholesale stationery establishment in Hamilton down here, after orders from the Government for caps, and post, and papers of that class, and he invariably gets an order, at least he has told me so. Well, why not place all the dealers in Canada on the same footing? Why not allow merchants in Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa to compete with each other, and let the quality be specified by the officer of the Government so that the supply may be kept up to the standard, and let the man who will furnish the paper at the cheapest rate get the contract.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think the hon. gentleman's information is not very recent. If this commercial traveller whom he speaks of has obtained orders here, he obtained it from some other quarter than the stationery office proper. What I want to do is to avoid what has been found an inconvenience in France and other places where a stationery office has been established, that is, canvassing for small orders from department to department, and trying to get an order for some small lots. I am sure that for the three or four years that I have been in the Department, these canvassers have had no success in the stationery office proper, not on account of my presence there, but on account of the vigilance of the head of that department. My object is, by the establishment of this Department, to secure that all the stationery will be bought by the superintendent, and this officer will act according to commercial principles, and buy on commercial principles. My hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior, says that a good deal of the stationery we require is not made in this country. A good deal of the note paper, the hand-made paper could not be got here, it is only manufactured on the other side, and in Holyoke, in the States. But very soon such paper will be manufactured in this country. I understand that a firm has applied for a contract at the same prices we pay for paper imported from Scotland from the controller of the stationery, the material to be manufactured in this country. After a couple of firms are able to manufacture that kind of paper, then it would be proper to ask for tenders for such paper. But we must not make the rules too stringent in the Statute, because you would hamper the useful action of the stationery controller. I think the amendment I have put in your hands covers what my hon. friend asked in the beginning. He asks for some more, it is true; his appetite has grown by eating. After I had conceded one thing, he asked for another, and I conceded that. He still asks for another, but I can go no further.

Mr, SOMERVILLE (Brant). Would the Minister inform me what he means by the stationery officer proper? Is that the department over which Mr. Young presides?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Well, it is within my knowledge that travellers have sold lots of paper to Mr. Young within the last two or three years, I think the last year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If they have sold lots, which I doubt very much, they must have sold them, I am sure, at better terms than they could have been procured by tender. My hon. friend is certainly mistaken if he thinks that officer has shown any favoritism.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I did not mean to say that any favors were shown to parties who sold this paper; I was merely reaffirming my statement as to sales being made there of paper. There is one other matter I wish to refer to. I think good work will be acomplished by this Bill in one way; not only in regard to keeping the printing in the hands of the Government, if they will do so, but it will prevent a good deal of jobbery in connection with the purchase of paper. I have been informed by paper makers who have sold paper to those who have been favored with the printing of immigration pamphlets, that the printers actually were not satisfied with the enormous profits they were receiving over and above the contract prices, but were getting 25 per cent. profit on the paper which they supplied to the Government, and for which the Government had to pay. I hope we are going to have a different state of things, that the printing of the Government is going to be honestly done for the benefit of the country, and in such a manner

as will be a credit to the Minister who presides over the Department. At the same time, I cannot see why all the stationery should not be purchased by tender.

Mr. TROW. I was informed within the last ten days, by two of the managers of leading firms in Ontario, that the paper manufacture had not come to such a state of perfection as yet in this country that makers are able to supply such paper as is required in this House. I am persuaded that the paper could be bought to better advantage in the old country in the meantime; but our manufacturers will be prepared, no doubt, in a year or two, to make paper such as is required for all purposes.

Mr. INNES. Even now there is a class of ordinary foolscap made in this country, and I do not see why that should not be included in the tenders as well as ordinary printing paper.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Let us do one good thing first.

Mr. MILLS. I do not consider any reason has been given by the Minister as to why all the printing paper should not be included. Why should the hon. gentleman specify certain printing paper? What reason is there for mentioning the paper used in the printing of the official *Gazette* or used in this House; that does not apply to all the printing done by the Government. The hon. gentleman told us that we were going to print various documents now in manuscript in the archives, so as to keep the staff employed, that otherwise would have nothing to do for a considerable portion of the year. As the hon. gentleman's motion now stands, the paper used for that purpose would not be obtained by tender. Why does the hon. gentleman undertake to except a large portion of the printing paper?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not do so; I have included all that will be required in large quantities. I have specified them, because those are the objects for which large quantities of printing paper must be bought, and at the same time not restrict or bind the hands of the superintendent of stationery when it is necessary to buy a small lot.

Mr. MILLS. This would not prevent the Government from purchasing small lots. There is nothing to prevent the paper for the Geological Report or for the Postal Guide or for any other special class of printing being purchased after application has been made to the various parties from whom such purchases can be made.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the words "Governor in Council or Minister" in the latter part of the clause be struck out, and the following words be inserted: "and shall form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 8,

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Some explanation is required with respect to this section which applies to the stationery furnished to both Houses of Parliament. At the present time the system is not a good one for the reason that there is great discrimination used between the two Houses. The senators, whom I suppose are a body of superior men, are supplied with a much better quality of stationery than that furnished the members of the House of Commons.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I doubt it. They have tried one year the control of the chief of the stationery branch, but this year they have discontinued that system; of course it was their privilege; they are lords in their House as we are in this, and they adopted another system. They have supplied themselves since, but I think they will find in the end that the present system is not, to say the least of it, so good as the one they had before. I think they will find they have paid a little more for what is not quite so good. The main features of the report of the Joint Committee in England was to leave entirely under the controller of stationery, not only the quantity but the quality of paper supplied, so that it should be uniform in all the Departments and in the House of Commons and Senate, and so that there should be no undue pressure to procure a fancy article, which is sometimes not so good, although it costs a great deal more.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I am glad to hear the explanation of the Minister, and I may now be allowed to say something with regard to the ancient usage of the House of Commons of supplying members with two trunks every year, one filled with stationery, and the other with I do not know what. I think it is an unnecessary expense and might be lopped off altogether. While we are here we are liberally supplied with stationery, and I feel quite certain that there are not half a dozen members of this House who, when they return to their homes, use one fourth of the stationery they are presented with. We get a new knife every year, and a pair of scissors, and every imaginable kind of article, which are of course useful and necessary in their places; we get a lot of note paper and letter paper and we get some envelopes, some of which cannot be used at all, because when they pass through the Post Office they fall to pieces under the postmaster's stamp. I do not wish to say very much against this ancient usage of the House but I only want to say that I am opposed to it, that I think it is unnecessary, that I do not think members or the country are benefited by it, and that it is so much money thrown away.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am afraid the only answer I can give the hon. gentleman is the one which was used by a witty writer, who said he had always a good deal of sympathy with an abuse which was to be reformed, because abuses were generally so well taken care of, they were nursed with such an amount of tenderness in order to establish them permanently, that it was too bad to destroy them. I fear this is the only justification I can give for this old usage. It was begun a long time ago, it has been well taken care of and nursed with a great deal of tenderness; would it not be too bad to remove it all at once?

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I fear I cannot induce the Minister to do away with it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I will do my part.

On the preamble,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is one clause I should like to add to this Bill, and I hope in another Session we shall be able to do it. It is to adopt the American system of having all paper used by Government or Parliament stamped, and to provide that if any person not authorised uses that paper, he shall be liable to a penalty of several hundred dollars. But that may remain for another day.

Committee rose and reported.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be read the third time this day six months. I think, when the Government of which the hon. mover of this Bill is a member, have the opportunity of having the public printing done by tender, and yet so seriously interfere with that business that $150,000 worth of printing is jobbed out in a single year, we cannot expect that a very great improvement will be made by the establishment of a Department of this kind. The hon. gentleman admits that, if such a Department were established, a very large number of people would be required as printers and

in other ways during the Session of Parliament, and during the rest of the year a smaller number would be required, and that, if there is to be anything like permanence in the service, employment must be furnished to these persons by engaging in printing enterprises that are not necessary for the public service and may be of no material advantage to the country. Believing that this measure will largely add to the public expense, and will at the same time diminish the efficiency of the public printing as performed by contract under proper supervision, I move this amendment.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have only to answer the hon. gentleman that I think it is really not right that an impediment should be put in the way of a step in the way of progress and economy, if not in the way of the perfection of a system for obtaining good printing at cheap prices. My hon. friend has stated that during one year $150,000 has been expended in printing outside of the contract. This is not correct; it was for a longer period than one year. There can be no danger of any departmental printing being given out by favoritism until December, 1887, and the parliamentary printing is under the charge of a committee of this House, and it will be for the committee to look after that. With these remarks, I hope the House will not adopt the views of my hon. friend.

Amendment negatived on division, motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

THE DOMINION'S LAND ACT, 1883.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 94) further to amend "The Dominion Lands Act, 1883." He said: I desire to explain that the amendment made by the Senate is one of which I gave notice to this House, and which I supposed had been put in the Bill in committee. I moved it in substitution of clause 9 of the Bill as printed, shortly before you left the Chair, Sir, at six o'clock, and some little discussion occurred in reference to it between the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and myself. Clause 9 is left out of the Bill, but this was not inserted. I should have looked at the Bill before moving the third reading, but did not, and the Bill was read the third time without this clause being in it which, I supposed, had been carried in committee. In the Senate this clause has been inserted, and its provisions will be found in the Votes and Proceedings of 3rd May. They relate to the question of advances to settlers going into the North-West by persons desiring to promote immigration to that country, and provide a means by which a lien can be obtained as security for the advances. I explained the clause when it was before the House, and do not think it is now necessary to repeat the explanation.

Amendments concurred in.

GRANTS OF LAND TO MILITIA FORCE.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved second reading of Bill (No. 142) to make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-West.

Mr. BLAKE. There is some information in reference to this Act which I think the hon. gentleman might fittingly give on this occasion. I am of opinion that, considering the distance at which we are from the place where those are concerned who are principally interested in this legislation, the time has not arrived when we ought to proceed to close the account. Time enough has not really been given to enable us to receive that information which would be necessary in order to present cases; but I shall lay before the hon. gentleman one case which came to me a few days ago, before there was any idea of this Act being brought forward, and which seems to me not irrelevant. Apart from that, I would like the hon. gentleman to say how many persons were entitled, under the existing law, to scrip or grants of land, and then, as to the operation of the existing law, what proportion of persons have taken up land as compared with the proportion of persons who have elected to take the scrip, and how much scrip he estimates will really issue under the existing law with respect to persons who are entitled to it under that law. What is the hon. gentleman's calculation as to the number of persons who will be entitled to benefit under the proposed amendment, in the different classes he gives here from A to F, and what is the amount of scrip which, assuming the same proportions, will be issuable? I would also like to understand whether any account has been kept of these issues, and whether any account is being made of the ultimate charge to the public Treasury, involved in their being taken up for the public lands, with the view of charging them to the sum total of the expenditure occasioned by the suppression of the outbreak. It seems quite clear this is part of the cost of the rebellion, and it seems to me, if the existing law does not suffice for the purpose of a proper account being kept, in order that we may distinguish these scrip issues from the old scrip issues of various characters, such a provision might be well added to the Bill. Inasmuch as he says he has received many representations with reference to the measure itself, no doubt he also received representations from various quarters for relief of this description before he introduced his proposal. Inasmuch as the measure is being put through very rapidly, I would like him to give information as to the classes of persons who have applied to be included in the provisions of the last Session for benefit, whose cases he has not thought fit to recognise. My attention was called some months ago—and I have been unable unfortunately to recover the letter to which I am about to refer—to the cases of certain persons who where engaged in a portion of the transport service on some of the rivers, but were not engaged in action, and who thought they should be included. The particular case to which I refer, which came under my attention the other day, is that of a person by the name of Thomas Healy, of Moose Jaw, who writes me he was a homesteader from 6th January, 1882, that on the 24th June he was in the service of the Government, being engaged in the transport of provisions for the troops to Clarke's Crossing, and unfortunately broke his thigh while engaged on that service. He made application for some relief in respect to this homestead and pre-emption, which he was informed was not capable of being dealt with under the existing regulations, and in respect of which I intended submitting his case to the deputy head for consideration, but it seemed appropriate, under the present proposal, to lay cases of that class before the hon. gentleman now, with the view of ascertaining whether they are to be embraced in the measure now before the House.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I believe that, so far, under the existing law, about 6,000 will be entitled to receive scrip or land warrants, as they may elect. As the hon. gentleman knows, it is for the volunteers to determine if they will take the one or the other. All the volunteers who were engaged in active service, west of Port Arthur, number about 6,000 altogether. The exact proportion who will take land warrants and the exact proportion who will take scrip, it is impossible yet to determine, for the simple reason that we have not received applications from a large number; but so far as we have received them, a very large proportion take scrip. Latterly there has been a greater disposition to take the land warrants, which, I am afraid, has arisen from the popular impression that these land warrants are a negotiable security, just as the scrip is, and I think that a good many people who engaged in the pur-

chasing of scrip have encouraged the volunteers to apply for land warrants, with the idea that they are more valuable and will sell more rapidly. Of course the impression is entirely erroneous, and I have taken every means possible, short of advertising in the papers, of informing people who bought land warrants in that way that they will really be valueless in their hands, inasmuch as they are only valuable to the volunteer himself or a duly appointed substitute, who must go on the land. I account for the fact that a larger number latterly have been electing to take land warrants from this circumstance, that the warrant or scrip brokers have been impressing on the volunteers the importance of taking land warrants and selling them. They give them a larger sum for the land warrant. I have heard of land warrants, which entitled a man to 320 acres of land, being sold as high as $75. They are really not worth $75, excepting to the volunteer himself or the substitute who may take them. The next question the hon. gentleman asked was as to the number of persons who, under these clauses would probably come in. It is not very easy to state the precise number, but from the information I have, under the first clause, that is the irregular forces other than home guards, I do not think more than about 100 persons will come under that clause. Those for whom this is chiefly intended, and whose case chiefly prompted it were the volunteers of Prince Albert, who were, as hon. gentlemen know, the first to go out and meet the enemy at Duck Lake, and who met so disastrous a reception at the hands of the Crees and half-breeds. There were scouts, I believe, attached to every column, and there will be probably from forty to fifty of those entitled to the advantages of this law. The master and crew of the vessel *Northcote* I do not think will number more than ten or twelve, and I do not think there was any other vessel engaged in action. Then there will possibly be about thirty of the medical staff. I can give no exact information as to the nurses and dressers, because they are to be recommended for specially meritorious conduct by the Major General. They cannot amount to many. These are all who are included in this list.

Mr. BLAKE. No; there is another lot.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, there were those in the regular forces, such as the military schools and the artillery. The reason for putting these in arose from a communication which I had from a member of one of the batteries, who said he was very anxious to go there and become a farmer as soon as his term of service was up, but he could not comply with the law requiring him to make an entry before the 1st August because his term of service would not be up at that time, and therefore we have given to these persons, for themselves but not for the purpose of naming substitutes, the power to enter upon lands within six months, I think after the term of service in these regular corps has expired.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has omitted sub-division *f* under section one.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think there are only two or three of those who were injured on their way or were invalided and had to return before action took place. There is one very remarkable case of a young man who was accidentally shot. As to the others to whom I was alluding, it is difficult to say how many, but I do not think there will be more than a dozen of those men who will take advantage of it, though it is to be hoped, for their own sakes, that more of them will take advantage of it and go into the North-West and become homesteaders. The last clause does not increase the number at all. The homesteaders included in the last clause are already volunteers entitled under the present law to their scrip, and this allows them to apply it on the farms where they were settled at the time of the outbreak. I think that answers the questions the hon. gentleman has asked. Then, as to the others who may have applied. The hon. gentleman has referred to a Mr. Healy who wrote to him from Moose Jaw, and who was a teamster and was injured as such. I have had one or two letters I think, but I had several applications made verbally from teamsters who thought they should be included in the advantages of this scrip. My own impression was that they should not be so included. They were persons who hired themselves and their teams, who were exceedingly well paid, and who, while they performed good service undoubtedly as teamsters, did not perform that kind of service which should entitle them to these special advantages. I have, however, done this for them. I have recognised the time they have been employed in connection with the service of the country as teamsters as if it had been spent upon their homesteads. As hon. gentlemen know, the volunteers who are homesteaders in the North-West are entitled to six months' consideration in view of the fact that they were off at the front. I have given practically the same consideration to the teamsters, those who went off early in the spring when they were about putting in their crops. I have assumed, for the purposes of their homestead duties, that that time was spent upon their land. To that extent a concession has been given to them as recognition of their services. As to the point the hon. gentleman raises, and it is a very important one, as to what account is being kept of the applications for this scrip, I may say that the Department takes this scrip as payment for any debt due for lands which any person may owe to the Crown. In the returns I receive each month of the financial operations of the Department, the payments made in scrip are all given. I cannot say at the moment whether a distinction is made between this military scrip which was issued in consequence of the outbreak, and the half-breed scrip, a very large quantity of which is out now, but the suggestion is one which, I can assure the hon. gentleman, I will take care to have arranged so as to be able to state to Parliament exactly, when the returns are brought down, what has been the amount received by the Department from this military scrip, and therefore what extra charge upon the country is the result of the rebellion from the issue of this scrip. That may be stated next Session.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I believe the House and the country will concur in the proposition to recognise the services of those who were members of the North-West field forces, and will besides sanction the proposition of the Minister to extend still further than was done last Session the desire to reward those who then served by grants of lands. And, as to the general proposition involved in the measure, I do not think there will be any exception taken. But I find that, while the Minister has made an exception against those who were teamsters during that rebellion, he has embraced another class and brought within the operations of the Act a class that, from circumstances that have been recently submitted to the House, do not appear to me to be entitled to the same consideration as those whose cases he has refused to consider. The Minister has just dealt with the case of the teamsters, and has told us what was perfectly true, that there were those who were very well paid for the services they rendered, but there were many cases in which those teamsters did more than render ordinary transport service, that they really subjected themselves to all the perils that were incident to a state of war, and that in one particular instance they were captured by the Indians who were in armed rebellion at the time, and that their capture under those circumstances was largely due to the fact that the transport service was not accompanied by that military force that is usual under such circumstances. Consequently the teamsters, in the majority of cases, were taking a considerable amount of risk in the journeys they were making as escorts, and subjected themselves to some of the perils incident to a state of war. In the case of those captured by Poundmaker, they certainly

underwent privations much the same as those of the military forces, and it seems to me are equally deserving as those mentioned in sub-section *c* of the Bill. Now, in referring to a recent report submitted to this House by acting Major Smith, commanding C Company of the Infantry School corps, I find this language used with reference to those who are embraced in this section :

"As we passed Batoche the fire was specially heavy and I heard a crash as if a portion of the upper deck had been carried away. About two miles below that place the rebel fire slackened, and I ordered the 'cease fire' and shortly afterwards we came to anchor. I then learned that the smoke stacks and the steam whistle had been swept down by the ferry cable, and were lying on the deck ; that the master and the pilot, who had both been in the wheel house, were in a state of great trepidation ; and that Mr. Pringle of the medical staff, and Vimen, a transport officer's assistant, had been wounded. Finding that we were so far down the river, I asked the master why he had not followed his instructions. When he explained that owing to the heavy fire, he could not manage the boat, and got on the cable before he was aware of it. I then directed him to go up stream again, but he objected that that was impossible, as the smoke stack being gone, there was danger of setting fire to the vessel and, besides, that it was unsafe for him to go into the pilot house. Steps were at once taken to repair the damage and two short stacks, made from one, were got into place. That being done, the next difficulty was the pilot house. The steersman positively refused to go into it. We then persuaded him to set his carpenter at it—material was carried up and the carpenter was on the house at work, when several shots came from the west shore, one of which hit him in the ankle and embedded itself in the foot, and we found that some of the enemy had crept along the west side of the river, and, got under cover of the bank, fired on every man who showed himself on board. This put an end to the work, for, as the master told me, it was impossible again to induce his crew to come on deck * * * Our weakness lay in the fact that the master, pilot and engineer were alien, and that the crew were civil employees, and not enlisted men."

Now here is a proposition to grant concessions, as the result of the operations in the North-West, to men who were thus spoken of by the officer commanding the forces on board the *Northcote* at Batoche, while others engaged in the suppression of the rebellion, and who did their work more satisfactorily, certainly undergoing equal or greater privations and danger, are entirely forgotten. I think if the line has been drawn anywhere it ought to embrace such I have mentioned, particularly those who were captured by Poundmaker, rather than those who were spoken of so depreciatingly in the report of the military commandant on that occasion. I think, besides, that these exceptional circumstances—and the fact that such large convoys of provisions were forwarded over such a length of country, where war existed, and without any military escort—offers a reason for considering the case of those who underwent exceptional hardships on that occasion.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot agree with the view expressed by the hon. gentleman. The teamsters certainly rendered very good service, but it must be remembered that they undertook to carry out a certain contract and were remarkably well paid for the services they rendered. The hon. gentleman, I think, is somewhat mistaken in stating that the teamsters were exposed to greater danger than they would have been exposed from the fact that they belonged to the escort. In almost every case where the military commandant considered it necessary to send out a military escort, the teamsters were sufficiently armed to protect themselves against any attack which might be made upon them. In the case of the capture of the teamsters by Poundmaker, most of these teamsters were armed, and they were not subject to any greater hardship than most of the men who were engaged in that campaign had to encounter. Now in reference to the crew of the *Northcote*, the hon. gentleman will see that this Act is really an empowering Act for the purpose of giving land grants to men who were engaged upon that special service. During the whole of the campaign it will be remembered that the *Northcote* had to encounter one of the most dangerous experiences of the campaign, when it was attacked while transporting troops from one point to another, and was exposed to severe fire.

Every man composing that crew may not be entitled to equal consideration, but there were men on that vessel who certainly distinguished themselves by their pluck and the manner in which they performed their duty. Under this Act it will be permissible for the Government to recognise the services which have been rendered by these men. If there are men in that crew who did not do their duty, as the hon. gentleman seems to say—

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It is the report made to the Department that says so.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Well, the hon. gentleman has taken up that side of the question. He states that some of these men are not deserving of the consideration which, under this Act, they might be expected to receive at the hands of the Government. That may be, but in any case the Government will exercise discretion in these individual cases. In other cases the hon gentleman will admit that many members of the crew of the *Northcote* showed an amount of courage and pluck which certainly deserves recognition at the hands of the Government.

Mr. WATSON. I heartily approve of the proposed grants to the parties specified in this Bill, but I would like to have seen the Minister go a little further. I believe the teamsters are entitled to more consideration than they have received. In a great many instances those teamsters rendered valuable services on the field of battle, services which, I think, ought to be recognised. Of course, I suppose, as a rule, they were paid for the services they undertook to render. But, in some instances, they were at the front during battle, and exposed to danger, and in many instances they rendered assistance to the wounded volunteers and carried them to the hospitals. In cases like that, where they exposed themselves, they ought to be rewarded in some substantial manner. I believe, in some instances, they were in danger of being cut off altogether. Ten teams went together and those ten men were supposed to defend themselves and the supplies. In some instances they were exposed to great danger and some of them were spoken of as showing great bravery in bringing forward ammunition while fighting was going on. In special cases where the teamsters rendered such service they should be dealt with liberally. Of course, they received their pay, but they did work not covered by it. While the Minister is dealing with the nurses, teamsters who assisted wounded volunteers and rendered other valuable service should be rewarded. I am also glad to see provision made on behalf of the volunteers of Manitoba, volunteers who at the time they went into active service were entitled to pre-emptions. While the Bill was under discussion last year I recommended to the Government the advisability of granting to the volunteers who resided in Manitoba the right to locate their warrant on their pre-emption. I regret that was not done at that time, as the First Minister stated in the most positive terms it could not be done. But the Government have changed their minds on this question, and I regret that they refused to take action last year, inasmuch as some of the volunteers who went to the front and had homesteads and pre-emption selected scrip for $80 instead of waiting to take advantage of locating their land grant warrant on their pre-emption. I suppose about half the persons who would have been benefited by this provision if it had been put in force last year, will not receive benefits. I am glad however that this policy has been adopted, for a number will be benefited, although as I have said a great many of those who would have been benefited, if my suggestion had been adopted last year, will not receive benefits.

Mr. WELDON. When the resolutions were before the House I ventured to call attention to the case of the volunteers who were called out and who did not go west of Port

Arthur. I do not think a very large number were in that position; but they were called out for active service and they deserve as much consideration as those who were actually engaged at the front. The principle of the Bill last year did not entirely apply to those who were engaged in action but also to those who went to Port Arthur, and they were entitled to the grant. I cannot see on what principle men engaged on active service but who had not the good fortune to take an active part in the campaign should be excluded, because I take the principle of the Bill to be to reward those men who left their homes and gave up their occupations in order to defend the country. The particular battalion to which I have reference is the battalion from New Brunswick. Immediately after the hostilities commenced a general order was issued, in April 1885, granting a field allowance for thirty-one, sixty-one and ninety-one days to those volunteers to enable them to fit themselves out for a campaign. In regard to the New Brunswick battalion, they were allowed only fifteen days' allowance while the Bruce battalion, the 32nd, and the 1st Prince of Wales got thirty-one days' allowance. I hope the hon. gentleman will see to it that those forming the provisional battalion will receive the same allowance as those battalions which were called out in the same general order. The New Brunswick volunteers willingly responded to the call and came out at very great inconvenience and sacrifice, and the principle which applies to battalions west of Port Arthur should be applied to those battalions that went under canvas, to be ready at a moment's notice to march to any part of the Dominion. With respect to the New Brunswick battalion, I may say that there were companies from St. John, Fredericton, Woodstock, Sussex and other points, and I am not sure but there was a company from Prince Edward Island. Those men suffered very great inconvenience. The officers spent a large amount of money for the purpose of getting nice kits for the campaign. They expended as much as if they had been going west of Port Arthur or west of Winnipeg. But there was another inconvenience. They were obliged to make great sacrifices with respect to leaving their employment, which arrangement extended over a long period of time, because it was to be supposed that they were called out for some months. So a great sacrifice was made by them for which they have received no compensation. Many of the young men had life insurance policies, and they were obliged to pay an extra premium for the purpose of continuing the policies for the benefit of their families or those dependent on them. All those expenses were incurred to as large an extent as if the battalion had been called to proceed to Callander or Port Arthur. Therefore the principle we are adopting should apply to those battalions, and I hope the Minister of Militia will see that this is done, and there cannot be a very large number of them. It will be simply recouping them a large expenditure incurred by them as volunteers for the benefit of the country. They have not the honor, in consequence of not having been in action, of wearing medals on their breasts. I consider that the men who came forward and showed their readiness to go to the front at the call of the Minister and the Government, and take part in suppressing the rebellion, are entitled to as much credit for the spirit of patriotism by which they were actuated. I know that some were at a great deal of extra expense for their kits, their life insurance, and also because in many cases when they left their employment they found their places filled when they returned. Considering the sacrifices they made and the remuneration allowed them, I think they are fairly entitled to this consideration and that the country generally would heartily approve of the Government extending the same consideration to them as to those who went west of Port Arthur.

Mr. McNEILL. I entirely concur in the remarks made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon). Speaking of the battalion in my own county, I know that many of the members of that battalion lost very seriously by reason of their being obliged to give up their occupations. When they went back to their homes they found in many cases that their places were filled, and they were thrown out of employment for weeks and months. I do not wish to elaborate the subject, as I took occasion to make some remarks upon it a few days ago, but I would earnestly impress on the Minister of Militia to reconsider this matter if he possibly can, and to consider that those men have endured all the losses which were sustained by those who went west of Port Arthur.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I certainly agree with the remarks of the hon. member for St. John and the hon. member for North Bruce. Everyone knows that when a battalion is called out, the officers and men are put to a great deal of loss when they are called out from their homes; and, while it may be perfectly proper that a distinction is drawn between those who went out on actual service, and those who remained at home, yet I think that every officer and man who left his home for actual service, is entitled to some consideration. In the case of a regiment which is placed under canvas for eight or ten days, the men and officers are put to precisely the same loss—in fact to a greater loss proportionately—than if they were for three or four months on active service; because, in the latter case, they got their pay, which goes for something in the case of the men, and still more so with regard to the officers. For that reason, I think that men who are called out for active service, and compelled to make the necessary arrangements, shall receive the same consideration *pro rata* as those who went to Port Arthur, and I think their case is deserving of consideration at the hands of the Minister of Militia.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Department followed exactly the rule that the hon. gentleman recognised should be followed in cases such as occurred during the disturbances in the North-West. We did give consideration *pro rata* to the men who were called out, and who were under canvas for a certain number of days, as in the case of the battalion from New Brunswick who received fifteen days field allowance, because they were that time under canvas. The Bruce battalion, and others which were called out, were treated in the same way. Of course, from the standpoint of a soldier, it was the misfortune of those battalions that they did not go to the front. But the hon. gentleman must remember that under the responsibility of the Department a number of battalions were called out and put under orders to keep themselves in readiness in case of their services being required in the North-West. All those battalions displayed that zeal which the hon. gentleman has spoken of, and which I am so ready to acknowledge on every possible occasion. They set aside their business and gave up their ordinary avocations for the purpose of preparing themselves, in case they should be called out, to fight the battles of the country, and I believe that they feel as soldiers that if they had been sent to the front with their comrades they would have fought the battles as others did, and would have received the same reward as those who went to the front. The same thing occurs in every country. In case of a war being declared a certain number of regiments are sent to the front. Others are kept in readiness, and if the war terminates before the reserve can be called out to support those who are sent to the front, the medals are given to those who fought the battles, and those who would have been as willing as others to go, not having gone to the front, do not receive that reward which the others receive. I believe the volunteers will recognise that in every case when they were called out they were treated with that consideration that should be afforded to them. But the line had to be drawn somewhere, and the line was drawn at the regiments who went west of Port Arthur, and most of those whose opinions I have con-

sulted upon matters of this kind were ready to admit that it was impossible to treat battalions which were called out early to be in readiness the same as those who went through the hardships of the trip north of Lake Superior and the subsequent campaign. The St. John battalion, which was mentioned by my hon. friend from that city, received fifteen days of field allowance simply because they were fifteen days under canvas. They could not expect more, and they cannot ask more than what as soldiers they were entitled to.

Mr. GAULT. I know that every regiment in Montreal was prepared to turn out, and they made great sacrifices to prepare themselves for the campaign. The Prince of Wales' regiment particularly were called out and were under canvas for several days, and I know that some of the men lost their situations and that the officers made great sacrifices. If the Minister wants a precedent, I might mention the fact that the 39th regiment left England for the Crimea, and on the way stopped at Malta, and still they received the medals the same as those who went to the Crimea. I think the men who were called out are fairly entitled to consideration.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. WELDON. These men of the New Brunswick battalion, whom the hon. gentleman mentions as having received fifteen days' field allowance, would receive, I suppose, about $15 in some cases and a less sum in others. Volunteers stand in a very different position from soldiers. We all know that they have to make great sacrifices on occasions of this kind, and it seems to me that when we are recouping those men who have given their services in the defence of the country, we should include all. Though some of the earlier battalions who went around Lake Superior early suffered some hardships, to the later battalions it was more like a pleasure trip. Some of the regiments along the line, who never heard a shot fired, are to get this scrip, while their most unfortunate fellow-soldiers who were not to the west of Port Arthur, and who are perhaps less able to recoup themselves, are to be deprived of it. I think the number of men interested is not very large, and I should like to add a section including them.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I desire again to urge upon the Minister the claims of the particular class to whom I alluded before. While there may be some ground for refusing to deal in a general way with the teamsters engaged in the transport service, there are exceptional reasons why those who were captured by Poundmaker should receive some consideration. The Minister says that the teamsters were well paid, and that they took those risks. I do not understand that they took the war risks. When there is danger of those engaged in the transport service being captured, it is the duty of the military authorities to send a military escort with them for protection. In this case there was no escort at all. The men in charge of the supplies were furnished with arms by the military authorities in the North-West, and that gave them a *quasi* military postion, and implied that they were entitled to some such consideration as was given to others who were no more a part of the enrolled force than they were—for example, the hospital attendants.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They were enrolled.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I can find no trace of their enrolment in the documents. But the Bill includes some forces who were not enrolled, and who did not occupy a military position. It is true, as the Minister says, that somebody got well paid for the transport service, but it has been alleged that the money did not in every instance reach the men who performed the service. It is a circumstance that ought to be considered in this case, that the men who really performed the transport service—those who were captured by Poundmaker—were not those who received $10 a day; they were employed at from $5 to $8 a day, and the men who had the contract with the Government secured the difference. These men did undertake a hazardous service, and they are entitled to equal consideration with some who are embraced in this Bill. I sympathise with the remarks made by the hon. member for Muskoka. Under all the circumstances, it ought to be the effort of the Department to encourage in every possible way the active militia force, and anyone who has had any connection with that force knows that the pay provided is very inadequate for the service performed. I would have been very glad if the Department had seen its way to embrace in the Bill the members of the force who were called out for active service but who were not sent west of Port Arthur. I realise that this would largely increase the burdens of the country; but if we have to depend on these men in the future, we must reward them liberally for the services they have rendered in the past. Now, those in command of the forces in the North-West asked the men in whose interest I am speaking to assume the responsibility of protecting themselves while conveying the supplies through a country where there were hostile and armed forces. In this case they were unfortunately unable to protect themselves, and were captured and subjected to great privations. Under these circumstances, I think they are as much entitled to consideration as those who had no recognised enrolment in the militia force of the country.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Would the hon. Minister of Militia object to this amendment? I move that sub-section *f* be amended by adding after the words "west of Port Arthur" the words "or was actually called out and placed under canvas."

The CHAIRMAN. That is out of order.

Mr. WELDON. I would move that the words after "west of Port Arthur" be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN. Out of order. Because it would increase the cost to the public.

Mr. WELDON. I regret the Government have not shown more generosity. The Montreal battalion lost thirty days' field allowance, and the Bruce and Southampton battalions received full field allowance. The Montreal battalion never left Montreal at all. The New Brunswick battalion were under canvas and some of the men had to drive 100 or 150 miles to join it, and they did not get the allowance the others got.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Every battalion will be placed on a footing of equality. I am not prepared to say exactly whether there is any difference or not, but every battalion will be placed on equal footing. Those who were merely called out to hold themselves in readiness will be all treated the same.

Mr. WATSON. There was a company organised and got ready for action at Shoal Lake, who have not yet received even their pay for the time they were in camp drilling. They were in the same position as the company ordered out at Birtle, but unfortunately they were not gazetted as the Birtle company was, and the men have not been paid even their time. The company was composed of a very fine body of men comprising a number of discharged mounted policemen. I hope the Minister will look into the matter and see this company gets paid.

Mr. INNES. I presume the first sub-section includes those who volunteered into the mounted police and were engaged in the fight at Duck Lake.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes.

On section 2,

Mr. WATSON. I understand this entitles volunteers who went to the front, the time they enlisted, and who hold pre-emption and homestead to receive pre-emption free.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is the intention. But I can hardly think the hon. gentleman is accurate in saying that a large number of the volunteers have not been able to take advantage of this clause. Early in October last, I announced in Winnipeg that this Bill was going to be brought down, and at Birtle I made the same statement as I did all through the North-West, and that was before any of the volunteers had their certificates at all, so that every one must have known of this.

Mr. WATSON. I might just say that the Government informed the House very decidedly a year ago, when the subject was under discussion, that they would not take the policy they have now adopted. A great number of the volunteers paid more attention to that statement than they did to the statement of the Minister of the Interior in the North-West, because they were then interested in looking to see what the Government would give them. I know a number of instances where the volunteers, who hold homesteads and pre-emption, selected $80 scrip instead of the right to take land, who would have rather accepted the privilege now granted them. I suggested last year the following amendment:—

"Any member of the said enrolled militia who has located a homestead and pre-emption shall, in lieu of the grant hereinbefore mentioned, be entitled to get his pre-emption free."

To which the First Minister replied:

"This provision is impossible. It would be a cause of discontent among all the volunteers, except a few corps in Manitoba The hon. gentleman says it is only 160 acres, but it is more than that, because the pre-emptions are $2 an acre, and the Manitoba volunteers would get $320 instead of $80, as the others get."

All through the First Minister stated it was impossible this privilege could be granted; but now the Minister of the Interior practically brings down a measure granting it. I regret that when a practical suggestion is made, it is not weighed and given due consideration, even when made by the members of the Opposition.

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

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. McLELAN. In moving that you leave the Chair and the House again resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means, I desire to explain some of the amendments which I propose to submit to the committee. It has been found by the Customs that in some respects the present tariff does not work easily, and some alterations are desirable in the general interest of the trade and of the country. I propose to submit to the committee a resolution changing the duty upon oil cloth in the piece, cut or shaped, oiled, enamelled, stamped, painted or printed, India rubbered, to five cents per square yard and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*. This is making it in part specific to prevent under valuations, of which the Customs complain. Floor oil cloth remains the same as at present, 30 per cent. There are several manufacturers of strawboard in the country, taking the farmers' straw and converting it into board, and great variations and differences have been shown in the prices at which that has been valued by importers. It is proposed to place a specific duty upon that of 40 cents per 100 lbs. The duty has been 20 per cent., and this is about the same as the average value at which it is imported, and what we consider the proper value of the article, not increasing the duty in any way. A good deal of difficulty has arisen in the Customs in regard to earthenware and stoneware by the invoicing of seconds and thirds, and we propose that demijohns or jugs, churns and crocks shall pay a specific duty of 2 cents per gallon of holding capacity. Rubber belting, hose, packing, mats and matting, 5 cents per lb., and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*. In carriage hardware, differences of opinion have arisen between the importers and the Customs house respecting the mode of invoicing. Parts of carriages are charged 35 per cent., and we propose to put carriage hardware at the same price. In perfumed and toilet soap, a good deal of friction has arisen between the Customs and the importers, and we propose to change the duty to 10 cents a lb., and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*. Union collar cloth paper, in rolls or sheets, not glossed or finished, 5 per cent. Union collar cloth paper, glossed or finished, in rolls or sheets, 20 per cent. Paper hangings or wall paper, in rolls, costing 8 cents or under per roll of eight yards, 2 cents per roll. In felt we have three or four different rates charged, to the glove manufacturers, the shoe manufacturers, the musical instrument manufacturer, all different prices, ranging from 10 per cent. to 22½ per cent., and it is proposed to make one uniform rate of 17½ per cent. Stereotypes and electrotypes and bases for the same, made wholly or in part of type metal, 5 cents a pound. In scythes it is found there is a very wide difference in the invoice value, ranging from $5 to $10, and it is believed that a good deal of undervaluation has taken place. It is proposed that there shall be a specific duty of $2.40 per dozen. Wire, covered with cotton, linen, silk or other material, 25 per cent. Stove bolts and nuts, and all bolts and rivets of one-quarter inch diameter and less, 35 per cent., the same as wood screws. They are a very similar manufacture to wood screws, with the addition of nuts. Difficulties have arisen in the importation of handkerchiefs. Handkerchiefs of cotton or linen have been charged at different rates. Some, on account of being printed, have been charged 27½ and others 20 per cent. It is proposed to name them and put them all at 25 per cent. Then, it is proposed that the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine, butterine and all such substitutes for butter, be prohibited under a penalty of not less than $200, nor more than $400 for each offence, and the forfeiture of such goods, and of all packages in which they may be contained, and of all articles, implements, machinery and appliances used in and about the manufacture or preparation of such articles. Then we propose to repeal item 353, in respect to colors, except in regard to ultramarine blue, and we want to change the item in relation to jute cloth, which is now named at a width of 42 inches, and to make the width 40 inches, as being more convenient for bag makers. Nail plate, iron or steel, is now imported at different rates of duty, one at $3 a ton and 10 per cent., and the other at 12½ per cent. We propose to make all of 16 gauge and thicker, uniform at 25 per cent. *ad valorem* Then we propose that items 37, 38 and 39 be referred back to Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of striking out the words "or fraction of a degree" in item 37, and the word "13" in items 37, 38 and 39, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "14"; also to strike out the proviso next after item 40, and substitute the following:—

Provided that when any cargo of sugar imported for refining purposes is found to grade in part above No. 14 Dutch standard in color, such part, to the extent of not exceeding 15 per cent. of the whole cargo, may be admitted to entry by polariscopic test."

Then, we propose to amend the schedule of export duties by increasing the duties on the following articles: Shingle bolts, $1.50 per cord of 128 cubic feet; spruce logs, $2 per thousand feet, board measure; pine logs, $3 per thousand feet, board measure; and we propose to provide that the powers vested in the Governor in Council to repeal certain

export duties and certain import duties shall be extended to the repeal of these export duties on sawlogs if it should be found advisable and necessary. This is mainly what we propose to submit to the committee, as well as to make certain alterations and additions to the items that have been referred back, which I need not detain the House to refer to until we get into committee.

TIMBER LIMITS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CAMERON (West Huron). Before you leave the Chair, I desire to call attention to some charges that have been made by me against the Government. At this late period of the Session, I shall not unnecessarily trespass upon the time of the House, but as the correctness of those charges has been challenged, I do not intend that this House shall prorogue without submitting to the House and country the evidence upon which I base my charges. I shall deal briefly with the few cases, where the correctness of my allegations has been challenged and if, when the proof is submitted, the judgment of the people of this country will not sustain me, I shall cheerfully bow to their decision. I charged that the Government had parcelled out, among their political friends a large portion of the public resources of this Dominion, in some four or five different instances, and in only four or five different instances these charges have been contradicted. The member for West Hastings (Mr. Robertson) on the 11th March of the present year, in introducing a Bill with respect to burglars, and while referring to some burglars that had been tried in his own town, and the punishment they ought to receive, made use of the following language :—

"I suppose they did not aspire any higher. They were taken to the police station, and their names were placed upon the list; not the list which has given so much anxiety to the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron). I was going to say—but I do not see him in his place—that I do not know what sort of constituency sent him to the House, but as these were young men and of a style unknown to us, they did not come from the fifty square miles of timber limits which he has referred to in his flaming declamations in the west as received by me from the Government, and perhaps they might have come from his constituency"

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not deal with the recipients of the Government's favors as burglars; I did not propose to treat them as burglars, I did not propose to punish them as burglars, I did not propose, as the hon. gentleman did, that they should be whipped, so the hon. gentleman need not be alarmed upon that score. The charge I made was against the Administration, with respect to the disposal of the timber limits and other public resources of the country among their followers, and as regards himself the hon. gentleman has seen fit to question the statements I made. But on reference to the Sessional Papers of 1884, No. 5[illegible], page 11, I find the following:—

"A. Robertson, Belleville, Ont., 15th August, 1884, Columbia River, B. C., fifty square miles."

Now, so far as this paper speaks at all, it tells but one story, and that is that the hon. member for West Hastings applied for a timber limit of fifty square miles upon the Columbia River. If the Sessional Papers do not speak the truth, the fault is not mine. Now I have a word or two to say to the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). That hon. member, in discussing what took place out of Parliament, made use of the following language:—

"I have no desire to prolong this debate, but in justice to myself, in justice to the hon. members who sit on this side, with whom I associate, and in justice to my constituents, I feel it to be my duty to repudiate the slander made against me at a place called Wingham, in Ontario, by a person named M. C. Cameron, in a speech which he delivered there, and which was reported in the *Globe* of 12th January last. It reads as follows:—

'George Taylor represents in the Conservative interest South Leeds. He, too, cast longing eyes on the vast coal and timber lands of the North-West. He accordingly applied to this Government, who distributed with no sparing hand the public estate among their followers, for both coal lands and timber limits. This did not exactly gratify the ambitious views of Mr. Taylor. He lives in Gananoque, a small town and with a limited population. In the Conservative interest he persuaded the Government to build, at the public expense, costly public buildings in this country village. This is not all. Last Session Parliament voted a sum of $20,000 to dam the Rideau Canal in order to supply water to the mills and factories in Gananoque in which Mr. Taylor and his constituents are deeply interested. George Taylor is the bond slave of Sir John, and dare not vote against the Government."

George Taylor, commenting on the foregoing, said:

"In answer to which I can only say that I have no interest in any timber limits or coal lands or grazing lands in either Manitoba or the North-West Territories, that I never applied for either coal lands or timber limits or grazing lands in the North-West Territory or Manitoba, and that I have no interest, individually, or has associated with any other party who has any interest in said lands or limits. This fellow Cameron, who made that statement, knew when he made it that it was a malicious falsehood I say that that statement was manufactured out of the whole cloth I say that there was no foundation for it, and I expect this fellow Cameron is the paid agent of the Grit party to go round the country abusing—what he cannot call himself—a gentleman.

Now, I say at once that neither the tone in which the denial was made, nor the language in which it was couched, merited at my hands the courtesy of a reply, but as I am now dealing with other members whose denials were equally explicit, although more parliamentary, I have a word or two to say to Mr. George Taylor. Now, bear in mind, I did not charge Mr. Taylor with having obtained either timber limits, coal mines, or grazing leases. My charge was against the Government for having parcelled out among their followers, in and out of Parliament, a large portion of the public domain. The following correspondence between Mr. Taylor and the Government, will show how far my charges were based upon fact :—

"GANANOQUE, 3rd October, 1882.

"To the Hon. the Minister of the Interior,
"Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—A friend of mine wishes me to enquire on what terms the Department will grant a timber limit in the North-West Territories, in townships supposed to be 39, 40 and 41, in ranges 18, 19 and 20 west, at a place called Passenger Hill. He is anxious to secure a limit. Your early reply will much oblige.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
(Signed) "GEO. TAYLOR."

The answer of the Department was as follows:—

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
"OTTAWA, 10th October, 1882.

"SIR,—I have the honor, by direction of the Minister, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3rd inst., enquiring on what terms the Government will grant you a timber limit in the North-West Territories, in townships 39, 40 and 41, in ranges 18, 19 and 20 west, of the second meridian; and in reply herewith enclose a copy of the timber regulation.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
(Signed). "A. RUSSELL,
"*For Surveyor General.*

"GEORGE TAYLOR, Esq.,
"Gananoque, Ont."

Now, Sir, the application in this case covered timber in nine townships, it purports to be made for a friend whose name is not given, whether the friend was Mr. Taylor or somebody else, I do not know, but the reply is peculiar in its way. The reply is not that "your friend" can get a limit, but the terms are that the Government will grant you, George Taylor, to whom the letter is addressed a timber limit. Now, Sir, I say that is ample justification for the statement I made. I have a word or two to say to another hon. member, who denied the charges I made. In a speech delivered by me at Wingham, I think in the month of January last, I charged that Mr. Peter White, of North Renfrew, was a director of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway, and while such director this road was bonused by this Administration to the extext of $272,000. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) repeated that charge on the floor of Parliament, and stated further that the hon. member for North Renfrew was also a stockholder in the Ontario Pacific Railway and in the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway. On the 6th May, 1886, the hon. member for North Renfrew made use of the following language in the House, in replying to what my hon. friend from the west riding stated:—

"Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say a word with reference to a statement made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) in the discussion of the motion of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). That hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) is reported in *Hansard* to have said:

"'I find, Sir, that the Ontario and Pacific Railway, running through Cornwall to Perth, has been bonused to the extent of $262,400, and that the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) and the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) are stockholders in that company.'"

Then the hon. gentleman said again:

"I find, Sir, that in 1885 this Parliament granted to the Ottawa, Waddington and Northern Transportation Railway $166,000, and that the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr White), the hon. members for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé and Mr. Mackintosh) are stockholders in the company."

In reply to this charge, Mr. White said:—

"I simply wish to say, in reference to those statements, that I am not now, and never have been, a stockholder in either of those companise. I regret I was temporarily absent when these statements were made, and was consequently unable to deny them then, but I take this, the first opportunity which presents itself, to make the denial."

The words "Northern Transportation" is a misprint for the New York road. The hon. gentleman denied that he was a stockholder in the Ontario Pacific Railway. I do not know what he meant by a stockholder in the railway. But I find the Ontario Pacific Railway was incorporated on 17th May, 1882, and among the incorporators is the name of Peter White, member for North Renfrew. The hon. gentleman also denied that he ever was a shareholder in the Ottawa, Waddington and New York Railway. According to the Statutes that company was incorporated on 17th May, 1882, and among the charter members of the company stands the name of Peter White, M.P., North Renfrew. I apprehend that is the same gentleman. I find also in a return submitted to Parliament the following letter from the President of the Pontiac Railway, which I will read to the House:—

"PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY,
"MONTREAL, 18th March, 1885.

"A. P. BRADLEY, Esq.,
"Secretary Department of Railways and Canals, Ottawa.

"SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 14th instant I have to say that the name of the president of the Pontiac Junction Railway is Louis Ruggles Church, the vice-president is William B. McAllister. The other members of the directorate are: Richard White, Peter White, M.P.; W. J. Cook, George C. Boulton, Hector W. McLean, and Hon. J. A. Chapleau. The only other shareholders apart from the directors above named is F. A. Peterson, Q.E. The total amount of the stock held by the individuals is $300,000, $6,000 of which is held by George C. Boulton above named, and the balance is divided as nearly as possible equally among the other eight persons.

"Yours very truly,
(Signed) "L. RUGGLES CHURCH,
"*President P. P. J. R. Co.*"

This letter from the president of the railway, addressed to the Railway Department here, shows that the stock of the company was $300,000, every dollar of which was held by those eight men, except $6,000 held by F. A. Patterson—the balance of stock is held in about equal shares by the other eight stockholders—thus giving each a sum of $36,750. The Secretary of State was a director, and his law partner was president of the company, and Richard White, manager of the Montreal *Gazette*, and brother of the Minister of Interior, was another director. I find that the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Dickinson) called in question the correctness of my statement also. On 10th May the hon. gentleman made use of the following language in explanation of the charge I made against the Government, not in, but out of Parliament—although I am quite prepared to make them in Parliament, as I have made most of them—but in a speech at Wingham, in which the following language was used:—

"Moss Kent Dickinson is the Tory member for Russell. He was first elected in 1884. I find the first thing a Tory representative does is to look out for 'Number One,' and just here I must do Moss Kent the justice of saying that with marvellous success and in a wonderfully short space of time he learned the first and prime duty of a Tory member of Parliament. On the 13th October, 1882, less than four months after his election, he applied for fifty square miles of valuable timber limits, and his son applied for two other limits. Now, gentlemen, you can hardly expect that Moss Kent can vote against the Government who have so generously provided for him and his out of the public domain."

I am prepared to apologise to the member for Russell, because either I or the reporter made a slight error with respect to the dates of the application for limits made by the member for Russell. The dates of the application, instead of the dates of the grants, are given. But the substantial charge is all the same true. The grants were made after the hon. gentleman was elected to Parliament. In reply to that charge the hon. gentleman said:

"It is to be noted that the gravamen of the charge appears to be that I received that limit from the Government after I was a member of this House."

So say I. The gravamen of the charge was that he received part of the public domain while a member of Parliament. That was not the first time he discussed the question. At Duncanville he drew the attention of his constituents to the matter, and in a report of the hon. gentleman's speech, which appeared in the *Citizen*, and which I suppose was correct, he made use of the following language:—

"Then the grant was made before he was even nominated as a candidate for parliamentary honors, and it was granted just as any other limit would be, to any other person who applied for it and exactly on the same terms."

Hon. members will observe that he admits that the gravamen of the charge was that he got limits after he was elected. In his speech at Duncanville he declared that the grant was made before he was even nominated. In his speech in the House, he declared that he got no limits after he became a member of Parliament. I take issue with him upon both those points; I say both are incorrect, and I am prepared to prove it. The hon. gentleman was nominated on the 1st June, 1882. In the return submitted to Parliament for 1884, the following entry occurs:—

"File No. 2881-2758. George L. Dickinson, 5th June, 1882, applied for a limit."

That was five days after his nomination. In the same return the following entry is made:—

"File No. 2758. George L. Dickinson, Manotic, Ont., 16th May, 1882, fifty square miles."

In the same return the following entry appears:—

File No. 2052. M. K. Dickinson, Ottawa, Ont., 13th May, 1882. Forty-eight square miles.

In return for 1883, No. 36, the following entry appears:

File No. 4359. John K. Dickinson, 4th November, 1882. Section 25, township 24, range 2, west, 5th principal meridian. 640 acres of coal lands

I do not say that this latter is a son of the hon. gentleman, although I am informed he is. There is another application from W. B. Dickinson for fifty square miles. The member for Russell got those limits after he won the election. Applications were made before, but not one single grant was made until after the seat was won. The fact of the matter is, as I stated before and as I state now, that those timber limits were held up dangling before the eyes of candidates and supporters of the Government until after the contest of 1882 was fought and won, and then those people appear to have got their reward. Let us see when the limits were granted, because I observe again that the gravamen of the charge is the granting of those limits after election. The hon. gentleman declared they were given before he was nominated, and I say they were given after his election. The Order in Council made in favor of Mr. Dickinson himself is dated 24th July, 1882, one month after the election took place. Another Order in Council is dated 12th July, 1882, and there is a third Order in Council on 24th December, 1883, one year and a half after his election. As to whether there were other Orders in Council or not, I do not know, but every single Order in Council granting these limits to him and his sons, was passed after the elections were over. In a speech delivered by me at Wingham I mentioned the name of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) as one of those who had received favors at the hands of the Government

and who had been trafficking in the public domain. In the House on 4th May, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) repeated the charge in so far as the coal lands were concerned, and during the discussion the following passage at arms took place between those gentlemen with reference to the coal lands:—

"Mr. HAGGART. An application that I made? For what?

"Mr. CHARLTON. A coal lease.

"Mr. HAGGART. No, I did not.

"Mr. CHARLTON. I found your name in the returns.

"Mr. HAGGART. No, you did not.

"Mr. CHARLTON. Well, we will hunt it up."

The hon. member for North Norfolk did hunt it up, and on the 6th of May he read the following correspondence which took place between the Department and Mr. Haggart: —

"OTTAWA, 9th December, 1882.

"SIR,—I have the honor to apply for a mining location, being west half of Section 16, Township 3, Range 9, west of second meridian, and I will comply with all the requirements of the Statute and the regulations of the Department.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"JOHN HAGGART.

"The Hon. the Minister of Interior,
"Ottawa."

"OTTAWA, 15th December, 1882.

"SIR,—I have the honor, by the direction of the Minister of Interior, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th inst., applying for a coal mine location, being the west half of Section 16, Township 3, Range 9, west of the second principal meridian, North-West Territory.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"A. RUSSELL,
"For the Minister of Interior.

"JOHN HAGGART, Esq., M.P.,
"Perth, Ontario."

Now, on the 4th of May, while the question of the disposal of timber limits by the Government and the parcelling out of the resources of the country among their followers was being discussed, the hon. member for South Lanark made use of this language:

"He (that is the member for South Huron) made a charge against me, and I have been waiting a long time, for an opportunity to meet that hon. gentleman and see if he would dare repeat it in the House, or hear what his reason was for making the charge, that I might give it a flat contradiction. He stated in reference to me:

"John Haggart, the Tory member for South Lanark, has managed to capture out of the 'loot' 320 acres of coal lands, a timber limit on the Shell River, at $5 a square mile, an interest with Peter McLaren, of 'Rivers and Streams Bill' notoriety, and in other portions of the public property, and is believed to have had an interest in more than one of the contracts on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Those who know John Haggart best say that there are many and peculiar reasons why he must stand firm by the Government.'"

And then he went on to say:

"I simply state that is a cowardly, lying statement, framed out of the whole cloth, by a party who had not a particle of evidence to justify him in making the statement."

Now, these are bold, brave words for the hon member for South Lanark to make use of. But the hon. gentleman should recollect that strong language is not argument, and that emphatic denials are not always conclusive. The hon. member for South Lanark denied emphatically the charge made by myself and repeated by the hon. member for North Norfolk, but two days afterwards the correspondence was produced and the hon. gentleman had to admit its correctness. Now, I say that if the hon. member for South Lanark did nothing more than write that letter and make that application, I would not have mentioned his name. But I charge that he did something more and that he got something more, as I shall prove by the blue-books before I am done. On the 20th May, 1884, Mr. Peter McLaren, the friend of the hon. gentleman, obtained a limit on the Turtle Mountains, on the application, as I understand, of the hon. member for South Lanark. But that is not all. What he got for his friend is not what I charge but what he got for himself in the names of third parties. If you turn to the Sessional Papers of 1882, No. 30, page 9, you will find the following Order in Council passed by this Administration:—

"On a memorandum, dated 15th June, 1880, from the honorable the Minister of the Interior, reporting that certain application for timber limits were received severally on the 20th September, 31st December and 3rd January last, from Messrs. John Shields, John Haggart, Peter McLaren and Thomas Nichol, and recommending that fifty square miles on the Shell River, between Duck Mountain and the Assiniboine River, described in the said memorandum as parcel No. 1, be granted to the applicants, the license therefor to issue in the name of Peter McLaren, of the town of Perth, in the Province of Ontario.

"Also, that fifty miles on the Fairford or Little Saskatchewan River, being the outlet of Lake Manitoba, at some point between the said Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg, described in said memorandum as parcel No. 2, be granted to the applicants, the license to issue in the name of Thomas Nichol, of the said town of Perth.

"The several applicants to have one year within which to furnish the Department of the Interior with a survey by metes and bounds, plan, description and field notes made by a Dominion land surveyor, of the several tracts, which, it is understood, shall each be in one block intact of fifty square miles. The bonus to be paid on the approval of the survey and the issue of the lease, in the meantime the applicants to be permitted to erect their saw mill at a point within either of the said limits as they may decide, and to proceed with the manufacture of lumber from such limit, paying thereon the duties fixed by section 52 of the Dominion Lands Act, 1879, and also on the issue of the license and payment of the bonus, a sum of $2 per square mile ground rent for one year for the limit on which they may have erected the mill and entered upon the manufacture of lumber.

"The committee submit the above recommendation for Your Excellency's approval, such licenses being from year to year.

"Certified.
"J. O. COTÉ,
Clerk Privy Council."

That is not all, Sir. I find on the same page, of the same blue-book, another Order in Council, dated the 7th February, 1881:

"On a memorandum, dated 2nd February, 1881, from the hon. the Minister of the Interior, stating with reference to the grant of a timber limit of fifty square miles on the Fairford River in favor of Messrs. Shields, Haggart, McLaren and Nicol, by the Order in Council of 23rd June last, that the gentlemen above named now apply to be permitted to exchange the above limit for a limit of equal extent on the Shell River, a tributary of the Assiniboine, on which they have at present a limit of fifty square miles, which was granted by the Order in Council mentioned.

"The Minister observes that the gentlemen named propose to surrender the limit on the Fairford River to Mr. W. J. M. Pratt, who has mills at Totogon, but is unable to supply them elsewhere than from the above fifty square miles."

That the Minister goes on:—

"The Minister reports that Messrs. McLaren & Co. also ask to have granted to them in the vicinity of the said river (Shell River) an additional limit of 100 square miles, they to bind themselves to have a good grist mill in operation before the 1st day of January, 1882; that as the proposed exchange would give the applicants in all 100 square miles on the river mentioned, he, the Minister, feels that he can consistently recommend the additional limit asked for.

"The Minister suggests that as the limits in question will be held by annual license and not under a twenty-one years' lease, the bonus exacted be put in a form of an annual ground rent at $5 per square mile.

"The committee submit the foregoing recommendation for Your Excellency's approval.

"Certified.
"J. O. COTÉ,
Clerk Privy Council.

Now, Sir, in the face of the facts I have stated, I think I treated the hon. member for South Lanark with extreme moderation in my Wingham speech. That moderation does not seem to be appreciated, but that is not my fault. Now, if the hon. gentleman has a quarrel, that quarrel is not with me but with the blue-books submitted to Parliament and with the Orders in Council. I say in reference to this matter that it is not to be wondered at that members of Parliament and supporters of members of Parliament think that the public domain and the public resources of this country are their legitimate spoils when we find Ministers of the Crown and sons of Ministers of the Crown using their influence with the Administration in which their fathers hold important positions to capture large portions of the public domain. It is bad enough, in all conscience, when we find members of Parliament and friends of members of Parliament trading in the resources of this country, but when we find members of the Government, Ministers of the Crown, the trustees of the

people, the men who are supposed to look carefully into and guard the interests of the people, when we find them using their influence to advantage their own selves, then I say, Sir, that the thing becomes a public outrage which should not be tolerated in this country for an hour. And I am satisfied that when the people of this country throughly understand it, and know how the public resources have been dealt with for the last four or five years they will not tolerate it much longer. I find, for instance, that the Minister of Militia was an applicant to the Government of which he is now a member for fifty square miles on the 17th November 1882. I find by the records of Parliament that the Minister of Militia is a stockholder in a railway bonused by this Government to the extent of $96,000 two years ago. I find by the Votes and Proceedings of Parliament of two or three days ago, that this same railway, in which the Minister of Militia has a direct personal interest, is proposed to be bonused by an additional sum of $186,295 of the people's money. I find that the Secretary of State is one of the directors of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway, which was bonused in 1884 by this Administration, while the hon. gentleman was a member of that Administration, to the extent of $272,000 of the people's money. Not only is he a director of that railway, but I believe he is the head and the middle and the tail of it. I find that this same Secretary of State, when a shareholder to the extent of $12,000 in the Montreal and Western Railway, voted a bonus, or secured from the Government of which he is a member a bonus to that railway of $160,000; and I find by the Votes and Proceedings of Parliament of two or three days ago that this same railway is to be further bonused to the extent of $361,270. We all know that the Minister of Railways secured, from the Administration of which he was a member, an enormous bonus for the International Railway, which was owned and controlled by him while he was a member of Parliament and a member of that Administration. I find that the Minister of Inland Revenue is a lessee, from this Administration of which he is now a member, of 59,000 acres of grazing lands on Mountain Creek, in the North-West Territories, at 1 cent an acre, on which he never put one head of cattle, but which he got for purely speculative purposes, and holds for purely speculative purposes. I find that on the 16th of February, 1882, before he was a Minister, but while he was a member of Parliament, he applied for the north half of section 14, township 6, range 16, 320 acres of coal lands. I find that his son was a stockholder in the St. Catharines Milling Company, whose law costs this Government is paying to the extent of $11,000, a law suit prosecuted solely to deprive the Province of Ontario of its rights. I find that this company obtained a license from this Government to cut timber on 32,000 acres of land in the disputed territory. I find that H. A. Costigan, described as of Ingersoll, on the 10th of November, 1882, applied for fifty square miles of timber limits. I find that this same H. A. Costigan, described as of Winnipeg, on the 14th of October, 1883, applied for another fifty square miles of timber limits. I find that an H. Costigan, described as of Ottawa, on the 23rd of September, 1882, applied for another fifty square miles, and on the same day he applied for still another fifty square miles. I find that John Costigan, the Minister of Inland Revenue himself, on the 3rd of April, 1882, applied for fifty square miles.

Mr. McMULLEN. To himself.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). And to himself. Yet the hon. Minister of the Interior declared that John Costigan had ever applied for fifty square miles. If he turns to his own report of 1884, No. 50, page 11, he will find that he and his partner, Mr. Short, obtained no less than six permits to cut timber in the disputed territory.

Mr. LISTER. In the Province of Ontario.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). In the Province of Ontario, as my hon. friend says. When you find Ministers of the Crown acting in this way, it is high time that the people of this country should know it. I find that the Minister of the Interior, before he became Minister of the Interior, and while connected with a newspaper, obtained $18,000 or $20,000 of Government printing, which was said to have been charged at four to fourteen times its worth; and I find that a brother of this Minister is a director of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway, which has been bonused by this Government to the extent of $273,000. I find that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been fluttering, only just fluttering, on the border line between a patriot and a plunderer. The hon. gentleman cast longing eyes on the timber limits for himself and for a friend—of course, only for a friend. But the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Justice are too fresh; they are new hands at the bellows; they have not yet from their more experienced colleagues, learned the ways that are curious and the tricks that are vain. Let them not be discouraged; let them not be disheartened. Under the able and experienced leadership of their older colleagues they will live and learn; and I am very much mistaken, from the little I have seen of them during the present Session of Parliament, if, when the opportunity presents itself, each of them will not prove equal to any emergency that may arise Let me pursue the enquiry a little further. I do not see my good-natured friend from London here, and therefore I shall say nothing about him. Now, Sir, I find that the son of the First Minister of this Dominion, and the son of Sir Charles Tupper have for years been using their all-powerful influence with this Administration, in order to secure large slices of the public domain and the public resources of this country. For years they have been trading on and speculating in that influence and in the resources of the Dominion secured thereby. I say the startling disclosures that have been so far made in the equity side of the Court of Queen's Bench in the Province of Manitoba are enough to arouse the indignation of any people in any country. In the case before that court, Hugh J. Macdonald and J. Stewart Tupper were the plaintiffs, and their former law partners were the defendants. The history of that litigation and the disclosures so far made—and they are not all made yet - are of the most scandalous kind. From the evidence, so far as it has been submitted—and it has only been partially submitted—these two young men appear to have secured a timber limit on the Swan River in the name of one John McMahon. Several partners were interested in that limit, and these two young men had a ninth blind share in it. But that was not sufficient to compensate these two young men for the valuable services they had rendered in securing the limit, and so the Order in Council granting it was cancelled. A new deal was effected; a new Order in Council was issued, granting the timber limit to T. P. Walsh, for T. P. Walsh, John McMahon, the Hon. Edgar Dewdney, and Macdonald and Tupper, and in that timber limit Macdonald and Tupper held a three-fifths interest; and the Hon. Edgar Dewdney, pet and friend of this Administratian, offered to sell it for $50,000. I have always been amazed and astounded, considering the charges that have been made against Edgar Dewdney by the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite in and out of Parliament, who have denounced this man as utterly unfit for the position he occupies—I say I have been surprised that a man so described by the Government's own friends, should have been retained in his place until a rebellion broke out, to some extent through his instrumentality. The mystery is no longer a mystery, this litigation has unravelled it. Edgar Dewney helped Macdonald and Tupper to capture the public domain. Edgar Dewney divided with Macdonald and Tupper the resources of the country so

captured. Macdonald and Tupper also applied for, and, I believe, secured in the name of John Apted a timber limit on the Rolling River, in which they held a fourth blind share, and for which a firm of manufacturers offered $25,000, although it cost these young men I suppose but $250, if they paid for it. These same young men, in the name of Alexander Moffatt, secured the passage of an Order in Council on the 20th August, 1883, granting them a timber limit of fifty square miles in the disputed territory, in which they held one-fifth blind share. They also obtained a limit on Swan River in the name of some one to me unknown, in which they had one-fifth blind share. These young men appear further to have applied for and, I believe, secured section 32, township 21, range 20, and section 36, township 21, range 21, west of the fourth principal meridian, 1,280 acres of coal lands at the Blackfoot Crossing, where, it is alleged, the best coal lands in the country are, and these worthy representatives of worthy sires had one-half blind share in that little deal. Bedson, the warden of the provincial penitentiary, was also a partner in this little transaction, and the name of Frederick White is also mentioned in connection with some of these scaly transactions. I would like to know from the Minister of the Interior, or the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, if this Mr. Frederick White is the comptroller of the mounted police. His name is mentioned in connection with these young men as a co-sharer in the public plunder. Section 6, township 22, range 20, west fourth principal meridian, south ½ of section 18 in same township, all coal lands at Blackfoot Crossing, appear to have been offered to those young men at $10 an acre, and in that little deal they had one-third blind share. These young and enterprising speculators, by wholesale in the public resources of the Dominion, appear also to have applied for if not secured sections 22 and 28, township 12, range 24, west 2nd principal meridian, valuable coal lands, at $10 an acre, in which they had one-half interest. Those worthy sons of worthy sires do not appear to have limited their operations to coal and timber lands. They were willing to turn a penny in any way out of the public resources of the country, over which their fathers then had full control, and so they applied for the Salt Springs flowing into Lake Winnipegoosis, and Mr. Hall of the Department of the Interior wrote them that those Salt Springs could be had at $5 an acre. These young men appear to have had a blind share in that little deal also. When the late Minister of Railways fixed the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Port Moody, the son of the Premier and the son of the Minister of Railways applied to this Government over which their fathers wielded unbounded sway for 400 acres of the foreshore at Port Moody. Whether they got it or not I do not know, but it is very likely they did not complete the purchase because the Canadian Pacific Railway changed the terminus of the road, and these 400 acres of foreshore would have been only a burden on their hands. They appear also to have applied for 160 acres of coal lands near the Cascade Mine in the Rocky Mountains, and I believe they must have secured it because it is said they sold their interest to McLeod Stewart of this city for $1,000. They captured one-half of this "boodle." Macdonald and Tupper were not content with dealing in coal limits, timber berths, salt springs and foreshore lands. Their range appears to have been as unlimited as their influence with the Administration, which their fathers controlled, was unbounded, and so they dabbled in half-breed claims; they purchased from Joseph Ebbyn and Isabel Gladee three half-breed claims of 240 acres each, for $60 each. But that is not all. Nothing came amiss to these enterprising and influential young gentlemen. Hugh J. Macdonald, not of course because he was Hugh J. Macdonald, secured the solicitorship to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's land department at a salary of $5,000 a year, payable at Winnipeg. J. Stewart Tupper, his partner in law, was appointed—not of course because he was J. Stewart Tupper—joint solicitor with Hugh J. Macdonald to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's land department, at $5,000 a year payable at Montreal. One was appointed while the present First Minister was First Minister, and the other was appointed while Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways. But that is not all. The oldest and perhaps the best known legal firm in Manitoba, had been for many years solicitor to the Hudson's Bay Company, they were dismissed, and these two young men were appointed in their stead, to the intense disgust of every lawyer in Winnipeg. They were appointed of course, not because one was a son of the First Minister and the other the son of Sir Charles Tupper. Sir Charles Tupper's presence at the headquarters of the Hudson's Bay Company in England of course, had nothing to do with the capture of this fat piece of professional picking. All these transactions are of so shady a character that attempts are being made to prevent the facts reaching the people. Copies of the papers disclosing these facts were applied for to the court at Winnipeg, but while the papers were being copied, Macdonald and Tupper made an application to the court and obtained an order from the court to stop the copying. The startling facts I have mentioned are all capable of proof, and I now challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to appoint a commission to investigate these matters, a commission in which the public will have confidence; let them name any one of the Judges of the Superior Court of Ontario or any one of the Supreme Court here to sit on that commission, and I venture to say that the statements I have made will be established before that commission. In fact it looks as if Ministers of the Crown and their friends considered the public resources of the country as a "loot" to which they were fairly entitled. This position is well illustrated by a case tried a few days ago at Regina, in which a Mrs. Doig was plaintiff and Sheriff Chapleau defendant. This Mr. Chapleau is the same man who figured here some years ago in connection with some scandals in the public Departments. It was charged against him that while he was a servant of the Crown he had hired himself to a firm of American contractors at so much a month to reveal the secrets of the Department. It was charged against him that he obtained $4,000 from another firm of contractors in connection with a contract on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for those offences he was dismissed the service here, and on his dismissal the Minister of Railways said the Government could not afford to retain him in the service with those charges against him. His dismissal was of a peculiar kind. He was dismissed from an inferior and promoted to a superior office, for gross misconduct.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman is not correct.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). He was promoted. He was what we may call "kicked up stairs."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman is not correct.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is not correct.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). He was removed and promoted—is that correct? He was kicked up stairs. He was made sheriff and inspector of public works in the North-West Territories, and he officiated, of course, at the late execution at Regina. During the progress of this trial, it was found that it was very troublesome and expensive that the Crown witnesses should get their meals in Regina, it being two miles from the court room, and it was arranged by the sheriff that meals should be supplied at the court house, by

a Mrs. Doig at 50 cents a meal, Mrs. Doig says, though the sheriff says at 40 cents a meal. Under this arrangement, 397 meals were supplied. The account was made out by Mrs. Doig to the sheriff at 50 cents a meal, and it was sent by the sheriff to the Government at Ottawa, and was paid, as I understand it, by the Government at 50 cents a meal. The sheriff and his deputy then undertook to pay the woman at 40 cents a meal. The woman objected, she insisted on 50 cents. They would not pay it, and the woman brought an action against the sheriff for the account, it was tried before the stipendiary magistrate. Mr. Nicholas Flood Davin was counsel for the plaintiff. The following evidence was elicited. Mr. Chapleau, the sheriff, was sworn, and examined by Mr. Davin. He says:

"His books showed 397 meals served, and he told Mr. Gibson to make out the bill for 397 meals against the Department of Justice and at the rate of 50 cents a meal in order to recompense him for his trouble in sending messages, &c."

I am quoting now from the report of the trial in the Regina *Leader*:

"Cross-examined by Mr. Davin:

"Such things have been done before. The Government are not going to discuss it. He told Mr. Gibson to pay Mrs. Doig, and that the Department would not pay more than 40 cents per meal. The difference was credited to Mr. Gibson.

"Did it ever get into Mr. Gibson's hands? It was credited to him.

"Did Mr. Gibson ever receive a cent of it? It was credited to him.

"Mr. Davin said he had proved that certain meals ordered had been supplied, that the original arrangement with Mr. Gibson was 50 cents a meal, that subsequently 40 cents was the amount offered by him, that Mrs. Doig had sworn to a conversation with Mr. Chapleau, who, as the duration of the trial was shorter than expected, told her to charge 50 cents. She considered Mr. Chapleau as sheriff, and it was with his office she had to deal. She was therefore justified in putting in her bill at the rate of 50 cents. The extra expenses incurred establish her right to do so. The number of meals is sworn to, and the court will notice that $198 50 is a proper charge, and that $158.80 only was paid. The amount paid by the Department for the meals ought, at the very least, to be paid to Mrs. Doig."

Recollect that the Department paid the sheriff $198.50, and he wanted to pay this poor woman with $158.80.

"Mr. Chapleau in reply said it was customary for the deputy sheriff to charge more than he paid; for instance on the railway, the deputy sheriff paid so much but he charges more, and so in this case.

"Judge.—The law says positively just such fees as the Order in Council directs.

"Mr. Chapleau.—But I have nothing to do with criminal matters.

"Judge.—I say you have. You are the first criminal officer in the country.

"Mr. Chapleau.—I claim that the bargain was made with Mr. Gibson."

Then the judge gives judgment as follows:—

"I suppose I ought to say what I know about the matter. The matter arose out of the following state of things. It was found that the time wasted in taking recess was attended with a good deal of delay, and gentlemen who represented the Government authorised the sheriff to do what was necessary in order to facilitate and to advance the trials. The result was that meals were supplied here to jurors, and witnesses and others. The bill for $198.50 was brought me to certify whether it was a proper sum to pay to the person who furnished these meals To my mind the number of meals charged for is the proper number. I may at once say this, and unless there is some direct Order in Council governing such a case as this, the deputy sheriff is most undoubtedly not entitled to take commission on such transactions. My judgment is for the plaintiff for the difference between the cheque given here and the amount charged the Department."

Now, here you have in this trial an illustration of what I have been saying, you have the bold and brazen statement that the charge of 50 cents a meal was made by the woman and paid by the Government, and that the sheriff tried to get rid of the woman by paying her 40 cents; you have the bold and brazen statement that it is customary to charge the Government more than the officials pay; and you have the further bold and brazen statement made that not only is it customary to do it, but that the Government will not even enquire into or discuss it. Thus the Government are parties to this fraudulent custom. Here was a clear attempt to cheat this poor woman out of $40 of her Bill. The sheriff had the money in his pocket, the Government paid it, and yet the sheriff tried to get his deputy to pay off this woman with $40 less than her bill, the money being in his pocket all the time. I should like to know is this really the case? Is it customary for officials to charge, and for the Government to pay, more than the officials pay out of their own pockets? Is it customary for the Government, as Mr. Chapleau says, never to enquire into or discuss these questions at all? Is it a fact that the Government will not enquire into these things, that they will not discuss these things? All I can say is that, if such is the case, it is high time the people of this country understood thoroughly the kind of Government they have and the kind of officials they employ, not only in the North-West Territories, but all over Canada.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I desire to occupy the attention of the House for a very short time in bringing under the notice of the members of this House a matter of vital importance, a matter affecting the independence of Parliament and the honest representation of the people in this House. Every member of this House is aware that certain revelations have been made during this Session of Parliament, not only on the floor of this House, but in the Public Accounts Committee, with reference to trafficking in railway charters by members of this House. We have all heard what has been said with regard to the conduct of the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), in endeavoring to secure for himself and other members of this House, co-directors with him in the management of the North-West Central Railway, a sum amounting to $670,000. We have all heard these revelations, and I fancy that the country, as well as the members of this House, has been startled and shocked to think that such practices are in vogue in this House, which is supposed to represent the free and independent electors of the Dominion of Canada. This is not the only instance which has been pointed out during this Session of Parliament, which indicates that members of this House who support the Government are indulging, from time to time, in practices which do not reflect credit upon them or upon the Administration which they support—practices which are corrupt in every respect and which will eventually lead to the thorough demoralisation not only of this Legislature but of the people throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion. I would just call attention, when speaking of railway grants, to the fact that the Government at this Session propose to vote a sum amounting to nearly $5,000,000 in bonusing local railways in certain parts of the Dominion of Canada. Now, I think, and a great many of the members of this House, and I believe a vast majority of the people of this Dominion think, if they had an opportunity of expressing their opinion, that this system of bonusing local railways by the Dominion Government is one of the most corrupt systems that has ever been introduced in this or any other Parliament. It has a tendency to demoralise not only the people's representatives in this House but the constituencies that are represented, and the Provinces of which they form part, and, if this Government determines to demoralise not only the members who represent the people in this House but the constituencies and the Provinces that are represented by those members, by the system of log-rolling, which they have established in granting bonuses to local railways all over the Dominion, I think it is time some action should be taken by the people to put a stop to this system of government. I say that the practice is vicious, and calculated to demoralise the House and the people at large. It is the duty of every honest man in this House to endeavor to put a stop to these practices, and to purge this Parliament of the presence of men who bring discredit upon the House and upon our responsible form of Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, it has long been a fond idea of the people of Canada that we enjoy the blessings of responsible government. We know that many years ago we had to strive against those who were

trying to oppress the people in certain portions of this country, under the old family compact. We all know the struggle that the people of Ontario had to go through to secure for themselves the blessings of responsible government. The people of this Dominion have reason to feel proud of the form of government we possess, but at the same time, when they review the acts of this Government which have been placed upon our Statute-books during the last seven years, and which are found recorded in the official reports of this House, they have reason to fear that their rights have been trampled upon in many ways, and that they do not now, in reality, enjoy that responsible government which was guaranteed to them. Sir, the revelations which have been made here to-night by the hon. member who preceded me, and which have been proven by the documentary evidence he submitted, go to show that for corrupt practices some of the members of the Government and their supporters in this House stand out more prominently than the representatives of the people of any other country I ever read of, possessing responsible government. But, Mr. Speaker, I will confine myself to making a specific charge against a member of this House. I regret to say that I feel it to be my duty, as a member of this House, to try to expose some of the practices which have been indulged in by members of this House, which are calculated to subvert the true principles of responsible government, to demoralise our whole system, and render nugatory the will of the people in sending their representatives here. The charge I am about to make is one of a very serious character. I regret that it is my duty to make it, but still, I consider that it is the duty of the people's representatives in this House to expose all corruption, and in this case, although the duty is a very disagreeable one, I shall not flinch from it. I make the charge with the full conviction that I can prove the statements I am about to make. The charge I make is this: That the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), in the year 1884, used his influence to procure from the Government and Parliament a subsidy for the Erie and Huron Railway Company, of $3,200 a mile, for thirty miles, amounting to $96,000; and that while so engaged he wrote, in effect, to an officer of the company stipulating that a commission or bonus of 10 per cent. on the amount of such subsidy should be paid to him for himself and two other persons, whose co-operation he had secured, one-half of such commission to be paid on the subsidy being voted, and the other half on the money being paid over. This, Mr. Speaker, is the charge that I prefer against the hon. member for North Victoria. I may say that I did not wish to take any undue advantage of that gentlemen, and after being satisfied of the truth of the charge, and being satisfied that I would be able to establish the truth of the charge if afforded an opportunity, I wrote to the hon. member for North Victoria, yesterday, stating that I intended to make this charge in the House to-day. I now do so, and I believe that if I am afforded an opportunity I can establish the truth of the charge.

Mr. CAMERON (North Victoria). I understood from the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that his charge would take a specific form, and that it would be in that shape in which it could be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, that he meant to make a charge that I had in some way violated the Independence of Parliament Act and that it could be referrred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The shape in which he has just expressed it is not that in which I expected it would have been made, from the communication he sent to me. I asked him if he was prepared, on his responsibility as a member of this House, to make a statement which necessarily would be referred to that committee. He has not done so. He has simply adopted the policy of slander.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CAMERON (North Victoria). I am in order. I repeat my statement, that he has adopted the policy of slander.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Is that language parliamentary?

Mr. SPEAKER. Stronger language than that, I am sorry to say, has been used in the course of debate here.

Mr. CASEY. The question is, is it parliamentary?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not parliamentary to use any personal expression, or any language that is offensive to any hon. member of the House.

Mr. CASEY. Then the language must be taken back and apologised for. As you have ruled that language that is offensive to any member is unparliamentary, I require that the hon. member should apologise for and retract the language before he proceeds. I ask for your ruling on that point.

Mr. SPEAKER. Language that is offensive is contrary to the rules of Parliament. I am sure the hon. gentleman will not use any language that is offensive to any hon. member, no matter under what provocation he may labor.

Mr. CASEY. The rules of Parliament require a retraction.

Mr. SPEAKER. Give the hon. member an opportunity.

Mr. CASEY. I ask you to rule as to the necessity of an apology and a retraction of the language.

Mr. SPEAKER. If any language that is not parliamentary has been used the hon. member should withdraw it. We have never gone the length of asking hon. members to apologise; they simply withdraw the expression.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). If I have used unparliamentary language, I withdraw it. I am not aware that I had done so.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker has ruled you have done so.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). My complaint against the hon. member who has made this statement in reference to me was that instead of bringing the charge forward on his responsibility as a member of this House, in such a shape that the matter could have been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which could have investigated it, he has thought fit to make it in an unauthentic shape. He has made a statement mentioning me personally, and he has not done it on his responsibility as a member of this House. There is a well known rule and practice in this House by which any hon. member who seeks to charge any other hon. member with any act done in violation of the rules of Parliament, or that he has in any way placed himself in a position that the Committee on Privileges and Elections could investigate the matter and decide whether he had acted in such a manner that his seat in this House was forfeited—it required that a member of this House should on his own responsibility as such member stand up and make the charge. The hon. gentleman has not thought fit to do so. In the course of a debate he raised certain questions and made a certain statement in regard to me. In reply to that statement I say this—and I make that statement on my responsibility as a member of this House—I never made any agreement in any way or shape whereby I became interested in any way whatever in any bonus or subsidy that was voted by this House to the Erie and Huron Railway or any other railway. The hon. gentleman who last spoke, the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has on other occasions referred to me, and I take this opportunity of saying, that I never applied for one acre or one inch of Government land from the Government in my own interest. I never

had any interest in any application ever made or any grant ever made for any timber lands, colonisation lands, grazing lands, coal lands, or any other land from the Government. I never was interested in one single inch of any land applied for to the Government. I never applied for any in which I had the slightest personal interest, and I never received any such land. I have never asked the Government, of which I have been a faithful supporter ever since the present Government was in power, for any favor for myself or in which I had any personal interest; and I defy any hon. gentleman to prove I have ever done so. In regard to the specific statements which the hon. member for Brant has just made, I beg to make this statement: I was requested by a client, who has been a client of mine as is well known for a great many years, when he was about leaving this country and going to the southern States and the West Indies, to act as his solicitor in making an application for aid to the Erie and Huron Railway. I was asked by him to procure the co-operation of other gentlemen, not members of this House, who could work the matter up, find and furnish the necessary statistics and information and details in order that the Government could see that it was a proper grant to be made. When the request was made to me this gentleman stated that he was prepared to pay a commission, not only on any Government bonus or subsidy that might be given but also on any municipal bonus, and he mentioned the name of one gentleman in particular who would be of assistance to him in obtaining municipal bonuses more particularly; and he said, I wish you to procure the co-operation of gentlemen who will aid in this matter; I wish you to act as my solicitor in it, as I cannot be here to attend to the matter myself, and I am willing to pay those parties whom you think necessary to employ in my absence a commission or percentage on the amount of any bonus they may obtain. On that request on his part I procured the co-operation of several parties, whose names I need not mention now; but I will say that none of them are members of this House. Subsequently a bonus was granted by the Government, and after that bonus was granted a question arose as to the amount of commission and whether it was payable or not. A certain letter which I had written to that gentleman, and which I believe was marked private and confidential——

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I say it was marked private and confidential, and which I presume is the letter to which the hon. member for Brant has referred—and I have no objection to that letter being produced and shown, and read to this House—was never received by that gentleman for whom it was intended, owing to his moving about from one place to another. That letter was returned to me months afterwards from the dead letter office at Washington, it never having reached his hands. No agreement was ever made by me, no arrangement was ever made by me; and if any arrangement has been made, that arrangement did not in any way provide for a percentage, commission or interest on my part in any bonus or subsidy to be granted by Parliament to that road; it was an arrangement made by me as this gentleman's solicitor, intending to provide for the commission to be paid to the other parties, not to myself. I had no interest in it; and I say, and it is borne out by the fact, that he never received that letter, that no agreement or arrangement of any kind was ever made; and in answer to the statement, and in the presence of this House, on my responsibility as a member of it, I say that I never had any agreement or arrangement of any kind whatever for receiving any commission, any percentage or any interest in any subsidy to be granted or which was granted afterwards by this House to that railway; that I acted in the matter simply as the solicitor of that gentleman who was largely interested, if not entirely interested, in the road; that in my correspondence with him I wrote to him confidentially as his solicitor, stating the arrangement I had made with other parties whose aid and assistance he wished me to procure in his absence when he could not be personally present, and that gentleman not having received that letter no arrangement or agreement could have been made. I state, moreover, that I never have received, never expected to receive, and I have no right to receive, one single cent of commission or percentage of any shape or kind on that bonus or any other bonuses ever granted by the Government to any railway company. Not only that, but I can say that I have never had any interest in any grants from the Government in any way, shape or form in land or in any other way, and so far as I have been able to maintain the independence of my personal interests in my negotiations with the Government, I have done so. I have sent in applications on behalf of my constituents for timber limits, for coal limits and perhaps for other things. In that matter I felt I was doing my duty to my constituents and nothing more. I have not asked any personal favors; I have never had any personal interest in any applications I have made to the Government, and if the hon. gentleman will formulate his charge in such a way that it can go before the Committee on Privileges and Elections; if he thinks he has discovered a mare's nest by which he can bring forward a personal charge against me—in pursuance of a policy which I will not characterise for fear of transgressing the bounds of parliamentary decorum—I defy him to do so; I defy any hon. gentleman on that side to do so, or to prove that I have asked any favor from the Government for myself, directly or indirectly; that I have ever sought to gain any personal advantage from the fact that I support the Government or sought any favor from them other than my duty to my constituents required.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). With the permission of the House, I will comply with the request made by the hon. member for North Victoria. He desires that this matter should be investigated. I desire that it should be investigated, or I would not have brought it to the attention of the House. I believe that the charge that I make can be substantiated. He says it cannot: and in order to give me an opportunity of substantiating my charge, and in order to give him an opportunity of showing, as he says he can show, that the charge is not correct, with the permission of the House I will now move for the appointment of a committee to investigate this matter. I may say that this matter would have been undertaken sooner in the Session had it not been for the fact that the principal witness I desire to call was not in the country and could not be had. I may state for the information of the hon. gentleman that the letter he talks about is not the letter I speak about at all. I wish to say that if I move this resolution I do not want it to be understood that it is an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply—if I may be permitted to move it on going into Supply—for I do not wish to move it as a motion of non-confidence.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then it ought not to be moved now, but after the House comes out of committee.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I suppose it may by permission of the House.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). As this is a personal matter I crave the permission of the House to ask that the hon. gentleman instead of moving this matter by way of amendment to go into Committee of Supply, should formulate his charge in a tangible shape, as the rules of Parliament require, and that then I should have the opportunity of meeting it; and if the House thinks fit, have it referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It is not right that a member of this House, on a motion to go into Committee of Supply, should rise up and make an informal

charge against another member of the House. If the hon. gentleman wants to take the responsibility of moving a motion which affects the seat of another hon. member—because if his motion has any foundation it would affect my seat—he should take the responsibility of doing it in a way in which, if he fails to prove his charge, he should have the responsibility of having it reported that he has not proved it, and that the charge was malicious and unfounded. I claim that it is not proper to bring it forward in this way; I told him so this afternoon, and that the proper way was for him to rise in his place, before the Orders of the Day were called, and to make a specific charge, if he had one to make, and then give the House an opportunity of referring it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, if they thought fit to do so after hearing my answer to the charge.

Mr. MILLS. I do not understand the rule of Parliament to be what the hon. gentleman has stated it to be. It is open to any hon gentleman, who believes that another member has violated the Independence of Parliament Act, to state upon what ground he thinks that violation has taken place. He can state anything he may know affecting the position or the seat of an hon. member. He may say, as the hon. gentleman has said, that if a committee is appointed he will be able to establish his charge. But he is not bound to move for a committee. It is as open for the hon. gentleman, against whom the charge is made, to ask that this charge should be referred; and it is the bounden duty of the Administration who lead the House, to see—if there is any charge affecting the seat of a member—that action is taken. It is not any necessary part of the duty of the hon. gentleman, who has made the statement, to make such a motion as the hon. gentleman calls for. He is just as free to ask that this matter shall be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or to a special committee, as the hon. gentleman is who has made the charge.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I again crave the permission of the House to answer what has been said by the hon. member for Bothwell, either this matter is a charge affecting my right to sit in this House or it is a matter of personal scandal—a personal charge against myself. If it be simply a personal charge against myself for having done something which I ought not, as a member of Parliament, to have done, then I say it is a matter which ought not to have been brought before the House. If it is a matter affecting my seat, it should be brought before the House on the responsibility of the member making that charge. As the hon. gentleman has brought it up, it is simply in the shape of a motion of non-confidence in the Government. The Government move that the House go into Committee of Supply, and he moves in amendment that they do not, but that a committee be appointed to investigate whether I wrote a certain letter or whether I did not; whether that letter was an improper or a proper letter for me to write. Now, is that a matter which can properly be referred to a committee or not? Is every letter which any hon. gentleman has written a subject which can be referred to a committee to enquire into? Is there any foundation for the charge, or for a committee, unless it be a matter affecting a seat of a member? If it is a matter affecting my seat, let him take the proper constitutional way of bringing it up. If it is not, what right has he to enquire into what letters I have written or not. I may say that the letter he refers to was a letter marked private and confidential, and that any man who read that letter, with that superscription upon it, disgraced himself as a man of honor; because I say that that letter is marked private and confidential and was addressed to a particular person; and if that person goes and shows that letter to another person, be he the leader of the Opposition or a member of the Opposition, the man who reads that letter is a dishonorable man.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). What does the hon. member for Brant propose to do. He proposes to ask for the appointment of a committee to enquire whether I wrote a certain letter which proposed or suggested—what? If it suggested or proposed anything or made any arrangement or agreement on my part which in any way violated the Independence of Parliament Act, then his proper course is to move that it be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. If he did not do that, he has no right to bring it up here; and I repeat, if I dare to do so, that it is just this policy of slander ——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Well, I withdraw the expression slander, and say it is the policy of attacking members on this side of the House because members on the other side have been pretty sorely hit in matters of this kind.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think this is not a matter of privilege or of urgency. A debate may be interrupted by a matter of privilege, but it must be a matter arising from something occurring in the middle of the debate; it must be a matter of urgency and of recent occurrence. This does not seem to be a case of that kind, for which it is proper that a debate should be interrupted. The time for bringing it up is before the Orders of the Day are called, when there is nothing before the House. May says:

"The latter part of this statement is limited to breaches of privilege committed during a discussion, or so immediately before it, that no earlier opportunity of making a complaint had arisen; as, for example, an insult or assault upon a member or any sudden act of disorder. In such cases, debates have been interrupted by complaints of breaches of privilege."

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Then I understand that I shall be in order in moving this motion to-morrow before the Orders of the Day are called.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think so. I think it is a question of privilege affecting an hon. member, and a motion affecting the conduct of any member will then be in order.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Then I will reserve moving the motion until to-morrow.

Mr. McCALLUM. I wish to make a few remarks on the course of hon. gentlemen opposite and their policy of throwing mud in the hope that some of it will stick. The hon. member for West Huron appears to regard it as a terrible crime in a member of Parliament to make application for a timber limit for his constituents. Is it more serious than to buy lands from the Government as the hon. member has done? I do not say there is anything wrong in that; but is it a more heinous crime for a man to get a timber limit from the Government or to make application for others. I stand here and say that I made application for others. In one case in which I sent in an application for some persons in my county they were told that they must apply by tender. They did apply, and paid the Government a bonus, and they were told that they would have to survey the timber limit. They never surveyed it, and the Government got the bonus money. There are many cases of the same kind. Now, I would not give 25 cents to-day for any timber limit west of Winnipeg and be obliged to carry out the regulations imposed by the Government. Does any man say that a member of this House is to be condemned for writing to the Government on behalf of his constituents if he wants anything for them The hon. gentleman dare not say that members doing that are violating the Independence of Parliament Act, because, under the law, they have the same privilege as others. He tells us that the hon. member for Russell has got a timber limit from the Government. Does

any man in this House says that that makes any difference with the member for Russell in supporting the Government? Does any man in this House say that anything I get from the Government would induce me to give them any more support than I give them now? Hon. members opposite must have short memories. When they get up here and accuse members of this side of the House of wrong-doing, they ought to think of their attitude when they were on this side—when they were getting contracts themselves, and giving them to the Speaker in the Chair. What is my great sin? My great sin is that the Government of this country paid me for a vessel I lost in the Welland Canal; and there were eighteen representative Grits in the Dominion of Canada who voted against that payment; the rest did not vote against it; they know it was correct. Hon. gentlemen said that Mr. Lash, the Deputy Minister of Justice, was opposed to paying the money; but the question was referred to one of the Dominion arbitrators, and when the first report came in, Mr. Lash said that the verdict was not according to the evidence, and that I should have a new trial. It was referred back to the board and no more evidence was taken, because I was satisfied to have the same evidence. Well, the Government paid me, why? Because they would have had to pay me through the courts if they had not paid me in that way. They kept me eight years out of my money and paid me no interest. I do not see that the vote of the hon. member for West Huron was recorded against me. Did he run too? But he goes through the country and slanders me by saying that the Government paid me money that induced me to support them. Why, Sir, I support the Government because I believe it is my duty to support an honest and progressive government. The hon. gentleman speaks of Macdonald and Tupper. He says they got appointed solicitors of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. He says they were appointed solicitors of the Canadian Pacific Railway because they are the sons of their fathers. Well, it is convenient to have fathers, and if they got it through their fathers, I do not see that there is any harm in that. I had not a rich father to help me on in the world, but, at the same time, if I had one, I would have been very glad to have had his help, and if I could benefit by his good name nothing could be said against me on that ground. There is a great deal said here about the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty). Hon. gentlemen opposite fancy he has a lot of money to build the railway. What has he got? He has got $380,000 of stock and 10 per cent. paid thereon, and he has given two years of valuable time and some money to the work. That is his great crime. Of course he had a disagreement with another hon. member of this House, and because supporters of the Government were willing to give the hon. member for West Toronto a month's extension of time to secure a company to build the railway, hon. gentlemen opposite are very indignant. I say that the people in that part of the country are suffering from want of railway communication, but in order to damage a political opponent hon. gentlemen opposite would retard the obtaining of this railway communication by cutting off the hon. member's head. I did not get up at this late day of the Session to make any lengthy remarks, but I thought it was due to the people I represent that I should hurl back in the teeth of hon. gentlemen any charge, if any one of them dare say that I got any favors from the Government in an undue manner. If I ever got any, and I assume I would get as much as any other member, and I would not expect to get but what is right and reasonable; and I never did get but what was right and reasonable. If hon. gentlemen opposite think that mud throwing is going to benefit them, they are very much mistaken. I would not do justice to the people I represent if I did not get up and repudiate the slanders uttered by hon. gentlemen opposite. With reference to the speech delivered at Wingham, I would say that when an hon. member slanders his brother members in that way, he ought to be ashamed to hold up his head. I would go out of the House before I would slander my brother members as he has done, and the hon. member owes an apology to every member he has insulted.

Mr. TAYLOR. On the 4th of May, when I attempted to review the slanders made by Mr. M. C. Cameron, of South Huron, at a place called Wingham, I made this statement:

"If the party who made this statement is the party who represents West Huron, I must express my regret that a gentleman aspiring to the position of a statesman should stoop so low as to go round the country slandering those who honestly differ from him on political questions."

I have heard to-night out of the mouth of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) that he is the gentleman who made the speech at Wingham. This is the first time I have been made aware of that fact, because the hon. gentleman, when he last made a speech in the House on the subject of slander, left immediately afterwards and did not return. The hon. gentleman in his speech said, referring to myself:

"He accordingly applied to this Government, who distribute with no sparing hand the public estate among their followers, for both coal lands and timber limits."

To-night he read a letter I wrote to the Department on behalf of Mr. Henry Ruttle, who had gone to Prince Albert and intended erecting a flour and saw mill in that section, and wished to secure a timber limit in the section in which the Cascade Hills are situated. I wrote the Department at his request transmitting his application, and I charge the hon. member for Huron with having manufactured his statement out of the whole cloth when he says I applied for a coal limit. I never did so. He cannot prove that I did, and he had not the manliness to-night to take back the statement he made or reiterate that it was true. I wrote the letter to the Department, and I say there was no harm in that. If the hon. gentleman has the manliness of a gentleman he will get up and say that, in so far as regards the statement made about my applying for coal limits, it was not correct. In the speech at Wingham he went further and said:

"This is not all. Last Session Parliament voted the sum of $20,000 to dam the Rideau Canal, in order to supply water to the mills and factories in Gananoque, in which Mr. Taylor and his constituents are deeply interested."

I can only say that I have no interest now, and that I never had any interest in any factory that is benefited in any way by the water power at Gananoque, but, on the contrary, my opponent at the last election, Mr. Britten, his brother, his father and his two brothers-in-law, each own shares in the Gananoque water-power. I never did and have no interest in the property, so that the statement that I was interested in the water-power in Gananoque, is another slander. It is hardly worth while to review, at this hour, all the slanders the hon. gentleman has made.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the hon. gentleman proposes to allow some little time to elapse so that those changes which are entirely new may reach the public and be laid before the parties chiefly interested. It is all but impossible for us to discuss them on the mere statement made by the hon. gentleman. Those ones we had before are easily enough comprehended, but all the others, although not of any great importance individually, yet appear to affect a very considerable number of industries, and I can hardly see how, bringing them up at this late time, the hon. gentleman is going to avail himself of the hints he ought to receive from those most interested. It is very rare to bring up so many changes at so late a period.

Mr. McLELAN. They are changes which do not affect very materially any industries or any particular class of

goods. I should think that, if you let them stand over for concurrence, the House will then be in a position to learn what any party or trade in the country has to say about them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would be reasonable enough. I make the remark to the hon. gentleman for reasons which he and the House will easily understand. It is utterly impossible, at a moment's notice, for any man not thoroughly cognisant of these matters to know what the effect of some of these changes might be. There are others which I caught when the hon. gentleman was reading a statement, that are, I dare say, rather modifications of the existing tariff not very materially affecting the interests of the trade, but there are some in regard to which I think it is desirable that we should hear from the parties immediately concerned.

Baking powder, 6 cents per pound.

Mr. McLELAN. We propose to include the weight of the package. That is the simplest way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will not that add materially to the duty?

Mr. BOWELL. No. It is a small package and sometimes very light, made out of very thin tin. In calculating the duty, you have to calculate the amount of powder in the package and the duty upon that, and then the duty upon the manufacture of tin. I am told by the appraisers that it will not make any material difference.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will it be equivalent to 7 cents a pound?

Mr. BOWELL. On the actual contents of the tin perhaps it would. The principle has been adopted in many other cases in the tariff in order to avoid trouble and difficulty.

Bolts, nuts, &c., not elsewhere specified, 1 cent per pound and 15 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This amounts, as far as I can make out, to a duty of nearly per 40 cent. That is a very high rate of duty for an article of general use.

Mr. McLELAN. It is claimed that it is not as high as formerly on the average sizes of bolts and nuts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not easy, when the hon. gentleman introduces the words "not elsewhere specified" to say exactly how far that may affect the original clause, but I have been informed that, owing to the very considerable fall in the value of these articles which has taken place of late years, this specific duty of 1 cent a pound on many of the articles would represent 25 per cent. I apprehend from what the hon. gentleman says that that is correct as to part of them, and that this duty would range in many cases as high as 40 per cent., which is a higher duty than he has hitherto imposed.

Mr. McLELAN. There has been a complaint from the manufacturers that it is making the duty less than before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be, and that is the danger in introducing this double form of duty. In the higher values it might be a smaller duty, but in the case of the cheaper articles it would be very high indeed, possibly even higher than I have stated.

Dessicated cocoanut, 6 cents per pound.

Mr. McLELAN. That is to be 8 cents instead of 6 cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that for confectioners' use, or what?

Mr. McLELAN. It is for confectioners' use.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it part of the National Policy to protect cocoanuts, or is it for revenue?

Mr. McLELAN. For revenue.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is all right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What might the revenue be expected to be?

Mr. McLELAN. I think I stated that last time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not in regard to dessiccated cocoanut. Would the importation amount to 50,000 pounds?

Mr. BOWELL. I think I can find it for the hon. gentleman.

Cordage, manilla and sisal cordage of all kinds, 1½ cents per pound and 10 per cent.

Mr. McLELAN. I want to strike out "manilla and sisal cordage of all kinds."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will not this have the effect of making the duty on the inferior kind of cordage exceedingly high? There is a sort of cordage brought into this country on which a duty of 10 per cent. *ad valorem* and 1½ cents per pound would run very high, and I should imagine that particularly as affecting the fishermen in the hon. gentleman's own Province, as respects the manufacture of their nets and some of the cordage they use, that would be found rather oppressive.

Mr McLELAN. For fishing it is free, I think, but the cordage duty will be rather less on the hemp cordage than the old duty, and upon good manilla it would be about the same. I do not think it is very desirable to encourage the importation of an inferior article. In the rope works here, there is always a certain percentage of the material imported that is worked up into the lower grades of rope, which are sold at a low price.

Mr. WELDON. In the Maritime Provinces the merchants especially complain that this is very inconvenient, and they have made a communication to the Minister.

Mr. McLELAN. There is just that objection, that it would strike harder the lower qualities.

Mr. VAIL. What percentage does the Minister calculate the duty will be under this tariff?

Mr. McLELAN. It will average about as before. The value of manilla rope ranges from 11 to 14 cents.

Mr. VAIL. That is just why it is excessive. Everyone knows at the present time that the fishing industry is in a very depressed condition, and the fishermen's interests will be largely affected by this duty. During the Mackenzie Administration, the duty on cordage was only 5 per cent., in 1878 it was increased, when the National Policy was introduced, to 10 per cent. on certain kinds for ships, and 20 per cent. for all other purposes. In 1884 it was further increased to 20 per cent. for all cordage. Now, not satisfied with that, the Minister proposes to put 10 per cent. *ad valorem* and 1½ cents per pound. I know that cordage has been purchased in the United States in the last year, of the best quality, for 8 cents per lb., but the Customs officials require that the importer shall enter the cordage at 11 cents, which is 3 cents in excess of what it has cost free on board in the United States. When it is brought to this country they are obliged to pay, under this tariff, 10 per cent. on the cost of 11 cents., and 1½ cents per lb., and if the Minister will calculate he will find that it is about equal to 29⅓ per cent. on the actual cost of 8 cents in the United States. I think that is too much of a tax, and ought not to be put upon an industry in the depressed condition in which the fishing industry is. I do not see why this increase should be made. The Minister stated the other day, when this matter was before the House, that he had consulted with some ropemakers. Now, I do not think

that the manufacturers of cordage in this country are the men whom the Finance Minister or the Minister of Customs should consult in a matter of this kind. The duty has been raised in their interest, raised for the purpose of shutting out American cordage and obliging our shipowners and fishermen to purchase the cordage made in this country. It is all right enough, to a certain extent, that the manufacturer of cordage in this country should have sufficient protection afforded him to make cordage that he can sell with a little advantage over the imported cordage, but when you attempt to make the duty prohibitory it is very unfair to the shipowners and fishermen in this country, who are obliged to purchase a great deal of their cordage in the United States. Then there is another point. I am told that it is the custom of the Department, if a vessel is in the United States and gets a new sail, when she comes into the Dominion to load, notwithstanding that the sail has been used in crossing to the Dominion, she is often called upon to pay the duty on that sail. Now, this is another restriction that our shipowners have never been subjected to before. I am told that even in the case of warps for warping ships, small cordage and spun yarn that are used for ships, although these articles may have been broken and worn, the Customs Department sometimes claim a duty on them. Now, it has always been understood that articles on board ship that were for the ship's use, both cordage and provisions, if they were landed at all, the master or owner of the vessel was allowed to enter them in bond and take them on board again when he went away without paying duty. Now, however, the Department is calling on these people in many cases to pay a duty on the broken coils of rope, and spun yarn. I should like to know whether that is done by instruction from the Department or whether it is a mere whim of the collectors of some of the ports?

Mr. GAULT. I think if an American vessel comes into our ports for repairs, no matter what the repairs may be, when she goes home again duty is charged on those repairs. If she has been damaged and has to be repaired, she has to pay duty on those repairs.

Mr. WELDON. The effect of that practice has been to prevent American shipowners from making repairs in our ports; that has entirely ceased. With regard to the mode in which the duty is collected, I know that importers complain of it very much, as being cumbersome and troublesome. They were willing for the duty to be lowered, but to have a specific duty entirely, instead of a mixed duty, is found very objectionable.

Mr. McLELAN. There is a very considerable difference in the value of cordage, and I had the duty made specific for that reason. The price the hon. gentleman has given as that for manilla cordage is lower than it can be obtained.

Mr. VAIL. No; I can assure the hon. gentleman that that was the ruling price all last year.

Mr. McLELAN. I know that cordage costing 8 cents per pound is largely mixed with sisal. I was interested in the purchase of a large quantity of manilla rope and paid 33⅓ per cent. more than that price.

Mr. VAIL. I have a letter from one of the largest shipowning firms in Yarmouth, and they state that they have purchased quantities this year in Boston at 8 cents, and been required to enter it at 11 cents. The firm is that of Wm. Birrell & Co., who own seven or eight vessels, some of them 1,400 tons, and I am quite satisfied they always obtain the best materials.

Mr. McLELAN. Perhaps rope of manilla and sisal mixed would not be bought intentionally. I know that one of my captains declined to purchase from the firm named by me, and got rope elsewhere. He made a voyage, and after three or four months he wrote to the other firm apologising for having withdrawn the trade from it, saying that the rope which was supposed to be good was a mixture of sisal, and he did not detect it until after three months. From my own experience of good manilla rope, I say it cannot be purchased for 8 cents a pound. Reference has been made to ships being repaired abroad. The hon. member for St. John, (Mr. Weldon) has said that American vessels which were formerly repaired at St. John do not get repaired there now. Having lost the American trade we ought surely to encourage the repairing of our own ships as much as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems very hard that ship-owners, in case of an industry which is not so very prosperous, should be subject to very heavy duties for the purpose of encouraging some particular friends of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. VAIL. I will read a portion of the letter to which I have referred. It runs:

"Your esteemed favor to hand. In reply to Mr. Kaulbach's statement"——

It will be remembered that Mr. Kaulbach made the statement that this duty would not increase the price of cordage.

"that the price of cordage would not be increased by the extra duty, we have been asking Boston manufacturers and also rope works for quotations for cordage for a large ship. The makers in Boston, whose make we prefer to all others, quotes 8 cents per lb., Dartmouth quotes 10½ cents. We are informed by Killam Bros., who are agents for the New Bedford Cordage Co., that they have to pay a duty at the Customs on 11 cents per lb., which is 3 cents more than it was offered to us free on board in Boston. It seems a very high-handed thing, on showing the collector an invoice at 8 cents and filling up the oath on the back of the entry, for the Customs officer to refuse the oath and charge us with committing perjury in reference to such entry."

That seems to be a strange proceeding, and is hardly fair on the importing public.

Mr. McLELAN. What do you recommend?

Mr. VAIL. I would prefer that there should be a fixed rate of so much per pound on cordage, which would be very much better than this percentage rate. These duties are having a very serious effect upon our shipping interests and are placing us in a very unfair position. I referred some time ago to the trade between Spain and Great Britain, wherein the United States has the advantage in the Spanish West Indies over us, and I am informed by shippers to the West Indies that they will be obliged to haul their vessels up in the western part of Nova Scotia, owing to the heavy expense of outfit. Those are matters which the Government should take into consideration, and if they are determined to protect some industries, the shipping interest is one which deserves attention, and it is affecting the fishing interest, which likewise needs consideration. I should like to know from the Minister of Customs if cordage or rope on vessels, which has been purchased in the United States, and which is intended only for the ship's use, is liable to duty.

Mr. EVERETT. I have had a good deal of correspondence with both manufacturers and importers of cordage in St. John, and the universal feeling so far as I know it is in favor of a specific duty rather than a mixed duty, *ad valorem* and specific. I should prefer to see some suitable amount, whatever may be thought proper in the case, levied in the shape of a specific duty.

Mr. VAIL. The Minister states that this is about equal to 20 per cent.

Mr. McLELAN. I move then that it be amended by striking out the words "manilla" and "sisal."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will not that be very heavy?

Mr. McLELAN. Not so heavy as 20 per cent. the hon. gentleman says.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps so. I do not suppose it makes a great difference but certainly it is a very heavy duty on the inferior articles.

Mr. EVERETT. Some of the importers wanted 2¼ cents per pound.

Mr. MITCHELL. Where is the necessity for this increased duty? Is the Government short of funds or is it for protection?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). It is to pay for advertising in the Montreal *Herald*.

Mr. MITCHELL. They do not require any duty for that; they are either too niggardly or too unfair for that. It appears to me that industries which are so severely taxed as the shipping and fishing industries should not have any addition made to their taxation, unless the purpose is specifically stated. If the purpose is for protection, I object to it. They have a large protection; we have protection and the National Policy run into the ground. If the purpose is revenue, we should take it from some other source than the shipping or the fishing industries, both of which are now suffering from excessive taxation.

Mr. WATSON. There is another industry which it bears very heavily upon and that is the farming industry. In the North-West, nearly all the binding is done with twine on the self-binding machines. This makes a duty of about 2½ cents a pound on binding twine, and although it is proposed to reduce it to 2 cents, I think it should be still further reduced. There were about 200 tons used in the North-West last year for binding purposes, making a duty of about $2,000 for the support of three large ropeworks in the Dominion, one in St. John, another in Halifax and another in Montreal. The principal factory I believe is the one which is owned by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs).

Mr. MITCHELL. He supports the Government and they should provide for him.

Mr. WATSON. It is a great hardship on the farmers of the North-West who formerly used American twine, but find that it is closed now by the duty, and they find they have to use the Halifax twine which is improving though it is inferior in quality. It requires about 2½ pounds of twine for every acre of grain, which amounts to a considerable tax.

Mr. McLELAN. I understand that the Halifax firm exported a considerable quantity of twine to the United States; at least they did so about two years ago. So, I do not think the hon. gentleman's constituents are suffering very much by having to get their supply from Halifax. I would say to the hon. member for Northumberland that the proposition is not to increase the duty on the fishing or shipping industries. The fishermen get almost everything they require in the way of lines or twines free of duty, and as for the shipping outfit, the ships get a drawback which more than compensates for the duty.

Mr. VAIL. That is for ship-building.

Mr. WELDON. It often happens, from what I see in the papers, that small trading vessels which may meet with a disaster on a voyage, or on which the lines become worn out, have to replace them in the United States, and then when they come back they are met by the duty. I think this is a great hardship and it bears especially upon the smaller vessels.

Mr. MITCHELL. The argument of the Minister of Finance is certainly not a very good one, considering all that has been said about the National Policy and the slaughter markets of Canada. The hon. gentleman says that the Halifax Cordage Factory has been shipping cordage abroad. What has been said about the manufacturers of the United States making use of Canada as a slaughter market, it seems that after they supply the markets of Canada they have a surplus which they must send somewhere, and they are making a slaughter market of foreign countries, which is certainly not an argument for increasing the duty on cordage.

Mr. BOWELL. This is not increasing the duty.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then, why change it. My own experience is that every change which is made by the Customs or the Finance Department, in connection with the revenue, is something in the way of increasing the taxation of the people, and I must say that there is a growing feeling in this country in regard to the way the Customs Department is administered, the tyranny which is exercised. The course pursued by the officers of that Department is anything but satisfactory to the traders and merchants of this country.

Mr. WATSON. I cannot understand how the Halifax firm shipped twine into the United States two years ago, unless it was of a poorer quality, because two years ago there was a good deal of American twine used in Manitoba. It was sold there for two or three cents a pound more than the Canadian twine because it was of better quality, finer spun and would go further. I have no doubt that some of that article might be shipped into the United States for people who did not know its quality or weight. Where it would take about two pounds to the acre of American twine it requires about 2½ of Halifax twine.

Mr. McLELAN. From the opinions expressed on all sides, I think I had better leave it as it is, at 1¼ cents and 10 per cent. There is a great difference in the values.

Mr. WELDON. I think manilla is used for ships. They require the best kind of cordage. Sisal is not needed for ships. I think 2 cents is enough.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman knows that from 20 to 40 per cent. of sisal may be put in a rope, and no man can tell whether it is all sisal or all manilla.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. Minister of Customs has not yet given me an answer.

Mr. BOWELL. In reference to the question of duty on cordage to which the hon. gentleman has referred, he, like many others who talk on questions of this kind, just half treats it. The statement by the gentleman who wrote the letter is quite correct, but he forgot to state that there is a drawback of from 1¼ to 2 cents a pound given by the United States Customs authorities to those who export the article, and consequently, under the law they are obliged to add whatever amount is paid to the party exporting, to the value of the article when it is exported to this country. It was only the other day that a gentleman imported two or three car loads of cordage from the United States for tying up lath; he is a large lumber and mill owner, and he supplies mills, principally in my own county. He imported the goods in the very best faith, and when he presented his invoice it was pointed out to him what the law was. Although he had been importing for a number of years, he said he had not been aware of that provision in the law. He said he had been given a drawback in the market here. He purchased the goods, and he at once paid the duty. The duty of 1¼ cents and 10 per cent. is considered as low if not lower than 20 per cent., and much lower on the more expensive quality of cordage imported for ship purposes. The duty will hit the low and inferior grades of cordage which are adulterated with a large admixture of sisal; and from what the manufacturers tell me it cannot be detected, except by experts. In reference to repairs to ships and ships' supplies: If a new sail is obtained to replace an old one, I

suppose that might pass as repairs to the rigging. No change has been made in the rule of the Department in this respect ever since I have been connected with it. If a vessel by stress of weather is driven into port, and finds it necessary to get anything to enable her to continue on her journey, the duty on that is never exacted. If, however, a vessel goes to the United States and is there repaired and comes back to our ports, she is charged duty on the repairs. If an American vessel is repaired in this country, no matter what is done to her, when she returns to her own port, she has to report, and a duty is charged upon every penny spent upon her in this country. The hon. member for St. John has told us that on that account we have lost the repairing of American vessels. If that be correct, there is no reason why we should allow our vessels to be repaired free in the United States, except when it is absolutely necessary to enable them to continue on their voyage, or why should we not treat them in precisely the same way as the American authorities treat their own vessels repaired in this country. It may be that, like many other provisions of the Customs Act, this has been allowed to fall into disuse; but my object has been to enforce the law as I have found it on the Statute-book. With regard to the statement of the hon. member that the administration of the Customs was getting into disrepute owing to arbitrary action on the part of the officers, I have simply to say that the action of the officers, in the seizures which have been made, particularly in Montreal, has been of a character that has met with the approval of every honest importer with whom I have had any communication. Only to-night, since I have come to the House, I have received a letter from the Montreal Board of Trade, urging the fullest investigation into all cases which have not been settled.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman says the same rule which applies now has always been applied to purchases for vessels. I never knew of a case nor do I believe a case can be found in the Province of Nova Scotia where a vessel has been obliged to buy a new sail or sails in the United States, or cordage, hawsers, coils of rope, or small things of that kind, where a duty was ever exacted. It is only in the last year or two since this outside service has been established and working under a system where they are getting a certain percentage for every seizure they make. Whenever they find one of our coasters trading with the United States, they go to the Customs house to seek information there as to whether anything has been purchased so that they can get hold of the vessel in some way when she comes back to port. They say to the captain you purchased such an article; if you have not entered that, I will seize your vessel. The master sometimes will drive a bargain to keep his vessels out of the hands of these men, and the system is killing our coasting trade. It does not affect large ships, and the Custom house officers never think of going on board those vessels; it is the coasters that suffer by this stringent law.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in error. I had brought before me yesterday by the hon. member for Annapolis, a case where they had seized a large vessel.

Mr. VAIL. It was a small vessel.

Mr. BOWELL. It was a large vessel.

Mr. VAIL. It was a coasting vessel, and they had to purchase lines to haul her through the bridges, and when they came back to Nova Scotia they were called upon to pay duty on the articles purchased. It is very unfair, and if that is the course to be pursued by the Department, they will kill out the whole of our coasting trade and oblige owners of vessels to sell them, and the whole trade of the country will be thrown into the hands of American coasters.

On resolution 2,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What effect does the hon. gentleman intend to produce by the amendments to 37, 38, 39, in sugars?

Mr. McLELAN. The effect of 13 to 14 is to put it back to the old standard and the old tariff, owing to the closing of one of the refineries at Halifax and to the suspension of operations at Montreal occasioned by the flood. The grocers of the country, especially in the west, made complaints that they were unable to get lower grades of sugar suitable to their trade, and they stated that by confining it to No. 13 Dutch standard for importation for grocery purposes, kept them out of the quality sought after by some of their customers, and it was advisable to raise the grade and admit No. 14 at the same rate we had fixed for 13. We make the change so as to admit more Muscovados and Porto Ricos that are sold by the grocers without being refined. With regard to the next change, allowing 15 per cent. of the whole cargo to be admitted on the polariscopic test, the amendment explains that 15 per cent. may go to the refiner and the rest may go to the grocer, when there is 1 or 2 per cent. more than the 15.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On what date is it proposed to ask concurrence on these?

Mr. McLELAN. As late as we can suit the business of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Say Monday.

Mr. McLELAN. With regard to the change in oil cloths to 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, the duty is now 35 per cent. The difficulty arises from calling it Nos. 1, 2 and 3. Any factory that may be near our borders will send in all the No. 3 and refuse generally, and it is desirable to make a specific duty.

Paper hangings or wall paper of 8 cents or under per roll, 2 cents per roll.

Mr. WELDON. What does that amount to?

Mr. BOWELL. It is less on the 7 cents and 8 cents paper than it would be at 30 per cent, but on the 4 cents paper it will be higher. The 30 per cent. is left on all paper over 8 cents.

Export duties—Spruce logs, $2 per thousand feet; pine logs, $3 per thousand feet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it would be well that the Minister should state why the Government propose to do this. This is a question which will affect different sections of the country very differently, and, while some may be for it in one quarter, I fancy it will be found to inflict considerable hardship in other quarters. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do? The duty he now proposes will be considerably in excess of the duties the Americans impose on lumber coming into the States. I think they charge $2 per thousand, and he proposes to impose $3 per thousand.

Mr. McLELAN. The proposition is to impose $3 on pine. The duty is the same on both spruce and pine going into the United States, $2 per thousand.

Mr. VAIL. What size logs are these to be? It is important that they should not be below a certain size. I presume the hon. gentleman does not intend to charge an export duty on all the spiling which is carried away to the States from Nova Scotia. Some of it is not more than three or four inches at the top end.

Mr. McLELAN. Those are hardly logs.

Mr. VAIL. It will be difficult for the collectors to distinguish unless it is named.

Mr. McLELAN. Under the old duty of $1 per thousand, such scantling as the hon. gentleman refers to went out free, and it is not proposed to make any change except to increase the duty on what are really logs intended for the manufacture of lumber.

Mr. IVES. It strikes me that the increase from $1 to $2 a thousand on spruce logs will, unless the Government take power to remit it in certain exceptional cases, work a very great hardship. In 1884, I made a motion in the House which was defeated at the instance of the then Finance Minister, asking to have the duty increased to $2 a thousand upon spruce sawlogs. I have not changed my opinion as to the advisability of my course. I know that, with the import duty charged by the United States of $2 a thousand upon rough sawn spruce lumber, it is only fair to our mill owners and manufacturers that a duty of $2 a thousand should be charged on the export of our sawlogs. I have seen American mill owners building mills on the frontier, depending entirely for their stock of logs on the Canadian side, and taking the logs over at a nominal rate upon railways, and sawing them there. What I have to say against this proposition I trust will not be misunderstood. Now there are certain cases in which this proposed increase, and, in fact, in which the duty as it stands of $1, is an extreme hardship. As you are aware, the international boundary between us and our neighbors to the south, where it passes through the Eastern Townships, attempts to follow a water-shed but it does not do so. In some cases, the head water of the streams are in Canada and run south; several miles probably of the head water of these streams are in Canada. In other cases, the stream's head is in the United States, and flow north into Canada. Now, there is in the counties of Stanstead and Compton—particularly in Compton, in Barford and Orford—a very considerable country, where the streams flow south, where there is not a sufficient amount of lumber to justify the erection of mills, but where there is a considerable quantity of lumber, and that lumber, so far as it has been taken out, has been floated down the river and manufactured in the United States. The only way in which that lumber can be utilised, is by permitting these logs to be floated down their natural course into the United States, to be manufactured there. They cannot be brought over the divide, which forms the international boundary, to the mills on the Canadian side. There are no waters by which they can be driven to mills on the Canadian side, and no railways by which they can be brought out, and they have either to remain standing trees—and I am sorry to say that lately those standing spruce trees are dying very rapidly, and it is necessary they should be cut, or be taken to the United States. Well, now, the mill owners come to the farmers on our side of the line and buy these logs, and they have to give them just $1 per thousand less for these logs under the existing duty than they would if the export duty did not exist, and if you put on an additional dollar you entirely deprive that lumber—and it amounts to a good amount of money—of any value whatever, and you prevent the possibility of its being taken out. I presented a petition to the House early in the present Session, from a large number of people asking the Government to take power to remit the export duty in their case, and I think that if the Government make this increase of $1 per thousand they should take power to remit or rebate the duty in certain exceptional cases like those I have mentioned, otherwise I can assure the Government that they are doing a great injustice to a considerable section of the Eastern Townships, and that they are in fact destroying property of the value of many thousands.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not see how the proposition of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), can very well be acted upon. The objection that he raised to the imposition of an import duty in exceptional cases, will apply in almost all cases. It has the effect of lowering the price of standing timber, and that is a tax upon the owners of timber. The object of the duty is to foster the manufacture of lumber in the country, but it is not in the interest of the owner of timber that the duty should be imposed. The imposition of the duty undoubtedly is faulty in principle; an export duty is the most obnoxious form of duty. But we must bear in mind that the American Government admit saw logs free of duty, while they impose a duty upon lumber; and that, no doubt, is the reason the Government has for imposing an export duty upon saw logs. If the American Government did not admit logs free of duty, then there would not be the reason that exists now for the imposition of a duty. I fear, however, that the Government makes a mistake in making the amount of duty imposed upon the pine saw logs 50 per cent. greater than the amount of duty imposed by the American Government upon lumber, while no exception could be taken, I think, to the imposition of a duty of $2 per thousand upon saw logs, as an offset to the American duty of $2 upon lumber. Now if our duty is made $3 per thousand upon logs, I fear the fact may be taken advantage of by designing men, and those interested in higher duties upon lumber, and a cry raised about discrimination, and possibly those interested in the imposition of a duty upon lumber may make a successful effort to increase the American duty to $3. For this reason I doubt the advisability of making the duty greater than the American import duty. Then there is the question of the towing of logs, although that has not commenced yet. No short pine logs have been towed upon the Georgian Bay itself, although a fair business is likely to spring up. The total amount of export duties last year was $12,300, and in the previous year $8,500, showing that the trade, even under a duty of $1, is insignificant. It is not at all likely that trade would increase if the duty were doubled, so I do not think we need fear any large amount of business being transacted under an export duty of $2 per thousand. We must bear in mind that the towing of saw logs is attended with certain disadvantage to the man engaged in it, the only point where there is any danger of a business springing up is in towing logs from the north shore of the Georgian Bay to the Michigan mills at Saginaw, some of them now being out of a supply of timber. Now, when they are delivered at the mouth of the Spanish River, or Blind River, or any stream upon the north shore of Lake Huron, the extra cost of putting these logs into rafts will be, at least, 30 cents per thousand, as compared with the cost of putting into a mill boom at that point, and the cost of towing these logs to Saginaw will be at least $1 per thousand. Besides, the risk of towing is very great, and I apprehend that parties going into the business of towing short logs across the widest parts of Lake Huron, will have reason to repent it. The risk in towing these logs cannot be estimated at less than from 5 to 10 per cent., to which must be added the cost of chains, &c., which places the person at a disadvantage of at least $2 per thousand upon his logs delivered in Saginaw, as compared with the cost of those logs delivered in a mill at the starting point. Some small advantages, as an offset to this disadvantage, will be secured if the lumber goes east. In the matter of freight, if he is sending the lumber from Saginaw to Buffalo, he can do it, perhaps, 50 cents per thousand cheaper than he could from Georgian Bay. If the lumber is going west of Chicago, the freight will be no greater from Georgian Bay than from Saginaw, so that the net disadvantage to the person towing the logs of the lumberer's going east is at least $1.50 per thousand, while, if the lumber goes

west, the disadvantages arising from towing and risk is $2 per thousand. Now, I do not apprehend that under an export duty of $2 there is any probability that the trade will attain to any considerable proportion. I have no objection to a high duty upon sawlogs designed for lumber, as far as I am concerned, except I fear, as I said before, that if we make our export duty larger than the American import duty, the fact will be taken advantage of, that a great cry will be raised, especially at a time like this when the relations between the two countries are likely to be somewhat strained; so I imagine there is a danger of our own interests being prejudiced by the step we are taking here to-day. Now, I am somewhat familiar with the feeling in this matter among the lumber merchants on the other side. I have heard them argue that a duty of $2 per thousand was too low. A duty of $2 per thousand on lumber worth $12 per thousand, is equal to 16½ per cent.; a duty of $2 per thousand on lumber, worth $10 per thousand is equal to 20 per cent.; while a duty of $2 per thousand on lumber worth $8, is a duty of 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. Now, Sir, an export duty of $3 per thousand on logs worth $8 per thousand amounts to an *ad valorem* duty of 38 per cent., which is nearly double that of the American duty. It is this circumstance which leads me to fear that we make a mistake in making this duty higher than the American duty.

Mr. BOWELL. What quantity of lumber do you make out of a log?

Mr. CHARLTON. From two and half logs to fourteen logs per thousand.

Mr. BOWELL. There is a regular standard?

Mr. CHARLTON. Not in the United States. Everything is computed by board measure. I am making my calculations on the value of sawn lumber per thousand and the duty and the export duty on saw logs based upon measurement in feet. There is one other view of the case I wish to present in regard to the matter referred to by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) and that is as to the definition of a log. Under the tariff as it has existed on the lakes I know spiling and lumber of that class has been classed as saw logs. Under the interpretation of the laws there the duty would be exacted upon masts, spars, yards and spiling. Certainly none of those articles can properly be denominated as logs. There is another class of lumber that is being got out—the business has not been done to any extent in Canada yet, but it has been done to some extent in Michigan—and that is long timber. This is a class of stock that is being used for the same purposes as our square timber. It is got out in the rough without being hewn. It does not interfere with the lumber trade; in fact it is carried on side by side with the lumber trade in Michigan, and some of the lumbermen engaged in cutting lumber are taking down timber of this class to be sold in the markets below. For many purposes very rough timber is found to answer well for long bill stuff. They also send the red pine down, which is almost valueless if converted into lumber. This does not interfere with the lumber trade, because this long timber when it reaches Tonawanda, Buffalo or Toledo is sold at a higher rate than it would bring if it were manufactured into lumber. It is used in small lines on the Erie Canal for manufacturing into small bills and special timber which is required promptly and in less than cargo lots, and which cannot be obtained from distant points except at great inconvenience and expense. Where large bills in cargo lots are required they are procured from the Michigan mills. This is a trade that amounts to from forty million to sixty million feet a year, about the amount that one of our first-class mills at the Chaudière would consume in a season. It is probable that this trade will enable our pine to be used with better results than if it were sawn into lumber. It would be well in designating what are saw-logs to exempt from duty timber, say forty-six feet and upwards in length. If this were done the law would not be avoided, because the cost of handling it and getting it to market would be more than the difference in duty. There are only a few streams on the Georgian Bay where this timber can be got out. It costs over $2 more to handle it than ordinary timber. I have placed these facts before the Finance Minister, because I know from my own experience as to the matters I have referred to. While I do not object to an export duty on logs, I am only anxious that the rate of duty should not be placed so high as to exceed the American duty, which might result in their raising the duty from $2 to $3. The long timber trade ought not be interfered with. That class of stock should be exempt from export duty, and certainly the duty ought not to be increased above $1.

Mr. HESSON. I have occasion to say a word or two on this subject because I have been corresponding with parties on the north shore in regard to the exportation of logs from Canada. Although the lumberers may not have already accomplished much, they are making very extraordinary preparations for this trade. In some cases they are prepared to abandon their mills and all their plant that has been put up at a very great expense, and they are building boats for the purpose of taking saw logs over in the rough to Saginaw. This is being done on the north shore of Lake Huron. While the hon. member from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is very much afraid lest we should hurt the feelings of the Americans, for which we give him credit, it is much more important that we should look after our own interests. The employment should be given to our own people. The hon. gentleman correctly states that the duty on lumber is $2 per thousand and on saw logs $1 per thousand. The export duty has not been sufficient to prevent timber being carried over in very large quantities, and I am told they can take 1,000,000 feet in booms to the American side in a few hours and at very trifling cost, and they will thus save $1 per thousand by taking logs over in the rough. We are having our forests depleted of the most valuable part of our exports, and this timber should be manufactured in our own country. In regard to the measurement; the difficulty of measuring logs is very great, especially in water, when they are afloat, and the careless way in which it is done, as compared with the careful and precise manner in which lumber is measured, is of itself a very great advantage to the individual who is importing largely in the rough state to the American side. So the Government would get, perhaps, upon 1,000,000 feet by that kind of measurement, by the careless way in which the measurement is conducted, very much less duty than they were entitled to. I am assured, that owing to the difficulty of measurement, there would be a loss equal to $1 per thousand. They have also refuse, which is worked into lath, and there is no duty placed on that. That is another inducement for lumbermen to take over logs in the rough. Besides the manufacture gives them employment, and that is a matter peculiarly within the province of Parliament. I for one, as a Canadian, must protest against any policy of that description, even if it should offend our American friends. I do not do it to offend them, but in order to give our people the benefit of the advantages which should be derived by Canadians from working upon Canadian capital. I believe that if these other parties, Wood & Co., who are living in Alpena, succeed in making these arrangements it is intended that Cook Bros. will follow suit; and if they try, I have no doubt they will succeed, and if the logs are measured in a careless manner in that regard they will have a considerable advantage with regard to the rough products of the mills—the slabs which are being cut, and the lath upon which they pay no

duty will prove a great advantage. So that on the whole we will have a very little difference in the way of protection in $3 upon pine logs against $2 upon pine lumber. I am glad that the Government are taking this step, and I am satisfied if they carry it out it will be to the advantage of our people. I do not think that the hon. gentleman, having had experience in the lumber business, would have any difficulty in determining what a saw log would be, or other measurements of that kind. There are certain sizes and dimensions of logs which are always known to those in the habit of dealing in those articles, and I am sure that those who will have the control of them, as the exportation of that sort of material goes on under Government supervision, will have very little difficulty in deciding what amount of saw logs and what amount of shingle bolts will be returned.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman says that as a practical lumberman I would have no difficulty in telling the difference in different kinds of timber. That is true, I would have no difficulty, but the difficulty is that the Government inspectors class these masts, spars, &c., together as sawlogs in the upper lakes. The hon. gentleman says that Cook Bros. are making preparations to move their mills to the other side.

Mr. HESSON. I did not say that. I said it was suggested that if these other parties, who are making arrangements were successful, Cook Bros. would follow suit.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may say that I have no interest in the matter out of any regard to the feelings of the Americans in raising the duty, except as it may incense them to legislate against us. It is merely a matter of prudence, and in that view I do not think we should exceed the amount of the import duty charged by the United States. The difficulty of measuring logs in water, to which the hon. gentleman refers, is purely a supposition on his part. If he were a practical lumberman he would know that the measurement of logs can be carried on rapidly and with almost as much certainty as the measurement of lumber. The trade of which he speaks as having grown up in the upper lakes does not exist at all. The amount of duty paid shows that it is but a very small proportion of the trade. One firm, Emery Bros., have put in a stock of logs on Georgian Bay, but it is a matter still to be determined by experiment as to whether they can tow the logs successfully over Lake Huron in its widest part. I do not oppose the export duty on short logs, but, as I said before, it is merely a matter of prudence as to what the duty shall be in our own interest.

Mr. HESSON. In reply to the hon. gentleman I would read a letter addressed to me from Gore Bay:

"Yours of 31st December, 1885, duly to hand, and in reply about lumber, timber or saw logs upon the North Shore. At Spanish River Mills I would say that the company manufacture their saw logs in lumber at their own mills and ship by boat mostly to American ports. Cook Bros. do the same, but I understand that there are two companies on the north shore that have got large limits of pine, and that intend to ship the logs in the round and manufacture them at their mills in the States. They are building boats for that purpose. I was told the other day that the Spanish River Mills Company may do the same if the other company succeeds all right."

Mr. GILLMOR. I am afraid this will operate injuriously to some parties in my own county on the Ste. Croix River between the State of Maine and New Brunswick. I cannot speak definitely with regard to their timber lands, but I know that some Canadians living in St. Stephen's own mills in the State of Maine just across the channel. I know that they have large quantities of timber lands in New Brunswick and that they have been in the habit for many years of cutting those logs and sawing them in their mills in the State of Maine. It certainly would astonish them to find that they have to pay $2 export duty a thousand on the logs cut on their own lands in New Brunswick and floated to their own mills across the channel in the State of Maine, just on the other side of the river and *vice versa*. Those logs would always be subject to an export of $2 a thousand—logs cut by Canadians on their own lands, and cut in their own mills just across the channel in the State of Maine. The firm I speak of own very large tracts of timber in Canada, which they have been cutting and sawing in these mills for the last twenty years.

Mr. BOWELL. Has the tariff operated in the past?

Mr. GILLMOR. There has been no export duty on saw logs, or if there has been, it has never been enforced on that river, to my knowledge. It will do no harm, of course, if the Government do not enforce it; but under the present law you certainly can collect $1 a thousand on all the logs sawed in those mills, and it is now proposed to collect $2. I thought that the National Policy would be about exhausted when everything that came into the country was taxed. The Government seem to have gone as far as they could in that direction, and now they are going to impose taxes on goods going out of the country. I have no sympathy with the absurd system of taxation adopted in the United States, and would not object to retaliate if that retaliation did not injure us more than it would them.

Mr. KING. The hon. member for North Norfolk has told us that something like 12,000,000 of logs are annually exported from Canada to the United States, and manufactured in mills there. I suppose the Government are aware that for every million of logs exported from Canada and manufactured in the United States, there are nearly 10,000,000 of logs brought into Canada and cut here; and I think I am correct in saying that the logs cut in the State of Maine and manufactured in St. John, amount to from fifty to 100,000,000. One hon. gentleman has said that one result of this change in the duty will be to increase the duty on lumber going into the American market. If there is danger in that direction, there is still greater danger in another direction. If the people of the United States were disposed to retaliate at the present time, when the relations between the two countries are somewhat strained, if they should impose a duty on spruce and pine logs cut in the State of Maine and floated down the St. John River and cut in the mills of St. John, it would be a great injury. Therefore, I think the time is inopportune for making this change. In New Brunswick we know nothing of an export duty on logs. We have a large trade in other descriptions of lumber besides saw logs—in spiling, in wood, in ship timber; and if a large import duty were placed on those articles by the Americans by way of retaliation, we in New Brunswick would suffer keenly.

Mr. FISHER. The circumstances and conditions which are familiar to me are somewhat similar to those the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) has described as existing on his border. We know that where the New England States border on the Province of Quebec the boundary line is an imaginary line, with no natural divisions between the two countries, and the roads and streams pass indifferently across the line, from one side to the other. The result is that the natural outlet for the logs cut in one country is mainly in the other. So that there is a considerable passage of logs across the boundary line there. In my own county, I am personally acquainted with many men who have for sometime back suffered considerably from the export duty of $1 a thousand on spruce logs. The Eastern Townships produce principally spruce and hard wood; I do not think the quantity of pine lumber is sufficient to make any practical difference. In looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that last year practically all the spruce exported from Canada was from the Province of Quebec. Therefore, I think I am correct in saying that this increased duty on

spruce logs will affect the Province of Quebec only, and I think it is going to be a serious damage to us. As a matter of fact, the people who cut these logs, and sell them to the millers on the other side of the line have to pay the duty; and our people will only pay the lumbermen less by the amount of the duty than the Americans have to pay.

Mr. BOWELL. In that case the consumer does not pay the duty.

Mr. FISHER. A solution of the apparent anomaly is easily found; but I am not discussing that question now. I do not see myself what possible good this increase in the export duty can accomplish on spruce logs. I can quite understand that in some instances in our western Provinces, especially in Ontario, the pine lumber industry is so great that some good may arise from it; but when I find that from no Province except Quebec are spruce logs exported, I do not understand why the Government have undertaken to impose this increased duty. The only possible excuse I can see for it is the preservation of our forests. Although I am thoroughly interested in the preservation and replanting of our forests, I do not think this is a legitimate mode in which that object can be attained. As a matter of fact, the people who sell these logs in the Eastern Townships and along the border are, as a rule, poor farmers who commence frequently with nothing but their axes, and have to depend for years entirely on the product of the forests, as years must elapse before they can so cultivate the land cleared that they may make a living out of it. It will seriously interfere with these people in their struggle to have this new tax imposed on them, and I cannot see what possible good can result from its imposition. Could the hon. gentleman inform me what amount of duties has been collected in past years on the export of spruce logs at $1 a thousand feet, and also what representations came to him in consequence of which he has imposed this duty.

Mr. McLELAN. Representations have come mainly from those interested in the lumber business, that preparations are being made to take over logs in very large quantities and manufacture them in the United States, so that they may avoid the duty there, and the consequence will be, our mills will be left idle. These preparations have been referred to by the hon. member for Perth as being made mainly in the west, and this additional tax is not imposed for the purpose of retaliation, but mainly to preserve our own forests and keep employment for our own people. Many men have invested large amounts in establishing mills, and it is very undesirable we should allow the logs to be floated to American mills and cut up there, thus obliging our own mills to shut down. The amount of duty is $2 a thousand feet on lumber in the United States, and it is supposed an average log will make 100 feet of lumber. With the log, of course, a great deal goes too, that can be manufactured into various articles. Therefore, the duty was fixed at $3 per thousand feet for pine lumber. The return does not give the value of the export duty at all, and I cannot give the hon. gentleman any information other than that contained in the Trade and Navigation Returns.

Mr. McCRANEY. I was going to remark when the hon. gentleman got up, that I think one of the strongest arguments for the duty the Government propose is the preservation of our forests. It is well known to our lumbermen that at the rate our forests are being denuded, probably twenty or twenty-five years will use them up to a large extent; that is those which are accessible. Consequently I approve of the course the Government are taking in imposing this duty on logs. I am well aware that there are special cases of hardship, such as have been referred by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, and the hon. member for Charlotte, but these are only special cases; and while the hon. member for North Norfolk has referred to the extra cost of getting out timber and floating it out to the United States, I still think the rates are altogether in favor of the parties who get out the timber in that way. Timber can be floated much cheaper than it can be shipped as lumber, and certainly the offal is worth considerable money. Long timber is worth as much in the log as short timber is cut up into lumber. I find in a late number of the *Lumberman's Gazette* of Bay City, Michigan, Col. M. Jeffers, of East Saginaw, says:

"'I have bought from parties in Canada 500,000 acres, or twenty townships, of standing white pine on the Serpent, Spanish and Mississagua Rivers, Georgian Bay. That this tract contains '2,000,000,000 feet of pine timber with a saw mill at the mouth of Serpent River that cuts 40,000,000 feet a year, with an iron steamer with a tow of barges. The whole plant costing $100,000.' And after stating that Governor Alger, Michigan, and Col. Bliss, of Saginaw, are interested in the same region, he says: 'We purpose to bring the logs over and saw them in Michigan. We are Michigan men and hope to make our purchases inure to our people here. Notwithstanding our investments in Canada, we will stand by protection for Michigan lumber.'"

In another part of the same paper the Hon. Isaac M. Weston, when criticising the Morrison Tariff Bill, says:

"We now admit Canadian logs free of duty. On the north shore of Lake Erie the Canadian saw mills are in ruins, but the mills at Tonawanda, N.Y., are employing thousands of American workmen, manufacturing Canadian logs towed from Erie north shore. The Saginaw mills are running out of American stock, and already they are looking to Georgian Bay for Canadian logs to cross the Huron Lake and keep their mills and men at work."

I think that in order to keep our own mills employed, without calling it protection at all, this increase of duty would just about meet the difference between the $2 per thousand feet on lumber and the $3 per thousand feet on logs, because they will have it in the shipping and besides they will have the refuse and the other advantage of getting these logs in long lengths. I am free to say that the duty is in the right direction.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) seems to think this duty will only affect the Eastern Townships and Quebec, or Quebec proper. It is quite evident he does not know anything about Ontario or he would understand the difference. It is going to be a serious matter with us as to how long our timber supply will last. Lumber is running up in price rapidly, and most of our pine lumber we get from the north shore of Georgian Bay. I think I can corroborate the remarks of the hon. member for Halton and the hon. member for Perth as to what is going on at present. The timber of Manitoulin Island and the North Shore of the Georgian Bay is being taken across in large quantities, and in a few years will be entirely destroyed if something is not done to prevent it. While I think this will partly prevent it, it does not go far enough, and the time is not far distant when we will have to adopt some other means to prevent the denuding of our forests in that country, or we shall be left to get lumber from a great distance, and, perhaps, from the other side.

Mr. DAWSON. There is no doubt that a high duty on logs would work very well on the Georgian Bay and Lake Huron, but on Lake Superior they import a large quantity of rough sawn American lumber and dress it in the mills there. What they would like would be a specific instead of an *ad valorem* duty on this rough lumber which they bring in, because there would be a great advantage then in the dressing of it. I do not know whether the Government has considered that or not.

Mr. FISHER. In answer to the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), I may say that my only information about Ontario was taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns, and, as I found from them that Ontario does not export any spruce at all, I took it for granted that was the case.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman was speaking of pine as well as spruce.

Mr. FISHER. I made no allusion to the duty on pine.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have one suggestion to make. The Morrison Bill is pending in the United States Congress. It has not been decided yet. If it passes, it removes the duty on lumber. There are very few logs got out for exportation this year, and they will catch very few by this duty. I am unable to see why it is not premature to move in this matter now. It may prejudice our chances with regard to the Morrison Bill, and I think it is premature until we see the fate of that measure. The duty might be imposed to catch stock got out in another winter, and I make that suggestion to the Minister of Finance.

Mr. McLELAN. We have made provision to repeal the duty if necessary.

The following resolutions were reported:—

1. *Resolved*,—That it is expedient further to amend the tariff of Customs duties and the schedule of free goods, in addition to the alterations per resolution passed on 31st March last, as follows;—

The undermentioned articles to be charged with the rates of duty specified as follows, and all former rates thereon to be repealed:

1. Oilcloth in the piece, cut or shaped, oiled, enamelled, stamped, painted or printed, India rubbered, flocked or coated, not otherwise provided for, a specific duty of 5 cents per square yard and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.
2. Floor oilcloth, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.
3. Straw board in sheets or rolls, plain or tarred, a specific duty of 40 cents per 100 pounds.
4. Earthenware and stoneware, viz.:—Demijohns or jugs, churns and crocks, a specific duty of 2 cents per gallon of holding capacity.
5. Rubber belting, hose, packing, mats and matting, a specific duty of 5 cents per pound and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*.
6. Carriage hardware, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.
7. Soap, perfumed and toilet, a specific duty of 10 cents per pound, the weight of the inside packages and wrappers to be included in the weight for duty, and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.
8. Union collar cloth paper, in rolls or sheets, not glossed or finished, 5 per cent. *ad valorem*.
9. Union collar cloth paper, glossed or finished, in rolls or sheets, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.
10. Paper hangings or wall paper, in rolls, costing 8 cents or under per roll of eight yards, a specific duty of 2 cents per roll of said length.
11. Felt, pressed, of all kinds, not filled or covered by or with any woven fabric, 17½ per cent. *ad valorem*.
12. Stereotypes and electrotypes and bases for same, made wholly or in part of type metal, a specific duty of 5 cents per pound.
13. Scythes, a specific duty of $2.40 per dozen.
14. Wire covered with cotton, linen, silk or other material, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.
15. Stove bolts and nuts, and all bolts and rivets of one-quarter inch diameter and less, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.
16. Handkerchiefs, cotton or linen, plain or printed, in the piece or otherwise, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.
17. That the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine, butterine, and all such substitutes for butter, be prohibited, under a penalty of not less than $200 nor more than $400 for each offence, and the forfeiture of such goods, and of all packages in which they may be contained, and of all articles, implements, machinery and appliances used in and about the manufacture or preparation of such articles.
18. Nail plate, iron or steel, sixteen gauge and thicker, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.
19. Repeal item 353. Revised Statutes of Canada except so far as it relates to "Ultra-marine blue."
20. Repeal also item 428, and substitute the following:—Jute cloth as taken from the loom, neither pressed, mangled, calendered, nor in any way finished, and not less than forty inches wide when imported by manufacturers of jute bags for use in their own factories.

The following items to be added to the list of goods which are entitled to entry free of duty:—

Jute yarn, plain, dyed or colored, when imported by manufacturers of carpets, rugs and mats, for use in their own factories.

Such philosophical instruments and apparatus as are not manufactured in the Dominion, when imported by and for use in universities, colleges, schools and sientific societies.

2. *Resolved*,—That it is expedient to amend Resolution No. 1, adopted on the 31st March last.

Item No. 3. After the word "pound" add *the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty*.

Item No. 5. After the word "steel" add *not elsewhere specified*.

Item No. 7. Change as follows:—

Cider, not clarified or refined, a specific duty of 5 cents per Imperial gallon.

Cider, clarified or refined, a specified duty of 10 cents per Imperial gallon.

Item No. 8. Cordage of all kinds a specified duty of 1½ cents per pound and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Item No. 9. Make rate 8 cents per pounds instead of 6 cents.

3. *Resolved*,—That it is expedient to amend Resolution No. 2, of 31st March last.

Item No. 4.—After the word "re-manufactured," add *and bloom ends, and crop ends of steel rails for re-melting*.

4. *Resolved*,—That items 37, 38 and 39 be amended by striking out the words "or fraction of a degree" in item 37, and the word "thirteen" in items 37, 38 and 39, and inserting in lieu thereof the word *fourteen*.

And also to strike out the proviso next after item No. 40, and substituting the following therefor:—

Provided that when any cargo of sugar imported for refining purposes is found to grade in part above No. 14 Dutch standard in color, such part to the extent of not exceeding 15 per cent. of the whole cargo, may be admitted to entry by polariscopic test.

5. *Resolved*,—That it is expedient to amend the schedule of export duties by increasing the duties on the following articles, viz.:—In lieu of present duties there shall be levied and collected on—

Shingle bolts, a specific export duty of $1.50 per cord of 128 cubic feet.

Spruce logs, a specific export duty of $2 per 1,000 feet, board measure.

Pine logs, a specific export duty of $3 per 1,000 feet, board measure.

Provided that the powers vested in the Governor in Council by the Act 42 Victoria, chapter 15, section 6, being section 9, chapter 31 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, shall be extended to and apply in all respects to the above named articles.

INSOLVENT BANKS BILL.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the order for the consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 15) further to amend the Act respecting insolvent banks, insurance companies, loan companies, building societies and trading corporations (Mr. Edgar) be transferred to Government Orders.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would it not be a good idea to incorporate Bill 121 in that motion?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman moves that, I will withdraw the other.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 2.45 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 28th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SATURDAY SITTING.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That when the House adjourns to-day it stands adjourned until Saturday, at three o'clock, p. m., and that the Government measures have that day and on Monday next precedence immediately after routine and questions to be put by members.

Motion agreed to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). I desire to call the attention of the House for a moment while I make a statement, not so much because it affects me personally as because it refers to a gentleman occupying a public position. It will be remembered that in the debate on Indian affairs which took place in this House on a resolution of the hon. member for South Huron, that I felt called upon to make some

remarks in reply. During the address the hon. member for South Huron and the hon. member for Brant, who supplemented his statement and the references he made——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. member say the hon. member for South Huron?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). I mean the hon. member for West Huron. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, because I do not wish to attribute to him that speech. I felt called upon to make some references in reply to the attack made upon the administration of that Department in the North-West by the Government and by its officers. Reference had been made by both those gentlemen to the Rev. Mr. Robertson and to statements he had made in a sermon or address somewhere in Ontario, which had been quoted largely in the *Mail*. His references and quotations were largely quoted by those gentlemen to buttress and strengthen the positions taken by them in attacking the administration of the Indian Department. I, in referring to that gentleman's statements and to the value which I attached to his statements, made use—I am reported to have made use of certain words which are reported in the *Hansard*, and although it has been the rule almost universally to accept the statements as they appear in *Hansard*, I have not the slightest hesitation in declaring from my place that I feel and believe I was not correctly reported on that occasion. I say that for this reason, that I had no consciousness or intention in any way of expressing myself so as to lead the House or the country to believe that I insinuated, or intended to insinuate, anything against the character of the rev. gentleman—anything such as has been attempted to be attached to the meaning of my expression by the Liberal press outside of this House. The hon. gentleman having made reference to the statements of the Rev. Mr. Robertson, I am reported to have said:

"I happen to know something about Rev. Mr. Robertson, which I do not care to disclose or discuss here, and which, to my mind, does not add much to the weight of his statement. I am not going any further on that subject."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Now, that was not my expression. I feel quite conscious of that, and that I was liable to be misrepresented there as well as in some sentences which precede that. In rising to my feet I mentioned the Minister of Public Works and said that I would deal with some specific charges, and leave the public to judge; but in the report the mention of the Minister of Public Works is not inserted at all. Now, when I was misreported in that expression, I feel undoubtedly certain, and I have reason to believe, seeing that I had no consciousness or intention of any insinuation against Mr. Robertson, that I did not express myself as written down here. What I meant to say, and what I believe I did say, was this: I was then dealing with the charges against the administration in the North-West, and I said that from what I know from my own personal knowledge, and from what I learned of the Rev. Mr. Robertson, I learned from the newspapers, and especially from a letter which appeared in the *Globe* of the 3rd of April, written by the Rev. Alfred Anderson, which in every detail, as far as my observation went, coincided with my view. I read Mr. Robertson's statements in the *Globe* and the comments upon them, and I heard the statements quoted here. I also read the one by the Rev. Mr. Anderson, and I may say that when I made that statement I did not know to what church they belonged. Both gentlemen stood exactly in the same position towards me. One I have learned since is Superintendent of Presbyterian Missions there, and the other is Superintendent of Methodist Missions. There were two statements made, the one by the Rev. Mr. Robertson, and the other by the Rev. Mr. Anderson.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The Rev. Mr. Andrews.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). The Rev. Mr. Andrews—both supported by the title of Reverend. Now, as a matter of fair play after the two statements, I naturally accepted the statements in the *Mail* as true, when they agreed with what I personally observed, and holding that view when, so far as I observed, the statements made by the Rev. Mr. Andrews were directly contradictory of the statements made by the Rev. Mr. Robertson, I concluded—and I think it was a legitimate conclusion—that I would not be influenced by his whole statement, and for that reason I stated that I would not permit, and did not permit, his statement to influence my judgment of the administration of affairs in the North-West. In saying that I said I did not care to mention or discuss the matter. The reason I did not care was that when I read his letter, when the statement was made here, I did not know what political party he had any sympathy with, but I had a strong impression amounting almost to a conviction, from the manner in which he was treated by the *Globe* and from the use which hon. gentlemen made of his statement, that he had a strong sympathy with the Liberal party. I concluded, and I think I reasonably concluded, when his statements were not in accord with what I myself observed, that he was somewhat partisan. I did not like to attribute political partisanship to a clergyman, and for that reason I did not like to mention the reason why I hesitated to discuss the reason in this House. That was the reason. So you can clearly understand—the House and the country can understand—that I had no such intention; I state that without reservation; I stated it in the presence of the hon. member for North Norfolk, because he has spoken to me on the subject. Unfortunately, when the *Globe* newspaper and the *Canada Presbyterian* said that, when promptly called upon in the House to explain it, I refused to do so.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). I was not in the House. I was not asked for an explanation when I sat down, and after the statement was made. I regret very much now that I was not present, because if I had been, I would then have made the explanation which I now make. In justice to the hon. member for North Norfolk I may say that I understood from him, that when he was about to ask the question, he sent for me, but by accident I did not receive his message, and that was the reason why I did not return and immediately give my explanation. The reason I have not referred to the matter before was that I looked upon the whole thing as a mere matter of political clap-trap, merely to affect political feeling outside. I only refer to it now because it has come to my knowledge from direct sources that Mr. Robertson attaches some importance to it. I do so now in order that as far as any insinuations that I was said constructively to have made against his character should be completely removed, so far as I am concerned. So far as the political aspect attaching to the matter outside of the House, and in the riding which I have the honor to represent, the people who are dealing in that sort of thing are quite at liberty to go on, because I do not hesitate to say that, while I fully appreciate the honor of the seat in this House which my constituents have conferred on me, to myself personally my being here is a matter of indifference. I do not conceive that the papers or hon. members wish to attack me personally, and therefore I infer it is only political, and even if they pursue it so far as to displace me in the riding, the only good they would accomplish would be to send to

this House perhaps a more staunch supporter of the Administration, and perhaps one less charitably disposed towards them than I am.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to say that I am very glad the hon. member for Leeds has made an explanation with regard to the statement made about the Rev. Mr. Robertson.

Mr. SPEAKER. The matter cannot be debated, as it is only a personal explanation.

Mr. CHARLTON. I simply wish to make an explanation personal to myself, but I presume it is not necessary.

CUSTOMS SEIZURES IN MONTREAL.

Mr. GAULT. I would ask if the hon. Minister of Customs is able to give us any additional information with regard to seizures made in Montreal. I have had many private letters on the subject, and I have received one to-day from the Board of Trade, which urges that the Minister shall make a statement of the whole matter, and not compromise it in any shape.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman means a statement of all the seizures that have been made in Montreal, it would take some little time to make it. If he desires to have information which would have been given to the House in reply to the question placed on the paper by the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Baker), in reference to the case of Patterson, Kissock & Co., I have it here. The question is:

"Is it true that Messrs. Patterson and Kissock, of Montreal, have made 'an amicable settlement' of the difficulties arising out of the seizure of their stock-in-trade by the customs authorities? By whom, on behalf of the Government, was such settlement made? What sum of money did the firm pay? Will the money be distributed, and in what proportion, among the seizing officers? Did the Government, or any of its officers, undertake to secure immunity from prosecution to the members of said firm, or either of them? And is it the intention of the Government to push to trial and judgment the prosecution for perjury, already instituted by one of its officers, against a member of said firm?"

The answer I intended to give is as follows:—No amicable settlement has been made, nor has any final settlement been arrived at, that case being still in the hands of the legal advisers of the Crown in Montreal. The firm has deposited the sum of $2,000, which covers the value of the goods so far found to have been improperly entered, and the fines imposed by sections 94 and 215 of the Customs Act. The Government has no knowledge of any of its officers undertaking to secure immunity from prosecution of the members of the firm, or either of them. The question of further proceedings, in the case of perjury, will depend upon the advice of the Crown advisers. Instructions have been given to the effect that if the prosecution for perjury can be successfully pushed to trial and judgment, to push it. Whatever sum is realised from the seizure, after deducting whatever duties are due, will be disposed of as provided by law, namely, one-third placed to the credit of the Receiver General, and two-thirds distributed among the seizing officers, and informers if there be any.

CHARGE AGAINST A MEMBER.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). At yesterday's session of the House, I undertook to prefer certain serious charges against the member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) in connection with obtaining a bonus of $96,000 for the Erie and Huron Railway. When I made the charges, I believed that if I were afforded an opportunity, I would be able to substantiate them. I still believe that if afforded that opportunity, I shall be able to substantiate those charges. Therefore I move:

That Mr. Somerville, the member representing the electoral district of the North Riding of the county of Brant in this House, having stated from his place that he is credibly informed and believes that he can establish by satisfactory evidence that Hector Cameron, then and now a member of this House, was in the year 1884 using his influence and exertions to procure through the Government and Parliament a subsidy for the Erie and Huron Railway Company of $3,200 a mile for thirty miles, amounting to $96,000; and while so engaged he wrote to an officer of the company, in effect stipulating that a commission or bonus of ten per cent. on the amount of such subsidy should be paid to him for himself, or for himself and two other persons whose co-operation in the business he had secured—one-half of such commission to be paid on the subsidy being voted, and the other half on the money being paid over; a select committee be appointed to enquire into the said allegations, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, with instructions to report the evidence and all proceedings of the said committee, and that the said committee be composed of Messrs. McCarthy, Langelier, Macmaster, Fleming, Desjardins, Colby and Lister.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). After the full statement I made on this subject last night, it is perhaps scarcely necessary I should say anything to-day, and I had better, therefore, leave the matter in the discretion of the House, to dispose of it, of course, as they think best. I can only repeat my statement of last night, that I never made any agreement of any kind for any commission or interest in any way in the bonus referred to, or that I was or expected to have any personal interest in it. My action was entirely as solicitor for the gentleman interested in the matter; no agreement was made with him of any kind, and the letter which has been referred to was never received by him until long after the matter was over. In whatever was proposed in that letter—if it be produced or whether it was produced—I had no personal interest, and it was never intended I should have any, but I wrote the letter simply as his solicitor. I took no action with the Government whatever beyond sending in, in my capacity as solicitor, an application for aid. I never approached or asked any member of the Government, or used influence of any kind with any member of the Government, or ever made any application to Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways, but simply handed him the application; and in doing so I told him I was acting as solicitor for the railway. I had no communication of any kind with any member of the Government; I had no interest, and never intended to have any interest in the bonus; any proposal that was made was made, not for myself, but for other parties, and was made on the suggestion of my client, who advised me in the matter, as he himself was leaving the country. I was away, in fact, at the very time the application was put in.

An hon. MEMBER. Who are the other parties.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The other parties are not members of this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it will be satisfactory to the House and to my hon. friend, that the mover of this resolution should state, for the information of this House, the nature of his information, from whom he got it, and when he got it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I have already stated to this House the nature of the charges I bring against the hon. member for North Victoria. I believe I am pursuing the usual course adopted when such charges are made against any hon. member. I do not propose to map out for myself any different course from that usually pursued. I make the charges in good faith. I believe they are true. I believe I can prove them, and I ask this House to appoint a committee, so that I can have an opportunity of substantiating them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must say that, in my opinion, the hon. gentleman is trifling with this House.

He ought to have stated when he was informed of the matter charged, and he ought, when he was informed of it, to have moved his resolution. It is trifling with this House to make, at the very last days of the Session, I may say at the very last hours of the Session, a charge which he knows cannot be satisfactorily looked into, and which is to hang over my hon. friend's head the whole summer. It is not fair to my hon. friend, it is not parliamentary, it is what no fair-minded man should do, it is eminently unfair, and it looks—I cannot impugn his motive, but the outside world will not be so charitable as parliamentary courtesy compels us to be—as if he had brought this matter up at the last moment, so as to prevent the possibility of its being enquired into, and in order that the semblance of a charge should hang over my hon. friend unnecessarily. He will not say whether he knew these circumstances weeks ago, and why he did not bring the charge up earlier, in order that a satisfactory investigation might be had into it, in order that he might have an opportunity of bringing forward his proof, and my hon. friend of bringing forward his rebuttal.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I would simply say, in answer to the statement made by the First Minister, that if he had been in his place in the House last night, he would have known the reason I did not prefer the charge sooner. I said that the reason was that the principal witness I wished to subpœna before the committee was not in the country. Had this witness—an important witness, a witness upon whose evidence I expect to substantiate largely this charge—been in the country before, I would have preferred the charges at an earlier period of the Session. I do not think I am open to the charge which was made by the First Minister in regard to my conduct in this matter, in delaying it until almost the last moment of the Session, as the reasons I have given for delaying the enquiry are substantial reasons, and reasons which will have weight with men who are desirous of viewing this matter, not from a political standpoint, but from a desire to look after the independence of this House and to purify this House from the presence of men who have been guilty of trafficking in their position as members of Parliament, for the purpose of procuring percentages on bonuses which have been granted by this House for the construction of railways. I am prepared to abide by the verdict of the outside public in regard to my conduct in this matter. I feel satisfied that the outside public will stand by me in this matter, and that they will say that I am discharging a duty which is due to them, a duty which is due to this House, and a duty which is due to every member of this House, in asking now for this enquiry into the conduct of the member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron).

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I regretted last night, when the hon. gentleman made his charge, that he had not, as the First Minister said just now, brought it much sooner. He stated then that he had given notice to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), two days ago, that he would bring this charge. That is all very good so far as this notice or charge is concerned now, but the hon. gentleman admits that he had knowledge of the facts that he now brings here against the hon. member for Victoria some time ago, probably long ago by what he says. I really believe that the hon. gentleman should, immediately when these facts came to his knowledge, though he might not have had the proof then, have given notice to the hon. gentleman, because I do not suppose he wanted to convict my hon. friend here of this, I do not suppose that he wanted to persecute him, but, that, as he says, he wanted to fulfil a duty as a member of this House. Well, he should have been very glad to have given notice to the hon. gentleman and to have given him a very early orportunity of clearing himself of any such charge, even if he had postponed his charge until he had that witness whom he says he had not then in the country, but who has come back since. At all events, I think, if this matter is to be investigated, it should not be referred to a special committee, but to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as we referred the other day another charge against two hon. members of this House. Therefore, I move in amendment, that the charge and allegations be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think that either the First Minister or the Minister of Public Works was justified in casting any blame on my hon. friend behind me for the course he has taken. The House may recollect that the hon. member whose conduct is assailed was absent from this House for a very considerable portion of this Session. If I recollect aright, it was not until the end of the second month that he returned here, and I fail to see how it would have been possible for my hon. friend to proceed in the matter until his witnesses were available. It is a very unpleasant and disagreeable task for any member on either side to assail in this fashion hon. gentlemen whose conduct may be called in question, but it is a duty we owe to the public, and I do not think, after the explanation my hon. friend made last night, that his conduct is in any way open to the censure attempted to be cast upon him.

Amendment of Sir Hector Langevin agreed to on a division.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. POPE moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (page 1551) respecting the granting of subsidies to the railway companies, and towards the construction of the railways therein mentioned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the House will allow me to lay on the Table two additional sets of correspondence in relation to this matter.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said there were five or six more.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These are the only two that have been sent over.

Mr. BLAKE. Is not the hon. gentleman going to make a statement in reference to the resolutions?

Mr. POPE. In moving that you leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider the resolutions, I have only to refer to what has taken place since 1882. In 1882, we brought down to this House certain resolutions granting subsidies to railways in this Dominion. The amount laid down at that time, that we would be prepared to vote in aid of railways, was $3,200 per mile. At that time it was intimated to the House that it was the policy of the Government, as far as possible, to confine those grants to leading railways between the Provinces of the Dominion, or railways within the Provinces that might become leading railways. That policy was successfully carried out. But since that time a great advance has taken place in railway construction. In 1883 we continued to grant further subsidies to railways, and the building of railways in certain sections of the country has been found to be very advantageous to the interests of the whole Dominion. We continued the policy in 1884-85, gradually departing from the principle at first laid down that these grants should be confined, as a rule, to leading railways throughout the country. We came to find that it was very important in the interests of the Provinces that we should assist all roads, that we should open up new sections of the country to facilitate their settlement by our own people, and so

develop the country at large. Sir, we find, particularly in the Province of Quebec, that this policy was necessary to restrict the emigration of our own people to the United States. It has been thrown to us across the House by the Opposition that we ought to do something to retain these people in this country, that we ought to do something further than building great lines of railway from one end to the other of the country. Well, Sir, we have also come to this conclusion, that we ought to do something to retain our own people in this country; we have come to the conclusion that we ought to go still further in opening up various sections of this country by means of railways, more particularly in the Province of Quebec, where the French people have a great love of country, a great love of their own institutions, and who will not emigrate to our own North-West, but, instead, find their way into the manufacturing districts of New England. We find such patriotic men as Father Labelle and Father Gendreau exerting themselves to the utmost to retain their people in this country, and I might mention many other gentlemen who have exerted themselves in opening up new sections of the country, some of them almost within a stone's throw to the north of us. The object is, that if our people will not go to our own North-West, that we shall still prevent them, if possible, from emigrating to New England, and endeavor to retain them at home by opening up new sections of the country by means of railways. Nevertheless, we expect to place millions of immigrants in our own North-West, a country where people from Ontario and the other Provinces may also make for themselves beautiful homes. We do not wish to restrict emigration to the North-West, but we wish to provide opportunities for those who desire to settle nearer home; we wish to meet the reproach of hon. gentlemen opposite who have stated that we cannot keep our people at home, and that we ought not to do so much for foreign immigration. We propose to devise means by which we will keep our own people at home, and particularly that class of people who are so well qualified to open up the country, and to become good citizens. We propose, by the development of short lines of railway, to give them a home in this country. No people on the face of the earth are so well qualified to go in and form these new settlements, no people are so anxious to do so, as are our French Canadian population, and we have decided to give them a chance to make a home in our midst, by opening up short lines of railway. If hon. gentlemen will look up at the resolutions, they will find that we have made every effort to meet the interests of the various sections of our people. The time is gone by when the country could be opened up by means of turnpike roads. What turnpike roads were to this country forty years ago, railways are to-day, so that there is no possibility of keeping our own people at home except by opening up the country by railways, so as to give them facilities for inter-communication. We are encouraged to do that by the noble example of those patriotic men that I have just mentioned, such as Father Labelle and Father Gendreau, who have gone into the woods and made great exertions to establish new settlements to the north and to the west. We are bound to assist them, when they come here and ask for aid to open up this country, by giving them railway facilities. Sir, while we continue the old principle, we extend it. The sum we put in the Estimates this year is something like $1,700,000. I am sure the hon. leader of the Opposition will not say that it is too much, when he remembers that when he was in the Ontario Government some years ago, he gave over $2,000,000 in one year for railways in Ontario alone. So I think he will say that we have kept within the mark in proposing these subsidies. Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider these resolutions.

Mr. POPE.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

1. That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned to the Railway Companies, and towards the construction of the Railways also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:—

To the Moncton and Buctouche Railway Company, for thirty miles of their railway, from a point at or near Moncton, to Buctouche, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $96,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I congratulate my hon. friend on the grand speech that he delivered a moment ago.

Mr. POPE. That is a patent speech.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not know that the hon. gentleman had the patent of that speech. I have heard so many people speak that speech in this House, that I supposed the patent had long ago expired. But I really thought that the hon. gentleman was going to give us a business speech, to give us some information as to these particular proposals. We are perfectly well aware what the policy of the Government and this Parliament has been, and we see that the subsidies are in the direction of that policy. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give us some information in regard to this particular resolution. There is a line of demarcation between the gush of patriotism and business. Having gone through the patriotism we will now come down to business. Perhaps, now, the hon. gentleman will make a brief explanation in regard to this particular item.

Mr. POPE. I will come down to business, and I will ask for a little amendment to be made.

Mr. BLAKE. St. Louis?

Mr. POPE. No. This is the Moncton and Buctouche Railway I am speaking of. I do not know whether I have the name right or not.

Mr. BLAKE. No. The hon. gentleman is too patriotic to get the name right.

Mr. POPE. That is business. You and I can arrange that. The patriotic part I have to do all alone. This road is a very important road, as the hon. gentleman will find is the case with most of the roads to which subsidies are to be given. This road starts from Moncton, which has a population of about ten thousand people. It is the headquarters of the Intercolonial Railway, where the principal workshops are located. There is a large sugar refinery, and extensive business operations are carried on. The road will run through a fine agricultural country producing a large quantity of cereals, peas, oats, &c., and there is also a large quantity of tanbark to be found in that section. The railway will run to the thriving village of Buctouche, on the Northumberland Straits, where oysters, lobsters, smelts, and other fish are caught. This road will be thirty miles in length, and its usefulness is best shown by the fact that it has received a subsidy from the Local Government. I move that the resolution be amended, so as to read: "For a railway from a point at or near."

Mr. BLAKE. Then this subsidy is not going to be limited to the existing railway company. The existing company is the St. Louis, Moncton and Buctouche Railway Company. Has the hon. gentleman any information as to the character of the country, from a railway point of view; also, as to the cost of the railway?

Mr. POPE. Yes. The estimated cost of the railway is $18,000 a mile.

Mr. BLAKE. Equipped?

Mr. POPE. Yes; a small equipment for a road of that kind. The hon. gentleman knows that on small roads a large portion of the equipment usually comes from adjoining roads.

Mr. BLAKE. Is than an engineer's estimate?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the Government engineer corroborated it in any way?

Mr. POPE. No; but the Chief Engineer is well acquainted with that section of the country, in which he has operated a good deal himself, and he thinks, from what he knows of the country, that that is a fair estimate.

Mr. WELDON. Where is it supposed to strike the River Buctouche?

Mr. POPE. I cannot tell.

Mr. WELDON. How far distant from the point where the Intercolonial crosses the river?

Mr. POPE. I cannot tell.

Mr. BLAKE. Why does the hon. gentleman propose to alter the resolution which would give the subsidy to the existing company, and insert words so as to be able to give it to another company?

Mr. POPE. I had not received satisfactory assurance of the ability of the company to build the road, and I thought I would be warranted in placing myself in a position so as to be able to give the subsidy to another company if they offered to build the road.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the amount of the Local Government subsidy?

Mr. POPE. $3,000 a mile.

Mr. BLAKE. That Government subsidy is given to the particular company now in existence?

Mr. POPE. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any other company formed to build the railroad except the company at present in existence?

Mr. POPE. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know that any other *bond fide* company is incorporated, and if so, how much has been paid upon the stock?

Mr. POPE. I said I was not satisfied that the present company could build the road. The time when I shall know what amount of stock has been subscribed, how much has been paid up, and whether the company have complied with their charter, is when it is proposed to give them this subsidy. That is the time I can obtain this information, and not before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So the proposition is in air. We are asked, under the supposition that a satisfactory company will be formed, to vote this money. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman whether the Government have come to any policy as to the amount of money they will require to be put up before they grant aid, or whether they propose to take power to grant these subsidies to any company that may be formed, without any definite amount of money being put up in order to guarantee the completion or prosecution of the road?

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman will see there are two subsidies which form something of a guarantee for the building of the road. Before the contract is entered into, the company must show me what guarantee they can give that they are able to complete the road. Not one dollar of public money is expended until ten miles of the road is built.

Mr. MILLS. Is not this road very nearly parallel to the Intercolonial?

Mr. POPE. No; that is not my information. It may be that it runs somewhat in the same direction, like north-east and north and south-east and south, but it is not parallel; and, besides, it will be an important feeder to the Intercolonial.

Mr. MILLS. It would be a great advantage if the hon. gentleman would lay a map on the Table showing the exact location of the different roads proposed to be aided. Practically what we are asked to do is to make a vote of this money without knowing precisely what we are doing. The hon. gentleman, in fact, is asking the House to take a leap in the dark, as he has not given the information which we ought to have received from his Department.

Mr. BLAKE. Did the hon. gentleman say there were two companies?

Mr. POPE. No, I did not.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought you said there was a guarantee from two companies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; two guarantees—two subsidies.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may say that I know something about the locality through which this road is to be built, and I am satisfied that the road is needed. If the Intercolonial Railway had been located further to the north than it was through that section of country, perhaps this particular road would not have been required, but there are large and populous settlements along the gulf shore that are completely cut off, because, in order to make the Intercolonial Railway a short road to Halifax and St. John, it was taken in a different direction, contrary to my wishes, I must say, but according to the wishes of the Government of which I was a member and the wishes of the engineers. This locality really requires railway facilities which they do not now possess, and I think the Government deserves credit for making this grant. It is not my own county, but I know the facts with regard to it.

Mr. BLAKE. At the present moment the hon. member for Northumberland will understand we are endeavoring to get information to enable us to form a judgment, and that, I suppose, the Independent party will not object to.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, I do not object.

Mr. BLAKE. I notice that the Minister of Railways is not unfamiliar with this company, because he had an application formerly to which he acceded.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). It is not the same company.

Mr. BLAKE. It is very like it, and I was informed that it was the same company. Of course, I do not know all the companies in which, as I see by the correspondence, the hon. member for Kent requests the Government to interest themselves, as well as he does, and therefore I at once accept his statement.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I do not wonder at the hon. gentleman falling into the error of supposing the company

mentioned here was the same company to whom a subsidy had been given to build the St. Louis branch. Looking only at the correspondence and the stock list, a stranger to the country might reasonably suppose that it was one and the same company, if he did not look into it closely. Some of the stockholders, I believe, are the same, but they are two distinct companies. Another reason why the hon. gentleman might be led into the error is that the company which constructed the St. Louis branch have sought legislation, though I am not very sure that they obtained it, to give them authority to extend their road from Richibucto *via* Buctouche to Moncton. While that company desired to do that, yet the company for whom the subsidy is intended had, by means of legislation and the steps they had taken, placed themselves in a more favorable position to secure the building of the railway, and therefore the subsidy is intended for them.

Mr. WELDON. What is the distance from Buctouche to the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). The distance at right angles is about thirty miles, or between twenty-five and thirty, and the distance from Buctouche to Shediac is twenty miles.

Mr. WELDON. I think it is only about fifteen.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). The hon. gentleman is mistaken. It is nearer twenty, if not quite twenty, than fifteen.

Mr. WELDON. Would it not be easier to build the road, and more advantageous to the people generally, to Shediac from Buctouche?

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I do not want to say anything disparagingly at all of the claims of the people who desire that, as they are numerous and have fairly strong claims for a subsidy for a railway to Shediac; but, while I have asked a subsidy for both branches when I first entered Parliament, yet the company favoring the road to Moncton have made such progress towards it that I felt that this one would ensure more quickly a *debouche* from Buctouche than by favoring a road to Shediac. But the time may come when an additional branch to Shediac might be both a profitable one and an advantageous one to the people; but at present I feel convinced that the prosperous town of Moncton would furnish to the surrounding country, and particularly to the country served by the railway now in contemplation, a larger, more convenient and more satisfactory market than would Shediac.

Mr. VAIL. Is there a railway from Moncton to Shediac?

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). There is a railway from Moncton to Shediac, and if the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) is correct in his figures about the distance from Buctouche to Shadiac being only fifteen miles, it is evident that with a Buctouche and Moncton Railway built, the same people would be more accommodated by the Shediac road, and would have, at the very furthest, only seven and a half miles to get to a railway to Shediac on the one side or Buctouche on the other. As to the cost of the road to Shediac, while the distance may be a little shorter, the cost must be considerably greater, because it would cross the numerous rivers in that county between those two points near their mouths, and would entail much larger expense for bridging.

Mr. WELDON. What sort of a country does the line from Moncton pass through? My recollection is that the large settlements are on the shore and not inland.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). There are prosperous settlements all along these rivers, extending back to the Intercolonial Railway and beyond, which would be accommodated to a larger extent by this road than by a road built to Shediac. That is my opinion as the representative of the county, without showing any partiality to one section over the other; and with that conviction, and the certainty of this road being in a better position to be built than the other, I have latterly urged that the subsidy should be given to this railway rather than to one to Shediac, and I shall have to assume the full responsibility of that position before my constituents.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Minister of Railways says that $16,000 a mile is the estimated cost with light equipment. How much has he allowed for equipment?

Mr. POPE. From $1,000 to $1,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Railways whether he will be prepared, on the second reading of the Bill to be founded on these resolutions, to make a statement of the exact amount of our liabilities in connection with all the past subsidies. I have asked for that information two or three times, and have been promised it, but, owing, I suppose, to the hon. gentleman's illness, no detailed statement has yet been made.

Mr. POPE. I will furnish the information.

For a railway from Ingersoll *via* London to Chatham, in the Province of Ontario, eighty miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $256,000.

Mr. BLAKE. This I presume is for the purpose of providing competitive accommodation to those towns through which the railway passes—to put them in communication with the Canadian Pacific Railway system. Would the hon. gentleman give us information as to the character of the country and the probable cost?

Mr. POPE. The country is a very easy country in which to build railways, and the estimated cost of the railway without equipment is $15,700 a mile.

Mr. BLAKE. That includes the acquisition of the necessary station grounds, &c., in London.

Mr. POPE. I think the London station grounds are proposed to be given.

Mr. MILLS. Will the hon. gentleman state whether this road is located north or south of the Thames, west of London?

Mr. POPE. I understand that it will be located north. It is intended to accommodate as many of the towns that exist in that thriving part of the country as possible.

Mr. BLAKE. I should judge, from the fact that the grant is for a railway and not for a company, that the hon. gentleman has not before him any proposals of a financial description in reference to this road, nor any plans of location.

Mr. POPE. I can only say that the understanding is that the towns and cities through which the road passes will contribute largely to it. That it is likely to be a good paying road, and that with this subsidy there will be no difficulty in getting a company to build it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is there a charter for the whole distance?

Mr. POPE. There is a charter. These eighty miles are intended as part of a road which it is proposed to run farther west to Windsor, and which would be about 127 miles long.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Under this head I would like to bring to the Minister's attention the interest of a very important town some thirty miles east of Ingersoll on the Grand Trunk system—I refer to the town of Paris. It

would be a great advantage to that town to have competition, which could be given to it by the construction of a railway eight or nine miles long to connect with the Credit Valley.

Mr. POPE. All I can say is that we are most anxious to give all the railway communication we can to all those places. If the hon. gentleman, whom I hope to meet next year, will speak to me in time, I shall be very glad to consider the matter.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Might I ask the Minister if that is all that is necessary in reference to these matters, that I should speak to him?

Mr. POPE. There is no doubt it would have a very powerful influence, but I would like the hon. gentleman also to give me some information about the nature of the road, and how it is to be built.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Of course the Minister said to-day that we were widening the matter, and I suppose it is quite proper for anyone to apply for railway accommodation. There is also the city of Brantford, to afford connection with which a charter has already been obtained, and I suppose my speaking to the Minister next Session in reference to that city will have as much weight with him as he is pleased to say it will have in reference to Paris. I understood the Minister to say he could not consider these questions this year.

Mr. POPE. I do say that any representations the hon. gentleman may make will receive my best consideration, but I cannot bring these matters up this year.

Mr. INNES. As the Minister of Railways has laid down the principle that he is going to assist competitive lines connecting different roads, I hope he will give favorable consideration to a project that we have for the construction of a railway from the city I have the honor to represent to a point on the Credit Valley Railway, which is part of the Canadian Pacific Railway system. I refer to the Guelph Junction Railway. The hon. Minister may recollect that two years ago we obtained a charter for the construction of this railway, and that this year we obtained a renewal of that charter with some necessary amendments. I beg to inform the Minister it is exactly in the same category of roads as the one referred to by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and I trust that he will give it the same favorable consideration another year as that which he has promised to the road in which my hon. friend is interested.

Mr. POPE. I do not know that I can say the hon. gentleman will have quite as much influence over me as the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), but I will consider his representations. I have not known the hon. gentleman so long as I have the hon. member for South Brant.

Mr. INNES. Perhaps when you do, I will be able to have as much influence as my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAKE. The Minister has not granted the bonus to the incorporated company. I suppose that is because he is not satisfied, as he stated in the other cases, as yet with the financial status of the company, or else for what reason is the proposed grant not made to the Western Ontario Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. POPE. I know there are respectable gentlemen connected with that company, but they have not yet shown their ability to go on with the work. Whatever happens they will be dealt with fairly.

Mr. BLAKE. The principle is a reasonable one that the hon. gentleman does not wish to give any particular company a sort of vested right, which the mention of it in an Order in Council would give, until he is satisfied they have the financial ability and standing which will enable them, with assistance, to construct the line.

Mr. POPE. Until there is reasonable expectation that they can do so.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the view I myself have taken when I had to deal with these things. I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the statement of that company shows that the distance of the railway from Ingersoll to London is twenty-two miles, and from London to Chatham sixty-five miles, making a total of eighty-seven miles, whereas the proposed grant is only for eighty miles, so that the subsidy will not cover the full length. It is like the Irishman's blanket—not enough to cover his back and heels at once.

Mr. POPE. I have got the information from the plans and measurements of my officers. If not sufficient, we can remedy it; if it is, we will be all right. My officers are more likely to get the correct distance than the company.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand the case to be a pressing one, and it may seriously interfere with the capacity of the company to make a contract from one point to the other if the grant is not adequate. I observe amongst the grants the hon. gentleman brings down, some in which complaints are made of errors of that kind which will have to be rectified.

Mr. POPE. I admit it would be better, to remove any doubt, to give the greater length, and would make an addition if the hon. gentleman has no objection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You cannot alter it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is going I suppose to bring down more subsidies.

Mr. POPE. I cannot say at present.

Mr. BLAKE. If he does, he can make the rectification and it will not cost us any more money, the object being to go to Chatham in any case. The want of business competition in this case has been very much felt; a gentleman who is a supporter of the gentleman for London, Mr. Carling, informed me that for lack of this competition the city of London has decreased in population of late years.

Mr. CARLING. No survey has been made to ascertain the exact distance. I think it is about 80 miles, as the survey will no doubt establish.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). While this item is under consideration, I wish to ask why this line should start from Ingersoll. In starting from Ingersoll to London, the road will run parallel to the Great Western, and close to it all the way; while starting a few miles further east on the Credit Valley, it would serve a large section of the country which is now without railway communication. I understand this matter has already been laid before the Minister of Railways or some members of the Government, and I cannot understand why the grant should not be given to some point on the railway. Ingersoll has no great interest in this road, for they have two systems at present. The road is more particularly for the benefit of London, and if it were to start from a point two miles east of Ingersoll, it would serve a large section of the country as well as one or two small towns.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I wish to avail myself of the remarks that have fell from the hon. Minister with reference to the bare possibility of his taking into consider-

ation the question of bringing down more grants. I would wish to direct his attention to a claim I have for a road in which Hamilton has very much interest.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. CASEY. I am unable to understand from the resolution before us what company it is intended to give this bonus to, because there is no company named. I am informed that it is the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company which is expected to build this road. Am I correct?

Mr. POPE. There is no particular company designated in this resolution. It may be any company that comes forward and shows us their ability to build the road with the subsidies granted, and that they are likely to get it through.

Mr. CASEY. But a company cannot build it without having a charter, and I do not know what company, except the one named, has any charter between those points. I want to ask the Minister if he knows what companies have charters between those points?

Mr. POPE. There is the company the hon. gentleman refers to. I do not know whether there are any other companies.

Mr. CASEY. The charter of the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company entitles it to build a railway from some point on the River St. Clair, between the town of Sarnia or the village of Point Edward and the village of Courtright.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman forgets that a charter was granted this Session which gives them the power.

Mr. CASEY. The original intention of this charter was to build a road from the point I have named "to some point on Lake Erie within the limits of the county of Elgin, with a branch to the town of Ingersoll or the town of Woodstock in the county of Oxford." Now, although the western terminus of this road may have been very properly changed in order to enable it to become an extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway system, which is just what it amounts to, I do not see why there should have been this discrimination with regard to the eastern terminus, or why a bonus should be granted simply for the part between Ingersoll and Chatham, and the main line, as originally intended running to Lake Erie, should have been left out. I do not see why, if the Government are going to bonus railways for local benefit in every neighborhood, they should not have given a bonus for that part of the original main line of this railway which was to run to a point on Lake Erie. It may be said that the county of Elgin has plenty of railway accommodation at present. Of course, we have railways running east and west through the county, but we have only one or two running north and south. We have a part of the Grand Trunk system running down to Lake Erie, but excepting the eastern part of the county we have no competition elsewhere, and it would be a decided benefit to have a road coming in and crossing the Canada Southern and touching some point on Lake Erie, perhaps the same point, Port Stanley. I desire to ask the Minister why he did not take account of that?

Mr. MACMILLAN (Middlesex). I am very much interested in this road inasmuch as it runs through the constituency that I have the honor to represent. I was exceedingly anxious that this road should have been taken from Woodstock west, but, after very full enquiry, the engineering difficulties were found to be so great that it would cost a very large amount to build the railway from Woodstock west through my constituency. I have found also that it is very much easier to carry it the way it is being carried from the town of Ingersoll through the city of London and west. In answer to what has been asked with reference to the assistance that was being rendered by the localities through which it is going, I may say that the city of London is granting $75,000 towards the building of this road and also supplying the station grounds in the city of London. Our object in doing that is to get competition as against the Grand Trunk Railway, and, although the bonus is only granted to the town of Chatham, we feel we may, with the assistance of the municipalities, including Windsor and Chatham and other places through which this road goes, at no distant date have it carried through to the town of Windsor, and thereby create competition between the two great railway systems of the country, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific. As it is now, we feel, more especially the city of London, that, by getting a connection with this road at the town of Woodstock or the town of Ingersoll, we shall obtain this competition that we so much seek. As far as carrying it into the county of Elgin is concerned, under the old charter, we are desirous of carrying that out, probably at some future time; but, in the meantime, the Minister has informed us that there is no possible chance of granting it to that locality at present.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). I quite agree with what the member for Middlesex (Mr. Macmillan) says, that there are engineering difficulties in starting from the town of Woodstock. I was not pressing upon the Government that the road should commence from the town of Woodstock, though personally I should very much like to see that, but I was pointing out, that by starting a few miles east of Ingersoll and running north instead of south of the Great Western Railway, as it is at present proposed, they would serve a large section of the country with railway accommodation. That is what I wished to press upon the Government and those who are most interested. I did expect, perhaps, that at least the member for London (the Minister of Agriculture) had considered this matter and would have given us some idea of his views, or the views of the Government in regard to it. The point I wish to make is that, in starting from the point mentioned here, the road simply runs parallel with the other road and does not serve any section of the country except in regard to the object of giving competition to the city of London; whereas, by starting a few miles east, they could serve a section of the country which is very thickly settled, in which there are a couple of small towns that are very anxious on the subject, and that would, no doubt, give substantial aid towards the extension of this railway a few miles further east to join the Canadian Pacific Railway system.

Mr. CASEY. It is satisfactory in a certain degree to receive the explanation given by the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Macmillan), in regard to the policy of the Government in reference to this railway. It would have been more satisfactory, however, to have had those explanations from the Minister of Railways, and I was expecting the Minister to give those explanations when the member for East Middlesex rose; but, as it appears that he understood why it was done this way instead of another way better than the Minister of Railways, it is well that we have had the explanations, even as far as they have gone. But the explanations have been vague to this extent. The exponent of the Minister of Railways has merely told us that that hon. gentleman informed him it was impossible to do anything for the branch to Lake Erie, at the present time, but he has not told us why, and that is what we want to know. I think we have a special claim in the county of Elgin in reference to this bonus.

Mr. MACMILLAN (Middlesex). I think you have.

Mr. CASEY. The special claim is this, that we have not in past years come to this Government for aid to build our railways; we have taxed ourselves to build the railways which now accommodate the county. Accounting the city of St. Thomas as part of the county, we have given a bonus of $275,000 to secure the building of the Canada Southern and Credit Valley, besides $80,000 for other railways—over $350,000 in all that the county of Elgin has given for railway accommodation, and has never had a dollar from this Government for any railway within the bounds of the county. Now we find that the company whose original charter was granted with the object of connecting some part of Lake Erie within the county of Elgin, with a point on the St. Clair River, is going to be granted a bonus for building a road to connect a point on the Credit Valley Railway through the city of London, to the town of Chatham, and that the original intention of that road to connect with Lake Erie within the bounds of Elgin, is overlooked. I think that the people of Elgin, who will be taxed to a large extent to pay these railway subsidies, should have some of the money which is being spent in this way. I claim again that if the Government is going to make this a general policy, as they evidently do intend to make it, to aid small railways, railways of the most purely local character—I believe there is one railway in the county of Huron only five miles long which is to receive a bonus, a purely local road—if that is the case, I think the claim of Elgin, either to have some substantial amount of this money spent on building new roads through that county, or to be recompensed for the money they have already spent in building railways for themselves, is so strong that it cannot be much longer overlooked. At a later period of the discussion on these resolutions I may have something more to say; I wish now to enter my protest against the diversion of the money from its proper purpose.

Mr. WILSON. Before the item passes I would like to get from the Minister some explanation with reference to this road between Ingersoll and Chatham, and I would like him to explain to me the representation made to him in connection with the proposition, and why it is that the people of the city of London complain of the want of railway facilities. Up to the present time I have not been informed. I have heard a bald statement made, but I have no fact placed before me sufficient to warrant me in voting this large amount of money for this road between Ingersoll and Chatham. I think there is a great deal of force in the remarks made by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) that if they are asking the country at large to construct a road, it ought to be built where it will serve the greatest number of people and best supply existing grants. As stated by him, if you commence at Ingersoll and run to the city of London, you run directly parallel with an existing road which has been there for years. The section of country between Ingersoll and London, about twenty-two miles, is amply supplied for all purposes of competition in carrying freight between those two points. Then, if you commence further east, you can deviate a reasonable distance and have a line that will afford facilities to open a newer section of country than if you start from Ingersoll. I think if a railway is to be built, it ought to commence further east than Ingersoll.

An hon. MEMBER. West.

Mr. WILSON. I understand that Woodstock is east of Ingersoll. There is another reason that was mentioned here; and a difficulty arose as to why the bonus was not provided for some particular railway, as one road had received a charter, and why the amount of the bonus was not conferred upon that road. Now, we remember that a few years ago another railway obtained a charter from this House, and that charter was to remain in force for four years. I understand they have already surveyed the line from London westward to Windsor, and also made explorations of a portion of that line east—I mean the Canadian Pacific Railway. That charter is not yet dead, and perhaps there is a reason why this bonus was not specially allotted to the company that came to the Legislature this Session and obtained an amendment to their charter. I can tell the leader of the Opposition that it may be that the seven miles will be covered, because it is a very easy matter for the Canadian Pacific Railway to construct this branch line from Ingersoll to the city of London. They can commence their road further west than the town of Ingersoll, and branch off on the line running from Ingersoll to the town of St. Thomas, thereby shortening the distance so that it will not cover more than eighty miles in all. I have been told that their intention is to run upon the Canadian Pacific Railway as far as Belmont, branch off from Belmont, and run to the city of London, thereby materially shortening the road, as I believe the distance is only ten or twelve miles between the two points. Whether this be so, I cannot say. It is unfortunate for us that we are not favored like the city of London in having a Minister at court. We had to pay our $50,000 for the sake of getting a road from Ingersoll to St. Thomas. Now, one of these companies that is supposed to get the benefit of this subsidy, had obtained a charter whereby they could run into the county of Elgin; but the bonus as proposed by the Minister of Railways, is not to be applied, any portion of it, to the county of Elgin. As the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), stated, we have paid enormous sums there for the construction of railways, and as yet we have not received one single cent of a bonus from this Government. While I am on my feet, I may say that I think that the section of country from Ingersoll to Chatham is not deserving of being bonused at all. It has all the railway facilities it requires. That section is thoroughly gridironed already with railways. The people there are almost forced to drive railway surveyors off their lands, because their farms are already sufficiently cut up with railways. Freights are so low at the present time that railway companies contend that they can make no profit in conveying freight from one point to another. Perhaps you are not aware, Mr. Chairman, that the city of London, through greed and a desire to obtain an advantage, a few years ago deliberately sold a road which gave them competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway and with the Canada Southern.

Mr. MACMILLAN. They did not, Sir.

Mr. WILSON. They secured control of the stock. They placed the control of the stock in the hands of the Grand Trunk, giving that company control over the London and Port Stanley road. The city of London and the county of Middlesex are to-day suffering in consequence of that step. We in the county of Elgin opposed it. Have we any guarantee that they will not repeat what they have previously done? For the advantage of having the workshops placed in the city of London they gave a controlling influence and a twenty-one years' lease to the London and Port Stanley road, and shut themselves out from railway competition. Not many years ago I asked the privilege, in the Local Legislature, of obtaining a charter, so that we might build a railway from St. Thomas to London. I was opposed in that Legislature, earnestly and energetically, by the present Minister of Agriculture. They did not desire of their own free will and pleasure to have a road there, they wanted to be isolated; yet we find them coming to-day, having incurred a heavy debt, and asking the Dominion to give them a subsidy of $3,200 per mile for the construction of a road where there is no necessity for it, where there is no want and no lack. They have every

facility, every accommodation and every convenience. The grant is an unjustifiable one. I believe that section will look upon it in that light. It is not only unjustifiable, unjust, unnecessary and unreasonable in that section of country, but it will burden the people with a heavy tax for the construction of a road where the public interest does not require it. The Minister of Railways says that the original plan was to open up communication between the different Provinces; that after a time we advanced and became more liberal in our views and initiated a more liberal policy, namely, to subsidise railways to open up new sections of country. I ask that hon. gentleman if this is a new section of country, and if this subsidy comes under any of the explanations he has offered to the committee. If it does not come under any of the regulations, Parliament is not justified in offering a subsidy to a railway that is not entitled to one cent.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I had no disposition to take part in the discussion on this vote and I would not have done so except for the fact that the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) has made a very definite statement to the effect that there are no advantages whatever to result to the locality through which the road is projected and that the section is not without that railway competition which would justify this subsidy. I know as a fact that the section through which the road is projected, the section intended to be covered by this grant, has for many years stood in serious need of competitive railway facilities. I know the progress of many of the towns has been seriously retarded from that cause. I know that the entire locality, embracing as it must, including the city of London, something like 250,000 people, has had heretofore to depend on one line of railway, and has consequently felt the want of those facilities which the hon. gentleman has said existed. That being the case, I am very glad indeed to see this road is projected and that the Government has seen its way clear to make the grant that is now being discussed. The only regret I have is, that the Minister of Railways could not have assured the committee that the grant would be of such proportions that the local municipalities would have had the prospect of being relieved of any part of the expense likely to be incurred in the construction of the road. It is perfectly true, as the hon. member for East Elgin has said, that the county of Middlesex, as well as the county of Elgin, has contributed a considerable sum to the construction of railways in the past. It is equally true, I believe, in regard to the city of London. But even if we do not receive as much as we might consider ourselves entitled to, and as much as we would like to see those localities get, and even if as a result of this step, the people of the locality are obliged to put their hands in their pockets in order to implement the grant here made, still I think the locality to be benefited will accept it as an evidence of good intention, and as an aid towards securing that competition which I say most decidedly has been the want of that section for some time past. The Minister of Railways has done that locality no injustice in saying that it is settled by an enterprising people, and there are, in that district, a great many lively and progressive towns I should like to see the interest of those kept in view as much as possible in the construction of this road. I am well aware it is impossible that all the details of such a scheme can be submitted to the committee, but I hope that, with the promise of the Minister of Railways, that it is intended to afford competition to that section of that country, the interest of every one of the towns and villages in the locality affected, will be conserved to as great an extent as possible when the project is actively undertaken. I have only this regret to express in connection with the question, that the grant is not a larger one, in order that the particular municipalities that will be expected to implement the grant made by this House might be released somewhat from the load that is proposed to be imposed upon them. The Minister of Railways may be aware of the fact or he may not, but it is a fact nevertheless, that considerable sums of money have been granted by the people of that locality to aid railway enterprises in the past. They have been generous in the past, and I believe instead of this grant leading them to be less generous in the future it will excite them to give such assistance as will be necessary, and as a result of the aid that the people of the locality will be induced to give, this road will be constructed within a reasonable time. I can assure the committee that the advantages of competition are very apparent, and have been particularly apparent since the amalgamation of the two trunk lines that served that section of the country in the past; and the only other assurance I would like to obtain from the Minister is that the public interest will be protected by preventing the possibility of the amalgamation of the projected road with any road to which it would operate as a competitor. I think the locality would accept this as a very decided assurance, and if that assurance could be given here it would be satisfactory to those localities which otherwise might have some misgiving. Of course they can have no objection to the amalgamation of the road with the Canadian Pacific Railway, in fact they would like to secure such an amalgamation because it would mean an extension of that railway. The people would like to have that assurance, and perhaps the Minister can give it, namely, that no amalgamation will take place with any of the roads that now exist with which this road might be a competitor.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman would probably have given some answer to my former question if he had not been anticipated by the hon. member for Middlesex, and had not subsequently left the Chamber. My point was this, that there was no railway having a charter to build anywhere in this neighborhood except the one to which I have referred, the Ontario and Pacific. In case that railway should not be able to show such financial prospects and solidity as the hon. Minister requires, who else could build this road.

Mr. POPE. I do not know of any other company which has a charter, but I would only say that in that case the money will not be expended, and probably some company will come to this House next Session and ask for a charter You may be sure that a country like that will not go without a railway. Some remarks were made by my hon. friend some time ago which have weighed very strongly with me with regard to those railways. When I looked at the country, when I looked at the Provinces and saw that they had spent almost their last dollar in building railways, I felt that perhaps we had exacted a great deal from them. He has referred to another set of people with whom I deeply sympathise; and those are the municipalities which have contributed very largely to those railways. I know that the people of that section of the country have done a great deal to build railways; I know that the municipalities have contributed liberally, and I do not want that we should weigh down our municipalities or the Provinces in this way in building railways which are really of general use to Canada.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman says there is no other company which is now in a position to earn the bonus and build the road except the one I have named. But he says, no doubt this bonus being appropriated some company will come next year and get a charter. Under these circumstances, I do not not know that my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Cameron) has such grounds for felicitating himself and his constituents on the construction of this road as he thinks he has. In the first place, it is absolutely uncertain what the route of the railway will be, and there is also uncertainty as to whether any company can be found to build it. My own impression is that this talk about affording

competition is only a cover for the real intention of the grant. There is just one other company besides the Western Ontario Pacific which could go on and build the road, and that is the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has a general charter to build railways all over the country; and I have little doubt that this railway will be ultimately constructed and the bonus earned by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Of course we all know that the object of this extension is not to afford competition to the towns between London and Ingersoll, or London and Chatham, but that it is really to afford a western outlet to the United States for the Canadian Pacific Railway, by way of the Credit Valley Railway. The only local competition it is likely to secure us in the case of London, where the residence of the Minister of Agriculture does create a certain amount of pressure upon the Government, and London's need for competition, caused by her own stupidity of action in the past, caused largely by the action of the Minister of Agriculture himself, has to be taken into account, and that need supplied at the cost of the Dominion at large. It is very comfortable that, when the people of the city of London had managed matters in the past so as to leave that city without competition, he, the representative of that city, should be in the position to induce the Dominion Government to make good that lack of competition. If my expectations are correct, that road will be built either for the purpose of an outlet for the Canadian Pacific Railway, by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself, or, on the other hand, it will be built by a so-called independent company and absorbed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. You will find that the local trade will be neglected, as it is on all other through lines. The Canada Southern in my own county for instance, the Grand Trunk through route, and some portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway do not care much for local traffic. They go in for through traffic. That is the object of these roads. Facilities will not be granted to local stations, so that almost the only benefit which that part of the country will derive is the expenditure of money in each neighborhood in the construction of the road. It is a part of the great scheme which we have seen progressing gradually for a number of years. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, having some doubts about the future profits of working the main line through the North-West, have been diligently securing a second through route from Montreal to Chicago, at the expense of the country of course, and this is part of the scheme.

Mr. CARLING. One word in reply to what has fallen from the hon. member for East Elgin and the hon. member for West Elgin. These gentlemen representing the rival city of St. Thomas seem to take a very great interest in the city of London, and they have chosen to say that I managed things so that that city is now without competition. I can only say that anything done with regard to railways in the city of London was done by the city council and the proper authorities who made the arrangements with regard to the Port Stanley Road. With respect to the Grand Trunk Railway, the hon. member for East Elgin is not correct, as the bondholders of that road can take possession when they think proper to do so. As to competition I can only say that it will be given, not only to London, but to all points between Ingersoll and London, and to points west of London.

Mr. CASEY. How many are there?

Mr. CARLING. There are the counties of Oxford, Middlesex, Lambton and Kent. This road will run through all those counties and give competition to the people residing along the line. I hope the thriving town of Strathroy will be on the line of this road; the town of Chatham with eight or ten thousand population——

Mr. CASEY. It has competition now.

Mr. CARLING. In what way?

Mr. CASEY. By the Erie and Huron to the Canada Southern.

Mr. CARLING. Well, this will give additional competition. Seeing that St. Thomas has so much railway accommodation, I do not see why these hon. gentlemen should object so strongly to London, Ingersoll, Strathroy and other points having competition. I am satisfied that there is no section of the country more in need and more deserving of competition than the counties through which this road will pass, and that its construction will be a source of great satisfaction to the people of those counties. If the company which is organised do not feel at the present moment in a position to go on, I hope they will be able to do so with this assistance from the Government. All the men connected with the charter I believe to be good men, and I feel satisfied that they will be able before long to take hold of this work and push it through with vigor.

Mr. WILSON. One remark made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture might mislead the House, and might convey the impression that I misrepresented the position of the London and Port Stanley Railway. He said that that road is under the control of the bondholders. He ought to know that it is leased to the Grand Trunk Railway Company for a number of years, so that the bondholders could not assume the control of the road if they wished to. There was much force in what was said by the hon. member for West Elgin in reference to competition. I say again that the citizens of London, but for their own foolishness, would be in as good a condition as any city in the Province of Ontario with regard to railway accommodation. If they are charged high rates—and I do not know that they are—they have themselves to blame; and because they have been improvident and careless, in the management of their own affairs, they ought not to come here and get the Government to relieve them from the consequences of their own want of foresight. It is very evident that this road is intended as a competing line from the east to the west for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Whether the company holding the charter build the road or not, it is intended ultimately to pass into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. This connecting link is unnecessary for the Canadian Pacific Railway at all. There is no use of disguising the fact from the people of the Dominion that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have had for some time their eyes upon the Wabash system of railways, with the view of securing communication with Chicago and the west, and this railway is part of the connecting link to enable them to get to Detroit, where they can connect with the Wabash system; and to say that it is merely to give London railway competition is to mislead the House, because the railway facilities of that city are ample already. It may be said that I am not a proper exponent of the wishes of the people of London. I have no doubt they would be very glad if the Government would build a railway to everybody's door in that city. But we know full well that railway companies with the rates at present paid, are not earning sufficient dividends, whether the stock is watered or not, and the result is that the poor unfortunate laboring men employed on those roads to-day are not getting the amount of wages they ought to have. Yet the Government, while claiming to be the friends of laboring men, undertake to construct lines that are not necessary in the interest of the country, which must have the effect of grinding down the poor laboring men still further. I say it is wrong, and I am bitterly opposed to any such legislation as this.

Mr. KIRK. Although coming from a distant Province, and not at all acquainted with this district through which this railway is to pass, I cannot sit here uninterested in what is going on. It seems rather strange to me to hear hon. gentlemen putting forth as the sole reason for so large a grant as this, that the railroad is needed only for the purpose of competition. Every hon. gentleman who has spoken either for or against this grant admits that there are ample railway facilities there at present, and that this road is to be built simply to compete with roads already built. One hon. gentleman, who is well acquainted with that part of the country, says it is gridironed with railways already, and that this road is altogether unnecessary and unjustifiable. Living in a Province where the people are exceedingly glad to get one railroad without any competing line at all, and where there are hundreds of thousands of people without any railway facilities at all, it does seem strange to me that the Government will ask for so large a grant as this for the purpose of building a road to compete with roads already built. I think there are some other reasons besides those given for this grant; I do not know what they are. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture is trembling in his seat, and it is necessary that something should be done to insure his re-election. At any rate, no good, sound reason has yet been advanced for building this road.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister of Agriculture gives as a reason for doing nothing for the county of Elgin in this connection, that the city of St. Thomas has complete railway facilities already. The city of St. Thomas has the competition of two railways, and why? Because the people of the city and the county put their hands into their pockets and paid for that competition; they did not apply to this Government to furnish it to them. And now the people of Elgin are asked to put their hands into their pockets again to pay for competition for the city of London, which threw away the chance it had of obtaining that competition itself. The hon. Minister thinks I charge him unfairly with being the cause of what was done in connection with the London and Port Stanley Railway; he said it was done by the authorities of the city. Of course it was. The hon. gentleman is very powerful in London, but he could not do that of his own notion, but he has long been the guide, the philosopher and friend of those authorities. It is well known how great his influence in that city has been, and I attribute it, as everybody does, largely to his action that this unfortunate transaction took place, for which we have now to pay. The hon. Minister of Railways was very kind and generous in his remarks about the municipalities; he had always pitied them very much for having paid so much for railway accommodation. For that reason he is going to give this bonus. In that connection, I would remind him again of my first point, which he has not noticed at all. The people of my county have very liberally paid out money for railway bonuses, and have as yet not got one dollar out of the all-round distribution scheme of the hon. gentleman. Instead of getting money out of this fund they are taxed over and over again to pay for so-called competition in other places. The hon. gentleman's own words condemn him in this connection.

To the Northern and Western Railway Company, for ten miles of their railway, intervening between the termini of the portions of their railway for which subsidies are already granted, the one from Fredericton and the other from Indiantown, and an extension of two miles down to deep waters at Chatham, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $32,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Northern and Western Railway extends from the city of Fredericton and runs in a northerly direction to the town of Chatham on the Miramichi, forty-six miles, and is now subsidised from Fredericton to Indiantown, forty-four miles. It was estimated those distances would cover the grant. But the estimated distance was eight miles short, which it is necessary now to provide for, besides the two miles of extension to deep water at the town of Chatham, so as to obtain facilities for ocean traffic at that point. I observe that the application of the company indicates that the latter object, which is to be gained by the grant for two miles, cannot be accomplished by such a subsidy as the hon. gentleman proposes. Their statement is that it would take a subsidy of $25,000 to accomplish this.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman any further assurance, for there is none here, that the grant will accomplish that which the company says cannot be accomplished for less than $25,000?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no assurance, but it is the intention of the city of Chatham to contribute the balance.

Mr. MITCHELL. We will come back by-and-bye for the original sum.

To the Caraquet Railway Company, for ten miles of their railway from the end of the present subsidised portion at Lower Caraquet to Shippegan, in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $32,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This railway is destined to leave the Intercolonial Railway at the town of Bathurst, and run in a north-westerly direction to Shippegan. Sixty miles have already been subsidised, and the present subsidy is to extend the road to Shippegan, which is favorably mentioned by Mr. Fleming, in his report of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, as a deep harbor. He recommended it as being the stepping off place to Europe.

Mr. BLAKE. The prior grant was to a point called Lower Caraquet. I do not observe this to be mentioned at all. The first grant was to Caraquet, and then to Shippegan harbor, and this grant is from Lower Caraquet, which is presumedly the termination of the present subsidised portion. I do not know the ground, but perhaps the hon. gentleman does.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know the ground.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman tell me something about the names? A person named Burns is the owner of eleven out of the twelve shares of the stock of the company, and the application is made by him. Has he any connection with the member for Gloucester.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the hon. member himself, and if the hon. gentleman enquires he will find that it is due very largely to the enterprise of Mr. Burns that this very important road is built. He has thrown himself into it with enthusiasm, and without that enthusiasm the road would not have got so far.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad the hon. gentleman has exhibited so much enthusiasm. Why should he not when he owns eleven-twelfths of the enterprise? If that amount should not give him enthusiasm I do not know what the hon. gentleman could be enthusiastic about.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. His enthusiasm was manifested by his becoming the owner.

Mr. MILLS. And he is still more enthusiastic when he finds his road well subsidised.

Mr. KIRK. Is this road subsidised by the Local Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, it had a local subsidy. It will require them both.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt and more too.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the expenditure per mile?

Mr. MITCHELL. $3,000 a mile. It will require the whole of this subsidy and the local subsidy. It is a very necessary road going through a fine section of country that needs a railway. I hope hon. gentlemen on both sides will realise the fact that there are some places besides Ontario to be relieved by railways. We need some down in the east.

Mr. BLAKE. We are entitled and more than entitled, it is our absolute duty, to obtain such information as we are now asking for, in order that we may understand these grants. Those of us who happen to live in Ontario are more familiar with that country, as the hon. gentleman is more familiar with the Province of New Brunswick. We do not enquire about these things of which we know, but about things of which we are ignorant, and with us, as with everybody except some more favored individuals, the things of which we are ignorant are more than the things of which we know. I hope the hon. gentleman will not be annoyed if we ask for information.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not see why the hon. gentleman should read me a lecture. He has no right to exercise authority over me as he does over the gentlemen behind him. I occupy an independent position in this House. The hon. gentleman asked for information as to whether the road had received a local subsidy, and I gave him the information. It is my duty, a duty I owe to my constituency, to see that all objections, particularly some querulous objections, should not be unnecessarily put forward, when the interests of the section of the country I represent are involved. I do not find fault with the hon. gentleman getting the information he tried to get, and I simply gave him the information he desired.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not reading the hon. gentleman a lecture, but was simply making a humble confession of ignorance as to the particular locality to which this subsidy has reference, and I hope the hon. gentleman will not be annoyed if, confessing my ignorance, I asked for information and got it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have the valuable information that eleven-twelfths of the road is held by a deserving supporter of the Government.

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

After Recess.

NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Mr. McCARTHY moved the second reading of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 25) respecting the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company.

Mr. SPEAKER. This amendment is important. It inserts a new clause and alters a contract which has been made with the Crown, and I think, therefore, it requires the assent of the Crown before it can be assented to in this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The assent of the Crown is given.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think this amendment ought to be read without a reference to a committee, or some notice being given of the time when it is to be read. It is of very great importance.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Bill came down the other day, and has been put on the notice paper exactly for that purpose, in order that notice should be given to the House, and that the House should not be taken by surprise. That is the ordinary way of dealing with these amendments. The hon. gentleman suggests that it might be referred to a committee. I think, at this period of the Session, that would be saying, the Bill, though passed by both Houses, should not have its final reading in this House.

Mr. BLAKE. Why? The committee could meet to-morrow.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. You could not have a committee just now. I have ascertained that we could not have the committee, because we must give the necessary notice, and we would not have the necessary number to take the matter into consideration. I think it would be dealt with better by the House considering the amendment now, especially when, on the objection which Mr. Speaker said was a valid one, the assent of the Crown is necessary in this case. The First Minister has given the assent of the Crown. I think it should now be taken up upon its own merits.

Mr. BLAKE. The course of the House has been, as a rule, though it is not absolutely imperative, to refer to the Railway Committee important amendments made by the Senate. I do not agree with the hon. the Minister of Public Works that a reference to the committee means that the Bill would not pass this Session, because the committee could meet to-morrow and discuss it, and this is the final stage of the whole measure. If the ordinary rule, which has been observed in my recollection in the case of all important amendments which were at all debatable, is not to be followed, one would think reasonable that this particular amendment at at any rate, should be understood, so that there might be an opportunity for the House to give it that discussion which the Minister of Public Works refers to. It is not to be forgotten that this was fully discussed in the House. I was not present, but I have read that in the *Debates*. It is not to be forgotten that the promoter of the Bill declared that there was no intention whatever of interfering with the position which the public occupies with reference to this enterprise by the measure which was before the House, that it was not intended to interfere with the right of the Crown to obtain this railway by paying not more than $8,000 a mile of bonds absolutely, and as to the rest dependent on the value of the road in excess of the $8,000 a mile and also in excess of the subsidy. That was the position in which it left the House, and it comes back to the House, I understand, with an alteration which practically, as you have just announced by the statement as to the consent of the Crown being required, reverses that view which it was supposed was implied by the previous amendments and makes this important change. The House has not had any explanation at all, either from the Minister or from the promoter of the Bill, as to the grounds upon which this very important change, contrary to what were said to be the intentions of those who were bringing forward the Bill, is made. I think it would be reasonable, under these circumstances, that, if the House is to deal with it and it is not to go to a committee, it should not at all events take its final stage at this time. It would be more in accordance with the practice that that which has been a debated measure and which has been dealt with in the way I have stated should not now be concurred in, in this altered sense, without its being understood that the discussion is to come on. That cannot interfere with the final progress of the Bill. We have several days yet before us, and, if it is understood that it will be taken up at the next opportunity for private Bills, it will be doing more justice to the measure, and will be more in accordance with the practice in regard to private Bill legislation which has animated us in the past.

Mr. THOMPSON. When the Bill was before the House at its last stage, the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) requested me to state whether, in my opinion, the amendment which was offered preserving the rights of the Government in respect to the previous contract would be effectual, and I made the statement that it would be. Since then, the company have made representations to the Government which I may be permitted to explain in a few words. It has been represented that it was exceedingly desirable that the company should be permitted to issue bonds to the extent proposed by this Bill without being restricted by the previous arrangement between the Company and the Government. The House knows by what took place the other evening that the limit then proposed, and in fact established by the agreement, was that, in the event of the road being acquired by the Government, the sum to be paid should be a sum of at least $8,000 per mile, and so much more as the road might be worth at the time it should be acquired. The $8,000 per mile, I understand, was a sum arrived at in consequence of an estimate that the cost of the road would be $20,000 a mile, the subsidy being $12,000, and the bonded debt, $8,000. Investigation has been made, with the result that it appears that the expenditure in constructing the work, which is now very near completion, has been very far in excess of the estimated cost. It appears that, irrespective of the cost of rolling stock, which is estimated to be $300,000, the expenditure per mile has been $26,208, and if we include in the estimate the equipment, the cost will be $28,905, so that in either case the estimate of $20,000 per mile, which was expected to be the cost, and which was the basis of that agreement, has been far exceeded. Under these circumstances, it has been represented as reasonable that the agreement should be so far modified by the provisions of this Bill, that the sum to be paid, in the event of the road being acquired by the Government, should be not less than $20,000 per mile.

Mr. MULOCK. It appears to me that we have got into the present difficulty by the Minister of Public Works, or the Railway Committee of which I was a member, adopting, what was often the case, the practice of going too fast. This Bill was not properly investigated before the Railway Committee. The facts which are now for the first time brought to the knowledge of this House by the Minister of Justice, ought to have been investigated before the Railway Committee. Before this House can consent to part with any interest that the Crown has in this road, the regular practice adopted in such cases should have been adhered to, and I submit it is not yet too late to do so. But irrespective of the whole cost of the road, I take another ground. I take the ground that no matter what the road costs, we are not justified, under the peculiar circumstances attaching to this road, in departing from the agreement of 1884. Now, if I am permitted to refer to the debate on this Bill, and I believe I am, I may say that when I gave notice of the amendment to the section under consideration, I pointed out to the House, both before we went into committee and afterwards, what would have been, in my opinion, the legal effect, as well as the moral effect, of the Bill being allowed to pass unamended as it came from the Railway Committee. I took the ground that the agreement of 1884 having, as against the Crown, limited the power of the company to bond the line to an excess of $8,000 a mile, whatever there is in the issue beyond $8,000 per mile, we were to that extent pledging the Crown to redeem the bonds so issued, and not to disturb the bondholders. When I took that position, the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), in reply, gave it as his opinion that my contention was not well founded; but even if it were well founded, he informed the House that we had no ground for alarm upon that point, because there was no intention whatever on his part to ask for any modification of the agreement of 1884. In support of that being his view then—and I believe it was—I am satisfied that he was of the opinion that that agreement ought not to be modified, and, in his opinion, the Bill as proposed did not modify it, I say, being perfectly satisfied that such was his real opinion, we in committee acted upon that statement. Now, let me refer for a moment to what the promoter of this Bill stated to the House in regard to his view as to what the action of the House should be with reference to this measure. On page 1362 of *Hansard* I find the hon. member stating:

"The hon. gentleman's argument amounts to this, that if this enactment is now passed, the effect of the contract between the Crown and the railway company will be practically done away with, if not in law, at all events in good faith. All I can say in answer to that is, that if that is the effect of it we can add in committee any words my hon. friend may suggest to neutralise that. That is not the intention of the promoters of the Bill. They simply desire, instead of issuing ordinary bonds, to issue debenture stock. I explained that to the Railway Committee, and I repeat it here. That is the whole object of the section, to make these bonds sectional; and if there is any doubt at all that passing this legislation would have the effect of nullifying the contract in any way, then an amendment can be put in, and I have prepared an amendment which I think will meet the view of the hon. member, which amendment is to the effect that nothing in the Bill contained shall interfere with the contract between the Government and the company."

Then further on, on page 1364, I am reported to have stated as follows:—

"I hardly think the hon. gentleman has put the issue correctly. It is true, as he pointed out, that the Act of incorporation gives power to bond the road to the extent of $20,000 a mile, but subsequently their borrowing power was modified by the contract made with the Crown. It is the position of the Crown we are seeking to protect."

To that, Mr. McCarthy replied as follows:—

"will introduce a clause to cover that."

Then, on page 1365, Mr. McCarthy states as follows:—

"As I stated, I have no desire at all that the contract between the Government and the company should be in the slightest degree affected, and I propose to add at the end of the clause the words: Provided that this enactment is without prejudice to the agreement between the Government of Canada and the company, bearing date the 12th day of April, 1884, respecting the assumption by Parliament of the portion of said line of railway between Gravenhurst and Callander."

Then he goes on to make some remarks in which the following statement appears:—

"Therefore the power to issue bonds was given in this way: There was power to issue bonds to the extent of $20,000 a mile, and the bondholders took their chances as to whether the road at that date would be worth $20,000 a mile or not. If not, then the bonds would not be assumed by Parliament. That is the position the contract was in, and it is not proposed to disturb that position in the slightest degree.

Mr. MULOCK. Does not the section disturb that?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think so. The company do not, in the slightest degree, desire to affect its contract with the Government by a side wind, but understands that Parliament, should the company not do its duty by the public, may at some future time come in and redeem the bonds, and the bondholders will buy on that chance."

Then, just before going into committee, the hon. member for North Simcoe yielded to the arguments advanced, and intimated that he would move an amendment that would entirely protect the Crown and preserve that agreement in its full force; and after recess he did introduce an amendment which appears as a proviso to the new section 1. Before the committee adopted that amendment, as the Minister of Justice correctly states, I did put a question in these words:

"Mr. MULOCK. If the Minister of Justice is of opinion that that amendment leaves the rights of the Crown just as they are under the contract of April, 1884, I have nothing further to say on this question.

"Mr. THOMPSON. I have no doubt at all that the clause which the hon. member in charge of the Bill has introduced would save all the rights of the Government.

"Mr. MULOCK. That being the case I am prepared to accept the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe."

The House will see that the hon. member for North Simcoe did not desire the contract between the Crown and the company to be in the slightest degree varied by any legislation. I am not aware whether he does now favor the amendment which the Senate has introduced, but the House unanimously came to a conclusion upon this question after debate extending over several hours. Now, another body, the Senate, undertakes to override the unanimous action of this House in a matter affecting the finances of the country I submit to the House whether we are prepared to abrogate our privileges, as a body, and allow the Senate to legislate in any way that is calculated to increase the burdens of the people. What is the effect of the amendment introduced by the Senate? The effect may be to increase the burdens by $1,320,000. We have a perfect right to acquire the control of the road whenever it makes default in conducting its affairs according to its agreement, on payment of the sum of $8,000 a mile, contingent in some degree on contingencies, which may mean nothing or a good deal. But we are only bound beyond question to pay $8,000 a mile. Now, the Senate has chosen to say that we shall charge against the road absolutely before the Crown can intervene and take this property, $20,000 a mile. Is it proper for the Senate to arrogate to itself the right to pass this legislation? That is not my impression as to the functions of that body, and on that point I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think this is an amendment imposing a further burden upon the people. It is, as I said before, an amendment affecting the interest of the Crown in this contract, and, therefore, requiring the consent of the Crown; but I do not think it is an amendment which will require the recommendation of the Crown before any proceedings can be instituted. It seems to me that this being a private Bill, if the House chooses to confirm the amendment made by the Senate, it will be in order.

Mr. MULOCK. That being your judgment, Mr. Speaker, I will not argue the point further. I may say that when the Bill came into the House from the committee, I then raised the point with respect to giving effect to the agreement. I did not get any ruling then. I asked whether the sanction of the Crown would not have to be given to the Bill. Probably that ruling was not given by you, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there may have been doubts as to whether the clause did go so far as I thought it was likely to go. However, we are now face to face with the merits of the question, if there are any. In 1884, Parliament granted to this road a very large bonus, $12,000 a mile. Why did it grant this large bonus? Because that road occupied a peculiar position, and it was expected that it would continue to occupy a peculiar position. It was not to enjoy all the ordinary rights of a railway, but it was to discharge certain obligations towards the whole country. It was to discharge and serve a purpose, having no special reference to one line or another, or to one part of the country or another, but it was to live up to certain stipulations set forth in the agreement. And those stipulations are of vital interest to the people of Ontario; they are of vital interest to the section of the country which this road traverses, to the section of country lying east, west and south. I am not aware of there being any road in Canada that occupies the important position this road occupies in regard to the welfare and trade of Ontario. An agreement was made—it is too late to protest against it now. The transfer of this line was made to the Northern and North-Western Railway. I venture to say that had the Government consulted the people of Canada before they made that lease, they would not have obtained the consent of the people to it. They entrusted that line to the management of two companies that have never done their duty to the people of Ontario. The Northern Railway has since its inception to the present time acted the part of tyrants over the section they served; they have entirely failed to appreciate the fact that their prosperity to some extent depends on the prosperity of the people. The North-Western Railway has also mistaken its functions. That company perpetrated what I cannot characterise as less than a gross fraud upon a large section of the country. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I think, will agree with me upon that point. The North-Western Company constructed its line with the aid of bonuses voted by municipalities upon the understanding that it was to be maintained as a rival road to the Northern. But a short time after it acquired those bonuses that company pooled with the Northern and to-day they are practically one body, and their tyranny is simply galling to the whole section served by that joint company. There is no redeeming feature in their management. Their service is defective, their rolling stock is deficient; I do not know whether it is intended to repair their broken rolling stock with money extracted from another corporation; however, their rolling stock is unsatisfactory, their management is tyrannical and they entirely neglect their duties to the public. To those two bodies the Government without reflection, without consideration for the section of the country served, without consideration for the vast interests dependent on that road, without it being known to the public, handed over the line in question, on the terms of the agreement of 1884. A greater mistake, and a more inexplicable mistake was never made, so far as we know. How it comes that that line was handed over to those two bodies under those circumstances, I fail to comprehend. At the very time the Government handed over that line to those two companies they had in their possession a tender to build the line for half the money. They had power to have got the line built from the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Ontario system for half of the bonus they handed over to that line. But having given those special advantages to this particular company in the contract, and the money having been handed over, to-day we are called upon to intervene and postpone the rights of the Crown further. Why should that be done? How much independent money is there in the company? $1,800 is all the money belonging to independent shareholders which there is in that company. It is scarcely proper that Parliament should be called upon to vote $1,320,000 to this company which has a gross subscribed capital of only $200,000. We have handed over $1,320,000 to a company with a gross subscribed capital of only $200,000, of which $182,000 is owned by other railways and only $18,000 by other persons, and on that grand total 10 per cent, or $20,000 has been paid. Before they come and ask for farther aid they should have put their hands into their own pockets and get their shareholders to contribute. They seem to think all they have to do is to knock at the door of Parliament and they will get all the money they want. And it looks very much as if all they have to do is to knock and receive any amount they desire without regard to the interests involved. I will state why under no circumstances should the financial position of this company be varied as is proposed here. I want the First Minister to remember this, because it will be realised as certain as the time comes, that so long as the road is under the present management of the lessees' line, the Northern and North-Western will fail to discharge their obligations to the public. It will be managed on exactly the same lines as the lessees companies are managed. I do not ask the House to accept my testimony on this point, but to obtain the testimony, not only of those belonging to rural public, but of the whole travelling public. Take such testimony, and they will unanimously say that the management of the Northern is not such as it should be. Now, you propose to hand over this line to that management and further render it impossible for the Government to withdraw the line from that management. Now, I submit that

the more you allow this road to be bonded, before the Crown can come in and take possession, the more securely you confirm the relationship between the company and the line in question—the Hamilton and North-Western. What reasons have been advanced why we should do what is asked to be done? We have an interest to-day in taking possession of that line when it fails to carry out its agreement. Hon. members may say that the company is controlled, that the Act provides that they shall conduct their business in a certain way. I admit that; but where is your remedy? Your remedy is taken away if the Crown cannot step in and take possession. To-day the Crown can take possession on the payment of $8,000 per mile after the default, and such other sums as it may be worth; but if you pass this amendment, it can only take possession on payment of $20,000, and such excess as it may be worth. It may be argued that the agreement is not varied, that because the road cost so much it is worth so much. But there is a vast difference between cost and value. Under this agreement the value is to be ascertained at a certain time. That time is when this road makes default in conducting its business according to the Act of Parliament and the agreement. When that may be, nobody knows, but my opinion is that it will be at an early date. But whenever it happens, a valuation has to be made by disinterested parties, and the value of the road will be determined on what? On its cost? Are railways sold by what they cost?

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). They are sold for what they are worth.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, and what is the test of its worth?

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The arbitrators will tell.

Mr. MULOCK. And on what principle will they proceed to tell? On the earning power of the road; on how much is over after expenses are paid; that is the value of the road. When the Canadian Pacific Railway the other day bought the North Shore Railway, what test did they apply? Why did they refuse so long to buy the road? They did not look into the question of cost but the earning power, and in that you have to consider rival roads. Supposing that a year hence there should be a rival road alongside this, and there are charters already to build rival roads to the Canadian Pacific Railway, would not the value be affected? Supposing that ten years hence there is another through line running alongside this road to the Canadian Pacific Railway, will the value then be the cost? No, the value is a fluctuating, a varying quantity, depending on the earning power of the road, and its future prospects. Therefore, when to-day you say you determine this transaction by the cost of the road, I submit that you are adopting an unsound principle upon which to act. Now, Sir; under these circumstances I think this House will, if it assents to these amendments, be doing a serious act of injustice to the section of country intended to be served by this railway and to the whole Province as well. At present it is the only line whereby Western Ontario can connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Ontario is specially interested in the Crown having the strongest hold upon this railway, and the more you postpone the rights of the Crown, the weaker you make the hold of the Crown upon that road, the more difficult you make it for the Crown to step in. The more you remove the obligation from the company to live up to this agreement—the more you prejudice the interest of the country. For these reasons and others which I shall not advance, owing to the lateness of the hour, I intend to oppose these amendments, and if unsuccessful here, I shall endeavor, at all events, to be successful somewhere else on the point.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. MITCHELL. This matter was fully discussed the other night. I think we discussed it some three or four hours and in a manner which quite satisfied the House that the Bill as it left this body was the Bill which should be passed by the Legislature of this country. The gentleman who has preceded me has so clearly stated the facts that I shall only refer very briefly to one or two salient points. It was said on that occasion by myself, as well as by several others, that the effect of the changes which the promoter of this Bill desired to introduce into it would be to fix upon this country a possible amount of $1,320,000 more than the company agreed with the Government, and more than legislation up to this time had sanctioned. Now, I put it to the House, and through the House to the country, whether we are prepared, without any evidence before us, to pass through this House a Bill creating such a liability as that. It is very well known that the promoter of this Bill, on that occasion, after discussion, stated that he would not consent to the amendment which was put in his hands. He modified that amendment and consented to the suggestions which were made in this House that a change should be inserted in it which would protect the public interest and which were fairly in accordance with the agreement. He disavowed any desire to change that agreement. What influences have been used in the Senate I know not. All that I know is that it is said that on the Senate Committee there were gentlemen who were interested in the success of that Bill. I can only say that it was in extremely bad taste, to say the least of it, on the part of these gentlemen to sit there and discuss this measure where there were directors of this company, and at least one person who, I am told, is directly interested financially in this measure. I say it was very bad taste on their part and very wrong to have consented to propose an amendment to the Bill which will take so much money as a possible chance out of the Treasury of the country. I am not speaking now for the purpose of talking the Bill out. I am simply going to put the question to the House, because I think this transaction is one which ought not to be sanctioned; I think it is a matter in which the Treasury of the country should be protected by the Government. I think the Government should not have consented to this Bill, and if they do consent, of course they have the power to carry it through; but it will be on their own responsibility, to be answerable to the public for it, and of having it charged upon them that they have consented to fix a possible cost of $1,320,000 on the public Treasury, which they are not liable for. Why should we do this? There was an agreement attached to the schedule of the Bill, and we have no right to go and extend that Bill. The Senate step in and they say they will construe that agreement by additions to it making it a right of the company to issue bonds to $20,000, instead of $8,000, per mile, thus creating an additional liability of $12,000 per mile, if the road should ever require to be taken over. I think it is a most outrageous piece of legislation, and one to which I hope the Government will not consent.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I listened to the remarks of the hon. member for North York with the greatest interest. Certainly he made a very clear and able argument. I was very careful to try and understand his argument, and the pith of it seemed to be this: That the present agreement between the road and the Government is that the Government could take it over and pay $8,000 per mile difference, between that and what it may be worth. But if you pass this amendment, the country will have to pay $20,000 a mile. But I am informed by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. McCarthy) and by the hon. Minister of Justice that this road has cost more than $20,000 a mile, and that it is worth more; that there are bridges upon it a quarter of a

mile long, and that there are some four rivers to cross. Everyone knows that a road with such bridging as this road is to have will cost more like $50,000 a mile. I cannot see where the danger is in passing this amendment, and I am quite sure I would be very loth to saddle this country with such an amount as that by my vote; but at present, from the statements made, I cannot see that we should be doing that.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has stated that from his knowledge of railway building generally, it is fair to assume that the railway we are discussing is worth the amount of the bonded debt which the Government are prepared to put upon it. That may be so, or it may not be so. If it is so, I ask the promoter of this Bill why he refused to refer it to the Railway Committee in order to obtain evidence to satisfy this House what the real cost of the railway was. I for one, having heard all the discussion which has taken place on this measure, think that the amendment added by the Senate should not be assented to by this House. When the Bill was before the House on a previous occasion, its promoter, familiar with all the circumstances, deliberately accepted the decision of this House as to the power to bond the railway. For some reason which has not been stated, but which we can conjecture, when the Bill went up to the other House, in which there are gentlemen whose names appear on the list of stockholders, means were used for the purpose of having the amendment now under discussion added to the Bill. I can support the statement made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), that some extraordinary work has been going on in the other House in order to accomplish this, and every person must be satisfied that more interest is taken in this Bill than the welfare of the community alone requires. Why is it, after the Bill had been passed in this House, and after its promoter here signified his willingness to accept it as it was passed, that on its being taken to the other House, that House thought proper to make this amendment to it, an amendment calculated to fasten on the people of this country a liability much greater than was contemplated when this road was subsidised? Now, let us look at the history of this railway. The company was incorporated as far back as 1881, by chapter 45 of the Statutes of that year, under the same of the Northern, North-Western and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company. The hon. member for North Simcoe was the promoter of that Bill, and he was a stockholder and a director in the company. In 1883 the Act incorporating the company was amended by its name being changed to the Northern Pacific Junction Railway Company, and by additional powers being given to it. The hon. member for North Simcoe was the promoter of that Bill and a stockholder in the company. In 1882 this railway was subsidised by the Parliament of Canada to the extent of $5,000 a mile; and in 1883 it was further subsidised to the extent of $6,000 a mile, making the enormous subsidy of $12,000 a mile for a purely private enterprise—as the sequel has proved it to be—a larger subsidy, I venture to say, than any other subsidy ever granted by this Parliament to any other railway except the Pacific Railway. The company received, and are to receive, $1,320,000 of the money of the people of this country, and it was but right that this Parliament should take all measures necessary to protect the interests of the people when it was granted such an enormous subvention. It was provided that the Government of the country should have the right, at any time they thought it would be in the public interest to do so, to take possession of this road, paying for it its actual value at the time. At the same time the company was given power to create a debenture debt of $8,000 a mile, and the Government could take possession of the road for whatever sum it might be worth over and above that $8,000 a mile. Now, the road has been completed, and it is as much a private enterprise as any railway in the Dominion. Whether it has been extravagantly built or not; whether there has been jobbery connected with its construction or not, I do not pretend to say; but before the hon. member for North Simcoe comes to this House and asks us to make this country responsible for $20,000 a mile, he has a right to satisfy this House that the money this country has granted has been honestly applied in the construction of the road. He has not done so. He asks us to take the word of the president of the Northern Railway Company. He has submitted no figures whatever to the Railway Committee or to this House which would enable us to form an opinion as to the actual cost of the road. The effect of this amendment, if it becomes law, will be that the country will have to pay $20,000 a mile for this railway, which, according to the hon. gentleman's own statements and that furnished by Mr. Barker, the president of the Northern Railway, is more than the road actually cost. According to Mr. Barker's statement, the total cost of the road, exclusive of equipment, was $26,208; we granted towards its construction $12,000 a mile, which would leave the cost to the company $14,208 a mile, exclusive of equipment; so that it is proposed to pay the company $20,000 a mile for what cost it $14,200 a mile. The cost of the road, with equipment, was stated to be $28,905 a mile; deducting the subsidy of $12,000 a mile would leave the cost, without equipment, at $16,905 a mile. According to the first calculation, they are to receive if we give them power to issue the bonds, $5,800 more than the road cost without equipment, and according to the second calculation $3,095 more than this road cost with equipment. As I said, this road is purely a private undertaking. It is a speculation entered into by certain individuals out of which they, as everybody else who goes into a speculation, expect to make something. This road has not been built purely in the public interests, for the gentlemen who have been promoting it are not such patriots as to devote their time and energies in constructing a road simply for the people of the Province of Ontario. Depend upon it, there is something in this road for somebody. As I have said, it is a private enterprise. The Northern Railway Company, of course, is a road which has been run a great many years, and which the member for North York tells us has given anything but satisfaction to the country through which it runs. The Hamilton and North-Western Railway is a railway I believe incorporated by the Provincial Legislature. This Government, by an Act of theirs passed here, seize all the provincial railways, confiscate the provincial railways, and they permit this Hamilton and North-Western Railway, which has received $500,000 from the people of the counties through which it runs, and which was given for the express purpose of having railway competition, to amalgamate with the Northern Pacific Junction, thus leaving the people in as deplorable a condition as they were in before. Why is it that the promoter of this Bill takes a different position or that the Government to-night takes a different position from what was taken the other night? What influence has been brought to bear on these individuals since then? Why is it? Perhaps the hon. gentleman will say that the bonds which they will issue and have issued will not be as marketable without this provision, but they entered into that contract with their eyes open, they knew what they were doing, and it is not for them now to come back to Parliament and say, if there is any loss in this matter, you and the people of Canada ought to incur that loss. On another occasion, and if you will permit, I will refer to that debate, I stated in this House that I found that this road was bonused while the hon. gentleman was a member of this House:

"I find that he, a corporator of that company, was an applicant to the Government to grant the road $12,000 per mile, the first grant being

$6,000, and that being supplemented by another of $6,000 per mile. I find the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was interested in shares of the stock of that railway company, I believe, of the majority of the stock. The Hon. Frank Smith, Senator, the Hon. James Turner, Senator, and Mr. Dalton McCarthy, member for North Simcoe, are upon the list of shareholders of that company. The Hon. Frank Smith, the Hon. James Turner, Mr. McCarthy and Mr. John Stewart, appeared to hold shares to the extent of 1,820 out of 2.000, so that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and his friends controlled entirely the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, and the hon. gentleman not only controls the stock of that road, but he is sitting in this House to-day as a member and as the president of the railway which has been bonused to this enormous extent."

Then the hon. member for North Simcoe stated this:

"The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) whom I see now in his place, who made this charge, ought not I think to have made it under the circumstances, and, considering the relations between us in the past, he ought not to have taken that course without a better knowledge of what he was speaking. Had some members done so I would not have minded it, but from him I did not expect it, and I think he ought not to have adopted it and to have made the charge. It is utterly and entirely without foundation."

This is the statement of the hon. gentleman, after stating that he held the 1,820 shares in trust for the company's interest. I desire to say to that hon. gentleman now that the only information that I had upon that subject was the return brought down to this House of the stockholders in the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company. In that return I found the hon. gentleman's name, with the other two gentlemen I have named, as holders of stock to the extent of 1,820 shares. There is nothing upon that return to show that they held those shares as trustees. I desire to say to the hon. gentleman that I accept his statement to the fullest extent, that, as far as these shares are concerned, I would not for a moment think of contradicting or not believing the statement he made. As to these shares, I believe thoroughly that he does hold then in trust for these two railway companies, and I suppose that the hon. gentlemen who are associated with him as well as himself, because the three names are bracketed together, must be trustees. But there is one thing in connection with this railway which I think requires some explanation. When the Northern, North-Western and Sault Ste. Mary Railway Company was incorporated, there was a stock list. Some persons must have assigned the shares over to these hon. gentlemen in trust. There was a stock list for the Northern, North-Western and Sault Ste. Mary Railway, and I am informed that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), was a stockholder in that original company, along with some others; that this railway, the Northern Railway, and the Hamilton and North-Western became interested in the Northern Pacific Junction as lessees; and I understand that, at the time that railway became interested, the stock was transferred, and that the stockholders, the original stockholders, the men who transferred the stock to these other railway companies, made considerable profits out of the transfer. That is a rumor that I have been informed of. I have been informed that such is the case. Of course, if the hon. member for North Simcoe states that that is not the fact, or that it is a legitimate transaction, and consequently not worthy of contradiction, I shall be glad to accept his statement so far as that is concerned, but I repeat that I have been informed that in the original stockholders of this road transferring their stock to other roads, or to the persons for whom they hold that stock in trust, there was considerable money, considerable profits made out of that transaction. This is the statement I have to make as it has been made to me. I can only repeat that, if the hon. gentleman says he was not a stockholder in the original transaction, although his name appears on the Statute as a director of that road, I shall of course accept his explanation. Now, I can only repeat that, under all the circumstances, I think that this Parliament would not be justified in assenting to the amendments which have been proposed by the Senate.

Mr. LISTER.

I think it will be doing its duty to itself, doing that duty which the country expects of it, to refuse to adopt the amendments which have been made by the Senate, and that the Bill, if it passes at all, should pass as it left this House.

Amendments read the second time.

Mr. McCARTHY moved that the first amendment be concurred in.

Mr. MULOCK moved:

That this House disagrees with the amendments because they seek to violate the agreement between the Crown and the company set forth in schedule B.

Mr. LISTER. I call attention to the fact that the hour for Private Bills is up.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, if the hon. gentleman takes the objection, I must rule. Do you take the objection?

Mr. LISTER. Yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then I give notice that, on Monday next, I will move that this order be put on Government Orders.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

House again resolved itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (page 1551) respecting the granting of subsidies to the railway companies and towards the construction of the railways therein mentioned.—(Mr. Pope.)

(In the Committee.)

To the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company, for thirty-seven miles of their railway, from Windsor to Leamington, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $118,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This railway is to run from the town of Windsor to Rondeau, a distance of about eighty miles. The subsidy, now proposed is to cover the first thirty-seven miles from Windsor to Leamington The road will pass through an excellent agricultural country and will not only be of local benefit, but will also afford advantages to the western portion of Ontario and to the whole country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is Leamington connected with Rondeau now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I think not.

Mr. CASEY. Do I understand that this road is to run from Windsor to Rondeau? I could not hear the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The charter of the Erie and Huron road does not run from the town of Windsor, but this subsidy is only from Windsor to Leamington, thirty-seven miles.

Mr. MILLS. How does the hon. gentleman expect by this road to get from Leamington to Rondeau?

Mr. CASEY. I wish to ask why it is not for the whole line of road down to Rondeau?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You know that we must cut our garment according to our cloth.

Mr. CASEY. The Erie and Huron goes to Rondeau and then it runs up northward. Rondeau is a harbor on which a good deal of money has been spent by the country already, a valuable harbor, and if this railway is to be use

ful, it should go to the more important places along the lake shore.

Mr. MILLS. I do not know exactly what the hon. gentleman's intention could be to extend this road from Leamington to Rondeau. Is it for the purpose of drawing away all the traffic from the peninsula to Detroit? Is it for the purpose of making Detroit the commercial centre of the whole west? I think the hon. gentleman will find that the population in the district in which he proposes to extend this road, would like railway connection in the direction of Chatham rather than in the direction of Detroit. My recollection is that the discussion has pointed in that direction, and I supposed, after the patriotic exhibition we had on the Treasury benches this afternoon, that the hon. gentleman would have done almost anything rather than to undertake to make Detroit the commercial centre of the whole traffic of the whole western peninsula.

Mr. WIGLE. However much hon. gentlemen opposite may find fault with the subsidies granted to other railways, I cannot see why they find fault with this.

Mr. MILLS. I am not finding fault.

Mr. WIGLE. In the first place the county of Essex, out of the millions of dollars expended by the Ontario Legislature, never received a dollar from that Government for railways. The district is so situated that it does not receive much benefit from the roads that run through there now, and this road goes in a different direction altogether from the roads now running through the county of Essex. That county has never received aid, I suppose because there are no counties behind it to back it up, no counties through which roads had to run in order to get west or south. It is bounded on the south by Lake Erie, on the west by the Detroit River, the boundary line between the Province of Ontario and the State of Michigan, and on the north by Lake St. Clair, and the roads that run through the county of Essex at the present time are direct lines from Buffalo to Detroit, and go on the north side of the county of Essex. The result is that the southern part of the county is not benefited by these roads. This proposed road commences at Windsor and runs about fifteen miles southward to a place called Harrow, in the township of Colchester, thence east to Kingsville, Ruthven and Leamington, with the intention of carrying it on to Rondeau or Blenheim and connecting with the Erie and Huron system there and then go to Chatham and so on to Sarnia. There is now a company, the stock is taken, bonuses are granted, and everything is arranged to commence within a week or two, to build a railroad from Leamington North to the Canada Southern, with the intention of still going further to the Grand Trunk, and it is needed very much in that part of the country. The hon. member for Bothwell knows well, as he has been there, and so does the leader of the Opposition, that it is a fine country, that it deserves railways, and I say we are getting no more than our rights. Then, again, opposite Leamington, only fourteen miles south, is that beautiful island known as Pelee, in Lake Erie. That island is becoming known all over this country, by the excellent wine which is made there, and it requires an outlet. The outlet for Pelee Island to-day is Windsor. They have to go sixty miles to get to a railway, but as soon as this road is completed, they will be able to get there by going fourteen. Then, again, by getting to the Grand Trunk Railway, the people of the south are greatly benefited; because the Canada Southern Railway is not a local railway for Canada, it does not go to the markets of Ontario, and the result is that anywhere along the Canada Southern, from the fact that they have to run over two roads, the people have to pay $40 a car, whereas from Windsor we can get a car to Toronto for about $22. So when this system is worked out, it will be a great benefit to the people of South Essex, and I am satisfied that all these large audiences the hon. member for Bothwell has had the pleasure of addressing in that country, will be very much pleased with this Government when they see that this matter is carried through.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman speaks about this road being opposed. I was offering no opposition to the road. I believe the road runs through a district that will make this road self-supporting, and a good investment to those who may undertake it, if it is economically managed. But I was not referring to the road the Government subsidised, but to the extension the leader of the Government spoke of, and it seemed to me that he was not very familiar with the geography of the district.

Mr. BLAKE. I would observe that this grant was made to a particular company, different from many of the other grants we have had. With respect to the grant itself, as the hon. member who represents that district has appealed to me, I may say that I had great pleasure in visiting his district, and I agree with him in his statement as to the character of the country itself. I had known a long time, from report, of the wealth of that country, but I observed, on going through it, that it surpassed my own expectations, and also that it was admirably well calculated for railway construction. The hon. gentleman is fortunate to have a very level country, and therefore he can get his roads built cheaper than most other people. I observe, also, that he has taken a long time to get the Government to do what they ought to have done in this matter. They are good at promising, as the hon. gentleman knows, and as I shall prove, but they have been very slow in performing. I have before me the papers with reference to this enterprise, and among them I find a letter to the First Minister from the representative of the other division of the county. I find that in the Session of 1884 a bonus was promised to this road by Sir Charles Tupper, the then Minister of Railways. The member for the north division of Essex says:

"My Dear Sir John,—I enclose a number of petitions which have been forwarded to me for presentation to you, in favor of a bonus to the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit Railway Company. This is the road for which Sir Charles Tupper promised a bonus last Session, and the people of south-western Ontario fully expect that there will be no further delay or disappointment, but that the promises which have been made will be fulfilled."

Well, this was written on the 29th April, 1885, and it also pointed out:

"I understand that Mr. Wigle, whose constituents are very deeply interested in this railway, has sent maps, &c., to the Minister of Railways."

The maps which, so far as I can judge from the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell, the First Minister has not looked at, or, if he has looked at them, has forgotten the way they described the country. So it appears from the statement of the hon. member for the north riding of Essex, that this bonus was actually promised by the hon. Minister of Railways in the Session of 1884, and the fulfilment of this promise was urgently demanded in the Session of 1885 and it is not until this Session that these promises are fulfilled. I can therefore understand how it is the hon. member for South Essex was very anxious that there should be no further delay in the fulfilment of these promises. Now, with reference to the actual grant, I observe that an application is made for $5,000 a mile in aid of the whole railway. But the hon. gentleman has observed that he must cut his coat according to his cloth, so he gave $3,200 a mile, and it seems, that being the character of the cloth, the hon. gentleman has cut it into a jacket, his cloth not being enough to make a coat. Let us hope that the hon. gentleman will be able to extend the garment and clothe the hon. member more abundantly and satisfactorily before he is called upon to meet his constituents. As the Minister of Railways stated very early in the discussion that, as he had

not evidence of the ability of the Moncton and Buctouche Railway Company to build the railway the money had not been voted to that particular company but to "a company." I ask if the hon. gentleman has received evidence as to the financial condition of this company, and if he is satisfied that the company is in a position to entitle them to have this subsidy voted them individually. Of course I am not cognisant of the fact; I do not imply that the corporation is not entirely strong financially, for I know nothing about it. I do not, however, find in the papers laid before the House any evidence on that point. I think there must be some papers, which the Minister of Railways has forgotten to bring down, which will enable the hon gentleman to answer that question.

Mr. WIGLE. The hon. member for West Durham does not exactly understand the position of this road or the position taken by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) when he wrote this letter. There was a charter which was granted in 1877 by the Ontario Legislature to incorporate the Leamington and St. Clair Railway Company. In 1884 Sir Charles Tupper promised me that if he had known about this road in time he would have given the subsidy to that road. But as he was not aware of the fact it was not granted. The charter for the Detroit and Lake Erie road was not granted till last year, and in that charter there is a privilege given to build a branch from Leamington North. The road referred to by the member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson) was that from Leamington North and it was that road to which Sir Charles Tupper also referred and not the one from Windsor to Leamington. It was the Leamington and St. Clair Railway which is now covered by a branch of the Detroit and Lake Erie road. So if this road is built from Windsor to Leamington there will then be an outlet from Leamington to the Canada Southern and also to the Grand Trunk Railway. The road to Leamington will be built this summer, the company has been formed, the stock taken, the bonuses voted by the municipalities, and everything is ready so that we can complete the road during the summer. So when the road is constructed from Windsor to Leamington it will connect with other lines and even if it is not built to Rondeau it will be a great advantage to the country, but it is intended to go from Leamington to Rondeau or Blenheim, forty miles further.

Mr. BLAKE. The Government was asked to bring down the papers which relate to the subsidy and which formed the basis on which they are to be granted. The Government agreed to adopt that course. They have brought down certain papers, and really the only papers are the letter from the hon. member from North Essex (Mr. Patterson) and the accompanying petition. So if I have made a mistake in supposing these papers to apply to this branch, it is only because the hon. gentleman who sits beside the hon. gentleman from Essex said so. If it does not apply to this grant, then there are no papers. But that is not the case, because the Government say those are the papers. So in addition to the First Minister not being thoroughly acquainted with topography, the Government have brought down papers which have nothing to do with the question, and they have represented them as having to do with it. In this matter the hon. member for North Essex says:

"I hereby enclose a number of petitions forwarded to me in favor of a bonus to the Detroit and Lake Erie Railway. This is the road to which Sir Chas. Tupper promised a bonus last Session, and the people of the county expect there will no further delay or disappointment in granting."

That may apply to some other railway, in Kamschatka if you please, but it is the document on which we are asked to grant this bonus. It seems the Government have other papers, and I hope they will produce them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. During the last and previous Sessions the custom was followed that if there was any doubt in the mind of the Minister as to the responsibility of a railway company which possessed a charter, the grant was made in favor of "a company" constructing such line. If there was a railway company having a charter, the practice had been, and very properly so, to give the grant to that railway. It makes no difference to the people or to this House, but the question I take is this: Whether this is an enterprise worthy of a subsidy out of the public Treasury. If this railway is such a road, and the Minister of Railways in bringing down the proposition gives us the assurance that it is, it should get the money. The company will obtain the money as soon as the necessary progress is made. If not the subsidy stands on the paper.

Mr. BLAKE. The ground is stated in the resolution itself I find, after setting forth the grants, this language:

"The subsidies herein before mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose shall be granted to such companies respectively."

There is further this language:

"The other subsidies shall be granted to such companies as shall be approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively."

It is because he named companies that have established to the satisfaction of the Government their ability to construct and complete, that they are named as getting the grant, and it is when this has not been established that no company's name is inserted. I did not dispute but that this company might have established its ability to build this road. I simply ask what proof was furnished; what the stock of the company was, what its subscription was, what its financial scheme was; and I also desire to ask what is the estimated cost of the road per mile inclusive or exclusive of equipment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand on very good authority that the cost will be $12,000 a mile.

Mr. BLAKE. With equipment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. $12,000 and a moderate amount of equipment.

Mr. SHANLY. I desire to ask the leader of the Government to explain one point. Is it understood that payments under all these grants are made on work actually done?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. SHANLY. I think the practice, in regard to the subsidised roads, has been that when ten miles were constructed a payment is made; but the Government never advanced the money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Never.

Mr. SHANLY. The very fact of having a subsidy is an incentive to set to work and build the road, and therefore the arrangement that payments are only made on work done is a complete safeguard, and I do not think it is necessary that we should have an explanation on everyone of the thirty-one items of subsidies to railways. If this has to be done we shall not get through in a week.

Mr. BLAKE. We have already got through six or seven and there is no difficulty in dealing with several of them, for on several of the roads work is proceeding. Take, for example, I was nearly going to say the road of the hon. member for Gloucester, but I will not do it - take, I say, the road to Caraquet. A large portion of that road has been constructed and no question was asked in regard to it. But as regards other roads, no information has been given. If full information had been brought down and laid on the table it could have been perused by all the members and the financial position of the different companies ascertained. We do not find that supplied and consequently we ask for it. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) states that the

subsidies not being payable until certain work is done, renders it unnecessary to discuss the standing of the company. I differ with him and the Minister of Railways differs with him, because the Minister on two occasions explained that he did not place the subsidies in the names of specific companies because he was not satisfied as to their ability to carry out the work, and you would thereby be preventing the issue of the grant to some other companies that might be chartered. I agree with the Minister of Railways on that point. I should be very sorry to delay the Session two or three hours in considering subsidies amounting to three millions and half at this late stage; but not receiving the information necessary I am obliged to ask for it.

Mr. SHANLY. I still think that the public Treasury is secure by not paying anything until work is done, and it is not at all necessary therefore that we should have such full information. It would be a great satisfaction if the Government were to assure the House that the company in each case was organised and ready to go on with the work; but this cannot be expected, and the very fact that the Government subsidised a road is a strong incentive to the people interested in it to push it forward.

Mr. CASEY. The point is, that in case the company is not financially strong, the building of a road for which a bonus is offered might be delayed. The subsidy might be kept dangling in front of the supporters of the Government as so many subsidies have been kept dangling, and the construction of the road delayed for years, with the result that the people lost the accommodation which Parliament intended to give by granting a bonus. Again, if the bonus is given to a financially weak company, it will lead to their coming back to Parliament in a year or two for an increased grant. But the First Minister does not seem to have been furnished with information with respect to the standing of the company. At all events, he has not given it; perhaps he can tell us at least who are the president and directors?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Indeed, I cannot.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps the hon. member for South Essex can?

Mr. WIGLE. I believe that Hiram Walker is president. Everybody knows that any enterprise which he takes hold of is bound to go through. I am satisfied that the financial standing of the company is sound.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What length is the branch running north from Leamington to Stoney Point, and is it to be built entirely of stock and municipal bonuses?

Mr. WIGLE. The road from Leamington North is fourteen miles and was subsidised last year by this Government, $3,200, to the Canada Southern. It is not subsidised for the other six miles. The municipalities interested have already granted bonuses, and stock is taken sufficient to build those fourteen miles. The road subsidised last year was subsidised without any particular financial standing, any more than that the Minister of Railways was satisfied from what we told him that the road would be built if the subsidy was granted. Since last year we have formed the company, received the bonuses and had stock taken sufficient to complete the fourteen miles, and we are now ready to go to work in two weeks. There is no doubt that we can get plenty of capital to build the road from Windsor to Leamington and eventually on to Rondeau or Blenheim.

Mr. CASEY. What is the amount of bonuses given by the municipalities to this road?

Mr. WIGLE. Until the Government subsidy was granted, nothing was asked from them, but they are willing and anxious to submit bonuses.

Mr. CASEY. As the hon. member for North Essex has come in, perhaps he can tell us the amount of stock subscribed and paid up.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I am not in a position to state the exact amount, but I have no doubt that the railway will be built, and that the men interested are financially able to build it.

To the Thunder Bay Colonisation Railway Company, for fifty-six miles of their railway, from the end of the present subsidised section to a point near Crooked Lake, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $179,200.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This railway is intended to open up and develop a large and valuable mineral country at Thunder Bay. The whole subject was ventilated last Session, when there was a vote for thirty miles to Whitefish Lake, and this vote is to carry it on a little further. Nothing has yet been done on the first thirty miles except making the location surveys, which, it is understood, are advanced. The opening of this road will develop gold, silver, copper and iron mines, and provide a heavy traffic, not only for this road, but with the Canadian Pacific Railway, with which it joins.

Mr. DAWSON. This road will have the effect of opening up a very important section of the country. It passes by the valley of Whitefish River, where a great deal of most magnificent land has recently been discovered, which will be of great importance in the future to the growing town of Port Arthur, which is destined to be one of the cities of the Dominion. It will also be the means of opening access to silver mines of great richness which exist in that valley. At the present moment, crushing mills are being put up, machinery is being sent in, and the result is likely to be very favorable in the way of developing these mines. There are already quite a number of men working at Rabbit Mountain, Silver Mountain and at Beaver Mountain, all of which are in the valley of the Whitefish River, which lies south-west from Port Arthur. Proceeding further on to the westward, we come to another mine known as the Huronian Gold Mine, which is now in active operation. Proceeding further to Crooked Lake, we meet with a continuation of what is known as the Iron Range of Minnesota, near the boundary line. It is now being developed in the other side of the line. The people of Minnesota have a railway running inland for sixty miles from Lake Superior to a place called Vermillion Lake, where there are large quantities of the most beautiful iron ore, from which Bessemer steel is manufactured; and that steel is of a quality that cannot be produced from any other known ore, which may be imagined from the fact that this ore in its native state brings $8 a ton in Cleveland. The company who worked the mines shipped last year 250,000 tons of ore, and this summer they expect to ship 350,000 tons more. Now, this iron range crosses into Canada, and is susceptible of as great development on our side as it is on the other side, and this railway will run through that iron range, at a point where the ore is found in unlimited quantities. Then, in that section of the country there is a great deal of the most valuable timber. Both white and red pine have been found in very large quantities there, and this timber is now quite inaccessible without a railway, for it is found at a considerable elevation above Lake Superior, and the streams are in consequence rough. This railway will be the means of developing a very important trade in lumber alone. The Ontario Government is doing what it can to encourage the opening up of that country. It is building a colonisation road up this same valley of Whitefish River, and the promoters of this railway hope to obtain from that Government some aid for its construction. Now, here is a line of railway which will open up a mineral and agricultural country —which will develop gold, silver, copper and iron mines for all of which that country is remarkable. The people of Port

Arthur have sent to the Colonial and Indian Exhibition in London, specimens of gold, silver, iron and copper ores from that district, and I am told they are attracting a great deal of attention; and along with them they sent at their own expense an expert to look after them, and to see that they were properly exhibited. If this grant will lead to the opening up of that section of the country, as it no doubt will, it will be of immense advantage to the Dominion at large.

To the Parry Sound Colonisation Railway Company, for forty miles of their railway, from the village of Parry Sound to the village of Sandridge, on the line of the Northern Pacific Junction Railway, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $128,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a population in the district to be served by this railway of about 18,000, who have no railway facilities at present. It is believed that there will be an influx of people there, as the land is suitable for agriculture, and the harbor of Parry Sound is said to do a large trade.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman state anything as to the financial standing of this company?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think there is no grant before this House that ought to receive more generous or hearty support than this one. We must plead to some extent *in formâ pauperis*. We are very poor people in the Muskoka district, and it is only by Government assistance that we can hope to have any railways built there. In consequence of the necessity of connecting the Ontario system of railways with the Canadian Pacific Railway, we have obtained the Pacific Junction Railway, which is a great boon to the people of that district. That line, as every one knows, runs north and south, and this line will run east and west to the westward of that line. Our hope is that the Ontario Government will supplement this grant by a subsidy, because that Government, as the leader of the Opposition knows, appropriated $8,000 a mile for building a line which has since been constructed through the co-operation of the Government of the Dominion, and we think the least they can do is to give for this short line a sum per mile equal to what they were willing to give for a line from Gravenhurst to Callander. If they do, we have reasonable hope that this railway will be constructed. When I tell the hon. leader of the Opposition that the man who has the greatest interest in this enterprise, and who is the largest stockholder in it, is William Beaty, of Parry Sound, the pioneer settler in that district, I am sure he will be satisfied that no opposition should be given to this grant from his side of the House. The railway must depend to a large extent on Government assistance, as the country through which it passes cannot afford to contribute towards it. It is purely a colonisation work, deserving of the support, not only of this Government, but of the Government of the Province, and I can assure the House that it will give energy and life to that part of the country. When the Government are spending millions in developing the North-West, and doing a great deal for the Eastern Provinces of the Dominion, I think it is doing no more than justice in making this grant to a district which has not the same natural advantages as many other parts of the country.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think it is of very much consequence who the principal promoter of an enterprise is. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I shall support or oppose these grants entirely irrespective of who may be promoting them; I shall support them just as freely if my hon. friend promotes them, and I shall oppose them just as freely if it happens to be a particular supporter of mine who promotes them. From what I know of the section of country to which the hon. gentleman refers, I can agree with many of the observations he has made. It is a country from which it is not reasonable to expect much, if any, municipal assistance. I am equally satisfied that this railway is in the character of a colonisation railway, and I am glad to learn that it is being promoted by gentlemen who are themselves taking a financial interest in it. In that respect it differs from many other enterprises with superior advantages, to which we are giving public aid. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is one of those who think that enquiry means opposition; but I can assure him that I shall continue to make those enquiries which I think my public duty demands should be made. It is for those who think they are bound to carry these votes without any enquiry at all to adopt and proclaim before the public that view. It is not my view, and I shall continue to make enquiries.

Mr. SHANLY. Whenever I see the word "colonisation" and feel that the word is properly introduced, I do not feel inclined to ask any questions. Where the "colonisation" can be introduced properly, as it is here, roads of that kind will be entitled to double the subsidy they are given. I shall have great pleasure in supporting this item.

For a railway from New Glasgow to Montcalm, in the Province of Quebec, eighteen miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $57,600.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road is supposed to commence at New Glasgow, the terminus of a section of the Great Northern Railway, and will extend to Montcalm. It is only contemplated to subsidise the first section from New Glasgow to Montcalm, which will be of great advantage in the development in that section of the country.

Mr. LAURIER. There is no locality that I know of which bears the name of Montcalm.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is in the parish of St. Liguori. The railway will be from New Glasgow or St. Lin, to end at Montcalm in the county of Montcalm. The Minister of Railways has put the starting point at New Glasgow, which is now the prolongation of the St. Jérôme Road from Montreal. The line is more direct and shorter from St. Lin to the northern part of the Montcalm Road, but the St. Lin Road is owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in case the company is willing to build the railway from New Glasgow to Montcalm it could do it with equal facility from St. Lin to Montcalm. This leaves an alternative, because the Canadian Pacific Railway is ready to continue the road which has been built from St. Jérôme to New Glasgow, which is only a few miles distant.

For a railway from Hereford to the International Railway, in the township of Eaton, in the Province of Quebec, thirty-four miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $108,800.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This railway extends from the village of Hereford, in the township of Eaton. The country is fairly settled, and the road will develop the lumber trade and greatly assist in settling that country. The estimated cost is $16,000 a mile, and this road has a local land grant.

Mr. BLAKE. The only difficulty I see about the railway is contained in the memorandum, which seems to involve a very different policy in the east than what is proclaimed in the west. The memorandum says it is for the purpose of connecting the International with the American system of railways, which is considered a very bad thing in the west.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Other countries, other manners.

For a railway from St. Felix to Lake Maskinongé, Parish of St. Gabriel in the Province of Quebec, ten miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $32,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road is ten miles in length, and extends from the terminus of the Joliette branch

of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Lake Maskinongé, in the parish of St. Gabriel, one of the most populous in the county of Berthier and a centre of colonisation.

For a railway for Glenarman to Wingham, in the Province of Ontario, five miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $16,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road will connect Wingham with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The people of this district have taxed themselves heavily to secure railway facilities, the advantages of which they cannot fully enjoy without having this line.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree as to the enormous amount of taxation and the very unfortunate position these people occupy for the want of railway competition.

Mr. ALLEN. There is one line which I regret is not included in the subsidies.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There are a lot not included.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Sins of omission.

Mr. ALLEN. I regret there is one railway left out of this list of subsidies. I mean the line from the town of Meaford past the town of Owen Sound, on into the county of Bruce and thence into the town of Wingham or Kincardine. We have no objection to either as the most suitable place. In that part of Ontario, all the railways run south-east, and the inhabitants of North Bruce and North Grey have to come down to Guelph or Hamilton or Toronto to pass by the Northern going on to Callander. This road I expect to be under construction by the end of the season or early in 1887. It will connect with the London and Huron railway, and cross the Wellington, Grey and Bruce, pass over the Stratford and Lake Huron and cross the Toronto, Grey and Bruce at Owen Sound and connect with the Northern and North-Western and the Northern at Meaford and Collingwood, thence to Barrie, thence to Callander, thereby giving that end of the country facilities in the winter time, when navigation is closed, by means of which they can go on to Callander to the west. The country has paid a large amount of bonuses in the construction of roads, not only in their own counties, but paid their share of the railways of the Provinces in general. The county of Grey has given more than $1,000,000 in bonuses for the construction of railways; Bruce has given about an equal amount, and I think the county I represent is entitled to a share of public moneys to assist them in building this road, which will be a feeder to the Pacific Junction Road and the Canadian Pacific Railway. If the Government do not bring down a grant this Session, I hope they will enquire into the reason and at an early date put in a subsidy for that road, at the next Session of Parliament.

For a railway from a point at or near the McCann Station on the Intercolonial Railway to the Joggins, on Cumberland Basin, in the Province of Nova Scotia, twelve miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $38,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is destined to connect the great stone quarries in Cumberland Basin with the Intercolonial Railway at McCann Station, and it will be an important feeder to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. KIRK. Is this road subsidised by the Local Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it is.

Mr. KIRK. I am sorry the Minister of Justice is not in his place for I wanted to ask him a question whilst this subsidy is under discussion. Perhaps the other Minister will be able to answer it. It is in connection with a telegraphic despatch which has appeared in the Halifax *Mail*, the organ of the Government in Halifax. The telegram reads thus:

"RAILWAYS OR REPEAL.

"We can't have both, and must decide which we will choose.

"(*Special despatch to the Halifax Herald.*)

"Ottawa, 25th May.—Mr. Elwes, the English representative of the syndicate formed under the Nova Scotia Government's scheme, together with others, had an interview with the Minister of Justice yesterday in relation to the aid which that scheme would require from the Dominion Government. It is understood that the delegation was given to understand that no terms would or could be discussed pending the result of the appeal shortly to be made to the people of the Provincial Government on its repeal of the Union."

Was that the answer given to Mr. Elwes, and if correct are the grants which are proposed to be made by these resolutions to railways in Nova Scotia to be treated in the same way, namely, that no money is to be expended on Nova Scotia railways until it is known how the elections in Nova Scotia now pending will result.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know anything about that. I know that one gentleman came to see me about a railway in Nova Scotia, and I chaffed him. I asked him if, in case of secession, he wanted the road. He said: If I never have a headache until secession I will be satisfied. I asked him what he thought about inserting a proviso in the subsidy that the road was to be built whenever secession was defeated. He said he was not sure but would do his best.

Mr. KIRK. I do not consider that an answer to the question, and will repeat it when the Minister of Justice comes in.

Mr. BLAKE. The only paper brought down in this connection is a letter dated 26th March, 1886, from John Boyd, the Senator, I presume. In that, he says that the promoters to whom a grant of $3,200 per mile for twelve miles was promised, were most desirous of extending the proposed line three miles further, so as to include the stone quarries and the immense hay marshes which would greatly benefit the Intercolonial Railway, and their proposal was based on the loss which had been sustained by the gentlemen who had embarked in these enterprises, on account of the grant not having been given last year. The road, he said, was one in which the population was deeply interested, and its construction would afford material help in many ways he need not mention. It appears therefore that as long ago as the 31st March, it had been agreed to give a subsidy for twelve miles. In point of fact, it may have been agreed upon last Session, yet the only paper we have in connection with the affair is a letter from Senator Boyd asking for the three miles not given. We have not the papers on which is based the grant, but this is a very strong appeal for a subsidy which will materially help in many ways.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is all a case of Oliver asking for more.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Is this proposed line all in the county of Cumberland?

Mr. McLELAN. I think it is, although it is New Brunswick interest. The stock of the company that is working the collieries is all held or nearly all in the city of St. John, and during the winter there is no communication with the colliery. The opening of a railway from the collieries and the quarries and the mills to the Intercolonial Railway has been discussed for some time.

Mr. WOODWORTH. It is wholly in the county of Cumberland?

Mr. McLELAN. I think it is.

Mr. BLAKE. Is Oliver to get some more next Session?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It depends on how Oliver behaves.

For a railway from L'Assomption to L'Epiphanie, in the Province of Quebec, three miles and a-half, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $11,200.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a road three and a-half miles in length, from L'Epiphanie, on the Canadian

Pacific Railway, to L'Assomption. They considered it so important that they endeavored to construct it without aid. Work was commenced, but for want of funds they had to give it up, and this is to assist them in their praiseworthy endeavors.

To the Montreal and Western Railway Company, for seventy miles of their railway from St. Jérôme, north-westerly towards Desert, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy of $5,161 per mile in lieu of the subsidies granted by 46 Victoria, chapter 25, and 47 Victoria, chapter 8, a subsidy of $361,270.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the railway that we have heard of before as being the enterprise of Father Labelle. This road was subsidised for 100 miles, at $3,200 per mile. The survey for location has developed the fact that the first section of seventy miles was much heavier and more costly work than had been anticipated. In fact they got across the Laurentian range before they reached the land fit for settlement. So much was that the case that it was impossible to proceed with the work of construction on the basis of the subsidy already granted, and in lieu of that subsidy it is proposed to grant $5,161 per mile for seventy miles. The road is to connect with the Gatineau Railway at Desert. It runs through a country capable of supporting a large population, but without the facilities to induce settlers to go in in such numbers as desired. At the same time, many people have been going in. The land is good, and the encouragement given by Father Labelle induced a large number of families to go in, and several townships have been settled. They have good crops, but several of them are getting dissatisfied, and have been proposing to abandon the country. As the hon. gentleman knows, there is an enormous country in every way fit for settlement directly north of that.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain what the increase is. Is the present grant just $3,200 per mile all over?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was $3,200 for 100 miles. The present grant is $5,161 for seventy miles.

Mr. BLAKE. What is being done is to give that grant over seventy miles instead of 100 miles—the same amount?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I fancy it must be a mistake in the draft—it says "a subsidy of." Is there any reason why you should not use the words "nor exceeding in the whole," which are used in the others?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It should be put in that way.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe that this does not completely meet the demands of the promoter of the railway. He points out in his letter to the Minister of Railways that the subsidy should be rather divided in a somewhat different way, that, instead of being $5,161 a mile for the seventy miles, it should be $6,000 a mile for the first thirty miles, and the remainder distributed over the last forty miles. He says:

The building of a railway across the Laurentian range being more difficult than in the interior, I would ask that the first thirty miles should have a grant of $6,000 per mile, and the balance distributed over the last forty miles. I ask you that favor, great as it is; but it is nothing for a man who is the grand dispenser and who possesses all the treasures? In short, it is just the application made by the company at the time of our last interview. Hoping that you will be always favorable to us,

I have the honor to be.

Would the hon. gentleman state why this reasonable proposal as to the division of the subsidy was not complied with? Was it not worth while? Would not the grand dispenser of all the treasures consider this application favorably?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Who was the signer?

Mr. BLAKE. Father Labelle.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It has been found that it was about the same thing and would put that road on a footing of equality with two other roads which might be considered with this one, the three great colonisation roads of the Province of Quebec, the Lake St. John Railway, the St. Jérôme Railway, or what is called Father Labelle's road, the Northern Colonisation Railway and the Gatineau Railway, opening up the immense fertile country which exists on the other side of the Laurentides. As Father Labelle puts it, it was asked that $6,000 a mile should be granted for the thirty miles forming the country where the mountains of the Laurentian range go, but, taking the information from the Department of Railways, in distributing the subsidy as it is, in fact that region will receive the amount in excess of $5,161, because, in determining the subsidies to be paid, the amount of work for each section in proportion to the other sections is taken into consideration, so that the demand of Father Labelle will be in practice granted, though the subsidy will remain the same as that of the Lake St. John Railway and the Gatineau Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. That explanation is very satisfactory. I observe that this is a repetition of the process in the preparation of the papers for the House to which I have already referred, that the applications which are brought down are those which have been refused and not those which have been granted. It is a little inconvenient, because what we have practically to consider is the ground on which the Government acted and not that on which they refused to act. Perhaps another time we may be given the information on which they acted.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It proves that the Government are wiser than those acting for these enterprises. They modified the demands so as to give the aid in a more practical and a wiser manner.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has failed to understand my point. I asked for the papers upon which the Government acted. These were brought down as the papers upon which they acted. The only paper brought down in this case is one asking for a change in the decision of the Government, which was not granted, so that the papers on which the Government acted have not been brought down.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This is granted. They will receive $6,000 for the first thirty miles, and for the forty miles after reaching Ste. Agathe they will receive $4,000 a mile.

Mr. BLAKE. Cannot the hon. gentleman perceive that the papers on which the Government reached their decision to give $5,161 a mile for seventy miles are the papers which it is important to have, and those papers we have not. What we have is a paper dated as late as the 14th May, after the decision was reached, asking for a modification which the hon. gentleman has explained it was not necessary to make, because in practice this will be accorded which Father Labelle asks, but the papers upon which this was granted are not before us.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If my hon. friend had read what is at the end of these resolutions, which is only a repetition of what is at the end of the resolutions of last year, he would have found that it is upon that paper, and it is a good paper because it is the Statute paper, that the Government have decided to grant the request of Father Labelle, but in the manner provided in the Statute, and not in the manner mentioned in the letter.

For a railway from St. Andrews to the Canadian Pacific Railway at, or at any point east of the town of Lachute, in the county of Argenteuil, in the Province of Quebec, seven miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 47 Victoria, chapter 8, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $22,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is not an additional vote, it is merely a change of location. This railway, seven

miles in length, is already subsidised from the village of St. Andrew's to Lachute, it is considered in the interest of the district to make it start from St. Andrew's, to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway at some point east of Lachute.

To the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, for twelve miles of their railway from Clark's Island to Valleyfield and from Lacolle, in the Province of Quebec, to the international boundary, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $38,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This railway extends from the Chaudière, in the city of Ottawa, passing through Côteau Landing and Valleyfield, to the international boundary. It was commenced some years ago, and so far as it has been operated has been a great benefit to the city of Ottawa. The section of three miles, extending from Elgin street to Chaudière street, was subsidised with $3,200. It is now proposed to grant a subsidy of $3,200 on that section of two miles from Clark's Island to Valleyfield, and ten miles from Lacolle to the international boundary, which is not yet constructed.

Mr. SHANLY. The result of the whole wording of this resolution is correct, but it is not very clear. It is proposed to subsidise twelve miles, but the wording of it is very misleading. That the Canada Atlantic has twelve miles of a railway, from Clark's Island to Valleyfield, is not correct.

Mr. BLAKE. Would it not be well to say, for twelve miles of their railway, being the portion from Clark's Island to Valleyfield, and the portion from Lacolle, in the Province of Quebec, to the international boundary—two different portions ?

For a railway from Truro to Newport, in the Province of Nova Scotia, forty-nine miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $156,800.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This line will run from the Intercolonial Railway to Truro, Nova Scotia, connecting with the Windsor Branch of the railway at Newport Station. It will pass through a section of fine agricultural country unserved by railways, and when the western system is consolidated, it will give direct communication between the eastern and western sections of the Province, and bring the western section of the Province twenty miles nearer to the western section of the Dominion than any existing railway. It will also reach a fine iron deposit.

Mr. VAIL. Is it intended to give this subsidy to the company that has lately been incorporated, and that is under contract now with the Local Government to build this road ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be granted to some company. The Minister of Railways will report to the Government what, in his opinion, is the best mode to construct this road.

Mr. VAIL. Will the Minister of Finance state how far this traverses the county of Colchester ?

Mr. McLELAN. About eight or nine miles.

Mr. ALLISON. Like the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), I think this is one of the most interesting and important roads under consideration this evening, and I take this opportunity of thanking the Government for giving it their attention. It is gratifying that this Government, which has so recently made arrangements for carrying forward to successful completion the greatest national enterprise which the Dominion of Canada has yet been called upon to undertake, has, a few days ago, decided to grant no longer tardy and scanty, but prompt and ample justice to Cape Breton, and is now giving evidence that small lines of railway, some of them extending only through portions of two counties, some, perhaps, only through a portion of one, are not beneath their notice. Perhaps the best evidence that can be given of the necessity of this line, would be seen by consulting a railway map of Canada. This line is a portion of the consolidation scheme, which was proposed by the Local Government four years ago, and is also mentioned in the scheme which is now proposed by the present Local Government of Nova Scotia—although it is not absolutely a part of that scheme—but it is mentioned in it as a part that may be taken up. The advantages of this, however, seem to have impressed themselves upon the Government in a favorable way, and I am thankful to the Government for having taken hold of it with so little representation and with no misrepresentation at all. The important towns of Truro and Windsor, which it will more directly connect, the enterprising farming and ship building villages through which it will pass; the rich mineral district, comprising gypsum, freestone, antimony, manganese, gold and iron, through which the railway will pass form a galaxy of advantages, which, when presented to the observant eyes of the present Government who are so anxious to serve the public interest, have decided them to take this matter up and to construct the road. It might appear to some that possessing such advantages as those it should at once secure a large traffic, and that the district through which the road passes would do very much in the way of granting bonuses towards the construction of the road. But it will be remembered, as it is known to those familiar with the route, that there is one large tidal river to cross, the Shubenacadie, which will necessitate a very large outlay. There is not an estimate made yet, but it is supposed that it will be a very expensive bridge. In reply to the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) I will say that the road is about forty-nine or fifty miles long, some ten miles passing through the county of Colchester and the remainder through Hants.

Mr. VAIL. I am very glad that the Government have been able to grant this subsidy. The construction of this road has been looked forward to for some time. It is a road which will be of advantage to the general public in that part of the country, if it is built, and I hope that now that there has been a company incorporated the Government will not withhold their hand but will assist that company as far as possible in completing the work. If the company goes on with the western consolidation it will form a very important part of it, and I am quite sure that the grant having been given for this company, it will be able to proceed with the work.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I am very glad that this bonus has been given. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Allison) has said that the Government gave it almost without any representation being made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, misrepresentation.

Mr. WOODWORTH. There are argus eyes like those which Juno put in her peacock's tail when she discovered some improper conduct beiween Jo and Jupiter and sent Argus to watch them, when he was killed by Mercury.

Mr. ALLISON. I certainly did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. WOODWORTH. This argus-eyed Government (my hon. friend feels as proud as the peacock with all the eyes in his tail) saw this road lying there, and the gypsum, manganese, silver, gold and precious stones only requiring development. The hon. gentleman is glad the road is to be built. The member for Digby (Mr. Vail) is also glad to see that the road will go on. We are all glad; and no doubt the road will be built. But what did the Government do, this argus-eyed Government, when fifty members of the House of Commons signed a memorial to the Government begging them, in the name of Heaven, to help the western part of the Province of Nova Scotia—the Nictaux and Atlantic road, which is lying there in a state of utter collapse, with the sleepers rotting, an attempt having been

made to build this road ever since 1877, the company having received a subsidy from the Local Government which was, however, totally inadequate to complete the undertaking. This argus-eyed Government did not turn their eyes in that direction. The hon. member for Lunenberg (Mr. Kaulbach) implored them almost on his knees to listen to this memorial, which graphically portrayed the extent of that road, and its necessity. It also gave the report of Martin Murphy, the Provincial Engineer of Nova Scotia, extracts from which showed the absolute necessity of the road, the counties of Shelburne, Queen's and Lunenburg having no railway communication with the outside world. I do not mean to say that they have not touched it. I do not know what goes on in that great Sanhedrim in the eastern block. I do not know what they say or do, or what may be in their minds now. They may bring this grant down, but the observation of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Allison) has brought to my notice the fact that these men do not require any representation; when they see a great and necessitous work like this, they bring a proper grant down. If they do not, I think the western counties of Nova Scotia will speak out with no uncertain sound. I think they will have something to say about this argus-eyed Government. I have every respect and admiration for their great abilities, their progressive intentions and the great works they do. I give them thanks for what they do, but I would like to know what fair play there is in giving all these subsidies to these different railways in Quebec and Ontario, and Nova Scotia, and leaving the western counties out, as they have. There are eight counties lying west of the line which I draw in this map, and in round numbers some $11,000,000 or $12,000,000 have been given to the counties east of that line, that never gave a dollar of their own money to construct a single rod of railway. To the west of this you take the Windsor Branch, which the Government own, and put it at a million, for it is only 32 miles. Take the Windsor and Annapolis, another million, making two millions, although as I say they, the Government, own the Windsor Branch. But give them credit for two millions, and I want to know what fair play there is, with the representatives from this Cabinet all from the east, with ten Senators allowed to Nova Scotia, all from the east, except one from Lunenburg; and yet the western part of Nova Scotia is treated in that manner. Why is all the money diverted to the east? Here the other day we voted for a railway from Stellarton to Pictou. I said: Yes, I hope you will put in something for this road. We have voted for a road from Oxford to New Glasgow. I said give it to them, though, mark you, they have railway communication. We voted two millions to Cape Breton. I said: Yes, give it to them. It was passed in this House. And then there was this great shipping railway which concerns the eastern part of Nova Scotia a good deal. That was voted, and we voted all these sums, while not a single item has been put in here in order to complete this road which has been lying so long in its present state. To show you the necessity for this road let me read you the memorial which fifty members of this House signed and sent to the Government:

"SIR,—The following memoranda set forth these facts, that is to say:—

"The Nova Scotia Central, formerly known as the Nova Scotia, Nictaux and Atlantic Central Railway, extends from the harbors of Lunenburg and Mahone Bay, in the county of Lunenburg, in the Province of Nova Scotia, by the way of Bridgewater and New Germany, connecting with the Windsor and Annapolis Railway at Middleton, in the county of Annapolis, a distance, including the branches to deep sea water, of seventy-five (75) miles.

"The building of this important road was commenced in the summer of 1877 with a subsidy of four hundred and twelve thousand dollars ($412,000), or about five thousand four hundred and ninety-three dollars ($5,493) per mile from the Province of Nova Scotia, and has been pushed from time to time since then in its construction, but owing to the insufficiency of means, is yet quite a long way from completion.

"When the subsidy by the Provincial Government was first granted, the expense of building such a line of railway was thought to be much less than it is now, and a much inferior class of road than what is deemed now a necessity was contemplated. Instead of wooden bridges at different places, it is proposed now to build them of iron, and to lay down fifty-six (56) lb. steel rails instead of forty-five (45) lb. iron, as was then recommended.

"The engineering difficulties were found to increase and much more work was found necessary to be done to make a good and substantial road than the engineer's report at first intimated. The road has been principally graded from Middleton to Stoddard's, a distance of about twenty (20) miles, and part of masonry done from Stoddard's to New Germany, a distance of about twenty (20) miles more. Nothing of consequence except clearing has yet been done. From New Germany to Lunenburg, the remaining distance of the road has been graded and a portion of the ties and timber necessary have been delivered but not placed. That portion of the road graded, with the timber and ties thereupon, are now lying there unimproved and useless in the present state of affairs, deteriorating day by day, while the people who will have to pay the right of way, are obliged to see their lands disfigured without the compensation of a railway.

"About five hundred thousand dollars ($500,000) have already been spent in constructing said road and it will cost at least another six hundred thousand ($600,000) to complete it, and lay the rails ready for the rolling stock, which will cost about two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000) additional.

"Mr. Martin Murphy, the Provincial engineer of the Province of Nova Scotia for many years, and under different Governments, and still is the Provincial engineer, has placed on record in the journals of the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia, of the year 1876, an elaborate report of this great work and which was approved of unanimously by the Legislature, containing his professional reasons why this railway should be built, extracts of which are herewith submitted and annexed hereto, marked 'A.'

"This great work has demanded and received the close attention of successive Provincial Governments, but all efforts have failed in obtaining its completion, and it is a fact patent that if the Dominion Government and Parliament do not come to its aid, there is no hope of the road ever being finished, and all that has been expended will be utterly lost, and the hopes held out to the people of the western counties, from time to time, doomed to failure.

"This memoranda also states that this railway opens up some of the finest agricultural and mineral regions in Nova Scotia, with lands heavily timbered.

"That the counties of Lunenburg, Queen's and Shelburne have never had the slightest railway accommodation, and to the inhabitants of these counties this railway is of the utmost importance and utility.

"That it affords an easy and cheap mode of obtaining access to the cities of St. John and Halifax, and other parts of the Dominion, and will operate when completed as an auxiliary and feeder to the Intercolonial Railway.

"The harbors of Lunenburg and Mahone Bay, the Atlantic termini of the railway, are among the best on the Atlantic coast, and are open for navigation all the year round.

"The speedy construction of this road is a burning and absorbing question with the people of the localities named in Lunenburg, Annapolis, Queen's and King's, and the surrounding districts, and they ask that as the Dominion Government has adopted and acted upon the policy of giving aid to railways which are calculated to develop the country through which they pass and add strength and wealth to the country; that they extend to this railway the same aid that they have extended to other railways in other parts of the Dominion, upon the plan laid down by the Honorable Minister of Railways in the Session of 1884, and acted upon and carried out by the Government of the Dominion of Canada ever since, namely, of giving a subsidy of not less than three thousand two hundred dollars ($3,200) per mile, with such other concessions as allowed to others."

Now I have the report of Mr. Murphy under my hand in the Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Nova Scotia, showing the great importance of this work, and it passed unanimously in that Legislature. We know that in 1884, when Sir Charles Tupper came to the House with his resolutions giving aid to railways, he took up, for instance, the Pontiac Railway of some eighty-five miles in length, which had $6,400 per mile from the Treasury of Quebec, but this was inadequate to build it. He said it was in a state of collapse, and he came with this aid, and Parliament seconded his efforts and voted $3,200 per mile. This road is precisely in the same position, only that they had the Canadian Pacific Railway, by which the people from Renfrew and other places in that direction could come to Ottawa and to all parts of the Dominion, while the people of Queen's and Lunenburg are shut off from railway communication. For them there is no road and no subsidy. I would like to know what is the real reason that this road has been left out? The Government could do something for it at this time, as they are doing for others; we are voting millions and mil-

lions to other roads. We have that road in Cumberland, and I want to see it, for it is a populous and wealthy county and sends able men here and elsewhere. But, Heaven knows, they have railways all over it, and yet they propose to open up some mines here by this road and the sum of $38,400 is granted to it. Then there is the Newport road. It is all right to give it aid to build the road. Why should this road, which has been struggling to completion since 1877, be left out and not have a dollar given to it? I listened to-day with great pleasure to the hon. Minister of Railways when he said that the Government, whenever they found a struggling railway, came to its aid. They may have had this railway in their mind; but I would be recreant to my duty, when we are giving these votes, which those people help to pay, if I did not raise my voice and ask the Government to come to the rescue of this road as they have gone to the rescue of other roads. It will be a wrong unredressed; it will be an act for which I can see no palliation or excuse; because that country is as heavily timbered, as well watered, as fertile, as abundant in minerals and as much entitled to be opened up and developed as any other portion of the country which we have been voting subsidies to open up and develop; and I do think, while I assist to vote away these large sums of money, that I am entitled to ask, if we do not get a fair share of the patronage as compared with Quebec and Ontario, that the hon. Ministers representing us in the Cabinet should see that we in the western counties of Nova Scotia get fair play.

Mr. VAIL. I am not astonished that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) speaks in the tone he does; I am only astonished that he has not done so before. It is quite true, that of all the public grants made by the Government for Nova Scotia, two thirds if not three-fourths have been made for the eastern part of the Province, while the western part has an equal population. However desirable these grants may be—and I think they are important roads which it is proper that the Government should assist—the Government have left out the railways that should have received grants. There is no doubt that the railway which the hon. member for King's has referred to, from Nictaux to the Atlantic coast, is an important road. The company controlling that road has been struggling for five or six years, and has done a great deal of work and laid out a large amount of money; and yet, as the hon. gentleman said, the sleepers and bridges are in a state of decay because the company cannot raise the means necessary to complete it. I am sure a vote of $3,200 a mile would ensure the completion of that road in a very short time. I was very glad to find that the Government two years ago granted $3,200 a mile to complete the link between Annapolis and Digby. The work on that road has not been commenced yet; but a company has recently been incorporated, and it is hoped that it will begin work some time this year. I believe a petition was presented to the Government this year asking that an additional subsidy of $3,200 a mile should be given to that road of eighteen miles, which is all that is necessary to complete the railway from Halifax to Yarmouth. It is a very expensive road to build. The bridges on it alone, according to the best information I can obtain, will cost from $400,000 to $500,000, if they are built as railway bridges now are. I was in hopes that the Government would see their way clear this year to grant an additional subsidy of $3,200 a mile to encourage the company to complete this link. In looking over the subsidies granted by the Government since 1884, I find that in 1885 the following additional subsidies have been granted to railways on which no work has yet been commenced: The Gatineau Valley Railway Company, $3,200 per mile, not to exceed in the whole $160,000, which has been increased to $6,400 per mile, or in the whole $320,000; the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway, $3,200 per mile, in all for 16 miles, $51,200, which has been increased to $70,000, or $4,375 per mile; Grand Piles on the River St. Maurice to its junction with the Lake St. John Railway, $3,200 per mile, or in all $217,000, which has been increased to $4,350 per mile for 50 miles. It seems to me, after these roads, which are merely projected roads, on which work has not yet been commenced, have received from this Government double the sum granted to them in 1884, that we might fairly claim an increased subsidy for this road between Annapolis and Digby, which is so necessary to the whole western portion of Nova Scotia. I hope the Government will consider its claims and grant a sum which will ensure its completion within a limited time.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman has forgotten to mention that about the time of Confederation a subsidy of $1,000,000 was given to continue the road from Windsor to Annapolis, about eighty miles, and some years after Confederation the Dominion Government offered the Windsor Branch to any company that would complete the road from Annapolis to Yarmouth. A company was eventually formed, and having been also subsidised by the Local Government of Nova Scotia, it commenced the construction of that work, and made the connection all but about eighteen miles. The hon. gentleman knows that the Local Government have now made an arrangement with a company to complete those eighteen miles, and that company are expecting to receive the Windsor Branch, and they are also expecting to receive $ 4,000 which was offered by the Dominion Government two years ago. The Local Government have also agreed to guarantee $200,000 a year for twenty years to that company, part of that sum being covered by a deposit. They expect to have the Windsor Branch which cost nearly $2,000,000, and they have a grant from the Local Government of $100,000 a year for twenty years, in addition to the $100,000 which is covered by deposit, and surely a company so largely subsidised as that is, cannot fail to build the eighteen miles of road to make connection, and put the whole in good order. I have seen the representatives of that company and they express no doubt of their ability to make the connection and put the whole in proper order. With that arrangement, they could hardly expect the Dominion Government to step in and give a further subsidy.

Mr. VAIL. All we want is to have the road completed, and the company will require all they can get to complete it, because the bridging is so heavy. The Minister of Finance has referred to the gift of the Dominion Government of the Windsor Branch. The Dominion Government simply gave to Nova Scotia what belonged to her before Confederation, and what was simply transferred to the Dominion Government and formed a portion of our debt when we came into the Union. We had something to represent our debt in the shape of railways in Nova Scotia; we had built our railways to Truro and Windsor, and that property was taken over by the Dominion Government and went into our debt. Other Provinces came in which had no public works to represent their debt, but it is not worth while to particularise them at present. The Government deserve no credit for giving back to Nova Scotia what belonged to her, and what her people had built and paid for before we entered Confederation. This road was promised to the Western Counties Railway Company, or any company that would build the connecting link between Annapolis and Digby. The explanation made is to some extent, perhaps, a fair reason why this additional amount should not be given at present, but we may require the whole of it before the road is completed.

Mr. SHANLY. I would like to say this with regard to the Western Counties Railway of Nova Scotia, that I am not surprised at this discussion because it is a very much involved question that may be heard of very

loudly yet in this House, and probably in the courts of law where it now is also. I shall not touch further upon it than to say that Parliament once made a grant of the Windsor Branch to the Western Counties Railway, and it proved in court afterwards they had no right or title to make the grant, but the effect was to draw a great many municipalities and individuals into serious financial difficulties for which, certainly in honor, Parliament is bound to see restitution made in some shape or other. But I am surprised to see that the road referred to by the member for King's, the Nictaux and Atlantic Railway, has been passed over in the schedule of subsidies. It is a road which is as well entitled to the full grant of $3,200 a mile as any road in the schedule. It is greatly needed in that part of the country. The company is struggling to build the road and is in financial difficulties, and, as my hon. friend has said, a great deal of the work done is going to ruin and decay for the want of some aid. I believe such a grant as $3,200 a mile would enable that road now to be carried to completion. It would confer greater advantages on a larger section of country than the majority of the roads named here. I am surprised it is not included in the subsidies, and I would express the hope that the Nictaux and Atlantic road will get a fair share of Government aid.

Mr. KIRK. I do not agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) and the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) in reference to the amount of money expended in eastern Nova Scotia being so much larger than that expended in western Nova Scotia. The hon. member for King's has said that nearly all the money expended in Nova Scotia has been expended, not in the western counties at all, but in the eastern. When you consider the amount of money expended in the Windsor Branch, in the Yarmouth Railway, in the Nictaux and Atlantic Railway, and in the Intercolonial Railway from Truro West, you must see there has been vastly more expended in the western than in the eastern counties. What money has been expended in the east? Colchester is not an eastern county. The only ones in which money has been expended at all in building railways are Pictou and Antigonish. No money has been expended at all in Guysboro' except in a small corner of it. Therefore, the hon. member for King's was not correct when he raised this objection in regard to grants which have been made to Nova Scotia. I agree with him there is necessity for a grant for the Nictaux and Atlantic Railway, which ought certainly to be subsidised and completed, for it is too bad that, after so much money has been expended on that road, it should be allowed to go to ruin. As other hon. members have spoken of other roads not mentioned in these resolutions, I might draw attention to another road, not in the western counties either, but in the eastern counties. It is a road for which a company of capitalists have obtained a charter from the Local Legislature, and which has been subsidised by the Local Legislature and which the counties through which it will pass are prepared to subsidise, at any rate, to the extent of paying for the right of way. I refer to the line from New Glasgow, on the Eastern Extension Railway or the Intercolonial Railway, to White Haven, through the counties of Pictou, Antigonish and Guysboro'. This is a line which the Government ought, not now, perhaps, because I do not think the company is prepared to ask for a subsidy just now, but they will be soon, to grant a subsidy; but I hope the Government if it be in power—and I trust it will not, I trust it will be replaced by a Government more disposed to do justice——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand the hon. gentleman desires to wait until then.

Mr. KIRK. I hope the Government will bring a subsidy for that railway which will certainly merit one, which at any rate, will not be a competing line with any other, and will be a feeder for the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BLAKE. I was a little surprised to hear the hon. member for Hants compliment the Government upon acting with so little pressure in this case. I have read the papers brought down as to all the railways, and this railway represents the greatest amount of pressure. No less than twelve large and important public meetings were held in constituencies interested in this road, where the representative men met, discussing the subject, passed resolutions, and appointed a delegation which came here. From the evidence, the pressure appears to have been very strong and cogent, and resulted to the satisfaction, no doubt, of those who pressed the claim of this railway for aid; but that the hon. gentleman should say, in the face of this mass of papers, that the Government is peculiarly laudable because, as the hon. member for King's has said, they saw it with their argus eye, without being pressed at all, is rather too ridiculous. As to the invocation which the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) says was addressed to the Government in reference to the Nictaux and Atlantic Railway, does it not occur to him that he made a slight mistake in that invocation? I understood him to state that the fifty members appealed to the Government in Heaven's name. Perhaps he had better try another name; it might be more successful.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I said, and everything else.

Mr. BLAKE. Did he? The hon. gentleman should not conjoint Heaven's name with the others.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Then the hon. member leaves me no alternative whatever.

Mr. BLAKE. As to the Nictaux and Atlantic road referred to by the hon. member for King's, having had occasion to enquire a little into that matter, my opinion concurs with his that relatively to some of the grants we are making to-night, and also absolutely, that is an enterprise which ought to be aided upon a consistent application of the policy we are acting upon to-night and have acted upon for some few years past.

Mr. ALLISON. I am glad the hon. the leader of the Opposition gives my constituents credit at all events for going to work systematically. I may say that nothing like the petition the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) has referred to so eloquently, and forcibly was signed by the members of this House in favor of the road from Windsor to Truro. I am glad also to find that the leader of the Opposition is offering no opposition to this to-night. I remember two or three years ago reading from an address presented to him by a Reform association in Ontario, I think it was in the county of Simcoe, if I recollect rightly, in which the Reform convention took the opportunity of thanking the hon. the leader of the Opposition for opposing grants which were made to what they were pleased to style local railways, which were being used as "a bribe to the smaller and poorer Provinces;" but, as these railways to which grants are being made are not confined to the smaller and poorer Provinces, but are also in the larger and more wealthy Provinces, I am glad to find that he is not offering any factious opposition.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not recollect any such address; I do not recollect being presented with any such address, but the hon. gentleman will be good enough not to put into my mouth, if that is his insinuation, the words of other people. I am not responsible for everything that is addressed to me. If I were, I should be responsible for some very unpleasant things I sometimes hear said to myself.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I would say one word as to my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach). He is unwell to-night and is not here; I know he will regret it to-morrow

and that he would have been here, ill as he is, if he had known that it was coming up. I know that he has been pressing this matter in every way possible. He has been instant in season and out of season, and he will be sorry that he was not here pressing on a matter concerning his own county.

Mr. MILLS. He has lost an arm.

Mr. KIRK. Perhaps he has gone home to look after the election.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for ninety-five miles of their railway, from a point 50 miles north of St. Raymond to Lake St. John, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $1,961 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole (in addition to the subsidy granted by 45 Victoria, chapter 14, and 46 Victoria, chapter 25, of $3,200 per mile), $186,295.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend the Secretary of State spoke of this road when he spoke of the other principal roads leading into the interior of the Province of Quebec. This road has on several previous occasions been explained to the House. It extends from a point near Quebec to Lake St. John, a distance of 175 miles. It has been subsidised at $3,200, and the road has been constructed for a distance of eighty miles, and, it having been found impossible to proceed further without additional assistance, it is proposed to augment the subsidy of $3,200 upon the ninety-five miles not constructed by $1,961 per mile, making the subsidy on this section $5,161 per mile. This road goes through a good country. There is a splendid agricultural district around Lake St. John. The road has a local subsidy and also a subsidy from the city of Quebec.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman explain how these cabalistic figures are reached of an aggregate of $5,161? Why that last dollar? It looks almost as if it was on some calculation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These figures were come to in this way: There were $3,200 given, for example, to the Gatineau Railway. The amount was not found sufficient, and the company asked to have the subsidy doubled. We could not double it, but we took so many miles and divided the subsidy of $3,200 per mile for the whole distance, which made $5,161 a mile; and this figure, being obtained for that railway, was applied to the other railway, the St. Jérôme road, and to this road also.

Mr. VAIL. Is this road in course of construction?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the Minister of Public Works tell us what amount of aid this road has received from various sources?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This railway has received from this Government $3,200 a mile for the eighty-five miles that have been built or are now being built. They received from the Local Government of Quebec the sum of $5,000 a mile on 170 miles, and then they received from the city of Quebec a subsidy of something like $400,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Then they receive a land grant of 5,000 acres a mile.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister of Public Works if any portion of this road is under contract for construction at the present time, and if so to whom?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, I think there is about fifty miles now being constructed from a point near St. Raymond to Lake Edward, that is being constructed and will be completed, I think, during the year. Then the balance will be undertaken at once with a view of completing it by the end of next year.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman say with whom the contract is made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the contractor is Mr. Beemer.

Mr. MULOCK. With whom was the contract made by the railway company?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand the company constituted themselves a construction company and gave this work to Mr. Beemer, who has been going on successfully up to the present time. He is now going on with this road.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that there is a railway company and a construction company, and that there was a contract made by the railway company with the construction company, and that then the construction company sublet the contract to Mr. Beemer. Is that the state of affairs?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. So I understand.

Mr. MULOCK. Is this Mr. Beemer the same person who had the contract for the building of the Quebec gates some years ago?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that this Mr. Beemer presented a claim against this Government on one occasion for a certain sum of money for extras in connection with the contract for building those gates. Is this the same Mr. Beemer who presented that claim for extras?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Could the Minister state the amount of his first claim for extras?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say that. That was laid before Parliament at the time, some five or six years ago.

Mr. MULOCK. Could the Minister state the rate of contract for building between the railway company and the construction company, and the amount at which the contract has been sublet to this Mr. Beemer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That I cannot say.

Mr. MULOCK. Could he say at what rate the construction was let to the construction company?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot answer that. I can say the work has been delayed, and precisely because the company could not proceed with it fast enough; the interior of the country is rather rough and difficult, and this is the principal reason why this increased subsidy has been given, in order to reach the fine region of Lake St. John.

Mr. MULOCK. What is it estimated that this road will cost per mile?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. About $22,000.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not desire in any way to prevent the construction of this road, but I wish to call attention to the aid it has already received. I am told this road has already received from this Government, in aid, $560,000; that it received from the Quebec Government $850,000, from the city of Quebec, $458,000—a total of $1,868,000. It has a mileage of 170, not 175, and with that mileage the cash bonuses I have enumerated allow for construction $10,941 per mile. In addition to that, the railway company has power to bond this road for $20,000 per mile, and now it is proposed for the remaining ninety-five miles to allow it a cash bonus of $1,961, which added to the cash bonus already mentioned, makes $12,902 per mile. In addition to this, it has 5,000 acres of land per mile, which, if estimated at $1 per acre—

Mr. BLAKE. 70 cents.

Mr. MULOCK. At 70 cents it is $3,500 per mile, so that this road has in cash, land and bonds, $36,402 per mile. Well, Mr. Chairman, we are getting up into high figures in

railway construction. We were told to day by the Minister that it cost $26,000 per mile to build a road through a difficult country from Gravenhurst to Callander, and it was a first-class road, intending to do a very different kind of work, I presume, from this one, which will be comparatively a colonisation road. Now, is it necessary that the public money should be given to that extent for the construction of a railway? I think under the circumstances the Government ought to have given us more particulars. The Minister of Public Works told us that the contract has been let for the construction of this ninety-five miles of road and, I think he should have told us the price.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I did not say the contract had been let for the ninety-five miles remaining to be built. I stated that there was a contract now going on by Mr. Beemer for the last fifty miles up to Lake Edouard, which will complete the eighty-five miles.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman state the rate?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the Minister of Militia can tell us. I understand he is a director in the construction company.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The cost of the road is about $22,400 per mile. The hon. gentleman must understand that besides the cash subsidies which have been enumerated, the financial position of the enterprise will depend a great deal upon what the lands will realise, and also upon what the bonds will realise. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the bonds as being available cash, but these bonds have not yet been disposed of. The hon gentleman also must know, as he seems to have taken a great deal of interest in these railway matters, that bonds at present are really not available for any cash purposes for the construction of any railway. The Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, as most hon. gentlemen know, and as the hon. gentleman who represents Megantic (Mr. Langelier), and who happens to be the mayor of the city of Quebec, knows perfectly well, is of the greatest importance for the district of Quebec. From the city of Quebec, it traverses a country leading to one of the most valuable portions of our Province. The valley of the Lake St. John is recognised as being equal to any of the most valuable and productive lands in the Dominion of Canada. It now has a population of 40,000 people, and from the fact that no railway communication exists between that valuable section of the country and the markets, the population are placed in the impossibility of continuing to remain in that district unless railway communication is given them. The subsidies which have been given are, no doubt, large, but they are small compared with the great difficulties which have been encountered in building that road. Those who have studied the geography of that section of country must understand the great difficulty of securing a line of railway starting from the city of Quebec, crossing the Laurentian range, and going down to Lake St. John. The estimated cost of the road so far, is $22,700 a mile, but that is partially equipped. Considering the difficulties that have been encountered, the building of that road, so far, has been a great success, but like all roads, traversing a difficult section of country, such as this railway traverses, it is not perfect by any means, and a great deal more money will have to be expended before it is completed and put into such a condition as the circumstances demand. I think that hon. gentlemen will admit that there is no more important road for our section of the country than the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway.

Mr. MULOCK. I shall extremely rejoice when the people of that section are in railway communication with the rest of the people of Canada. I do not ask these questions for the purpose of discouraging the enterprise in the slightest degree. I shall be glad if the Minister of Militia would inform me as to what is the difference between the contract for the construction of this line between the railway company and the construction company and the sub-contract with Mr. Beemer.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The first company organised was the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, and not the construction company. The construction was organised for the purpose of building this line. The subsidies were transferred by the original, the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company to the construction company. The company felt they were not in a position to carry out the contract without letting it to Mr. Beemer, the present contractor. The hon. gentleman has enquired about Mr. Beemer. So far as his honor and ability are concerned the member for Megantic can give the hon. gentleman all the information required, The contract was let to Mr. Beemer and he has done his work very well indeed, so far as he has gone, and has given ample satisfaction to the company which had undertaken to build the road.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman rather evades, accidentally, my question. Does Mr. Beemer obtain from the construction company everything the construction company obtains from the railway company for the building of the road?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, I think so.

Mr. BLAKE. I should like to know whether the Minister of Militia is himself a member of the construction company?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am.

Mr. BLAKE. And Mr. Ross?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And Mr. Beaudet?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And Mr. Baby was until lately?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He was.

Mr. BLAKE. He has retired, I believe. Some little question arose as to his remuneration for securing some of the aid.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not know as to that. I know he has retired.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the hon. gentleman says very rightly that the road is a very important road, and that it is of great consequence that it should be built. I have no doubt about that. The question is whether the amounts to be appropriated are being properly applied, and whether the financial basis is sufficiently strong. Having got a construction company of such respectability and influence as that, the particulars of which I have elicited from the hon. gentleman, it seems extraordinary that they should not have been able to have got along with construction without further assistance. No doubt the hon. gentleman in his position on the construction company was able to point to his colleagues the importance of adding to the financial arrangements of this railway. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would say what amount of cash has been actually paid up in stock by the company?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I cannot say.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps there has not been very much?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There has been a good deal but I could not say how much.

Mr. BLAKE. About $10,000?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I could not say at all.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that this great corporation of which the hon. gentleman is a member and is also a

member of the construction company, has paid in about that amount, and for that they are going to control a railway with subsidies of $10,000 a mile.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can tell the hon. gentleman, without informing him exactly what amount of stock has been subscribed, that no railway company in Canada, I believe, has expended more of its own cash in the building of a railway than has this company which has undertaken the building of this line. Mr. Ross and others have been for years carrying out this great undertaking, which is to produce such important results in the Quebec district. They have expended upwards of half a million of dollars upon the road, of their own cash. I think that no other company can boast of having achieved what they have achieved, and of having spent more of their own cash or shown more spirit of enterprise.

Mr. BLAKE. If this money has been expended, although the stock has not been paid up, it must simply have been advanced on the contract. Bonds or subsidies, and so forth, have been taken in security, and advances made which will now be recouped out of the public Treasury. Money is advanced in one or two ways: Either the parties lend money to the company on security, or they become shareholders. It is quite clear that if the money has not been subscribed for stock, the cash was advanced to the company, and I suppose that it will be recouped by these arrangements.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman will see from the figures, that if the road cost $22,700 a mile, and if the subsidy only amounts to $10,000 a mile, there must be expended upwards of $10,000 out of the company's own money per mile.

Mr. BLAKE. Or it is borrowed on the bonds?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman will understand that for a number of years, although in the company, I have had very little to do with any of its proceedings, and it is quite impossible for me to tell the hon. gentleman how the money has been disposed of—but I have shown, I believe, satisfactorily, that no company has done more to promote a great national enterprise, than has the company which has undertaken to build this road.

Mr. BLAKE. I perceive that the hon. gentleman is not well acquainted with the affairs of the company. I can tell the hon. gentleman, at one breath, where half of the half million dollars has come from. It has come out of the Quebec and Dominion subsidies, as the hon. gentleman will find stated in this letter, subscribed by J. J. Ross, president of the company:—

"An advance from the Province of Quebec, out of future subsides, of $148,000. It has also been necessary to expend, in order to complete the last forty miles, the sum of $96,000, voted by the Dominion last summer, for thirty miles previously constructed, which sum, according to the contract, should have been devoted towards the building of an independent entrance into the city of Quebec. Thus some $244,000 of the subsidy, belonging to unfinished portions of the road, have been unavoidably expended in completing the expensive central section."

There it is explained that half of the sum which the hon. gentleman has mentioned has come out of the treasuries of the Provinces and the Dominion.

Mr. KIRK. I am considerably surprised to find that only $10,000 of the subscribed capital stock of the company has been paid up. I understood that the members of the company were very wealthy and quite able to pay up their stock. I understand also that some of the members are in the habit of subscribing liberally for testimonials to members of the Government. I would like to ask whether this Mr. Beemer is the same man who subscribed $1,000 for a testimonial to the Minister of Public Works.

To the Cap Rouge and St. Lawrence Railway Company, for twelve miles of their railway from Lorette *via* Cap Rouge to Quebec, in the Province of Quebec, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $38,400.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This line of railway is a line from some point at or near Lorette, on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, running to the mouth of the River St. Charles, either within or without the city limits of Quebec, or running by Cap Rouge, then following the north shore of the river through the coves to the city of Quebec to a point in the city of Quebec, where the company may have a deep water terminus; and in all cases, before entering the limits of the city of Quebec, the consent of the corporation is previously to be obtained. This line taps the north shore at Lorette, and follows the valley of the river to Cap Rouge down to deep water at St. Felix de Cap Rouge. It is a valuable adjunct to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and will be a great accommodation to the lumber trade by taking it from Lorette to deep water at St. Felix de Cap Rouge, and thence to the harbor works, enabling them to deposit the lumber at the various wharves.

Mr. LANGELIER. Has any estimate been made of the cost of the land damages for this railway? On the other side of the river, at Point Lévis, they have been very large, and they are likely to be still larger on the Quebec side. Unless the amount of damages has been ascertained to be very low, I do not think the subsidy will be sufficient to construct the railway.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The subsidy is perfectly protected from the fact that it can only be paid when the line is built; but I may tell the hon. gentleman that, in so far as the right of way is concerned from Lorette to St. Felix crossing, the property is held by the Young estate and Mr. Duchesnay, and it has been secured at very little cost, if any. The cove owners, who see the value of this road going through their property and coming into the city, have held a meeting; and I understand that almost all of them have agreed to give the right of way for the purpose of securing the building of this line.

For the construction of wharves and landing stages on the line on the railway from Long Sault to the foot of Lake Temiscamingue, a subsidy of $6,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is intended to aid the farmers and others in transporting supplies and produce to market, the river not being navigable at that point. The river will pass a number of rapids, and a number of transfer landing stations and wharves are required, and this is to provide for them. The subsidy already granted is for eight miles of railway. There is already a large settlement there, and settlers continue to flock in.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe that the application is for another purpose, namely, for rolling stock and the requirements of steamers, I suppose, in connection with the navigation which is to form part of the scheme. They declare that a grant of $15,000 is necessary, they having been obliged to place four steamers on the water stretches. Now, what the hon. gentleman proposes is to give $6,000 for wharves and landing stages. Are there any other papers indicating the want of money for this purpose?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They made a request to the Minister of Railways for what is mentioned there, but they made to my Department a request for wharves, saying that they could not build them, and that the object they had in view and that we had in view in giving the subsidy last year to their railway, could not be attained unless we could give some aid in this way by building those wharves and landing places.

Mr. BLAKE. Here again we are in the unfortunate position of having papers brought down with reference to an application which the Government did not grant, and no papers with reference to the one which they granted. This is the third or fourth time that this has occurred. There is one observation made in the application which induces me to give it favorable consideration. I observe that Father

Gendron, who requests that this amount be given to the society to carry on its patriotic intention, remarks that not one of its members have the slightest pecuniary or personal interest in view. I am surprised that the hon. gentlemen opposite did not think that a disqualification.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is very witty.

To the Gananoque, Perth and James' Bay Railway Company, seventeen miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $54,400.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The original charter was rather a large one in its design. The application now is for the first section of eighteen miles, from near Ganahoque to Delta, an important part of the line, and it is with a view to construct it that this is proposed.

Mr. BLAKE. Has there been any evidence laid before the Government as to the financial standing of this corporation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not aware that there has been.

Mr. HAGGART. The company has not been formed yet. It is chartered, and it is principally under the control of Messrs. Rathbun & Co., of Deseronto. They have built a line of road from Gananoque to the River St. Lawrence, about three miles long, and have built two iron bridges over it; and they have a line of ferry to connect with the Utica and Black River Railway at Clayton. In order to utilise the railway on which they have expended over $70,000 they have applied for a charter, and the intention is to push the road with the help of the Government bonuses and the municipal bonuses.

For a railway from St. Eustache to St. Placide, county of Two Mountains, eighteen miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $57,600.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The old road from Grenville to Carillon is extended by the change which was explained a moment ago, and instead of the railway of seven miles being constructed from Carillon to Lachute the subsidy is applied to a railway from Carillon to St. Placide. It is proposed to carry the road to St. Eustache, making it one which, in the future, I hope, will reach Sault au Recollets, giving communication with the city of Montreal, to all that part of the country on the north side of the Ottawa, and giving at the same time, as much as possible, communication with that part of the country which lies between Grenville and St. Placide, on the south shore, which have no road until the Vaudreuil road is subsidised, and that is not done at the present moment.

Mr. BLAKE. In this case no papers are brought down. Are there any papers?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I gave up giving explanations, because the last I gave was not satisfactory to my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAKE. For that reason, I simply asked whether there were any papers. I thought the hon. gentleman could answer that question.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have not had any papers.

Mr. BLAKE. That is what one may call an evasive answer. It is as much as to say that some of the other thirteen or fourteen members of the Government may have had papers, but we are not to know upon whose or what representations this application is made.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I understand that the application is made by the same company which obtained the former grant.

Mr. BLAKE.

For a railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway through the Stewiacke Valley, on a line which will afford facilities of communication with the Iron Mines, Spring Side, Upper Stewiacke, and Musquodoboit settlements, twenty-five miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $80,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This railway is designed to meet the Intercolonial Railway near Stewiacke Station, and run easterly through the beautiful and fertile Stewiacke valley for twenty-five miles, in order to give facilities for communication with the iron mines of that district, which is entirely without railway service.

Mr. VAIL. Has there been any survey of this road, or who has made application?

Mr. BLAKE. I can tell the hon. gentleman who the applicant is, and I am not at all surprised that the application was granted. The applicant is the Minister of Finance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then, of course, it ought to be granted.

Mr. BLAKE. Because he has got the Treasury, and here is his levy.

Mr. VAIL. He appears to be looking after his own county, and neglects the western counties.

For a railway from Yamaska to the River St. Francis in the Province of Quebec, ten miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $32,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The application for aid to this railway is made in the name of the South-Eastern Railway, which has projected a line from Montreal to Chaudière Curve, on the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk. The total distance is estimated at 130 miles. The first section of that road is covered by the Montreal and Sorel Railway, which is built for forty-five miles to Sorel, and the distance from there to Yamaska is served by the South Eastern. The portion now proposed to be subsidised leaves the South-Eastern at Yamaska, and will run to River St. Francis, a distance of ten miles. Mr. Massue desires to call the attention of the Government to the fact that this road when completed, will be a good feeder to the local railway, and will bring that line into direct connection with Montreal. A local subsidy has been granted to it of $4,000 per mile.

Mr. MILLS. Is it proposed to put a double track on the Intercolonial Railway to do all the work?

Mr. BLAKE. With so many feeders.

For a railway from Perth Centre Station on the New Brunswick Railway, to a point near Plaster Rock Island, in the Province of New Brunswick, twenty-eight miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $89,600.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is for a line to the magnificent plaster quarries near Plaster Rock Island. It is believed that a large business would be done in this district with the western part of the Dominion if transport facilities were available. The construction of this road will afford the necessary facilities. It is to follow down the south side of the St. John River.

Mr. BLAKE. I have been informed that it is quite correct that these plaster beds are important, and they are very much required, not merely for the west but also for the east.

For a railway from Fredericton to the village of Prince William, in the Province of New Brunswick, twenty-two miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $70,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road is intended to run from Fredericton to Woodstock, a distance of sixty-three miles, following the south side of the St. John River, the population of which district are cut off from railway communication by the St. John River, the New Brunswick Railway running down the north side of the river. This section of country is well settled and a large area is under cultivation, but the people are becoming discouraged, as,

since the steamers have ceased to ply on the river, the means of getting their produce to market is cut off. It is proposed to subsidise the railway from Fredericton to Prince William. It has a local subsidy.

Mr. WELDON. When was the local subsidy granted?

Mr. TEMPLE. One of the directors told me it was granted in 1885—$3,000 a mile. This road is a most important one for that section of the country. It runs along the River St. John from Fredericton to Woodstock the whole distance of sixty-five miles, and that is one of the best and most thickly settled sections of the Province of New Brunswick. During the winter there is, of course, no communication whatever, and during the summer there is communication by the boats for about six weeks at this time of the year; and in some seasons, when there is a great deal of rain, they may run for two months. Otherwise the people are completely isolated. I hope this grant will pass, because the road is very much needed. It makes connection at both ends with the New Brunswick Railway, and is also a short line from Rivière du Loup to St. John. When this link is built from Rivière du Loup to Edmonton, it will form part and parcel of that line, and it passes through one of the best sections of the country.

Mr. WELDON. There are three railways from Woodstock to Fredericton and a river. My impression is the river will not be wanted at all.

Mr. TEMPLE. I think not. If we have this railway we will do away with the expense every year of laying out small amounts in clearing the river. The Government has been very kind for a long time in giving grants for clearing out the bars along the river in order that boats may run. This has to be done every year for the reason that the large amount of ice floating down the river rolls in the rocks continually and fills up the channel by forming a bar. The small amount granted for that purpose only merely serves to clear out the river every year, and is of little or no benefit whatever.

Mr. WELDON. Has any survey been made?

Mr. TEMPLE. About two-thirds of it has been surveyed.

Mr. WELDON. How far up?

Mr. TEMPLE. From Woodstock to Prince William.

Mr. MILLS. Is any part of that road reaching from Hong Kong and Liverpool?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes, it goes to Hong Kong.

For a railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway near Newcastle to Douglastown, in the Province of New Brunswick, six miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 a mile, nor exceeding in the whole $19,200.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road is destined to leave the Intercolonial Railway about three miles north of Newcastle and run down to Douglastown where large sawmills are in operation. It will give great facilities for the fishing trade of the village of Chatham on the opposite side of the river. It is proposed there shall be an amendment in this way. It provides now for a railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway near Newcastle to Douglastown. I would add the words "or *via* Douglastown to a point on the River Miramichi, opposite the town of Chatham, so as to have a ferry crossing to Chatham.

Mr. WELDON. Is it a feeder to the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We do not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. This is one of those cases in which I think the honorable applicant is to be congratulated. My hon. friend from Northumberland applied for from four and a-half to five miles of subsidy, and he has got six miles. Many others have applied for large quantities and they have got less. But my hon. friend, so influential in his position, when he asks for four and a-half miles, the Government give him one third more, where this tail of one and a-half mile long is to be appended I do not know; but so it is. Still I must admit there are countervailing considerations. My friend's application was, besides his great influence, based upon valuable consideration. It is one of the most potential applications I ever read. It is contained in a letter to the First Minister in which is recounted a conversation my hon. friend had with that hon. gentleman during the previous Session of Parliament, I think, or some time before. The letter is dated 18th May last, and the hon. gentleman after pointing out that he had applied for this subsidy the previous Session said:

"I discussed the matter frequently with the Minister of Railways last Session, and had a personal interview with yourself upon that and on other subjects connected with the county. Notably that of the successor in the Senate to our late Senator, the Hon. William Muirhead. I need not recall the substance of that interview in detail, as doubtless you will recollect it, and while regretting that an appointment to that office should not be made from the county where the vacancy was, and finding you resolved to give it to another county, viz., Westmoreland, I stated to you that I would be satisfied provided the two short lines of railway which I had asked for were subsidised so as to enable the county to get substantial benefit in some way or other."

The First Minister should state the account between Northumberland and the Dominion Government. The Dominion Government debtor to the hon. member for Northumberland, for one Senator abstracted from Northumberland and removed to Westmoreland, so many thousand dollars. Creditor, *per contra*, by one railway subsidy. Account balanced; paid in full, Peter Mitchell. I congratulate my hon. friend upon the cogency of that application. Although his reasoning had effect with the First Minister, it did not prevail with the Minister of Railways, because the hon. member points out that he made several applications to the Minister of Railways but could get no reply, and he goes on to say:

"At an early stage in this Session I again addressed the Minister of Railways upon the subject, asking him to provide the bonus customary in such cases and referring to the correspondence on file in his office. I have had several interviews with the Minister on the subject but without any satisfactory result."

So that, having unfortunately not succeeded with the Minister of Railways, he renewed his first application to the First Minister, who understands—as I observe from certain transactions which have not unfrequently occurred notably the one appointing a Senator—how to make these arrangements in an admirable political manner. I understand he can swap off a senator for a branch of railway.

Mr. MITCHELL. I suppose the right hon. gentleman will excuse me if I take upon myself to make the explanations the hon. gentleman seems to desire. He wants to know why it is, when I ask for four and a half miles I was granted six. It was because I represented the fact that, although the company chartered for the purpose of building the line to Douglastown, only made their application to Douglastown, it is necessary to go on to navigable waters, a mile further off; and therefore I asked for the additional mile, because I knew they intended to carry that out and their application failed to represent that. As to the other part in which swapping off comes up, as my hon. friend says, I will say this, that I understood last year, from a casual conversation, that I would probably get this little bit of railway; but for some reason or other it was not given. Perhaps it was not convenient; perhaps it was because I got my share, but it was allowed to stand over. However, after having written that letter, I happened to pass the chair of my hon. friend and asked him if he had received it. He said he had not. I said I wrote about that little railway subsidy. He replied: Oh, Mitchell, you deserve it, Sir; you have earned it. I said I thought I had or I would scarcely ven-

ture to apply for it, and he has been as good as his word and given me the subsidy. I must say to the credit of the Government, that the head of the Government does not allow any feeling to exist on his part against an hon. gentleman who is independent enough to give him advice. I thank him very much for the little railway I got. As to the point about the senator, I think, if I recollect correctly the conclusion of the conversation, the right hon. gentleman, when he got at what I was at, laughed and said: "Oh, old boy, you want the substance instead of the shadow." "That is just what I am after; if you give me the railway, you may keep the senator."

Mr. BLAKE. Then we are to understand that the market value a county puts on a senator, varies from $18,000 to $19,200.

Mr. MITCHELL. Whatever it may be, I believe my county is better satisfied to have the little railways than to have a successor to the senator, though we ought to have the senator too.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh.

Mr. BLAKE. I really must sustain the First Minister. I think he has given the hon. gentleman a quittance in full on his own terms. He did try to get the senatorship, but he compromised and said he would take the subsidy. He has got the subsidy, with usury thereto, and he ought not to press for the senator too. Besides, the senator is still alive.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is unfortunate, or he would have it.

For a railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Eganville, in the Province of Ontario, twenty-two miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $70,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company have constructed their road from Kingston to Renfrew Station, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and have arranged to run over the Canadian Pacific Railway from Renfrew to Pembroke, thirty-five miles. It is considered very important in the interests of the trade of the district that a railway be built from Renfrew to Eganville on the Bonnechère River, a distance of twenty-two miles, and it is this section of road it is proposed to subsidise. The cost is estimated at $20,000 a mile. So important do the people of the district consider this road to them that they contemplate taxing themselves in aid of its construction.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has stated that it is from Renfrew that this is to go to Eganville, but I observe that the provision is entirely vague. It says "from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Eganville." It may be from some other point than Renfrew. What is the reason for that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is to leave some discretion as to the best starting point, I fancy.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it with the object of bonus hunting from the various localities?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It may be. If you want to get bonuses you do not settle the line.

Mr. BLAKE. I know that, but if that is the object, I do not think it is a very good object, because I think, when we decide for ourselves that we will aid a public enterprise of this kind, we ought to decide what the best route is in the interests of the country, we ought to fix that route and then let the parties get the bonuses if they can. They need not build the railway if they do not, but this business of leaving a variety of different routes open involves sometimes a very heavy tax on the municipalities, who are called upon to compete with one another, though one has really the superiority. I think, if it is to go from Renfrew, we should say so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think there is no harm in leaving it as it is.

To the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company, for seven miles of their railway from the village of Madoc to the junction with the Central Ontario Railway at Eldorado, in the Province of Ontario, a subsidy (in addition to the subsidy of $1,500 per mile granted by 48-49 Victoria, chapter 59) not exceeding $1,700 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, $11,900.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think I have a memorandum here about that.

Mr. BOWELL. This is a short line running from Madoc to connect with the Ontario Central at Eldorado, which is built and in operation for about forty miles north of Eldorado. Last year, a subsidy of $1,500 per mile was given, which was supposed at that time to be sufficient to complete the road, but it has since been ascertained that it would not, and the proposition now is to put that short line of seven miles in the same position as other roads, and give it $3,200 a mile.

Mr. BLAKE. Why was it the grant was kept down to $1,500 a mile last year?

Mr. BOWELL. I thought I told the committee why. I said it was supposed at that time that it would complete it, but, after a survey, it was found that it would not, because much of the trestle work and other portions of the work on the road had decayed and had to be replaced. That is the reason.

Mr. BLAKE. The road is built then?

Mr. BOWELL. It has been built partially, and had been run on, but it has been allowed to fall into disuse; but, since the completion of the Ontario Central, which touches Eldorado, a point seven miles from the northern terminus of the Belleville and North Hastings road at Madoc, it is in the interest of that whole section of country extending 100 miles northwards in the free grants in North Hastings, that these roads should be connected, so that, when coming to the county town, instead of going all the way round to Trenton, they can connect with the Belleville and North Hastings, and go straight to Madoc village, then to the city.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that. We passed the subsidy last year, which showed we thought it was a proper road to be aided. I was asking why we were asked to more than double the aid that was then thought to be adequate?

Mr. KIRK. With your permission, and the permission of the committee, I will ask the Minister of Justice, whom I see now in his seat, the question which I asked, a little while ago, of the First Minister, and he was not in a position to answer. It is in reference to a telegram which appeared in the Halifax *Herald*, the organ of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The CHAIRMAN. If the committee is unwilling, I do not see how I can allow you to proceed, unless you move that the committee rise.

Mr. KIRK. I do not think I am out of order. We are discussing railway matters, and this is a railway matter. It is an important matter, and I think the Minister of Justice will be glad to have the opportunity of explaining it.

The CHAIRMAN. Order. I do not think it is before the committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Do it with the Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. BLAKE. He can bring it up when it is moved that the committee rise.

To the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company, for sixteen miles of their railway from Tamworth towards Tweed, in lieu of the subsidy granted by 48-49 Victoria, chapter 59, a subsidy of $70,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is merely a change. It is a subsidy for sixteen miles from Tamworth to Bogart, and the newly proposed route is from Tamworth to Tweed.

Mr. BLAKE. It is the same amount, is it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The same amount.

Mr. BLAKE. And for the same mileage?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The same mileage.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). They intend to carry it to Bridgewater. It is constructed by the Grand Trunk, and they will take that road to Madoc, and then the road to Eldorado. They cannot get a good line from Bogart to Bridgewater, but by going to Tweed, where they have a station, they will get a good road to Bridgewater. It is only a change of about three miles.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the subsidy granted originally was at a greater rate than the usual rate. It seems to be something like $4,375 a mile.

Mr. BOWELL. The contract was originally from Tamworth to Bogart and to Bridgewater, but they found they could not well reach that point, and they asked the Government last year to allow them to apply the full amount of the subsidy from Tamworth to Bogart, and now they ask to change the line from Bogart to Tweed, where they will connect with the Ontario and Quebec road and the Ontario Central.

Mr. BLAKE. Will this sixteen miles carry it to the connection with the Ontario and Quebec?

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I think not. They will have to go about two miles further, and it will be about eighteen miles.

Mr. BLAKE. At what point will they strike the Ontario and Quebec?

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). At Tweed.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see why the grant is not made for the eighteen miles from Tamworth to Tweed, instead of making it for the sixteen miles from Tamworth towards Tweed.

Mr. BOWELL. The reason is that all that Mr. Rathbun, who is building the road, asked was that he should be permitted to expend the subsidy already granted to him to build the road from Tamworth to Bogart on a line from Tamworth to Tweed, in the same county.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will amend by making it for the eighteen miles to Tweed.

To the Albert Railway Company, for their railway from Salisbury to Hopewell, in the Province of New Brunswick, which is a feeder to the Intercolonial Railway, in the form of a loan, repayable at such time and secured in such manner as the Governor in Council determines, a subsidy of $15,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This road is about forty miles in length, and extends from the Intercolonial Railway station at Salisbury to Hopewell. It has been built for some years, and paid working expenses, but very heavy storms of unusual severity have so injured the works of construction that it is found impossible to keep it in the same condition—in fact they are unable to repair it, and unless assistance is given the road will be closed. It is very important to the district that the road should continue to be operated, and for that purpose a loan of $15,000 is proposed. It is an important feeder of the Intercolonial Railway, and its close would seriously disturb the business of that section of the country. The transport and freight will go over the Albert Railway to the Intercolonial Railway. The Intercolonial Railway will, of course, collect the freight and pay itself from time to time out of the freights, and recoup itself for this temporary loan which, I think, is absolutely necessary.

Mr. BLAKE. The Intercolonial Railway will not have anything to do with the recouping; it is a loan from the Treasury. If I rightly understand it, the Albert Railway is bonded up to the hilt. I think the bonds were issued upon the London market by one of those arrangements by which a certain sum is deposited to answer for the interest for a certain time, so that it does not require that the profits of the road should pay more than the working expenses for that time. It is said that about $600,000 is the nominal emission of bonds on this railway. It seems to me clear that under the present circumstances it does not pay working expenses, and it will very shortly have to pay interest on its bonds as well, as soon as the period for which interest is provided expires. It seems to me perfectly plain that this money will never come in again, and we might just as well propose in plain English to make a gift of it, as to propose that it shall be loaned in this way. The hon. gentleman has just hinted at a mode of security upon the freights of the company, but I can assure him that if the company has to part with its freights, the road cannot be kept open. We will never see a dollar of this money again.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the committee rise and report.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the committee rises, I would like to make a suggestion. Some years ago a railway was chartered from Palmerston, and the charter gave the promoters power to construct the line to the Georgian Bay, either at Owen Sound or some other point. The company went on and constructed the road from Palmerston to the town of Durham. The road stands there. From there to the Georgian Bay is a distance of about thirty miles; the people have no railway facilities over a large tract of country between the town of Durham and the Georgian Bay. An agitation sprung up some time ago in order to extend the road from Durham to Meaford, in the east riding of Grey. Meaford is situated on the Georgian Bay. A line thus constructed would pass through a country rich in timber and agricultural resources. There is on the Beaver River an immense water power to be found at several points. If this road was constructed it would tend to develop that country and its resources of timber, agriculture and manufacture, and would be of incalculable benefit to the people in that section. The Dominion Government have never expended any money in the county of Grey, large as it is, for any purpose of this character. Some railways have been constructed there, but it was done out of the resources of the people, aided by the Ontario Government. The people, with that energy and enterprise, with that progressive spirit which characterises them, have, unaided by this Government, gone to work and built their own railway. The Dominion Government have looked into other lines that are probably well calculated to develop the places in which they are built, but they will not develop a richer section of country than the one I am now speaking of; and I did hope that when they introduced this policy—I do not approve of the policy of subsidising railways, but seeing that it is becoming an established policy I thought the Government would pay some attention to those localities and those lines calculated to do the most good. I did hope that they would have considered this line in their resolutions and have extended it so as to develop a country rich in natural resources, and one waiting this accommodation to become a source of great wealth to it. It would connect the interior of east Grey with the railway systems of the world; it would bring the people in communication with the markets, and enable them to get along much better. By an Act of this Parliament some years ago, local control was taken from the roads there, and freights have been probably increased as a result. The farmer gets a

lower rate for his grain, by reason of the local control being taken away and the freights being left as they are now. I think this Government could do nothing better than to insert a resolution to give aid to this line at the same rate, $3,200 per mile, that they have been giving to other lines of a local character. This line would become of Dominion concern, it would aid several large villages that are springing up, and would do a vast amount of good. I hope the Government will consider these suggestions and will give to that line such aid as will enable the promoters to build it to the Georgian Bay. The Government must be aware that in the counties of Grey and Bruce the people have spent very largely of their means to build railways. They have helped themselves, and it should be the policy of this Government to help those who have helped themselves. For many years they were without railway accommodation, and they would have remained in that position so far as the Dominion Parliament is concerned if they had not gone to work and taxed themselves to obtain railway communication. If this road extended from Durham it might proceed to Priceville, Flesherton, Markdale and on to Meaford, developing important villages and a rich agricultural district that is very much in need of a railway. I make these suggestions in the hope that the Government may see their way clear to aiding this line which would become a very useful factor in developing the resources of the country and would do a vast amount of good. There is no money given by these resolutions which would be better spent than that would be spent, and I am surprised the Government did not come to the rescue of that line so that the railway might be carried from Durham to Georgian Bay. It would give the people water communication and access to market and would develop a rich country. I hope the Government will consider the suggestion so that something will yet be done to complete the construction of this important road.

Mr. KIRK. I wish to read to the House and to the Minister of Justice the following despatch which appears in the Halifax *Evening Mail* of 24th May. It is headed special despatch, and it is dated Ottawa, 23rd May, Sunday, by the way.

"Mr. Elwes, of the English representative of the syndicate formed under the Nova Scotia Government's railway scheme, together with others, had an interview with the Minister of Justice yesterday in relation to the aid which that scheme would require from the Dominion Government. It is understood that the delegates were given to understand that no terms would or could be discussed pending the result of the appeal shortly to be made to the people by the Provincial Government on its repeal of the union."

I should like to ask the Minister of Justice if this despatch is a correct report?

Mr. THOMPSON. The despatch is not quite accurate.

Mr. KIRK. I should like to know if the hon. gentleman gave Mr. Elwes to understand that any such policy had been adopted by this Government. I notice in an editorial in that paper, the *Mail*, it is said:

"The Dominion Government have decided to defer all consideration of the Local Government railway policy until the people of this Province has decided at the polls whether or not they desire a repeal of the union."

The hon. gentleman says the despatch is not quite correct. I have Mr. Elwes' authority for saying that the Minister of Justice gave him to understand no such thing and no news paper reporter in Ottawa or anyone else gave this information to him, because he did not understand the Minister of Justice to reply to him in any such way.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have already stated, in reply to the hon. member, that the telegram which he read is not strictly accurate. I will now add for his information that nobody in Ottawa or anywhere else got the information or telegram from me, and that I did not profess to state to Mr. Elwes anything about the policy of the Government on this subject.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a word in support of the view expressed by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). I would have been very much pleased if the resolution would have contained a clause for the purpose of assisting the road from Durham to Georgian Bay. I have been through that section of country. I happen to be one of the promoters of the road from Palmerston to Durham, and the people will very much appreciate any assistance given for the purpose of securing to them the accommodation required. At Meaford on the Georgian Bay there is a connection with the Northern Railway, but all the passengers and freight going west have to travel an enormous distance to reach London or any point in the west, and a connection from Meaford running south connecting with the road at Durham would be a decided advantage. From Durham to Meaford there is a very excellent agricultural district which would undoubtedly contribute towards the construction of the branch. I have no doubt they would very much appreciate any assistance given towards the construction of the line. I fully endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for south Grey, and he deserves the thanks of his constituents and also those of east Grey for bringing the matter before the House. I hope the Government before the resolutions are finally passed will have sufficient influence brought to bear upon them to lead them to grant something towards the construction of this road.

Resolutions reported.

SECOND READING—IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 143) to authorise the construction of a railway from the Straits of Canso as a public railway.—(Mr. Pope.)

RAILWAY FROM METAPEDIAC TO PASBEBIAC.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of the Bill (No. 144) respecting certain subsidies for a railway from Metapediac on the Intercolonial Railway to Pasbebiac.

Mr. BLAKE. I have made some enquiries in regard to the position of this railway, and the hon. gentleman brought down some papers on a former occasion which I have not had time to examine fully, but I have received from other sources some information which I think it is desirable to present to the House. If I am correctly informed, and I think I am, the financial scheme of the company is this: $30,000 is said to have been paid up on the stock. $620,000 is to be given under this Bill by the Canadian Government, and there is a land grant of 10,000 acres a mile given by the Province of Quebec, in respect of which negotiations are proceeding, it is said, and likely to reach a favorable conclusion for the commutation of the land grant by cash subsidies or a guarantee or the issue of the bonds at the rate of sixty-five to seventy-five cents per acre, seventy cents per acre would give $700,000, which are the supposed or expected proceeds of the land grant in cash. That makes a finance of $1,350,000 from public sources, or, leaving out the $30,000, a net amount of $1,320,000 for the 100 miles, and besides that there is the bonding power of the company, which I understand they expect to use to the extent of $600,000. Now my information is that the road runs through a very old settled country, a very easy country, with means of communication close along to it. The work is, upon the whole, extremely easy work, and the cutting very light. It is true the first twelve miles of the first twenty miles is somewhat more difficult than the rest, though still not very difficult. After that the work is extremely easy and it is on the whole very light. As I have said,

it is on an old settled country with supplies, and men, and materials and means of communication. Everything in the conditions, as to labor and otherwise, is very admirable for the construction of a cheap railway. Now, the papers which the hon. gentleman brought down show what the composition of the company is. The company is composed of shareholders holding 6,000 shares. Of these there are a batch of Robitailles. There is Senator Robitaille 500 shares; ex-Senator Robitaille, his brother, 1,000 shares; Mr. L. A. Robitaille, another brother, formerly employed by the Government of Quebec, 980 shares; Mr. Riopel the member for Bonaventure, who, I think, is a brother-in-law of Mr. Robitaille, 1,000 shares; making in all 3,480 shares or seven-twelfths of the whole stock of the company in that connection. Then there is the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. McGreevy), who I think has been associated in some transactions with Mr. Robitaille, 1,000 shares; Mr. R. H. McGreevy, his brother, 500 shares, making 1,500 shares in that connection or one quarter of the stock. Then Mr. C. N. Armstrong, of Montreal, I believe a relative of the hon. Minister of Public Works, and who is a railway promoter, having had a connection with the Montreal and Sorel Railway and whose operations on the stock exchange have redounded so much to the credit of the country, has 550 shares; making in all for the Robitaille connection, the McGreevy connection and Mr. Armstrong, 5,530 shares out of the 6,000, or over eleven-twelfths of the stock of the company. Now, as appears by the papers, on the 7th of November, 1885, an agreement was made with the company by the Government, which is laid upon the Table, and in pursuance of which this legislation is asked, that the Government would hand over to the railway company which undertook to construct the first twenty miles the $300,000 which Parliament voted for its construction as a public work, and would allocate that as a subsidy on the twenty miles; that it would also grant the subsidy for the whole 100 miles, for the remaining eighty miles, doubling that subsidy of $3,200 up for the second twenty miles, and thus giving for the second twenty miles $6,400, the result being $15,000 a mile for the first, $6,400 a mile for the second and $3,200 a mile for the remaining eighty miles. Well, according to the information I have received, the company made an agreement according to the admirable arrangement which we have seen exemplified this evening in the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway—it made an arrangement for construction, which arrangement was made with one of its own shareholders, Mr. Armstrong—who, of course, shared in the benefits, and who has the contract for the construction. The contract was that this gentleman should build the road for $15,000 a mile cash and a certain interest in the bonds, with the understanding that he was to sublet the contract, and that the company was to receive certain shares of the profits to be made out of the business. This contract, which has been in existence for some time, contains certain specifications as to the character of the work. I have not seen the document, but, according to the information I have received, it does not indicate for the whole of that work—certainly not for that portion beyond the first twenty miles, as to which we have a contract between the Government and the company on the Table—certainly not as to the other eighty miles—it does not contain such specifications as are consistent with a first class work. I do not complain of that except in so far as the permanent structures are concerned, which I think should be made of a really permanent character, in the first instance. It is certain, according to my information, that the contract which has been made does not contemplate anything but a second class road, at any rate for eighty miles of the road. Now, the contractor and the shareholder, Mr. Armstrong, as I believe, since November, when he obtained this contract, in pursuance of the understanding on which he obtained it has been negotiating with several different sets of persons in advance of the sanction of Parliament to the scheme, and of the local authorities as to the commutation of the land grant for money or securities equivalent to money—has been negotiating for the subletting of the contract, and these negotiations were somewhat upon this basis: That a construction company should be formed, of which Mr. Armstrong himself was to be a partner or shareholder with one-third interest; that the construction company should agree to build the road for $14,000 per mile, and a certain proportion of the bonds. This $14,000 per mile leaves, of course, $1,000 per mile out of the $15,000 per mile, which is stipulated in the contract of Mr. Armstrong; or $100,000. Of that one-half is to be given to the company by Mr. Armstrong, on an understanding between him and the company; the other half is to go into the contractors' funds. This gives to the company $500 a mile, or $50,000. Then it was understood in the original contract, and in these proposed sub-contracts, that the contractors were to pay the company $600 per mile out of the cash contract money, or $60,000 more. Then it was proposed that the company should retain out of the moneys paid to the contractors, 3 per cent. on all payments. This is equal to $450 a mile or $45,000 more. Then the company were to receive at once a cash bonus from the contractors—because the same operation with which the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) has made us familiar, with regard to another enterprise, which appeared to have been initiated on a somewhat similar basis as this, is intended to take place; the contractor is to begin his operations by paying money to the company instead of receiving it from the company. A bonus of from $25,000 to $50,000 is to be paid by the contractors to the company, in part to recoup them for their expenses; because I believe they have made outlays particularly at times of political activity in the county of Bonaventure. These are said to have amounted to not more than $8,000 or $10,000, and the balance, I suppose, will go to profit and loss, particularly profit. You will observe that the cash receipts of the company would be about $13,200 a mile, and to make up $15,000, it will be necessary that $1,800 should be provided for. This is intended to be provided out of the bond issue of $6,000 a mile. This is the only charge intended to be created on the undertaking, and if it has any commercial merit at all, its earning power should be sufficient to make up the interest on that amount; so that you may assume that the bonds will be sold at par, which will leave $4,200 a mile to be divided between the contractors and the company, giving $2,100 a mile, or $210,000 more. These various sums—$50,000, $60,000, $45,000, $35,000 as the net bonus, allowing for those official expenses, and $210,000 as their share of the proceeds of the bonds, added together give a gross sum of $400,000 to be received as a profit by the shareholders. Out of this, of course, we have to take the cost of the rolling stock, which, on a small second-class railway like this, as the Minister of Railways observed with regard to a similar enterprise this afternoon, would cost probably from $1,200 to $1,500 a mile, because the bulk of the work will be done by the cars and stock of the longer line with which the road is connected. We will say $1,500 a mile. That will make $150,000 to come out of the $400,000, leaving $250,000 as profit for the company. This will go to the shareholders to whom I have referred, and the names of those holding eleven-twelfths of the stock I have given to the House. They will thus obtain the railway free of expense, subject to a charge of $6,000 a mile, with a profit of some $250,000 put into their own pockets; their only risk in the whole transaction having been the original payment, if it has been *bond fide* paid, of $30,000 of their stock. As I say, the road, according to the plan on which

it is projected to be built, will be built for somewhere about $13,000 a mile, or $1,300,000, which, with $200,000 added for rolling stock will give say $1,500,000, but it is to cost, including the bonds, some $1,920,000, or $420,000 in excess of a liberal cost of the road. The real cost of the road is going to be provided for as you know entirely at the public expense, and a sum nearly approaching the whole bonding power goes to the shareholders of the company along with the rolling stock. Of course, it must not be considered that the shareholder who has such a modest proportion of this class of profits, Mr. Armstrong, is being dealt with so unfairly as would appear from this distribution of the spoils, when he has only that small amount of the shareholding interest; because if he is limited in the shareholding interest, he has large profits with the contractors, because the arrangement gives the contractors profits far in excess of the fair commercial profits of contractors, and these I think will be found more than fair to Mr. Armstrong—something like $100,000. That is the state of the facts, so far as known and as I have been able to ascertain it, on which we are asked to agree to a vote of over $300,000, for the construction of the first twenty miles as a public work, and on which we are to agree to give $320,000 for the remaining eighty miles. In order that the profits of these projectors should be realised at an early moment—for it is not proper that they should not be kept out of their money too long—it is arranged that they should get the $15,000 a mile besides the land grant of the Quebec Government for the first twenty miles, and $6,400 besides the land grant for the second. So we may hope that their patriotic exertions, their great expenditure of capital, their earnest desire to forward the interest of the locality affected, will receive not merely a handsome, but a very early reward. You find, then, that the public money is proposed in effect to be distributed amongst these three gentlemen, of whom one is a member of the Upper House, and two are members of this Chamber. That is the transaction we are asked to sanction.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got the figures he has given. All I know in regard to them is what I know by the vote of Parliament here, the vote of the Legislature of Quebec, and by the information given by the company to the Department, that the amount subscribed by the stockholders was $300,000, on which they had paid 10 per cent. Then the hon. gentleman says that according to the scheme before the House, to which the committee has assented, we are to give to the company another $300,000 for the building of the first twenty miles. That was what Parliament voted last Session, and we tried to obtain tenders for the building of those twenty miles, and were unable to obtain a tender from anyone who would build that portion of the line for less then $128,000 more than the vote made by Parliament. Therefore they were rejected, and the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company then applied to the Government, and offered to build those twenty miles for the $300,000, on condition that half the line which would cost $150,000 more than the vote of Parliament, would be worked by them, would belong to them, and that the $3,200 voted by Parliament for the old line from Metapediac to Paspebiac should be left to the company and paid for, according as the work would proceed, and that the $3,200 per mile of the first twenty miles would be given to the second twenty miles, in order to induce capitalists to build the line, taking it as one line from one end to the other. When the $300,000 were last voted by Parliament, the leader of the Opposition said it would be a great deal better at once to say that the $300,000 ought to be paid and should be granted to this railway. It would secure the 100 miles, and thus the money would be applied as evidently it must be the intention of the Parliament to apply it. We did not go that far. We tried to have the twenty miles built as Parliament wished the line to be built, but we could not do it, and we have made this arrangement provisionally subject to the vote of Parliament. Parliament is not voting, we are not asking a single cent more for the road than we had to pay before by the Act of Parliament. We are taking the same subsidies to secure, as far as we can, the building of the 100 miles for the same money that was voted for the first twenty miles, and which was considered by the company as insufficient, because although they have been incorporated several years they have been unable to proceed with the line. The hon. gentleman says there is a subsidy of 10,000 acres of land per mile to that company, and he goes on to say that land is worth 70 cents an acre, which makes a subsidy of $700,000, and he counts that as a portion of the assets of the company. Of course, he says, that is as good as if it were cash down. Reasoning in that way, he adds that to the subsidy voted by Parliament and he goes further. He takes the $600,000 worth of bonds and counts that as cash also. These things put together make $1,950,000. He divides that by the 100 miles, and says there is a great deal more money voted than the company would require to build the road. In that way the hon. gentleman would build all the roads of the country. How is it that companies have so great difficulties in building railways? How is it that so many of the subsidies granted for the last four years to railways have lapsed? Is it because they are not sufficient? How is it that though lands are granted by the Local Government to certain railways, these grants with the moneys voted here are found insufficient? In this case the $300,000 for the twenty miles may succeed in securing the 100 miles, and I really believe it will. The hon. gentleman took the trouble to state to the House that one of the shareholders of the company was a distant relative of mine. What has that to do with the company? What business has Parliament to know that Mr. Armstrong is a distant relative of mine? I do not think that is worthy of the leader of the Opposition. It is unworthy of his high position. It is one of those small things we should not expect from a man in his high position and high intellect and the confidence he has of his party. No doubt it must have escaped him at the moment. For my part, he will never hear me reproaching him with a thing of that kind.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not believe I will.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I never act that way. I have always treated the hon. gentleman with the greatest courtesy; although he and some of his friends may insult me across the House, they will never have insults of the same kind from me. I will treat them always with courtesy, and I expect to be treated with courtesy by them.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee and reported.

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS IN MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (page 1551) respecting the granting of Dominion lands to the railway companies mentioned, in Manitoba and the North-West Territories.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1, Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where will this land be located?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). North of the point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it intended to give this in townships?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No; we have the power to do it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the hon. gentlemen has considered that question.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The land grant to this Manitoba and North-Western is given in alternate sections. If they have to take it further west, we can arrange for them to take it in townships as a matter of negotiation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is an entirely new grant, and therefore it is quite optional to give it in whatever way the Government may please.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes. I may say that I have no hesitation in expressing my own preference for the township grant, and I would be very glad to see that plan adopted.

Mr. BLAKE. This is, as I understand, for a branch of this railway?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). This is a branch.

Mr. BLAKE. Has there been any statement at all of the finance of the railway?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think this is one of the railways in relation to which there can be no doubt.

Mr. BLAKE. I know what it has done, but I speak of the financial basis on which it proposes to build the branch.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I understand that they hope to obtain from the Manitoba Government the same guarantee of their land grant that they obtained on the other. The interest in this part of the country is very large, and they hope the Manitoba Government will give them the same guarantee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the Manitoba Government is going to guarantee four millions and a-half to the Hudson Bay Railway, I do not think they will be in a position to make many grants to other roads.

On resolution 2, North-West Central Railway Company.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is this the Beaty railway?

Mr. BLAKE. This is the same old railway. I suppose this is intended to be in substitution for the grants formerly authorised?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No. The hon. gentleman will remember that the free grant was given by Order in Council after Parliament rose last year, subject to confirmation by Parliament. This is practically a confirmation of that grant. The Order in Council I laid upon the Table last night as well as the other papers. The hon. gentleman will also remember that, by the legislation of this Session extending the time for the company to commence operations, there was a clause inserted by which they are required to give to the Governor in Council substantial evidence of their ability to go on with fifty miles this year, before the 1st June, upon doing which a proclamation is to issue bringing the Act into force. The Act is of no effect unless that proclamation issues. I think everyone who takes an interest in the North-West at all, at any rate both sides of the House, have admitted the value of this particular line of railway and the importance of its construction, and have acquiesced generally in the wisdom of making a land grant to it. The only question is as to the construction of the railway, and I may say that the decision is that the company are required to make a substantial deposit in cash, subject to forfeiture if the road does not go on, or to be paid out to them *pro rata* as the road goes on; but they are to make that deposit in cash before the proclamation will issue. We take the power, in the event of their not going on with the railway, for the Governor in Council to make other arrangements for the construction of that railway, and that is why in this resolution we take power to give the land to another company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What amount is required to be deposited?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). $50,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is hardly a substantial deposit.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is for the fifty miles of railway they are to build this year. It is pretty substantial for forfeiture.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I doubt that, where 2,700,000 acres of land are to be given as a free grant.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). But not one acre of this land is to be given until fifty miles of railway are built. Therefore we have the deposit of the land in our own hands and the $50,000 as a guarantee of the construction of the first fifty miles of the railway, which takes it into a part of the country where the immediate demand has been made for the railway, and makes a basis for the construction of the railway onward, as, after that time, they will have the land grant and fifty miles of completed railway to finance upon.

Mr. BLAKE. The papers the hon. gentleman brought down last night do not contain any further papers with reference to the North-West Central Railway since, I think, the papers of last Session. They contain, it is true, the Orders in Council of a later date, but I speak of papers coming from the railway company itself. I presume there has been some correspondence and some action by the Government, after what the hon. gentleman has said on the subject of the authority with which it was clothed, as far as it could be by a Bill, with authority, or the duty imposed upon it. As he says the company have been required to make a substantial deposit. I suppose that communication was in writing?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Oh, certainly.

Mr. BLAKE. It is a pity that we have not got it here. I also observe by the public papers a statement that a contract for the construction of the railway by New York contractors, it was said, I think, had been received some days ago and submitted to the Government. Is that the case?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There was a contract laid on the Table of the Railway Committee

Mr. BLAKE. No other contract?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No other. That contract has been again submitted to the Government, but it has not been considered sufficient, and a note has been sent to the president of the company to say that he must make that deposit or the proclamation will not issue.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have heard certain rumors that financial arrangements had been made and the money forthcoming and all that kind of thing. Has the Government received any information to that effect?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). We have had assurances to that effect, but we perferred a substantial deposit of money in the bank of Montreal as an assurance that these financial arrangements had been made.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes. There is too much assurance about this. The hon. gentleman will observe that the scheme he proposed and the House has sanctioned by passing the Bill was one that should ensure the possibility at any rate of some company constructing the road if this one failed, as I think, after the developments which have taken place, it is very likely to do.

Mr. MITCHELL. And ought to do.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree with the hon. member for Northumberland—and ought to do. If so, it is important that the Government should clothe itself with the necessary

authority, and to that end it has taken no steps. I do not know of any general statutory authority by which the Government can create a company authorised to construct this road. For that, legislation would be necessary, and I have been expecting from day to day to see the Government introduce a Bill to clothe itself with the authority necessary to carry out the plan, unless indeed the hon. gentleman places so much confidence in those assurances to which he refers that he thought it was unnecessary and that it was quite sure that he would issue the proclamation.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is a means by which that country can be supplied with railway facilities under an existing charter granted by the Manitoba Legislature last year for a southern branch of the Manitoba and North-Western. That could be done. I do not by any means intend to say it will be done, but it could be done. I think the general statement made in relation to this when the Private Bill was passed extending this charter would authorise us, under letters patent, to empower a company to go on and construct this railway with the grant of this land.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the hon. gentleman's colleague who sits behind him will confirm that statement of the Minister. I think he will find that it is not competent for him under a general statement made in the progress of a Private Bill, to create a company by letters patent with the necessary powers for constructing and operating a railway. I think, if he asks a little advice before he speaks, or, not having asked that advice, takes the next best course and obtains it after he has spoken, he will find that legislation is necessary. Of course, this company can build it, and of course there is another company that could built it, the Canadian Pacific, but what is necessary is that the Government should be clothed with full power to see that the work is done, and if we trust to the possibilities of the Canadian Pacific Railway doing it, and the possibilities of this other company he refers to doing it as a branch, the Government is fettered. There is not the same security which certainly the Railway Committee, and I think the House, understood would exist for the Government implementing that very obligation which it made. I think the Manitoba Legislature passed a vote of thanks to the Government, with the assurance that they would see that this road is put through, if not by this company, in which they did not appear to have much confidence, then by another. I do not think the Government will put itself in the position to implement that pledge by the means to which the hon. gentleman has referred, unless they take power to incorporate a company.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman will see that in this amendment we take power in this resolution to grant to this particular company, or to such other company as may be incorporated, land for the construction of a railway through that country. Perhaps I ought not to express a legal opinion on the point, but after the suggestion made to me, I think we shall probably be able to take the power before the House rises yet.

Mr. BLAKE. When are we going to rise ?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I hope on Monday. We can get through with a good deal in a day, with the consent of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. I am glad the Government are to give a grant to this railway in the North-West, and I regret that the step was not taken years ago. I believe if it had been, the settlers, who have been suffering for the want of railway, would have had one before this. Now, I hope there will be no mistake this year, and if it is necessary for the Government to take power before the House rises, to grant this good company these lands, I hope they will do so, so that the people may not suffer another year for the want of a railway. I will read a telegram sent by the Minister of Public Works to the Manitoba Legislature, in reply to telegrams that were sent to him as chairman of the Railway Committee :

"Telegram received and read to Railway Committee. Charter revived but not to be in force except on proclamation to Governor General to be issued before 1st June next, if company shows to Governor in Council its ability and means to build road, fifty miles to be built before the end of present year Failing this by 1st June Governor in Council will issue letters patent and incorporate good company to build road."

Now the people up there appear to feel very grateful to the Minister of Public Works for the trouble he has taken to inform them as to the intentions of the Government, and they feel satisfied, on the strength of this telegram, that a good company will be formed to build this road in case the present one fails. I hope the Government will take such powers as are necessary to enable this good company to build the road. I have no doubt that the Local Legislature will do all in their power to grant such assistance as they can to the Manitoba and North-Western to have this road built. I am glad to believe that there is no person in this House who objects to the construction of this road, or to the land grant. I think, however, the $50,000 deposit is too small. If they are going to construct fifty miles of road, as they expect to this year, of course they will be entitled to receive that back. From what has been stated by a gentleman who was a director of that company, it would seem that the company expect to make out of this road something in the neighborhood of $670,000. Now, if they are going to speculate on this charter, I think that $50,000 is too small a deposit, and I think the company ought to satisfy the Government that it will construct this road or give a larger deposit. I would ask the Minister of Interior if this company has given the Government any assurance that they are in a position to go on with the construction of the 50 miles. I have seen in the press that they had secured some $800,000 at present, and were prepared to go on with the work at once. As the season is short it is very important that this matter should be put on a solid basis.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I would like to amend that clause so that instead of saying "to such company as may be incorporated," it shall read "to such other company as may undertake the construction of said railway," as at present it would prevent us from negotiating with any existing company for the construction of a railway in the event of the present company failing to make that deposit and going on with the work. In answer to the hon. gentleman I may say that we are assured that the present company are prepared to go on, but we want them to supplement that assurance by a substantial deposit, and we think that $50,000 is a substantial deposit.

Mr. WATSON. Even if the company who have this charter put up this deposit, there is no time specified for doing the work. The fifty miles has to be completed by the 1st December, and if the Government have not the assurance that this road will be completed this year, even with that deposit, I think they should take power to themselves to have this good company organised. I do not care who builds the road as long as it is built, but I want to see the Government take such means as will secure the building of the road beyond doubt, so that the people of the North-West may have railway facilities as soon as possible.

On resolution 3, Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company,

Mr. BLAKE. With respect to this, as in reference to the others, I would invite the hon. gentleman, when he brings the Bill in which will be based on these resolutions, to make some provision as to the conditions to be inserted in the grants to these companies. He will observe that

this grant, and still more the grant we have just dealt with, is for a very long line of railway, and these roads lock up the land for a very long time unless provision is made for tolerably early construction. I quite agree that construction must be progressive, and that it is important that very strict conditions for regular and very fairly rapid progress should be inserted.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman will see that in the charter the time within which the road must be commenced and built is fixed. That is within the power of Parliament to extend or adhere to as may be determined. In this particular case the Order in Council granting aid to this line fixes the time for the completion of the first section, that is between the point of commencement on the Canadian Pacific Railway and Fort Qu'Appelle, at six months from the time fixed in the charter for commencing the railway; that gives time to organise the company, and afterwards fifty miles are to be built each year.

Resolutions reported.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion, for the year ending 30th June, 1887; and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 28th May, 1886.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:40 a. m. (Saturday.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 29th May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MISSISSAGUA BAND OF INDIANS.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) asked, 1. Whether the Government have had under consideration the question, what members of the Mississagua band of Indians are entitled to participate in the amount of $68,000, or thereabouts, that was placed to the credit of the said band about the year 1884? 2. If so, have the Government decided to pay the said sum, or the interest thereon, to those who were the legal members of the band in the year 1828, and their descendants only, or to all those who are now members of the said band?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a subject of a good deal of difficulty and it is now under consideration. I hope a solution will soon be found.

REV. M. LABELLE'S REPORT.

Mr. DESJARDINS (for Mr. TASSÉ) asked, Whether the Government have received a report from Rev. M. Labelle, entrusted with a mission to France in the interest of emigration? If so, is it their intention to lay the same before Parliament?

Mr. CARLING. A report has been received from Rev. Mr. Labelle respecting his mission to France. It is the intention to publish said report as an appendix to the report of the Department of Agriculture. It would have been inserted in said report and laid before Parliament this Session, but it was not received until the commencement of the current month.

SENATE REPRESENTATION OF FRENCH CANADIANS IN ONTARIO.

Mr. DESJARDINS (for Mr. TASSÉ) asked, Whether the Government have considered the fact that each Senator for Ontario represents, on an average, 80,000 souls, according to the last Census, and that there were then over 100,000 French Canadians in that Province? If so, is it their intention to grant a representative in the Senate to the French minority in Ontario?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government are fully aware of the numbers and importance of the French Canadians in the Province of Ontario. Of course they cannot, without breach of their oaths of office, state what advice they are going to render to the Governor on this subject.

GOVERNMENT LEGAL AGENT AT HALIFAX.

Mr. MILLS asked, Whether the First Minister has received from the Conservative members of the bar at Halifax, through Mr. Daly, a protest against the appointment of Mr. Wallace Graham, as legal agent of the Government at Halifax, on the ground that he was the partner of C. H. Tupper, M.P. for Pictou, and a participator in the profits, and suggesting that the Premier had not been well advised in making the appointment, &c., or any remonstrance to like effect?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Sometime ago I received a letter against the appointment of Mr. Graham, and recommending the appointment of another professional man as the agent of the Government, but not on the ground stated in this question.

THE TEMPERANCE COLONISATION COMPANY.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the House proceeds to the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask the Government if they expect to be able to indicate what course they propose to adopt in regard to the colonisation companies. Last Session, and again this Session, it was intimated by the Minister of the Interior that the Government would deal with the colonisation companies which had failed to carry out the terms of their agreements with the Government. My particular reason for calling the attention of the Government to the matter at the present time is that I have had placed in my hands a copy of a petition, which I believe has been sent to the Minister of the Interior, on behalf of the Temperance Colonisation Company. It states that this company is in a most unfortunate position; in fact, it appears to be financially embarrassed, and all the circumstances indicate the necessity of relief being given to it. I would just trouble the House by reading one letter from a gentleman concerned in the company, which letter indicates very fairly, I am told, the position of many others interested in the company. It is from a Methodist minister to a brother Methodist minister, and, as the House is aware, a great many Methodist ministers are interested in this company. Without giving the name of the writer or the person to whom the letter is addressed, I will read it:

"MY DEAR BROTHER,—With the darkest cloud of trouble that ever enshrouded my person, I write you. I am one of those unfortunate ones that hold scrip in the Temperance Colonisation Company. I was served with a sheriff's writ, and yesterday I was visited by the deputy sheriff to make a seizure of all my effects, but he did not seize. I am not able to pay; it is impossible to pay down $632. Then the prospect of being called upon to pay more, and then lose all, is bad enough. I write you to see what is going on in Toronto about the matter. Are any in Toronto being sued? Is there any hope of getting a settlement of the case? I am just crushed; the idea of having a sheriff around is killing to me."

I have——

Mr. SPEAKER. I thought the hon. gentleman was simply going to ask a question. He must not proceed in a matter that may lead to debate.

Mr. MULOCK. I have indicated what I desire to know: whether the Government propose to do anything with the view of relieving from their obligations to the Crown those companies which are unable to carry out their obligations.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I stated on a former occasion that the companies have made application to the Government for a modification of their arrangement by the Government taking land instead of the money they have already paid in, at the rate of $2 an acre. That plan is being carried out as far as the information before the Department enables it to be done. As to the case of the Temperance Colonisation Company, to which the hon. gentleman refers, I think the difficulty between the company and their scrip holders is a matter of entirely internal arrangement, and the Government can, of course, have no influence in relation to that. But the proposal of the Government is to wind up those companies which we can wind up, by lessening the area proposed to be colonised, on the basis of taking lands in place of the money they have already paid in.

QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I beg to call the attention of the House to a statement which I find in *Hansard*, made in a speech of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) on the 27th of May, when I was not present. One or two of the charges made by that hon. gentleman against myself personally are of such a nature that if I did not now take advantage of the opportunity to contradict them, it might appear as if I admitted their correctness. When the hon. gentleman came to refer to my transactions, the hon. gentleman spoke as follows:—

"I find that the Minister of Inland Revenue is a lessee, from this Administration of which he is now a member, of 59,000 acres of grazing lands on Mountain Creek, in the North-West Territories, at 1 cent an acre, on which he never put one head of cattle, but which he got for purely speculative purposes, and holds for purely speculative purposes. I find that on the 16th of February, 1882, before he was a Minister, but while he was a member of Parliament, he applied for the north half of section 14, township 6, range 16, 320 acres of coal lands. I find that his son was a stock-holder in the St. Catharines Milling Company, whose law costs this Government is paying to the extent of $11,000, in order to deprive the Province of Ontario of its rights. I find that this company obtained a license from this Government to cut timber on 3,200 acres of land in the disputed territory. I find that H. A. Costigan, described as of Ingersoll, on the 10th of November, 1882, applied for fifty square miles of timber limits. I find that this same H. A. Costigan, described as of Winnipeg, on the 14th of October, 1883, applied for another fifty square miles of timber limits. I find that an H. Costigan, described as of Ottawa, on the 23rd of September, 1882, applied for another fifty square miles, and on the same day he applied for still another fifty square miles. I find that John Costigan, the Minister of Inland Revenue, himself, on the 3rd of April, 1882, applied for fifty square miles."

With regard to these applications for timber limits, a great deal has been said during the past two or three years. I felt bound, two years ago, to offer an explanation and a contradiction of certain charges made against me in connection with these matters, which I thought were satisfactory at the time. But there are points raised here which were not raised at that time. With regard to the applications made by H. A. Costigan, I have not one single word to say. I have a son of that name, and if he chooses to make application, to this or any other Government for timber lands, coal lands, or any other lands, and is willing to pay the regular price, I do not think I am called on to defend his action. I am free to admit that if my son made application while I was a member of Parliament or of the Government, and if through my influence he obtained special favors, or if his applications obtained consideration that the applications of others did not receive, I would be open to a very serious charge. With regard to the principal charge, that I am the lessee of 59,000 acres of grazing lands on Mountain Creek, all I can say is that I never applied for any grazing lands and never held any grazing lands, either for grazing or speculative purposes, and I do not hold any to-day. I am aware that my son was interested with a man from St. John named Hays, and some others, in a lease in that section of the country. They paid their semi-annual rent; they made three or four payments in cash; but they were unable to raise the means to stock it. The Government passed an Order providing that if parties holding leases failed to put on stock, though they might have paid the rent, their leases should be cancelled; and I was present when this lease was cancelled, and I never opened my mouth to say it should not be cancelled, just because I knew my son was interested in it with those gentlemen; and the lease was cancelled a year ago, although they had made four payments on it. So that neither my son, nor any one belonging to me, holds any interest to-day in these grazing lands; and so far as I am personally concerned, I never was an applicant, and never had any stock or share or interest in them, good, bad or indifferent. More than that, I never took out of the North-West, although I was there three or four times, through speculation, my travelling expenses in going there. The only operation I had in the North-West was in getting out some ties with a man named W. J. Short, one small operation of $700 or $800. My name was afterwards coupled with that of a man named R. J. Short, by mistake, who was doing a large business in supplying ties to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. My name was mixed up with his, and I was said to have applied with him as a partner for numerous timber limits, all of which is wrong. I never had any transactions with R. J. Short, and never was interested in his contracts or operations. The only transaction I had was with W. J. Short, a brother of his, who went west, and then we applied for a permit to cut railway ties in the district of the Lake of the Woods. And under the conditions the Government laid down we had to pay twenty per cent. in advance. We paid the twenty per cent.; we never cut a tie or got a dollar back.

Mr. HAGGART. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to say that I was not here the other evening when the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) reiterated the charges which I denied the other day. I waited till yesterday evening. I had not an opportunity yesterday of answering them, because it was late in the evening before the *Hansard* was published, but I see in the *Hansard* which is on my desk to-day, a statement of this kind:

"Now, on the 4th of May, when the question of the disposal of timber limits by the Government and the parcelling out of the resources of the country was being discussed, the hon. member for South Lanark made use of this language:

"'He (that is, the member for South Huron) made a charge against me, and I have been waiting a long time, for an opportunity to meet that hon. gentleman and see if he would dare repeat it in the House, or hear what his reason was for making the charge, that I might give it a flat contradiction. He stated in reference to me:

"'John Haggart, the Tory member for South Lanark, has managed to capture out of the "loot" 320 acres of coal lands, a timber limit on the Shell River, at $5 a square mile, an interest with Peter McLaren, of Rivers and Streams Bill notoriety, and in other portions of the public property, and is believed to have had an interest in more than one of the contracts on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Those who know John Haggart best say that there are many and peculiar reasons why he must stand firm by the Government.'

"And then he went on to say:

"'I simply state that is a cowardly, lying statement.'"

Mr. CASEY. Order.

Mr. HAGGART. I am reading from *Hansard* what the hon. member for West Huron stated:

"'I simply state that is a cowardly, lying statement, framed out of the whole cloth, by a party who had not a particle of evidence to justify him in making the statement.'"

That statement that I made at that time I repeat to-day. I read this charge made against me:

"John Haggart, the Tory member for South Lanark, has managed to capture out of the 'loot' 320 acres of coal lands."

I say that that statement is untrue. I never had an acre of coal lands or an acre of any kind in the North-West. I was not directly or indirectly interested in it.

"A timber limit on the Shell River at $5 a square mile."

I never denied that. I never stated anything to the contrary in this House. The papers were brought down in 1882. I was an applicant in 1879 for limits on the Shell River. I complied with the conditions that were required by the Government. I built a mill at Brandon, or was one of those interested in building a mill, and I built another mill at the mouth of Shell River. We applied; we got an Order in Council upon the usual conditions to give us the limits. The limits were never granted, unfortunately, on account of some difference between the parties interested, which is at present in litigation in Winnipeg. What I particularly denied was this:

"And is believed to have had an interest in more than one of the contracts on the Canadian Pacific Railway."

That is a statement which, under the Independence of Parliament Act, if true, voided my seat in this House. I stated that that was a cowardly, lying statement, framed out of the whole cloth, and I repeat it at the present moment before every member here. There is not a particle of truth in the statement. I should have not only voided my seat in this House under the Independence of Parliament Act, but I should have been guilty of perjury.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. I wish to ask for your ruling on the hon. gentleman's statement, that a statement by any hon. member is a cowardly, lying statement.

Mr. HAGGART. I state that the statement made——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I understand that the hon. member is referring to a speech made out of this House.

Mr. HAGGART. Out of this House, at Wingham.

Mr. CASEY. The same statement was repeated in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, it was not. It is only a reading from *Hansard*.

Mr. HAGGART. I am referring to a speech made by a person of the name of Cameron at a place called Wingham, in the Province of Ontario. I state that this is a cowardly, lying statement. I heard the statement before. It not only accuses me of something which would void my seat in the House under the Independence of Parliament Act, but it accuses me of committing perjury. On the first opportunity I had, after hearing the statement or the charge against me, I came down. When the Royal Commission was sitting here, I took the opportunity of going before it, and made the statement upon oath that I was in no way connected with it. It is a statement which accuses me of perjury, of something which would void my seat under the Independence of Parliament Act, and I say that a member of Parliament who, without a tittle of evidence to support it, makes the statement, is a coward and a liar, and I cannot use any stronger terms.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CASEY. I call for your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is unnecessary to use such strong language.

Mr. CASEY. The member who has the floor stated that a member of Parliament who could use language which is known to have been used by this member of Parliament, which he states he used, is a coward and a liar. A great part of that language was used on the floor of this House, that in reference to the coal lands and the timber limits, and must be included in the statement. It is insufficient to say that such strong language is unnecessary. I ask you to rule that it is out of order, and I ask you to rule that it must be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER. I say that to apply such language to any speech in Parliament is unparliamentary and out of order, and I say that, even referring to a speech made outside, the language is too strong.

Mr. HAGGART. I withdraw the statement. I refer to the statement made by a person outside of Parliament at Wingham, and I repeat that it is a cowardly, lying statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. HAGGART. In reference, not to a member of Parliament, but to a speech made by a person named Cameron at a place called Wingham.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On behalf of my absent friend, Mr. Cameron, I call the attention of the House to this. He repeated the statement in his place. It was not his fault if the hon. gentleman was not here to contradict him. He gave every opportunity.

Mr. HAGGART. I made a denial after the hon. gentleman had made the statement, but he left his place in the House, and was not here to meet the denial. He did not give notice to me that he was going to reiterate the statement last night.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. Minister—no, the hon. the Minister of Railways—I hope he will be right hon. some day or other, as he deserves it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He understands you.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, I understand him. I have great respect for him—a good deal of him.

An hon. MEMBER. How you love him!

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, I have about as much love for him as I have for anybody in the House. I would like to ask him whether he could lay upon the Table of the House to-day a return asked for by me and ordered by Parliament, in relation to some claims on section 16 of the Intercolonial Railway, because I would like to use them when the Estimates come up.

Mr. POPE. I cannot lay them on the Table to-day, but I will early on Monday.

Mr. SMALL. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to say that I have received a letter from the reviser's clerk of East Toronto, denying the statement made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) the other night, in reference to the Franchise Act. He says:

"I see by the *Globe's* parliamentary report that Mr. Edgar credits me with a statement regarding a proposed amendment to the Franchise Act. I never made the statement, and the whole thing is utterly without foundation as far as I am concerned."

And he adds:

"It is only some of Edgar's Montreal gas escaping."

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is all right now because Mr. Edgar is away also.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 143) to authorise the construction of a railway from the Straits of Canso as a public work.—(Mr. Pope.)

Bill (No. 144) respecting certain subsidies for a railway from Metapediac, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Paspebiac. (On a division.)

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. POPE moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole on resolutions respecting the granting of subsidies to railways, be read the second time.

Resolutions concurred in.

Mr. POPE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 146) to authorise certain subsidies and grants for and in regard to the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned. He said: I would like to say that while I was absent last night—not being able to be out very much in the evening —my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake), and my hon. friend from Prescott (Mr. Shanly), stated that a certain road in Nova Scotia was of very great importance in that section of the country. I regret, Sir, that I had not been informed of it earlier, so that this road could have been placed on the list of those subsidised by this Bill. I will say, however, that the Government will be prepared to come down with a measure of relief for this road next Session.

Mr. VAIL. The Minister of Finance was absent when a certain resolution was under discussion granting a subsidy to the road from Upper Stewiacke to Musquodoboit I asked the question where this railway commenced, in what county, and nobody was able to answer me. Perhaps the Minister of Finance will tell us to-day, what some know already, whether this second railway subsidised in Nova Scotia is also in Colchester county. Of the other running from Truro to Newport, a considerable portion of it is in Colchester county. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Allison) said eleven miles of it were in that county, but I say that the road cannot pass through that county to Newport without passing a distance of twenty miles in it. Three-fourths of this other road is also in Colchester county. I I mention this so that the people may understand what portion of the public funds is being taken to subsidise roads when there is no probability of their being built for the next two or three years. It looks at present almost as if these grants were made to influence the local elections in Nova Scotia. I would not like to say so but I am rather inclined to think that is the reason.

Mr. SHANLY. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways if he referred just now to the Western or to the Nictaux and Atlantic.

Mr. VAIL. I did not understand the Minister to say it was for both roads.

Mr. POPE. I said that my hon. friends from Grenville and Durham had expressed a strong hope that the Government would look into this matter. I had heard from other quarters that this was a very important road; and after hearing all that had been said, I felt that perhaps we ought to have included this road in the Subsidy Act. I said that next Session we would come down with a measure of relief for this road.

Mr. PAINT. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) has stated that the distance which this road from Truro to Newport will pass through the county of Colchester, is about twenty miles. I have frequently driven over the line where this road is going to be constructed, and only eleven or twelve miles of it is in the county of Colchester.

Mr. McLELAN. I wish to say that the hon. member for Digby is entirely wrong. This road has been promoted in the interests of the county of Hants, and about ten or eleven miles of it necessarily passes through the county of Colchester.

Mr. VAIL. Can they bridge the river there?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes. I do not know a better section of country than that eleven miles over which this road will pass in my county. The hon. gentleman has no reason to say that these subsidies have been granted to two roads in Nova Scotia for the purpose of influencing the elections. The grants have been given *bonâ fide* all through, and in almost all cases they will benefit the country at large.

Mr. POPE.

Mr. BLAKE. With regard to the statement of the Minister of Railways as to the Nictaux and Atlantic Railway, I am very glad to hear that he has considered the representations made, and that next Session, at all events, that road will be given a measure of relief. As to the Western Counties Railway, I did not refer to it because I did not want to say a word that was unnecessary, for I understood hon. gentlemen opposite, when the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) brought up the case of that road, to point to the fact that it would be embraced in the scheme of the Local Government of Nova Scotia; that there was no intention on the part of the Government to depart from the general policy and arrangements which were indicated by previous legislation in connection with the completion of that portion of the scheme, and it was suggested that the present arrangements would be adequate. I understood the Finance Minister to say that it was the expectation that those arrangements would be adequate to complete the missing link, and therefore no further measure would be brought down this Session. That is what I understood. The Government, I understood, were of the opinion that the arrangements would be adequate to accomplish that result. I certainly would say, if the arrangements were not adequate, that this was also a case which merited the attention of the Government. I did not think it worth while to say so, because hon. gentlemen opposite appeared to think that the arrangements made would accomplish the object.

Mr. KAULBACH. I had the honor to address this House some few days ago commending the Government for having come to the rescue of the deserving and long suffering people of Cape Breton in granting a railway over their island, and I expressed the hope that the claim for like privileges in the western part of Nova Scotia would not be overlooked. Notably is this the case with the Nictaux and Atlantic Railway. That road is one most deserving of public support. It is one opening up a beautiful country, a country that is unsurpassed for its fertility, its agricultural resources, its mineral wealth, its abundance of timber. It is a road upon which nearly half a million dollars have been expended. The ties are piled up on the sides of the road, trestle work for bridges and other material are lying unused, and if this state of things is allowed to continue another year it will involve serious loss to the contractors and the parties interested. I feel greatly disappointed at hearing this afternoon the announcement by our respected friend the Minister of Railways that this matter must lay over for another year. It will be a serious disappointment, not only to myself as the representative of the county of Lunenburg, but I feel that it will also be a serious loss to those interested in the road and a disappointment to the four counties, namely, Lunenburg, Annapolis, Queen's and King's, they having looked forward with gladness and hope to a subsidy being granted by Parliament to this road as well as to other roads in the Province. When interviewing members of the Government last week, I was informed that they were impressed with the idea that the newly formed company or syndicate, which is recognised as a mere bubble, which has no foundation, as I believe, which is managed by a person by the name of C. A. Scott, and which is known as The Joint Stock Association, is simply intended to retain the Local Government in power. It is a sort of mushroom company, which has only sprung up within a few days, and no one knows anything about it. This company's arrangement is, it is said, to take over the Western Counties Railway, but there is nothing definite about the Nictaux and Atlantic. It merely says they may acquire the Nictaux and Atlantic Railway and build lines from Yarmouth and Shelburne and Windsor and Truro. That statement is inserted simply to have a certain effect. If that proposition were to be carried out as contemplated,

what would be the result? It would mean for Nova Scotia nothing more nor less than to take all its roads and bridge money and the appropriation for schools and drive the people to direct taxation. In that view, I think members of the Government must see that no reasonable ground can be offered for supporting the position taken by that association. I was very sorry I was unable, from sickness, to attend the House last night when the matter was brought up. So soon as I was telephoned that the subject was up I hurried here, but it was too late. I regret that circumstance. Nevertheless, I feel that there is still sufficient time, if the Government are disposed to make a grant in the direction I have spoken of, to place this road on the same footing as the other roads, subsidies for which are now being pushed through the House in the form of a Bill. I hope my wish will still be carried out, and that the Minister of Railways may see the importance of this road and recall the statement made, and feel that it is in the interest of the public and of the Province to grant a subsidy this year.

Mr. LISTER. I am sure the Minister of Railways can hardly resist the appeal of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach). I am sure the language he used will appeal to the tender chords of the tender-hearted gentleman the Minister of Railways, and will lead him to make a promise such as that he made to the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth). When these resolutions came down it looked as if the Government intended to bring on an election this year; it looked as if they were preparing to capture constituencies all over the country by means of those railway bonuses; but from the assurance of the Minister of Railways made to the hon. member for King's, we must be led to believe that the day which was looked forward to with so much interest is postponed for another year, and the elections will not come on till next year. Then the hon. gentleman, in all probability will not have the opportunity of carrying out the promise he has made. If it is a railway that is entitled to proper consideration, the probabilities are that hon. gentlemen on this side, who will then be on the other side of the House, will give it their favorable consideration. In looking over the railway debate—because I was not present at the greater portion of it—there is one speech above all others that struck me as being a singularly able speech, one which must have appealed to every member of this House with almost resistless power to grant the aid which that gentleman so ably advocated. That, Sir, was the speech of my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Paint). He spoke with all the patriotism and fervor of a man who believed that his utterances were based on purely patriotic motives. He pleaded for a railway on the Island of Cape Breton in language that has seldom been surpassed or equalled by any member of this House, and the effect of that appeal was that the hon. gentleman is about to have a railway built on that beautiful and productive island. There seemed to be one difficulty which stood in the hon. gentleman's way, and that was a difficulty as to the route. It appears there are three routes by which this railway may run, and it seems to me that the hon. gentleman particularly referred to one route, and that one by way of Louisburg. He said:

"Mr. Chairman, my desire to secure justice for my Province and for my county must stand as my apology for the length of this speech. The interests concerned are apparently local and provincial, but on examination will be found in reality national."

Well, Sir, these are grand words for the hon. gentleman to use. He also used the following language:—

"While rejoicing as a Cape Breton member, at substantial aid being afforded to any railway in that island, yet I cannot, as a member of the Dominion Parliament, allow the true interests of Canada to be injured by the possible selection of an unsuitable port as the terminus of the Cape Breton Railway."

This is language which is becoming to a member of this House representing a constituency which has honored itself by sending him to this House. According to the speech which the hon. gentleman made his motives were purely patriotic, and had I seen nothing but the speech of the hon. gentleman, I would have left this House with the highest opinion of him as a patriotic man. I would have believed that of all the patriotic men sitting in this House, the hon. member for Richmond was the most patriotic. But, Sir, I happen to have a letter or two written by the hon. gentleman which, I am sorry to say, to a certain extent destroys that feeling in my mind. On 7th March, 1884, the hon. gentleman wrote the following letter:—

"The matter is just as I stated to you. * * * I am working in the direction I indicated to you. I beg to enclose you herewith a letter from P. C. Hill, Esq., in regard to my railway claims, which he states he has understood from his lawyers was $72,000 of an award. There has been another award since by three commissioners, which I am waiting daily to hear announced. There are a number of influential members of this House interested in them and we are all combining to press those claims to the front, and the Government have assured us they are going to have early attention."

Now, I ask the hon. gentleman, for I am sure the House will be interested and anxious to know, who were the members who were so deeply interested in the claims which the hon. gentleman was pressing so vigorously on the Government, and which at that time he had an assurance would be responded to by the Government in a satisfactory manner. Surely hon. members of Parliament would not be found pressing claims of the hon. gentleman against the Government, and taking an interest in it. On the 15th February, 1884, he wrote as follows:—

"I am in hopes to have the Intercolonial Railway claims brought to a point, the understanding being that I am to pay you double the claim when I effect a settlement with the Government, which I am in hopes of doing weekly, the commissioners having finished their work and closed the case, but the verdict is not given or made public. Of course the Government knows and many others who are interested in Government contracts are waiting to know."

On the 14th May, 1884, the hon. gentleman wrote as follows:—

"I have some lands in which I have an indirect interest in, in the direction of where the new line of railway is to pass, in Cape Breton."

Is that true? Does the hon. gentleman have to admit that it is to sell his land to the Government that he is so zealous in pressing the claims of Cape Breton?

"I may get this matter in shape in a few weeks, as the surveys go on. If I do, rest assured you shall hear from me."

Again on the 28th May, 1884:

"There is another hope I have of being possibly able to pay you, and not detain you even until railway claims are arranged, that is the railway through Cape Breton, which is to go on to some extent this summer. I am living here watching my interests in this matter, for the county of Richmond, as the railway must pass through lands in which I have an indirect interest."

Is it the county of Richmond, or the lands in which the hon. gentleman has a direct interest, that he is watching? On the 24th June, 1884, he says:

"I have always hoped that my position in the House of Commons might help me out; if pressed it might not."

What does the hon. gentleman mean by saying that his position in the House of Commons will help him out? Does he feel that he is to make money out of this railway passing near those lands? Again he says:

"Had the Short Line Railway gone on in Cape Breton, without a doubt I could have paid you, because it would have passed through or alongside of the twenty acres of land which I offer you for debt. Instead of that Colonel Snow has failed to carry out his agreement and hundreds are disappointed, but it will go through for certain next winter. In this way you will not lose your money."

Again he says:

"If you take in consideration the land I will do my utmost to engineer the railway through it. It might be the solution."

If the hon. gentleman's speech had gone to the country just as it appeared in *Hansard*, the whole of Cape Breton and the whole of Nova Scotia would have given him credit for being one of those patriots—I was going to say those patriots so numerous in this House, but perhaps they would have excepted him from that class. I suppose this railway is all right, and that the Government have decided to build it as a Government road, and if it is a matter of national importance I am not going to take any exception to it. But I will just ask the hon. member for Richmond to reconcile his patriotic utterances with the letters I have read.

Mr. PAINT. It becomes my duty to reply, although this discussion is taking place after the Bill has received its third reading, and may therefore be somewhat irregular. These letters were produced in some law suits which have taken place in Nova Scotia, and they have been sent up by members of the Reform Association of Halifax to have an effect against me.

An hon. MEMBER. Did you write them ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. PAINT. Never mind. They were printed and have been forwarded here by members of the Local Government.

An hon. MEMBER. Did you write them ?

Mr. PAINT. I may say that my firm were the financial agents of the contractors on section number twelve of the Intercolonial Railway, when the hon. Minister of Finance was one of the commissioners, and we lost a large amount of money by having advanced it to the contractors, and that has never been settled. I have made claims upon the Government of the Dominion ; and the hon. Judge Clark, and the other commissioners examined the claims and they chose to rule them out. This matter was brought up in the county of Richmond when I was canvassing the county for a seat in this House. It was discussed on the hustings, and I said to the people : If my claims are unjust I have enemies enough no doubt to prevent me from getting them, and if they are just, you can have no objections to my receiving them. I was elected on that basis. They knew I was pressing these claims and they elected me. Besides that, a complete answer to the insinuations is that the lands referred to in those letters were bought thirty years ago.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). You want to sell them now ?

Mr. PAINT. That is what the hon. gentleman desires me to say, but I do not say so.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I am very sorry the Government have not seen fit to come down this Session with the usual subsidy to the Nictaux and Atlantic road, after it has received the approval of both sides of the House. The leader of the Opposition was forced to the conclusion that this road should receive a subsidy, and in the present Session that was assented to by the members on this side of the House by their silence and some by their speeches. We find the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly), with his long railway experience, and understanding the locality, advocating that this subsidy should be given and given now, and for a very good reason, that the sleepers are lying there rotting, and the road is falling to pieces. However, the Government have put the matter off until next year, and the hopes of this year have to be abandoned. Of course these railway subsidies are not given for support. The counties through which the subsidised railways run are supposed, at any rate, not to be against the Government granting them. I do not suppose the Government expect further support in the eight counties lying west of Halifax, if they have refused it on that ground. They could not refuse it on the ground of necessity, because there never was a proposition before any Parliament that received a more unanimous assent than the proposition that this road should receive aid. I am very sorry for my hon. friend from Lunenberg, that his hopes have not been realised to-day, for his county is more interested in that railway than any other, although Queen's, Annapolis, and the county I represent are interested as well. But the hon. gentleman can take this comfort to himself, that he has reached the last ditch, the end of his tether, and that everything must now turn for the better; reminding everyone of that old story of the man who went up on the side of a mountain, to live a recluse, taking his family, his cow, his pig, and his dog with him. First, his wife died, then his child died, then the cow died, by-and-bye the pig died, and he had only the dog left; and finally it got sick and died also. The people in the valley, hearing of his disasters, went up to commiserate with him, and to their inexpressible surprise they found him dancing and laughing about the yard. They asked him: "What's the matter?—we thought you lost everything you had!" "That is so," he said, "but every change must now be for the better; the dog is dead." And my hon. friend may have this consolation, that any change now must be for the better, because the dog is dead for this year.

Mr. KINNEY. As the leader of the Opposition has made some allusions to the Western Counties Railway extension, it may not be out of place for me to make some remarks regarding that enterprise. It is quite true, the Nova Scotia Government have taken to themselves power to convey that road to a joint stock association organised in London, and I wish to say that the terms and conditions of that arrangement are such that I trust the Dominion Government will not for a moment think of assisting in carrying it out. The scheme on its face looks very plausible and reasonable, but when analysed is found to be simply a project of the Government of Nova Scotia to hand over to a foreign company sixty-seven miles of finished and furnished railway, and the Windsor Branch, which is computed to be worth $1,000,000, for the magnificent sum of $120,000. This is the vast scheme that the present Liberal Government of Nova Scotia are going to the people with. It looks to me very much like a political scheme to delude the people of western Nova Scotia into the belief that they were sincere in building the road. But in the Bill there is a clause by which the people may be saved from being robbed of their railway system. It is that the Dominion Government are asked to give their sanction to this enactment; and I trust that the Government, when they look into the scheme, will remember that the parties interested have invested nearly half a million dollars in this railway, that the municipality of Yarmouth has sunk $100,000 in it, and that a number of bondholders have put their money into it in good faith, and I hope the Dominion Government will not permit the Government of Nova Stotia to step in and rob the people of this railway in order to hand it over to this company for a paltry $120,000.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman has referred to the contract made with this company. If he had referred to one particular clause in the contract, the House would have seen at once that the Nova Scotia Government have taken the security of providing that no money shall be paid on this road except as the work progresses, so that the Government have the whole thing in their own hands. As I understand, this company are prepared to go on and complete the work. Full enquiries have been made into their capability, and the Government are satisfied that they are able to accomplish it. The hon. gentleman says this is more like an election kite than some other railway subsidies that have been granted. I do not think it is any more an election kite than that which the hon. gentleman undertook to

fly in 1882 when he promised to pay back to the municipality of Yarmouth the $100,000 which it had paid to aid this railway, provided he secured his election. He has not been able to do that yet, but I hope he will be able to accomplish it before the end of the term.

Mr. McLELAN. I would say to my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Kinney) that it is not the wish of the Government to take any action that will result in an injury or a wrong to any company. If the company he represents in the county of Yarmouth has any rights, they will, I presume, be presented to the Government, and will be considered before any action is taken in the matter finally. It was brought to the notice of the Government some time ago that a company was being formed for the purpose of completing the link between Annapolis and Digby, so as to make the railway complete from Yarmouth to Halifax. The Government expressed their anxiety to have that completion made years ago by the donation of the Windsor Branch for that purpose. At a later period they supplemented that gift by $3,200 a mile for the eighteen miles that are yet to construct. The Nova Scotia Government approached the Dominion Government, and negotiated on this matter. The Dominion Government had nothing but the greatest anxiety to see that that link should be completed and that whole road perfected, but that no injustice should be done to the municipality of Yarmouth or the Western Counties Railway, and any correspondence or negotiation, verbal or otherwise, which passed between the Nova Scotia Government and the Dominion Government, was always in the views that justice would be done, and that everything would be done with the assent and approbation of the Western Counties Railway. Any action that the Dominion Government has taken has been on the supposition that it would be with the entire assent and approval of the Western Counties Railway Company, and that no injustice should be done to them. Now the question has been raised by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) why have we not dealt with this railway? As I stated last night, it was because they had been negotiating with the Nova Scotia Government. We saw that the Nova Scotia Government had been for months making an arrangement and would perfect it so far as they could, and the terms agreed upon by which that road should be completed. If we had interfered, and there had been any failure, the Nova Scotia Government would have said: You have interfered and destroyed the whole arrangement. It is much better that their proposition shall be, if possible, carried out, if justice can be done to the Western Counties Railway, that is being tried, I think the possibilities are that they may succeed. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Kinney) thinks otherwise, that it cannot be done without doing great injustice to the municipality of Yarmouth and the Western Counties Railway.

Mr. VAIL. The municipality of Yarmouth has no objection.

Mr. McLELAN. Then, if it can be done with the entire assent of the municipality and of the Western Counties Railway, I think the means which have been provided for that are certainly ample, when they contemplate the raising of about $4,000,000 to put in a link of eighteen miles of railway and to complete the system.

Mr. POPE. I have only one word to say to my hon. friends behind me. There is nothing that I regret more than to have to refuse hon. gentlemen such as my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Woodworth) and my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) in a proposition which my friends say is a proper thing to do; but, while they have pressed that upon me for several days, and pushed it as strongly as any members of Parliament could, their constituents ought to know that, if we possibly could have yielded, we would have yielded, but we still feel that it is impossible for us this year to do more than we have been doing, although we regret that we cannot meet the views which they have so strongly urged.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. KINNEY. I wish to refer to a matter——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has spoken.

Mr. KINNEY. It is a personal explanation. While the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) was on his feet, he made a statement to the House which will leave a false impression if allowed to go uncorrected.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. That is not a personal explanation.

Mr. KINNEY. I desire to correct it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Very well; go on.

Mr. KINNEY. The hon. member for Digby said I had made a promise to my constituency in 1882 that I would relieve them from a debt of $100,000 created by the corporation of Yarmouth in connection with the Western Counties Railway. I wish to give all due credit to the hon. member, and to suppose that he was mistaken when he said that, but the statement is without any foundation. It has not a particle of foundation.

Mr. VAIL. I may give a personal explanation too. It was quite public, and I think it was stated by the hon. gentleman himself ——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. VAIL. And I think he stated so himself, and made the offer.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman must accept the statement. He says he did not.

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS IN MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole respecting the granting of Dominion lands to certain railway companies in Manitoba and the North-West Territories be read the second time.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will say if he has come to any conclusion as to the steps to be taken with reference to some other company in case the North-West Central does not comply with the terms.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No, but we will not go into committee until Monday, and I will be able to say then.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give us, on Monday, a statement, if he can, of the total amount of lands which have been now pledged in one way or other to railway companies throughout the North-West, up to date.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the Minister of Interior if it is the intention of the Government to give any land grant to what is known as the Portage Central for which a charter was granted by the Local Legislature of Manitoba. I believe there have been strong representations made by the promoters of the scheme, backed up by resolutions of the Local House, asking that such aid should be granted. I should like to know if there are any hopes of that land grant being made by Order in Council.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not suppose the hon. gentleman expects an answer to that question. The intentions of the Government are embodied in the resolution they have brought down; in the meantime, at any rate, any other application will be duly considered in their course.

Resolutions concurred in.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) introduced Bill (No. 147) to authorise the granting of certain subsidies of land for the construction of the railways therein mentioned.

Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—WHARF AT NEGUAC, N.B.

Mr. McLELAN, moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MITCHELL. On the 7th of April last, I put a notice on the paper for papers in reference to the construction of a wharf at Neguac, in the county of Northumberland, and, owing to the fact that the Government business is ahead of us, we have not been able to reach it. I would ask the Minister if he would bring down these papers before we go into the Supplementary Estimates, or when we are considering them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will bring down the necessary papers.

REPORTS ON THE NORTH-WEST REBELLION.

Mr. CASEY. Before you leave the Chair, I wish to call attention to a transaction which appears to me to be a glaring irregularity in the shape of tampering with documents which have been laid upon the Table of this House. A few days ago there was laid upon the Table the long expected report of the Department of Militia and Defence, upon the suppression of the rebellion in the North-West Territory. We remember that, when the hon. the Minister of Militia was questioned as to when this report would come down, he stated that it was being delayed in the hands of the printers. On being asked where it was being printed, he could not at first remember, but, upon further discussion and questioning, he did remember that the job of printing it had been given to Mr. Foote of the Quebec *Chronicle*, who I believe, sublet the printing to somebody else. Instead of being printed by the Government contractors, it was given to this paper at Quebec which supports the Government, and whose editor is a very near neighbor of the Minister. He informed us that he would hurry up the printing as much as possible and get it here. Well, it got here at last in the form which I now hold in my hand, containing, in the first place, an introductory report by the Deputy Minister, a special report by the Major General Commanding, and several despatches relating to engagements, &c., and a report of Major T. Charles Watson, concerning the erection of the stockade at Yorktown. There is also the report of the War Claims Commission, including 234 pages of appendices, in which the whole evidence taken before that commission is set forth. Besides, there is the report of the surgeon-general including a number of subheadings. That is the report that was laid upon the Table of the House. There was some delay in distributing it to members; I only got my copy to-day, several days since the report was laid before the House. But, Sir, since that report was laid upon the Table, I find another report, appearing, by the inscription upon the back of it, to be also the report of the Department of Militia and Defence upon the suppression of the rebellion in the North-West Territories—having exactly the same cover as the genuine report. It appears to be printed at Ottawa, and has the regular Government imprint. It contains the submission by the Minister of Militia "I have the honor to submit," &c. From anything you can tell about this book from its outside or inside appearance, it is the only and genuine report of the Militia and Defence Department upon the suppression of the rebellion. Now, Sir, I do not know how such a report can have come into circulation. This report contains all that is contained in the first and genuine report to which I have referred, with the exception of the 234 pages of evidence taken before the War Claims Commission, which is entirely omitted. Three pages containing the preliminary statement of the War Claims Commission stating that they "submitted herewith the evidence," &c., are included in the bogus report. But the evidence which is said to be submitted is not submitted. The preliminary report of the commission contained in the second or bogus report, says:

"The respective reports submitted from time to time are herewith embodied, showing action taken on the various numbers, together with your remarks thereon."

It goes on to intimate that these are "submitted herewith," but the evidence is not contained in this report. Again, the omission of the 234 pages of evidence from the genuine report of course would affect the paging. The report of the War Claims' Commission in the original report began at page 67, and continued on for 234 pages, but the paging from that point goes on in the bogus report without the breach that would have been caused by the simple taking out of 234 pages. It is clear, then, that of this document, which purports improperly to be the report of the Department of Militia and Defence, which bears the Government imprint, and the submission by the Minister to His Excellency, the latter part has been reprinted by somebody. Whoever published this report has reprinted the latter part of it, at considerable expense, undoubtedly, to somebody. Now, I have been putting the case hypothetically. I have been saying that it seems impossible that this second and bogus report could have been issued by the Government themselves, but I am afraid, from the fact that it has been distributed from the Distribution Office of this House, that such must have been the case. In fact, I have no doubt of it, although for the sake of saving appearances, I put the case, in the first instance, hypothetically—I have no doubt that the Government have, for some reason best known to themselves, issued a second report, which I must call a bogus report, because it is not the report laid upon the Table of this House. The second report is the bogus report, from which the most interesting and important portions of the original report are carefully excluded. I am sorry that the Minister of Militia and Defence is not now in his place, as he was earlier in the afternoon, when I had not an opportunity of calling his attention to this matter. But, whether he be present or absent, I cannot allow you to leave the Chair without calling attention at the earliest moment to this peculiar transaction, in order to show the House what this omitted matter is. I must refer to one or two items of evidence included in the original report, and excluded from the second and bogus report. I have not had time to go over it carefully, as I only got my copy to-day, but there are a few points which force themselves on my notice. For instance, we find a report of a transaction with the celebrated United States firm of I. G. Baker & Co., in regard to transport, by bull or ox teams, for the military column in the North-West. The report of the commissioners shows that they received an account from this firm for freighting, amounting to $15,480. This appears to have been composed of four accounts. In the beginning they say:

"I. G. Baker & Co., freighting supplies by bull or ox teams, $15,480. A letter under date of 1st April, 1885, from I. G. Baker & Co., to the Honorable the Minister of Militia and Defence, offering ox-teams at a certain rate per day, appears to be the document containing what purports to be the agreement although there is nothing to show acceptance by the Minister."

So that they had been carrying on freighting business for a long time with a large number of teams, running up a bill of over $15,000, without any documents showing a contract between them and the Minister. Concerning one of these accounts of $1,800 they report:

"Account, $1,800. If the Honorable the Minister considered the letter above referred to a contract, and he ordered the teams into service, as stated, the three accounts amounting to $14,130 appear to be regular, and are recommended for payment in full."

And concerning the next account:

"Account, $1,350. There is nothing to show that these six teams left Macleod or arrived at Calgary, on the contrary, Mr. McGibbon states in his report, attached to the claims, that they were not reported to him; had they been so reported they would have been loaded at once; it is evident, therefore, no service was rendered, consequently this account cannot be recommended, and is rejected."

To this report is appended in italics the comment "payment approved—A. P. C," which I take to be the initials of the Minister of Militia. So, notwithstanding the report of the Commission that the transaction on the face of it was irregular, there having been no definite contract entered into—and there was really no ground at all for asking payment for one item—we find the Minister of Militia endorsed, "payment approved." I shall not trouble you with the details of these letters that were put in by I. G. Baker & Co. In regard to another point. We are aware that Colonel Whitehead, a member of this Commission, had also been in control of the transport and supply service during the campaign. The charges were that he was implicated in some of the frauds known to exist in the transport and supply service; that for that reason another gentleman, Colonel Peebles, was substituted for Colonel Whitehead during the taking of evidence on those claims. The charges against Colonel Whitehead were very serious and were put in by one of the contractors, James Anderson, addressed in writing to Colonel Jackson and Colonel Forrest. He alleges in that letter, as follows:—

"*Re* contract from Saskatchewan Landing to Battleford:—

"1. That Colonel Whitehead, by wire, advised General Laurie to give this contract to John Stewart.

"2. That Major Bell, transport officer, would not permit Stewart to carry out this contract.

"3. That Major Bell sent one Jones, chief clerk in the transport office, Qu'Appelle, to take charge of the Saskatchewan Landing contract.

"4. That said Jones took bills of lading from a firm, Bell & Lewis, for about 90 tons of freight.

"5. That the greater number of the teams were hired by Major Bell and other transport officers at Qu'Appelle, and shipped to Swift Current for this contract.

"6. That about 4th June one Captain Howard arranged with Colonel Whitehead to go on with the above contract, and a day or two afterwards Howard went to Saskatchewan Landing and took charge of the contract from Jones, and made receipts or bills of lading in his own name.

"7. That between 22nd May and 5th June (see "Winnipeg *Times*") tenders were called for to transport freight from this point and others, and the said tenders were to be in on the 5th June.

"8. Notwithstanding this advertisement for tenders which were to be in on the 5th June, this contract was arranged privately between the said Howard and Whitehead on the night of the 4th June, without reference to any tenders or competition of any kind."

I pass over one or two charges:

"That Colonel Whitehead allowed Bell and Lewis to be paid their contract from Qu'Appelle at prices 150 per cent. too high, and was guilty of improper conduct or negligence in permitting this to be done."

Perhaps I had better now quote from the deliverance of the Commission upon these twenty-nine charges and show which of them were established. The Commission reports:

"Major W. R. Bell appears to have attempted to induce Stewart to throw up the contract he had secured, and accept a share with Bell and others in the contracts covering all the different trails; a memorandum of this matter was signed by W. R. Bell and John Stewart, at Qu'Appelle, on the 21st May (See Exhibit R). Stewart swears that his object in signing this paper was to get Bell to recognise the contract he had made with General Laurie but not with the intention of carrying out the terms of the memorandum."

The terms of that letter I cannot find at this moment. It is merely an engagement between Stewart and Bell, the transport officer, that they, Bell and Stewart, shall share in the profits of all contracts awarded to Stewart, and Stewart shall also share in the profits of any contract secured by Bell:

"It is admitted W. E Jones, chief clerk of transport under Bell, went to Saskatchewan Landing, and shipped about 90 tons for Battleford. Bell swears this was to protect the Government, and to prevent a stoppage in the forwarding of supplies, pending the acceptance of tenders for freighting, by the tonnage system. Jones swears he went there and engaged the teams at $70 per ton, expecting he was to have the contract, which Bell had promised to get for him, if possible, in recognition of his services as clerk, and there is no reason to doubt Bell knew the stores could be hauled for $70 per ton as arranged by Jones, when he offered the contract to Thomas Howard at $125 per ton, less $10 for feed for teams. There is no date showing when Howard accepted this contract, or when approved by Lieutenant Colonel Whitehead."

That is pretty strong evidence showing that the Government transport officer, who was continued in office for a long time after these facts were known, let contracts to a friend for transport at nearly double the price that he knew it could be had for.

"17th and 18th. Major W. R Bell did sign an agreement on the 21st May with John Stewart, for the purpose of sharing the profits in freighting over the several trails. Stewart swears he entered into this agreement for the purpose of getting Bell to recognise his contract with Major General Laurie, but made no further effort to carry it out, in fact declined to do so; this frustrated Bell's design. The telegrams and correspondence (Exhibits A to R, John Stewart's evidence), particularly a note written by Bell at Moose Jaw, 27th May, addressed to 'my dear Stewart,' in which he says he 'has quite cleared himself with the General, and laid a foundation for a good thing,' shows Bell was trying to manipulate the various contracts for his own benefit. These very urgent telegrams and letters passed immediately after Bell's visit to Winnipeg, about the 19th or 20th of May.

"21st. There appears to have been an impression that Bell, Lewis, Yates & Walsh were the contractors, but Bell's evidence shows they were not."

Also, that Bell and others, not including Yates and Walsh, were the real contractors. On charges 27 and 28 the Commission reports as follows:—

"27th and 28th. About 1,003 tons of hay, in addition to 49 tons not yet paid for were delivered (*Vide* Exhibit A in evidence of William Clarke, factor, Hudson Bay Company). Bell says there was a written contract between Alex. McDonald, Hudson Bay Company's agent at Fort Qu'Appelle, and himself, as manager of the Qu'Appelle Valley Farming Company, for 500 tons, at $20, for loose, and $22 for pressed and double wired. Wm. Clarke, factor, says there was only a verbal contract; subsequently Mr. Clarke, on behalf of the Hudson Bay Company as agents of the Government, entered into an agreement with Major Bell, as a personal contractor, for pressed, double wired hay, at $25 per ton. W. L. Boyle, president of the Qu'Appelle Farming Company, says the company delivered less than 300 tons. As 1,003 tons were delivered and paid for, not less than 703 tons must have been on Bell's private account. Exhibit A shows that he was paid by the Hudson Bay Company $10,732 85, Beecher says, $9,179.35; but if the Farming Company delivered only 300 tons, Bell must have received individually fully $6,842.15 more."

The Commission then go on to point out that on Bell's private account there was a profit of $7,030. The Commission go on to say:

"Qu'Appelle to Clarke's Crossing, 18 days for the round trip, teams were being paid from $5 to $8 per day by the Government, $4.50 being the ruling figure after about 12th April; $7, therefore, would be an outside average, making $126 for the trip by the day, or say for one ton.

"The contract freighting price was $140 per ton. As these teams conveyed from one and a half tons and upwards, one ton at least should have been hauled by teams working for Government by the day, more particularly as the tonnage teams were paid by the contractors only $4.50 per day. At this price a trip, one and a half tons would cost the contractor $81 instead of $126 for one ton, thus leaving a much larger margin of profits to Bell, Lewis & Co., who were also to provide teams at $5 per day on special service, if required."

These are only a few of the gems of evidence in regard to the transport service. There is a correspondence between Mr. Boultbee a former member of this House and the Minister of Militia commencing on 22nd June, showing that the Minister had notice of these transactions at a comparatively early day. I will quote one of the letters:

"TORONTO, 22nd June, 1885.

"Hon. A. P. CARON,
"Minister of Militia, Ottawa.

"SIR,—I am instructed by Mr. John Stewart, contractor, Winnipeg, that he had a contract with the Government to carry freight from Qu'Appelle to Clarke's Crossing at $150 per ton net, and another to carry freight from Saskatchewan Landing to Battleford at $135 per ton net, and that he made all his arrangements for carrying them out, which involved the transportation of some thousand tons or more of freight. Mr. Stewart was, however, not allowed to carry out the work by those who, under the Government, had control of it, but it was handed over to other parties—Bell and Lewis and one Jones and others who have been doing the work at far higher prices than those agreed on by Stewart. Now, I think, under these circumstances, payment for the work done should be stopped, and an investigation had, in order that the profits accruing from the exution of the work may be paid over to Stewart, and not to these men, Bell or Lewis or Jones, who, Stewart is informed, are interested with Bell and others who are representing the Government, and

who have been instrumental in depriving Stewart of his contracts for the purpose of improperly putting money in their own pockets. I am led to believe that an investigation into this matter will not only be the means of doing justice to Stewart, but of saving the Government a large sum of money.

"Yours respectfully,
"A. BOULTBEE."

Then he appears to have had an interview with the Minister of Militia. Again, on 25th June, after having an interview with the Minister of Militia, he writes once more to the same effect, pointing out that W. R. Bell was acting as assistant transport officer under Colonel Whitehead, and with him had the management and control of the forwarding of supplies from the points mentioned in his letter of the 22nd instant. Also that Bell was one of the firm of Bell & Lewis who had got the contract. So that the Department had notice, long before the campaign was fully over, of the state of things which was going on. Then, Sir, the Commission report on the Canadian Pacific Railway claim for transport, of which I must read one or two items. It appears that the claim put in for the transport for the Montreal Garrison Artillery from Montreal to Winnipeg by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company amounted to $24,917.53, or over $83 per head for officers and men. The Commission report that this is excessive, and they also report a basis on which a settlement might be affected with the railway company. It is to this effect:

"1. Over all finished portions of the road for officers and men, two-thirds (⅔) the regular passenger rates.
"Horses to be in proportion to the passenger rates, as compared with the Grand Trunk Railway charges. Freight to be the regular Canadian Pacific Railway rates.
"2. From Biscotasing to Port Arthur, 461 miles, 10 cents per mile per officer and man, the number of miles actually marched by men and horses over the gaps to be deducted. Freight to be in proportion to passenger rate, but charges for handling baggage, building fires, guides or charges of any other kind, except subsistence, shall not be allowed.
"3. For the return (eastward) from Port Arthur to Biscotasing, 461 miles, two-thirds (⅔) of the rates of No. 2.
"All other portions of the line the same as No. 1."

Now, Sir, according to the proposed rate at 5 cents over the unfinished portion but continuous rail, the amount would have been $15,330.68, or, if the road were completed $12,119.37. A member of the Commission, Colonel Jackson, goes on to say:

"I may here mention Mr. Drinkwater stated, in presence of the Commission, it cost about one thousand dollars to run a passenger train from Montreal to Winnipeg, consequently their proposed charge of $24,917.93 for one corps appears exceedingly large."

And then, Sir, there is a postscript, which like the postscript in a lady's letter, is important. It is as follows:—

"P.S.—It may be added the troops were returned by the North Shore route, for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway; they recommended 5 cents per mile going east per man, and proportional increase for freight, being nearly double full first class rates. There were three lines of steamers from Port Arthur and two lines of railway east of the lakes, the whole of the troops could have been sent by these routes, for two thirds (⅔) the regular rates, viz., 2 cents per mile, or two-fifths (⅖) the amount recommended.

I may say that there is no endorsation on this report either approved or rejected. By the way, I notice that the hon. Minister seems to have committed the crime which is so unpardonable in the eyes of the *Mail*, of signing his initials to endorsations on these documents. We have seen a great deal about "D. M." in late issues of that paper, and perhaps it will now learn that it is the customary way of signing such endorsations. I call attention to the fact that hundreds of pages more of this damaging evidence, as to the conduct of the transport business during the North-West rebellion, have been omitted from this copy, which has been put in circulation ostensibly by the Government—this bogus report—put in circulation since the original and genuine report was placed before the House. There is something else omitted from both reports which I think ought to have been there. We should have had a report from the Adjutant General. We have a report from such a comparatively insignificant officer as Captain T. Charles Watson with regard to the organisation of a volunteer company. We have reports from Major General Strange, Colonel Otter, Brigade Major Smith, and one or two others, and a despatch from the Major General Commanding, on the engagement at Fish Creek. It has not been unusual for commanders of corps under a general to make reports to him on matters coming under their personal notice, which he incorporates in his own report. We have no report from Colonel Van Straubenzee, who might have been asked by the Major General to report on the proceedings at Fish Creek and Batoche, so far as he had an opportunity of observing them. There are other omissions, but I hope the Minister will be able to give us, at least an approximately satisfactory reason for the glaring irregularity of tampering with documents which have been officially laid before the House, and are the official property of this House, and explain how it was that this bogus report got into circulation.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am glad that the hon. gentleman, who has just criticised the report on the suppression of the troubles in the North-West, has found so little to say against it. It is true that with his usual zeal for the public good, he has used some very strong expressions; and if he had left out the expression of a bogus report, I think I should have had little to complain of, so far as his criticism of the report goes. I say there was nothing bogus about the report which has been brought down, and I leave it to every hon. gentleman who has taken the trouble to read it, to say that if there is one thing that can be said with reference to the report which it was my duty to place on the Table of the House, it is that that report contains every piece of evidence, contains much more than is usually placed in any public document of that kind. But, Sir, I felt that as the troubles in the North-West had attracted so much public attention, when I remembered that during the troubles in the North-West, when the Department was called upon to undertake possibly the most difficult task that I hope it will ever be called upon to undertake, the Department was severely criticised at a moment when it could not defend itself, and I thought it was only right and proper to bring down and submit to the House everything which had taken place, every piece of evidence which was gone into by the men appointed for the purpose of investigating the claims which were made against the Department. Sir, this is the report which I had the honor of placing on the Table. This report contains everything, and without attempting in any way to diminish the importance of the evidence which has been taken, I considered that in so far as distributing the report to the force or to the public outside of Parliament, the whole of that evidence was not of sufficient importance to justify me in going to the expense of having this voluminous report printed for distribution outside. I had two reports; one containing not only the various reports which have been referred to by the hon. gentleman, the report of the officers, the report of the general commanding the force; and I had also a report made containing merely these reports, and not taking in the whole of the evidence as it appears in the report which I placed on the Table of the House. I want to know whether it is not a fact that a full report has been distributed to every member of the House, and that the other report has also been distributed or will be distributed? Both reports will be distributed to every member of the House, so that if any hon. gentleman wishes to send away the report of the field operations, without the more tedious portion of the report containing the evidence of the investigations which took place, he can do so. Therefore, there has been no attempt to produce or circulate anything like a bogus report; but a great many people outside will be much more interested in the smaller report containing merely the field operations, than in the full report, contain-

ing all the evidence of the investigations. The hon. gentleman has spoken of some of the charges which were made against Lieutenant Colonel Whitehead, and has characterised those charges as very serious. The investigation into those charges, however, has resulted in altogether disproving them. Lieutenant Colonel Whitehead rendered most valuable services to the Government during that period. It is true, the position he occupied at Winnipeg, unfortunately for himself, caused animosities to be raised against him in the performance of his duty. As soon as I heard of those charges, I considered that Lieutenant Colonel Whitehead should be replaced in the investigation of the particular claims in regard to which the charges were brought against him. I instructed Colonel Peebles, an officer and a magistrate in Winnipeg, a man of high standing there, to investigate them with the two remaining commissioners, and the result of that investigation has shown that Lieutenant Colonel Whitehead did his duty, and he came out of the ordeal without a single stain on his honor or any reflection on the manner in which he performed his duty for the Government. The hon. gentleman says that those charges were brought by Mr. Anderson, a contractor. Mr. Anderson was not a contractor; he was an officer in the employ of the Government at Winnipeg, in connection with the transport service. He was examined, as well as the gentlemen whose names appear in these charges, and the charges were completely disproved. The hon. gentleman also referred to the celebrated Bell case. Major Bell had some contracts with the Hudson Bay Company, and also acted as a transport officer for the Government. For his contracts with the Hudson Bay Company he was responsible to that company alone; but to the present day that portion of the claim which was made by Major Bell upon Government has not yet been paid, but has been submitted to the Minister of Justice. I would not assume the responsibility, as head of the Department of Militia, of acting on that claim without getting the opinion of the legal adviser of the Government upon it; and although a great deal of pressure has been brought to bear on the Department, and Major Bell has complained several times rather bitterly of the delay that has taken place in settling this claim, up to the present moment it has not been settled. If it is settled, it will be because, like every other claim, the evidence will be gone into, and it will be established beyond any possibility of doubt that the claim is a just claim. The hon. gentleman also referred to the transport service carried on by the Canadian Pacific Railway. When I look back to that period, I must say that had it not been for the energy displayed by that company, it would have been impossible for us to transport the troops, the heavy guns, and the ammunition to the front in such a short period of time as we did. The hon. gentleman has referred to a report which does not bear my initials, and that indicates that that report was not accepted; but another report which does bear my initials will show that the whole case was gone into for weeks—nay, for almost a month—regarding the transport service of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The president of the Commission, Colonel Jackson, for whose services I must say we cannot be too grateful, who performed his duties as the head of the Commission in a remarkable manner, gave a great deal of his time personally to investigating every possible branch of the claim put in by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and the Commission called in as witnesses some railway men, who were considered to be the best possible authorities, to express an opinion on such claims. It was after all this investigation had been gone into, that the amount decided upon was paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and seeing that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company did not seem to be quite satisfied with the result, contending that we had cut them down a great deal too much, while the hon. gentleman, as one of the members of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, thinks that we gave them too much, I think between the two we must have struck about the average, and must have paid what was justly due. The hon. gentleman also says that the report of the Adjutant General should have been sent in. The hon. gentleman will consider that, in the operations which took place, it was almost impossible to send in a report unless it be one comprising all the reports which form really the bulk of this book which has been submitted to Parliament. The Adjutant General handed over the reports which appear in the ordinary annual report of the Militia Department of the proceedings of the year; but, this being a campagin which was conducted more particularly by the officers who were at the front, by those who were in command of the various columns, the reports naturally had to come from them, and the Adjutant General could not to a great extent add to the information which is contained in the reports sent in by the various officers. Of course, the Adjutant General, like every other member of the militia staff here at headquarters, performed his duties in a manner which was certainly very remarkable, and which entitles him to all the credit possible; but, as I have already explained, the reports of the store branch and the other reports which comprise the proceedings of the Department appear in the annual report and are not comprised in this report of the campaign proper. The hon. gentleman also finds it very extraordinary that there should be a report which appears as the report of Captain Watson.

Mr. CASEY. No, I did not say so. I said that, when a report which appeared to be of such small importance was to be found in this return, I was astonished that reports of greater importance were not there.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman will understand that the report of Captain Watson bears upon one part of the operations which was certainly very well conducted, and which required to be looked into and studied. In case of any disturbance occurring again, it was important to know how these home guards were organised, and what had been done for the purpose of organising them. We had other reports bearing upon that and took the first that was sent in, so as to give all the information which possibly could be given to Parliament; and that is the reason why this report was sent in. I think I should have been perfectly justified in publishing merely the findings of the Commission appointed for the purpose of investigating the claims; but I thought it was better to lay before Parliament all the evidence which had been taken, everything connected with the Commission. I think that, when the hon. gentleman has more time to look into this report, when he finds, during the vacation, more leisure to be able to follow it up from the beginning to the end, he will find that the Department were anxious to keep nothing from Parliament and the country, but showed their desire, by publishing the whole of the evidence, to put Parliament and the public in full possession of all the facts connected with the campaign.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to explain one point. The hon. Minister, not having been in when I began my remarks, appears to have misunderstood the nature of my charge. I did not charge that the report laid on the Table was insufficient, or that there was any attempt at concealment in it, but I charged that another report had been published under the same heading, with nothing to indicate that it was not the genuine report and the whole report, which would go into the hands of people who had not seen the genuine report, and that that was necessarily a bogus report. I am sorry the hon. Minister has had to confess that the second report has emanated from the Department itself.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). As the Minister of Militia has entered into a defence of the operations of the militia in the North-West, in reply to the remarks of my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey), I propose for a

moment or two to still further trespass on the pressing time of the House in order to draw attention to the same matter. It has been a matter of significant rumor for some time; in fact during the progress of the operations in the North-West it was alleged that those in whom the Government had placed its confidence, in the way of making preparation and arrangements for the forces in that campaign, had misused the confidence which the Government had placed in them. It is evident, even from a hurried glance at the report which the hon. gentleman has referred to, and which has been placed too recently in our hands to allow us a fair opportunity of discussing its contents in full, that public rumor has in no sense misstated the facts of the case. On a cursory examination of the report of the Auditor General, I find that in the one particular item of tea alone, this country paid for a sufficient quantity to maintain 41,362 men in the field during the entire time that that rebellion lasted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What did my hon. friend say?

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I say the quantity of tea that was supplied to the forces in the field and paid for by the Government, as appears by the report of the Auditor General and the sudsidiary statement brought up to the 30th March last, according to the *per diem* ration allowance, would have maintained 41,362 persons in the field for 90 days. I find that, basing my estimate on the same length of time, 90 days—and I think that is a fairly liberal allowance, taking the average of number and the average of time the forces were under arms—the meat supplies were equal to the maintenance of 14,220 men, and that the bread supply was equal to rationing 14,975 men for the time I have stated. I confine myself to the supplies furnished to the men under arms, and in that statement have not included the accounts which appear in the Auditor General's report for scouts, couriers or the transport and mail service. I have attempted, as fairly as I can, to get at the cost of the maintenance of that force in the field, and I have omitted all accounts that do not fairly bear on the maintenance of the force under arms. I also find that for many of the troops there have been allowances in lieu of rations. I find that as much as $2,000 or $3,000 has been allowed to some regiments, while in transit or while the supplies could not be furnished out of the Government allowance, which would still further increase the astounding difference between the actual number under arms and the quantity of supplies furnished; but what strikes me as most surprising of all is that, if we take the number of horses returned as having been engaged in active service in the field, we find it would require every horse that was a portion of the military force under arms there, to have eaten something like 253 pounds of forage a day, in order to consume the quantity paid for by the Government. The absolute impossibility of their doing so is a fair reason for saying that the mismanagement of affairs in that campaign was something sufficiently scandalous to bring the blush of shame to the face of any Canadian. There is not a man in this House, no matter on what side of politics, who would have objected, if the money which went to pay for these supplies had been paid to the members of the forces in the field; but when we find the Minister of Militia complaining that the House is apt to refuse the small amount necessary to engrave the medals received from the Home Government, he casts an aspersion on the House which is not justified, when he asks us to vote the vast sums of money necessary to pay for the 5,000 or 6,000 men who were in the field for the suppression of that rebellion. I do not at all allege that the horses were able to eat the quantity of fodder I have mentioned. I admit that whatever became of these supplies to the men, whatever wastefulness there may have been, it is absolutely impossible that the horses could have eaten the quantity of hay that is charged for. But the very cursory opportunity of looking over the report distributed this afternoon and that the hon. member for West Elgin has referred to, indicates to me what became of a very large portion of these supplies. I find in the evidence submitted, that the Minister of Militia has referred to as approving in that report that very inferior food was supplied to these forces. It is alleged by some of the witnesses examined before the Claims Commission that instead of oats being supplied, a very inferior quality of wheat was furnished, so inferior indeed as to be absolutely useless for the purpose of rationing the troops. The report admits besides that, in one instance, there was something like 100 tons of hay that had been paid for at a very fair price, bought through Major Bell, that proved to be absolutely worthless. I conclude from reading the evidence produced before that Commission that a great many of those men to whom the Government had given confidence as its agents for transporting supplies for that force, expected that they were to make fortunes as well out of the opportunity offered them of swindling the country. I understood the Minister to say that Major Bell had not received any money from the Government other than in discharge of the obligations as transport officer he had pledged the country to, but I find by the report of the Auditor General, on page 498, that W. R Bell was paid $6,652 for supplies furnished by him, and I find that Bell, Lewis & Co., of Winnipeg, were paid $52,774 up to the 30th June last; and according to the supplementary statement submitted of the North-West operations to the 30th March, 1886, I find that he has been paid a further sum. I find that the Qu'Appelle Farming Company, of which Mr. W. R. Bell acknowledges himself to be the manager, was paid up to the 30th June last, the sum of $52,774.92. These sums are still further increased by the subsequent statements brought down to the 30th March. Now, it is clear from the action of the Government that this Major Bell was acting in the double capacity of contractor with the Government and at the same time as transport officer in the Department of Militia. Sir, this is a very serious state of affairs—particularly in view of the generosity shown by this House to the Government last Session, when we gave the Government *carte blanche* to expend $4,000,000 as they pleased in putting down the rebellion. This is the way that confidence has been misplaced, and it arises from the Government putting the charge of these matters into the hands of men who have shown themselves to have been utterly unworthy of confidence. It is apparent, besides, that not only had Major Bell made up his mind that the appropriation made by this House to suppress that rebellion was fair plunder, but there were others with him, and he attempted to bring others who were prepared to tender at a fair price on their own account into collusion with him, and when they refused to make a bargain to the detriment of the country, he attempted to get the contract away from them. I will now refer again to the statement that hay was wasted in its transport to the North-West, and I will read from page 197 of the investigation. In answer to Colonel Jackson, of the Commission, the witness, C. H. Fox, states:

"Q. Hadn't Bell a certain number of teams of his own or hired teams?—A. I know of one lot that he purchased with carts that made one short trip for us, and they were represented as the private property of Major Bell.

"Q. Don't you know anything about teams?—A. Those were only owned by the Farming Company, I understand.

"Q. Who owned these teams? (Pay list produced).—A. I could not say who owned them—I suppose W. R. Bell.

"Col. Peebles:

"Q. Personally?—A. Yes, personally.

Then further on, page 199:

"Q. How were supplies generally carried to the different stations on the other trail?—A. They were there previous to my going, when the Government teams were working by the day.

"Q. Had you an opportunity of seeing quantities of hay along the way?—A. The trail was pretty well cleaned up; there was a quantity of hay at Clarke's Crossing and a quantity of oats at Humboldt.

"Q. In what condition was the hay at Clarke's Crossing?—A. I should say it was useless.

"Q. About what quantity do you suppose?—A. If I remember correctly, Captain Hudson told me several hundred tons.

"Q. Did he say anything about stopping the conveyance of it?—A. He gave me to understand that his instructions were to dispose of it."

That is the evidence as to one quantity of several hundred tons. There is another portion of evidence which indicates that oats designed for the troops were also lavishly distributed and wasted, and this fact is further substantiated by the general reports that comes from the North-West, that at present wild oats are growing profusely in all that section of the country. I have only briefly referred to a number of facts that have come out in my investigation of this report. The statements I have made by no means indicate all the interesting facts available to those disposed to examine it. The Minister has stated that the report has been available to members, and that being the case, the credit is reflected on the Government from the fact that the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) has been able to find so little to question in it. It will be remembered that the report was distributed but a few minutes before the sitting of the House to-day. It is known that a copy of the report was laid on the Table of the House on the 20th instant, yet its distribution was delayed until now, and at this late period of the Session it is a glaring injustice to this House, that gave its confidence to the Government to the extent of placing four millions at its disposal with which to suppress the rebellion, that the report should not have been submitted before it in time to allow members to criticise the account created under that vote. But I say there is sufficient in what I have already stated to show that the management of the expedition was grossly extravagant. The mode the Minister adopted of sending up numbers of men unconnected with the militia force without any responsibility whatever, except that of making as much as possible for themselves, was in itself provocative of a great deal of mischief and extravagance. Men who were in the militia force had the responsibility of their commissions to weigh with them in anything they did, and if they had been charged with the duty of transport and supply service and the other services incidental to a campaign, the work would have been more efficiently performed. How does the case stand? We find that Major Bell does not belong to the militia force; that Mr. Bedson, chief transport officer, is not in the militia force; that his assistant is not in the militia force; that all along the line of the staff, a very large proportion were not men who were in any sense impelled to consider the interests of the country which they had in charge. The Government took the responsibility of placing the North-West campaign accounts in the hands of the Hudson Bay Company. In the first place they allowed that company to become purveyors for all the Government and the force might require; and in the next place they made arrangements by which that company was to receive 5 per cent. on all accounts they might cash. I find under that one head alone, the Hudson Bay Company drew, on commissions, $65,564. And while this country has been led to believe that under the ægis of the present Government, we have had constantly recurring surpluses which the Government have been almost unable to get rid of, the Bank of Montreal was paid between seven thousand and eight thousand dollars discount on notes that had been drawn on the Minister of Militia or Minister of Finance, and the discount was at the rate of 7 per cent. per annum, 1 per cent. higher than is being paid to the same bank by good financial firms in the country. I find several drafts on one or other of the Departments, which does not definitely appear, at thirty days, which was discounted at 7 per cent., and for sums in each case of a quarter of a million dollars. The Minister of Finance has more than once told this House, and we were told by his predecessor, that an immense advantage resulted to this country from the advent of the present Government to power, in the fact that they were able to reduce the rate of interest to the people. Yet there was a total of something like $1,500,000 or $2,000,000 drawn by the financial agents of the Government in the west on the Minister of Finance and discounted at the rate I have mentioned. Those are the reasons why I think the opportunity should have been afforded this House to have made a closer inspection of the management of the North-West campaign. I should have been glad to have had an earlier opportunity of criticising those figures. I am sure that, independent of our party leanings, we would like that such a Department as that of Militia, embracing such a large proportion of our able-bodied young men within its fold, should have been enquired into in a spirit that would have indicated that both sides of the House felt that whenever there was anything wrong it should be enquired into without any of the possible prejudices that arise from party feelings being engrafted into the discussion. But if I continue my investigation still further I find, on the question of supplies for troops, there are some surprising facts to be noted. Up to the time when the accounts were submitted something in the neighborhood of 20,000 suits of underclothing have been bought for the forces; that the quantity of blankets was also very large but not equally so. What surprises me is the immense number of rubber blankets supplied at that time. I need not say that a supply of such an article under reasonable circumstances is judicious and necessary, but there are rumors in connection with this item which represent the peculiar methods of securing supplies for the field force. We have in the accounts something like $50,000 paid out besides for clothing supplies of which there are no details, and at the same time a proportion of the force under arms was allowed the amount that the supply officer determined as the value of a kit in lieu of the Government furnishing it. The men belonging to two or three battalions were each allowed $13.95 in lieu of the kit that the Department should have furnished. To refer again to the amount that Major Bell drew, I find on reference to a memorandum I made hurriedly a few moments ago, that according to the Public Accounts and the supplementary statement brought out on the 30th of March, there has been paid in all the sum of $103,958 to that employee of their own, either in person or as a member of one or other of the firms in which he was interested. This is certainly a surprising sum in its amount, and its scandalous character is increased from the additional fact, as evidenced by the report just submitted, that he was practically keeping up the price of the transport service, that he was protesting against the Government hiring teams at a lower rate than $8 per day, while there were opportunities for the service to get teams at something like $4.50 per day. Such is the character of the man who drew this large sum from the Department by one and another of his manifold means of pressing accounts on the Government. It is true they are not all presented in his own name, but a sufficient number were presented in his own name to make it a glaring abuse of the confidence which the Government placed in him. I referred a moment ago to the prices paid for supplies furnished to the Department. The Minister of Agriculture has more than once this Session attempted to show how much cheaper underclothing has become under the development of the National Policy than it was when a different fiscal policy prevailed. Now, the hon. gentleman would have been wise to have confined his comparison to generalities, until he had seen a statement of the cost to this country of the clothing supplied to the forces in the North-West. I find that the underclothing is charged at a much higher figure than the average he represented, and other clothing supplies are also much higher. I find that socks are charged as high as $1; in another case as high as 70

cents, and not by the single pair but by hundreds of pairs. In another case fifty pairs of gloves are charged at an average of $2.75 per pair. I find that blankets are charged as high as $10 per pair. I find that I. G. Baker & Co., who are ever present when there is something to be made at the public expense, although they do not figure as largely as in some of the other departments, supplied fifty gauntlets at $2.75 per pair, and 100 pairs of socks at 65 cents., and while the Minister thought it impossible, with the immense drain on his resources, in order to meet the requirements of this rebellion, to pay the $1,200 or $1,500 necessary in order to engrave the names of those who had so ably defended our interests in the North-West on the medals which were presented to them, while he believed that the House would not grant that infinitesimal amount for that purpose, I find that Major General Strange, who drew a general's pay for ninety days' services, a total sum of $2,752, had a pair of boots paid for him by the country at a cost of $8. I find that other gentlemen occupying high positions were equally well treated. I find that even the Deputy Adjutant General, an officer in command at Winnipeg, could not go to meet General Middleton on his return to Lake Manitoba, without taking a large supply of provisions and liquors of a costly character, against which there was apparently no protest when the account was sent in, while the Department were extremely reluctant to pay 25 and 35 cents a meal for some of the troops during a portion of their progress to the scene of action. There are many other items of this kind which attract attention, many of them which will justify the House and the country in looking much more closely into the administration of that Department than has heretofore been the case, and I only regret that the hour is so late and the disposition to get away is so strong that an opportunity for discussing these matters as they ought to be discussed has not presented itself before now. But I have deemed it to be my duty, at the risk of inconveniencing members of this House, to submit these facts, as they developed themselves in my examination of the documents, to the House and to the country, and as far as possible to excite an interest in this question, a question which in its manifold aspects is of as much interest to every true, loyal Canadian as any other question which could be discussed in this House. We have had the first expeditionary force in which the Canadian people themselves undertook the task of suppressing a rebellion without the assistance of the Home Government. We have to examine the papers to know how those on whom we conferred authority for the management of that expedition discharged their trust. It is of interest to us to know how they did so. I have attempted to show that in every respect in which men should have proved themselves capable these men have failed. I have only this to say in conclusion, that I regret that the time does not permit a closer scrutiny into these accounts. I have made the statements after examination, and I believe the facts I have stated will be borne out by the accounts. There are many others which might be discussed in the same way, and I feel satisfied that the House will appreciate the reason why I do not proceed further on this occasion.

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

After Recess.

THE PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the Supplementary Estimates which have recently been laid before us. I should have been very glad if those estimates, and the various subsidies which the Government have presented for our approval, had been of a character that would have permitted me to dispense with comment beyond what was necessary upon the several items in committee. As it is, I shall endeavor to compress my remarks within the briefest possible compass. I had hoped that the facts which were disclosed in the speech of the Finance Minister himself would have led the Government to consider a little more carefully than they seem to have done, the propriety under our present circumstances of retrenching our expenditure, as far as possible, or at any rate of avoiding adding needlessly to the fixed charges of the country. But I am sorry to say that not merely do the Supplementary Estimates, but also the several proposals which within four or five days of the close of the Session have been laid before the House indicate that a feeling, which I am scarcely using too strong terms in characterising as one of utter recklessness, has taken possession of hon. gentlemen opposite. I suppose it is idle to expect from them any particular regard to the public opinion of this country. They seem to have made up their minds that it is easier to manage that by means of divers grants for public works and railroads throughout the country, and subsidies to the newspaper press, than by appealing to the feelings which the people as a whole do, I believe, entertain, in favor of economy and good management. Now, I would have thought, at a time when a deficit of $2,250,000 had been announced for the year 1885, and when a deficit of $5,000,000, according to the statement of the Finance Minister himself, is anticipated for the current year, at a time when, unless we succeed in obtaining a much larger revenue than our *Gazette* returns at present indicate is likely to come into our coffers, there is serious danger that a deficit may be anticipated of a greater or less extent in the ensuing year, more particularly at a time when the Minister, in order to make a settlement and to obtain a considerable amount of money from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, had found it necessary to give up many millions of a debt which we had been informed was most excellently secured, of which in fact we were told by hon. gentlemen opposite that they fully expected to receive every cent that had been advanced —I say, Sir, under these circumstances, we could hardly have expected that hon. gentlemen would come down to the House and propose that a sum of $3,250,000 of Supplementary Estimates should be added for the year 1886, that a further sum of $2,000,000 should be demanded as Supplementary Estimates for 1887, and, when they had fair and reasonable opportunities of escaping large grants such as that to the Chignecto Railway, that, instead of availing themselves of those opportunities which were almost thrust into their hands, they should choose to increase our liabilities; still less that shey should have found it necessary to come down to us, when the net volume of our debt has been very considerably increased by the operations I have alluded to, and should propose additional subsidies involving a further charge of five or six millions, as near as I can make out, to the total debt of the Dominion. It has been abundantly demonstrated, in the debates that have taken place on these subsidies, that every one of these grants is certain to be the parent of many more—that whenever you make grants of this kind to one section of the country, you put into the hands of the constituencies not yet similarly favored almost irresistible arguments for conferring similar boons on them, thereby increasing the liabilities and indebtedness of this country to an almost indefinite extent, Now, Sir, I shall review very briefly the circumstances in which we now stand. There are two or three facts in dispute between myself and the hon. Finance Minister, which I shall merely indicate. One is as to the true extent of our liabilities. As to the extent of our gross liabilities there can be no question; but as to the amount of our genuine liabilities a considerable amount of discussion has arisen. Still, when you come to examine the question,

and when you deduct the sum which we can fairly claim should be abated from our gross liabilities, that is, our cash in hand and our sinking fund, and when, on the other hand, you make due allowance for the enormous number of liabilities which have been incurred, although they have not yet matured or become due, you will find that the real difference between the net amount I estimate, and the net amount the hon. gentleman has estimated, is too slight to affect the argument very materially. In the same way as to the other question in dispute between us, the question whether the actual population of Canada has increased, as I maintain, not over 300,000 within the last five years, or 400,000 or 500,000, as hon. gentlemen opposite maintain, when you come to examine all the facts we possess, I think the House will see that there is only too strong a presumption that the statements made on this side of the House, as to the total increase, are much more likely to be verified. I may observe in this connection that we do not maintain, and we never have maintained, that the population of Canada, as a whole, has decreased. What we have alleged is, that the rate of increase during the past five years has not exceeded the rate of increase during the past decade, from 1871 to 1881; and those who have taken the pains to acquaint themselves with the returns made by our municipal authorities, and who attach due weight to the census returns taken in the Nort-West Territories, will say that at the least there is a reasonably strong presumption in favor of our side of the argument. But, Sir, there are facts which are not in dispute. There are facts which neither the Finance Minister nor any of the hon. gentlemen opposite can pretend for one instant to deny. They cannot deny that there has been an immense increase in our total debt and our total taxes during the last few years: that since the Mackenzie Government went out of power rather more than $100,000,000 have been added to the total debt of this country; that according to the estimates submitted by the Financial Minister himself, rather more than $10,000,000 a year have been added to the actual taxation of the country, and even more than that to the total expenditure. They cannot deny another fact of very great moment, that the percentage of the fixed charges to our total income has increased enormously and is now greater than it is in any other country calling itself civilised, of which we have any knowledge. I believe, Sir, that to-day you will find that the fixed charges, by which I mean the interest, the sinking fund, the subsidies, and the charges for the collection of revenue, paid by the Dominion of Canada, amount within the nearest fraction to the total annual expenditure of the year 1878. Sir, I do not wish to do more than call the attention of the House briefly to that fact; but every man of business, every man of intelligence, every man of common sense in Canada must see that when, out of a gross nominal income of $35,000,000, you have charges over which you have no practical control, amounting to over $23,000,000, and tending to increase all the time, you have a condition of things which calls for great care and economy on the part of those entrusted with our finances. Then, Sir, we have another consideration which I think also ought to weigh with these hon. gentlemen, that is, that it is perfectly clear that the whole future of Canada has been staked, rashly staked, in my opinion, on the development of the North-West. I believe that a great deal can be done there, I believe that it is a great country, but I do not approve of seeing, as we have seen, by reason of the reckless expenditure in which hon. gentlemen have engaged, such an enormous proportion of the fixed charges of the Dominion incurred in the attempt to develop the North-West. At any rate, I do not approve of it, when we have before us, unhappily, so clear a proof that the policy of the Government in that respect has been a most disastrous failure as shown by the fact, which we cannot but regret, that we have to-day in Manitoba scarcely 110,000 white people and in the adjacent Territories 23,000 whites. I cannot but regard that fact, in view of all the exactions and sacrifices the people have submitted to for the purpose of developing the North-West, as proof of gross incompetence and mismanagement on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I may add that every intelligent protectionist will feel constrained to admit that the effect of the taxation of this country is that the portion of it which goes into the public Treasury only very partially represents the extent of the burdens on the people. Our taxes are vastly more than the nominal taxes, and the nominal taxes to-day are very nearly threefold what they were eighteen or nineteen years ago. In face of these facts, we have heard the Minister of Finance openly proclaiming, in the first place, that the policy of the Government is to add to our taxation, whenever they are asked to do so by anyone who says he will open this or that factory. Sir, I say that that policy is fatal to the progress of this country and tends, as indeed has been sufficiently proved in the course of recent discussions, to add very greatly to the burthens of people in distant parts of the country and to interfere not slightly with the prospect of developing the North-West. That, Sir, is one part of their policy, and apparently these very estimates, these very proposals for additional subsidies, these very grants that have been made, these new liabilities or old liabilities that have been revived, all tend to show that the other part is to add to the debt with the utmost recklessness, with the utmost indifference to what the result may be. I am not going at present, particularly as we will have another opportunity of saying something on that head, to do more than allude in the most general way to the alterations that have been made in the tariff, but I cannot help observing this much, that as to that particular alteration, the duty on sugar, from which the hon. gentleman expects most revenue, it is only too evident that if he does succeed in extracting $400,000 or $500,000 of additional revenue from the imposition of that duty he must necessarily add not less than $1,000,000 to the total burthens of the people, while in many of his other proceedings, in particular in the tax which he is imposing on twines and cordage and the tax on such articles as wire for fences, he has shown himself, I am sorry to say, wholly indifferent to the necessities of the settlers in the North-West. Now, it is no light matter, under the circumstances, when, as I have said, almost the whole future of Canada is staked on the successful development of the North-West that almost on every occasion when a change in the tariff is proposed we find the Finance Minister and the Government of Canada making changes which press, as in the case of the two articles I have named, with very great and very unnecessary severity on the industrious agriculturists who are striving to open up and develop the North-West. I will not at present go on to dwell at greater length on what is only too apparent to all of us in the older Provinces, that is to say, the fact that older Canada has become almost stationary in point of increase of population, nor do I wish to say much more than I have already said with respect to our utter failure to encourage settlement in the North-West, other than this, that I believe that not only I myself, but all my hon. friends behind me here, before the census was brought down by the Government, would have admitted freely, that, in their judgment, there were probably fifty or sixty per cent. more people settled in the North-West than the actual returns of Government show to be the case. I am sorry to say that in all these points the mischief done is almost incalculable. It will be a very difficult matter indeed to reverse the direction which the unhappy policy of the Government has given to the stream of immigration to this country, and until that is done, until that is effectually done, it is idle for us to expect any material alleviation of the burthens of the people or to expect that anything

like an adequate return can be reaped by the people of Canada for the enormous sacrifices to which they have been subjected. Now, with respect to these particular estimates which have been laid before us, I desire to point out very briefly some few items out of those, all of which are either totally unnecessary or go to show the extreme carelessness with which the estimates heretofore prepared by Government were submitted. I take these Supplementary Estimates for the years 1886 and 1887, and, first of all, I find a charge of $200,000 is to be inflicted on the people of this country most needlessly, most unnecessarily, for the purpose of administering the Franchise Bill which was put through last Session. I find a little further down that a sum of $399,617 is demanded for the service of the Indians. Now, that may be necessary. I am not going at the present moment to enter into a discussion of that point, but it only shows how right we were on this side of the House in pointing out to the Government that, when they brought down an estimate of three-quarters of a million as sufficient for the service of the Indians, they were utterly and entirely mistaken. I recollect pointing out at that time that, after you had accustomed these savages to an expenditure of nearly $1,100,000 a year, it was almost impossible with any due regard to the safety and peace of that country, to make a reduction of nearly 40 per cent., and that we must be prepared, as the event has shown, to see further estimates to the tune of $400,000 or $500,000 submitted to Parliament, and here is the proof of it. At the same time I pointed out that, if they found it necessary to add largely to the numbers of the Mounted Police, a large additional sum would probably be required for that service, and I find that for that service, wholly apart be it remembered from the expenditure for war purposes, a sum of $150,000 is required; while for additional service of the post office no less than $105,505 is asked. I will not repeat what I said about that. I am willing, and I believe the House is willing, to allow a very liberal expenditure for the purposes of the post office which has a great educating influence on our people, but I am bound to say, when we find the deficit of the post office amounting to $1,000,000 a year, it is time for us to cry halt, and to enquire whether it would not be possible to conduct the service of this country so as to give very much greater accommodation to those portions which really require it without the enormous expenditure, daily and hourly increasing, which we see taking place on that head, and which, be it remembered when I speak of the deficit, does not include the $130,000 or $140,000 which are wanted for the expenses of the head department here, which, if added, would represent a total deficit of very nearly $1,150,000. Then we find, and to this I would direct the special attention of the House and of the First Minister, that our experiments in constitutional law have cost us somewhat dear, and that we are called upon, in time of need, in time of deficit, to pay $125,000 on account of the Liquor License Act. Now, I say that of these several large items, there is scarcely one which might not by wise management have been largely reduced, and many which were most idly and unnecessarily incurred. Then we find a further sum of $100,000 demanded for the service of the Franchise Bill, and we find, although a small item yet one deserving of some special mention, that an attempt—what shall I call it?—to bulldose the Province of Ontario has resulted in a further bill of costs to be paid to the St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Company for costs to the extent of $11,500. These are some of the items, and some of the reasons which have impelled me to put on record my disapprobation of the policy to which the Government have at present committed themselves. As I said, I do not desire to occupy the time of the House, particularly as we have only a limited period at our disposal to-night, as the facts, after all, are facts which speak for themselves louder than any tongue can speak, and as it is perfectly clear to anybody who examines the details that, in the statements which I am about to make, I am not only not over-stating but that I am under-stating the case. I am not including any of those charges which ought, I think, to be properly put in our annual expenditure for expenditures on public lands; I am not including charges which are improperly charged to capital, and which, I think, ought to go to income, such as the charges for rolling stock and Pullman cars, and other items of ordinary expenditure for the Intercolonial Railway; I am not adding, as I think I might justly add, to our annual expenditure the sums which are granted for railway subsidies, and which, if we grant them at all, I think ought to be charged to annual income and not to capital account, seeing that we have no asset, as a Dominion, to represent them; I am simply taking the facts from the hon. gentleman's own statements, from the documents submitted by themselves, and those facts, I contend, do, of themselves, almost without one word of comment, reveal an amount of carelessness, recklessness and mismanagement in the administration of public affairs which ought to call down upon those who are at present charged with the conduct of the business of the country the severest condemnation of all intelligent people. Without further comment, I now move:

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

That all the words after "that" be left out, in order to add the following:—the expenditure for the Dominion of Canada for the year ending 30th June, 1878, was $23,503,158;

That the expenditure for the fiscal year 1884 was $31,107,756;

That the expenditure for the fiscal year 1885 was $35,037,060, including $1,700,000 for war expenses;

That the estimated expenditure for the present year up to the 30th June, 1886, is $38,126,413, including $3,400,000 for war expenses;

That the estimated expenditure for the year ending 30th June, 1887, is $34,220,379, exclusive of any Supplementary Estimates which may be proposed next Session;

That the fixed charges for interest, sinking fund and subsidies, together with the charges for collection of revenues, amounted to $16,970,647 for the fiscal year 1878;

That the similar charges for the year 1885 amounted to $22,442,231, and are estimated at $22,508,469 for the year 1886, and $23,079,082 for the year 1887;

That the total taxation for the fiscal year 1878 was $17,841,938, and for 1885 was $25,384,529;

That the estimated taxation for 1886 is $26,000,000, and $27,200,000 for 1887;

That the actual deficit in the fiscal year 1885 was $2,240,059, including $1,700,000 for war expenses, and that the deficit for 1886 is estimated at $4,900,000, including $3,400,000 for war expenses;

That the growth of taxation and expenditure from 1878 to 1886 is out of all proportion to the growth of trade and population and has attained such dimensions as greatly to hamper and impede the progress of the Dominion, and that the lavish outlay and the methods of expenditure and indifference to the increase of liabilities on the part of the Government during the above-mentioned period have contributed very largely to corrupt and demoralise the public service and to impair the independence of Parliament.

House divided on amendment.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Guay,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Gunn,	Platt,
Béchard,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Innes,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Kirk,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Landerkin,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Lister,	Springer,
Casey,	McCraney,	Trow,
Fairbank,	McIntyre,	Vail,
Forbes,	McMullen,	Watson,
Geoffrion,	Mills,	Weldon,
Glen,	Mulock,	Wilson.—36.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Barker,	Dupont,	McCallum,
Beaty,	Everett,	McCarthy,
Bell,	Farrow,	McDougald (Pictou),
Benoit,	Ferguson (Welland),	McDougall (C. Breton),
Billy,	Fortin,	McLelan,
Blondeau,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Bowell,	Gaudet,	O'Brien,
Cameron (Inverness),	Gigault,	Orton,

Campbell (Victoria),	Gordon,	Paint,
Carling,	Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Guillet,	Pope,
Chapleau,	Hall,	Pruyn,
Cochrane,	Hesson,	Riopel,
Costigan,	Hilliard,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Coughlin,	Homer,	Robertson (Hastings),
Cuthbert,	Kaulbach,	Shanly,
Daly,	Kilvert,	Small,
Dawson,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Landry (Kent),	Temple,
Desaulniers (St.M'rice),	Landry (Montmagny),	Tyrwhitt,
Dickinson,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Wallace (Albert),
Dugas,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Cardwell),
Dundas,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Hastings).—70.

Amendment negatived, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Geological Survey..... $41,600 00

Mr. VAIL. Where is this money to be expended during the coming year? The reason I ask the question is because no survey has been made in the western part of Nova Scotia, and we have been asking from year to year that some examination of the country should be made.

Mr. CASEY. I have time and again on this item pointed out that far too small a proportion of the grant for the Geological Survey is expended on examining and publishing an account of the lands properly belonging to the Dominion. A great deal of money is spent on examining and reporting upon lands belonging either to the Provinces or to private parties, and too little is known of our own domain. Of course we are aware that a passing exploration was made of the North West, and that some abortive attempts were made by the use of the diamond drill to ascertain where coal was located on the supposed coal lands; but that attempt was conducted in such a bungling and unscientific manner that no further operations have been carried on. For the last year or two there has been no report of the soil and climate of the North-West and the mineral resources of the Rocky Mountains such as we ought to have had. I think the Government are not justified in spending so much money examining property of private individuals. We have very elaborate maps and reports on the geology of Cape Breton. This has been developing private property. The Dominion has been sending scientific men to ascertain what quantity of coal exists on certain private property which is for the benefit of the owners only. This may or may not be a proper use of public money. If it is held to be so, it is still more proper to use those funds in ascertaining the value of lands belonging to the Dominion itself. The Canadian Pacific Railway has opened up a vast extent of country, not only in Manitoba and the North-West where the land belongs largely to the Dominion, but in unsettled portions of Ontario. If the Government are going to report on land belonging to private parties or Provinces they should report on this land in Ontario. I am aware that Mr. Macoun was sent along the line of the railway, but it must have been but a very cursory examination made into the climate and resources. It is well known that there must be very valuable mineral deposits in some parts of the Province, at Rat Portage they are known to exist. I want to know whether any large proportion of expenditure is proposed to be spent in developing this new country.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The work of the Survey will be as follows: Cariboo District, British Columbia; Rocky Mountains, in the vicinity of the Canadian Pacific Railway, North-West Territory; Regina, between the Bow River and the North Saskatchewan. That will cover a very considerable ground of the North-West. Moise River and part of the shores of Hudson's Bay; and the party goes to the south shore and in the vicinity of Albany River. Explorations will be carried on in the country round Lake Huron, in the Madoc and Hastings districts and in the Eastern Townships of the Province of Quebec; also in New Brunswick and in the north-west portion of Nova Scotia, Pictou, Guysboro', Antigonish and Halifax counties. Those are the places where surveys will be made this year. As regards the North-West, I do not quite agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman, as I believe that Mr. Macoun made not only a very extensive and thorough, but a valuable exploration, and one which tended to make known the character of that country.

Mr. CASEY. No doubt it was as valuable as it could be made in the course of a hurried trip through the country, but it cannot be called thorough in any ordinary sense,—because Mr. Macoun went through the country in belts very considerable distances from each other, and it would not be possible for him, therefore, to make a thorough exploration. I am glad, however, to join in bearing testimony to the fact that the work was as thorough as it could be made under the circumstances, and in the limited time. I am glad that the suggestions which have been made from this side of the House have been adopted as regards the work for the coming year. I desire to enquire whether it is the Minister's intention to continue to have this report printed elsewhere than by the Government printers, as has been the regular course hitherto. The argument that was formerly used in favor of having the report printed in Montreal was, that the Geological Survey had its headquarters there. Since its removal the Minister has been constantly urged to have this report, like all other reports, printed by the Government printers here. We have been told that the Government printers have not the facilities, though in looking over the report, I fail to see, from year to year, what there is, except the plates, that they could not do quite as well as anyone else.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Parliament so far as this House is concerned has established a printing bureau. At that time we will possess all facilities for doing that work creditably, so that an exchange of reports may at least not be discreditable to the country. So I fancy in that case there will be no doubt whatever that the Geological Report like all other reports, whether special or otherwise, will be printed by the printing bureau.

Mr. CASEY. Is that to be ready this year?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I should be sorry to see the Geological Report printed as one of our ordinary reports this year. The parliamentary printers have done, what as business men they were right in doing, refused to put in new type for the printing of the *Hansard*, because the contract was for too short a duration. It would be quite wrong to have the printing of the Geological Survey reports done with that kind of type—I am speaking of the kind of type in the office at this moment.

Mr. DAWSON. There was an exploratory survey going on in the Thunder Bay district last year. A very able officer was sent up there and made a very interesting exploration, I understand. Of course, we will see the results obtained when the report is issued. There is a good deal of mining going on in that district just now as well as all over the country, and if the Geological Survey would bestow more attention on mining and less on purely scientific matters it would be attended with a great deal of benefit. Last year we had a good deal of exploration going on, and it seemed to be very satisfactory. In the Lake Superior regions and all through Algoma there are immense fields there, but few people have gone over them. So at the Lake of the Woods, the gold discoveries there have been very important, and researches, investigation and reports by the Geological Survey would tend to lead people into the country and develop those mineral regions.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister if the number of persons he is putting in the field is more or less than last year.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I believe the number is about the same. That is what the director informs me, and there

is a supplementary estimate of $15,000 which will bring it up to the amount of last year.

Mr. MULOCK. My reason for asking is this, that last year certain young men were employed for the summer, and I understand they have applied for a renewal of their appointments. I have had some of the replies to them sent to me, in which it is stated that if the same number of parties were put in the field their appointments would be repeated, but if not it would be a matter for the Department to consider.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I have requested Dr. Dawson, the acting director, to keep within the estimate, and he is also to act on his own judgment in regard to the persons employed and everything in relation to the survey.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the cost of printing the report each year?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I cannot tell at sight. I may say with regard to the printing that, acting on a suggestion which was made in the House last year and with a view of getting the report more quickly, they are now being put out practically in pamphlet form, each pamphlet on a special subject, so that people can get reports on different districts as they require them. Some three or four reports of that kind have just come out.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understood that the printing costs something in the neighborhood of $5,000 or $6,000. I would like to understand if the contract, which was given to the Montreal firm who now do the printing, was given with or without competition.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I hardly think this is the proper time to go into a discussion of that kind, but as the hon. gentleman knows very well this work is not done by tender. It has never been done by parliamentary contract; it is specially excepted from the contract, and the only difference between the price paid now and the price paid formerly, is that formerly 50 cents per 1,000 ems were paid and now 35 cents are paid.

Indians—Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces.....$34,838 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are these amounts distributed where needed for the relief of distress or handed over to the several bands?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A certain amount is for the purchase of blankets and there is $4,200 for the relief of distress among the Indians of the Province of Quebec. This amount is expended each year, and no decrease is possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice there is a slight decrease for Indian schools.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A small amount has been saved, I think, in the salary of one of the schoolmasters.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know, generally, how many schools there are, and how many scholars in fair annual attendance?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not that information. I will make a note of it and give it on the Supplementary Estimates. This amount is for boys' and girls' schools, industrial schools, salaries of teachers, and so on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the exact position of this Robinson Treaty dispute? I had hoped that a final settlement might be arrived at in these disputed amounts between the Dominion and the Provinces.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The note I have is to this effect: To provide for the payment under the Robinson Treaty of an annuity to 4,897 Indians, at $4 each, $19,588; expenses of payment, $400; total $19,988; less interest accrued on funds invested for these Indians, $4,400, leaving a balance of $15,588, which is asked for.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If I remember rightly we have always claimed that Ontario should pay this, and I wanted to know if that claim was admitted?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is not settled yet.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I always understood that the amount claimed from the Ontario Government is in addition to the amount now paid to the Indians.

Mr. DAWSON. There is a very large sum due to the Indians under the Robinson Treaty, extending back for years, and the payments now made to them annually have nothing to do with that. They were promised a certain amount if the resources of the territory should ever be sufficient to yield it, and that amount has been paid to them since 1875. Previous to that year, for a very long period, arrears were constantly accumulating, which I understood amounted to $200,000; but I understand that, after a careful enquiry by the Department, the sum has been found to be more like $300,000. This is a large sum to be due to those poor Indians, and it is very desirable that some means should be taken to have these claims settled. The Indians, under the Robinson Treaty, extended from the Georgian Bay and the great lakes to the height of land. The Robinson Treaty made the payment to the Indians a lien on the land, and the land having fallen to Ontario by the Act of Confederation, it is claimed that the Province should pay those arrears. What I contend is that the Indians should be paid in the meantime, the question of which Government should pay the claims being left to be decided afterwards. I do not say that this large amount should be paid to the Indians at once, but that it should be funded and the proceeds used for providing them with schools and farming implements, and for aiding them when they are in distress. I draw the attention of the Government to the matter, so that it may not be forgotten.

Mr. MULOCK. I would also call the attention of the Minister to what I consider the unnecessary expenditures in connection with the Chippewa band of Indians on Snake Island and Georgiana Island. If you refer to the Indian report of last year you will find that that band consists of only 134 souls, and the gross amount distributed amongst them last year was $1,261.94, while the Indian agent receives a salary of $500 a year, nearly half as much as is given to the whole band, although his services are comparatively light. I speak from pretty reliable information when I say that his personal attendance on the Indians amounts practically to nothing. He was only appointed in the fall of 1882, when there was a change in the management. There can be no justification for such a misapplication of public money. There are reeves all through this Province who devote fifty times as much time to the interest of their particular municipality as this man devotes to the affairs of these Indians. I would call attention to another matter in connection with this band. There was an enquiry in the month of February and March last into certain affairs of this band by an officer who was sent from Ottawa to the nearest village. He went on two separate occasions, and the cost of his two trips was $198.25. Looking over his two accounts, I find these items: Board, lodging, &c., from 16th February to 28th February, both days inclusive, thirteen days, $45.50; and board and lodging, from March 1st to 29th March, both days inclusive; twenty-nine days, $101.50 He charges to this Indian fund for forty-two days at the rate of $3.50 a day. The enquiry took place in a small village, and it is absurd to suppose that under any circumstances he was justified in charging that rate during that time. It cannot be said that the $3.50 a day covers any other items, because if you examine his bills, you will find that he has apparently forgotten nothing I am aware that $3.50 a day is the recognised departmental allowance; but there can be no justification, in my opinion, for the continuance of that

allowance when officers are not put to expenses that justify it. This officer has charged fully $2.50 a day more than he should have done, so that he has made a clear profit at the expense of the Indians, on this particular transaction, of $105. If he has been making similar profits among the different bands in the country throughout the whole year, he has added a considerable sum to his salary. I presume, that, in view of the status of the Indians now under the Franchise Act, they will receive a little measure of consideration which was denied them before.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend has called attention to a fact which really deserves a good deal of consideration, that is the enormous proportion which the salaries paid to agents bear to the sums devoted to the Indians. I am afraid that, in a great many cases, nearly one half the sum the country designs to go to benefit these poor savages really goes to pay the officers who are alleged to look after them, and it is a very great hardship that it should be so.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have taken a note of that, in order to call the attention of the First Minister to it.

Indians, Nova Scotia..... $5,032 00

Mr. VAIL. It is very evident that the Indians in the Province of Nova Scotia are in a very bad state of health to require so large an amount for medical attendance. I notice that the amount expended to relieve distress and for the purchase of seed grain amounts to $3,045, while the medical attendance amounts to $1,012, one-third of the amount contributed for the purchase of seed grain. It seems to me out of proportion altogether, and I notice that in some of the counties the charge for medical attendance is between $120 and $130, where the agent only gets $50 for his services for the whole year. It seems to me that those medical accounts require looking into a little. They are growing larger every year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are reduced by $100 this year.

Mr. VAIL. I think last year in the county of Digby $125 was expended, and the year previous about the same amount.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry they get ill, but we cannot help it, we must give them the medical aid and attendance which are required.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps they have a surgeon general?

Indians, New Brunswick..... $5,090 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is an illustration of what I was speaking of. These salaries may be used for the benefit of the Indians, but salaries to the tune of $1,870 and a balance of $3,200 spent for the Indians does look like a case of all frill and no shirt.

Mr. WELDON. In Nova Scotia $4,000 is spent for the Indians, and the salaries amount to $900, while New Brunswick requires salaries of $1,870 to disburse $3,000.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the bands in New Brunswick are more numerous, more scattered than in Nova Scotia, therefore there must be more salaries for the agents and medical men attending to their wants.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is evolving that explanation from the recesses of his inner consciousness. I do not think the fact is so.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not say positively it was, but I think it is likely.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is rather reasoning backward. The hon. gentleman sees these large salaries, and supposes it must be so. I am rather afraid, from my recollection, that the Indians in New Brunswick are not more scattered than they are in Nova Scotia.

Mr. WELDON. They are not so much scattered as they are in Nova Scotia.

Mr. McLELAN. They are very much scattered, and the salary paid to each agent is small.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You pay twice as much in New Brunswick as you do in Nova Scotia. Is not that an invasion on the privileges of Nova Scotia?

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I am glad to see that hon. gentlemen are taking so much interest in the Indians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, we are going to do so.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I wish they had paid as much attention to them when they were in power, instead of giving Mr. Cook a rebate of $2,000, which belonged to the Indians. I think that is a matter which ought to be ventilated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. $2,000? I see an item of $2,000 for a certain Dr. Jones, who edits, I believe, an Indian newspaper in the Conservative interest. Is that what you are referring to?

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). No, I am referring to the logs cut by Mr. Cook in the Christian Islands. I do not know anything about Dr. Jones or about the paper he edits.

Mr. MULOCK. I call the attention of the Minister to the enormous increase in salaries in connection with the management of Indian affairs, not only in the outside service but in the inside service. I will not trouble him with details, as it is not his Department, but last year there was charged to the Indian fund for cost of management over $42,000. It is an enormous sum, and I think unnecessarily large. This sum was paid in salaries and incidental travelling expenses during the past year, and I may say that one very considerable item in connection with that is the item for travelling expenses of agents. If the Minister will cause enquiry to be made, I am sure he will be able to remove an abuse which is becoming very aggravated at present.

Mr. DAWSON. I can say that in our district there are very few agents in proportion to the number of Indians, and they are very badly paid. They receive extremely low salaries, $600 or $700 a year or something like that, and they are devoted to their duties, and take very good care of the Indians. In the district I represent there are as many Indians as in all the rest of Ontario together, and, therefore, the agents have more to do. They manage exceedingly well, and they are not overpaid. The salaries are very low and they attend very well to their duties.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not complaining of any particular agent.

Mr. DAWSON. I am speaking generally.

Mr. MULOCK. There may be cases in which there are grievances, but I think the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) will agree with me that the particular case to which I referred, where $500 are paid to an Indian agent to distribute in all $1,261 amongst a small band of 130 Indians, who are as civilised as the agent himself and quite independent of his assistance, must strike every person who takes an interest in this affair as a waste of the Indian fund. I do not profess to know what advance in civilisation the Indians of Algoma district have made, but the Indians I refer to have lived in a settled community, surrounded by whites, for many years—I will not venture to say how many, but at all events since the commencement of this century—and you can easily see that there is very little necessity for an agent to give them instruction. They are very good farmers in their way, and, if the class of Indians generally who have been enfranchised are represented by those I refer to, I would have no complaint against their having the fran-

chise, provided they are allowed their freedom, but I am sure the hon. member for Algoma will say that his agents cannot possibly be remunerated on the same liberal scale as those I refer to.

Mr. DAWSON. No, they are not. We have a very large number of Indians in Algoma, altogether about 10,000, and the agents are paid at very moderate rates; and, so far as I know, throughout the Dominion, Indian agents are not excessively paid, not even where the numbers of the Indians are small. It is very necessary sometimes in those cases to have an agent to look after their interests. I am exceedingly happy to see that so many hon. members have something to say about the Indians. Some years ago the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) and myself, were the only persons in the House who seemed to take much interest in them.

Mr. WELDON. I find that in Nova Scotia there are seventeen agents who are paid $820 each; in New Brunswick eleven, who are paid $1,213 each. I cannot understand why they should be paid more in New Brunswick than in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture if he has established a post office for the benefit of the Chippewa Indians on Georgian Island. There was a petition presented to the Department when he was Postmaster General, asking for the establishment of a weekly mail to the Georgian Island.

Mr. CARLING. I cannot give the information.

Mr. KIRK. There were $1,000 voted last year for building roads for the Indians in Nova Scotia. Has that money been expended, and where?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, The grant was made for a road from Chapel Island to the mainland and it is expected that the road will be finished before the 30th June next, and that no other expenditure of that kind will be necessary.

Indians, British Columbia..... $52,367 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must call the serious attention of the Minister to this expenditure. Now, here are $31,000 asked for the Indians of British Columbia, and so far as I can discover, on examination of the expenditure for 1885, the only sums that could be said to go to the Indians directly were $1,488 for aid to the sick and needy, and $1,344 for medical attendance and medicine. All the rest of the $31,000 goes as follows: Salaries of agents $15,234, of teachers, $2,798; travelling expenses, trip to and fro from Ottawa, of I. W. Powell, $4,149. I was in error on one point, I find that $4,000, in round numbers, goes to the Indians directly. Now, it appears monstrous that barely $4,000 out of this sum of $31,000 should go to the relief and assistance of the Indians. It may be true, however, that such items as are found under the present arrangement are for their benefit, and perhaps the same is true of the reserve commission. I find the salaries range from $1,600 up to $2,600. It appears to me there is something here that requires a great deal of attention before we can satisfy ourselves that this expense is really laid out for the benefit of the Indians who, I have always understood, are rather of a superior class and disposed to attend to their own affairs.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount of $31,030 is divided as follows:—Salaries, $19,580; relief of distress, $1,000; for seed grain, tools and agricultural implements, $1,000; medical assistance and medicine, $1,800; schools, $1,950; travelling expenses, $4,200; miscellaneous, $1,500. The officers, of course, are numerous, because these bands are scattered through the immense Province of British Columbia. Besides a stipendiary magistrate had to be appointed, which increased the amount by so much. Then, there is a caretaker at the reserve. The hon. gentleman finds that the proportion for salaries is great in comparison with the balance. Well, that is so, but the experience of the Department has shown that these officers are required. The hon gentleman knows that there is a local superintendent, Dr. Powell, who has a salary of $3,000. That is the only high salary, except that of the stipendiary magistrate, who has $2,600. Then there is the salary of Mr. Moffatt, and other salaries, varying from $600 to $1,200. The hon. gentleman said, also, that these Indians are of a superior class. Some of them are, but very few of the bands can manage their own affairs. In Ontario and Quebec there are some bands of Indians, such as the Caughnawagas, who, to a large extent, manage their own affairs. In British Columbia there are some bands more or less civilised who can also manage their affairs to a certain extent; but for some years to come we shall have to keep a staff there and look after those Indians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But it hardly appears what the Indian agents can do. To pay an amount of $20,000 apparently for the distribution to sick and needy Indians of $4,000 appears to be a farce. Almost the whole payment is for salary. The only item from which the Indians derive any material benefit is perhaps the item of salaries to teachers which amounts to $2,798. I do not understand what services it is in the power of the agent to render to the various Indian bands. Do the Indian agents reside among them?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Some of them do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the majority do.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think so. The travelling expenses of Dr. Powell, who goes from one agency to another, are included.

Mr. O'BRIEN. One can understand that in British Columbia it is necessary to have resident agents, not so much as distributors of money, but in the capacity of magistrates to maintain order, otherwise the white population might be placed in a very embarrassing position. But we ought to look forward to the time, and that very soon, when the Indians who are now enfranchised will be ready to fully assume the privileges of British subjects. The Oka Indians in the township of Gibson manage all their affairs, and they are no further advanced than other portions of the Ojibeway tribe. I hope the time will come when the Indians will be able to manage their municipal affairs. If they are entitled to take part in party elections, surely they ought to be entitled to manage their municipal affairs.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In regard to surveys there is an increase of $2,837.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many surveys are made and how many remain to be made?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say. The First Minister explained the other day that those surveys would have to be continued perhaps two or three years more, in order to make a complete separation of the lands to the Indians from those of the Crown or private individuals.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is proper that the Indians should have their lands surveyed; but this work has been going on for about ten years, and one would imagine it would be completed. Is the land sub-divided, or is it given on the tribal principle?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When I was in British Columbia some years ago, I found that the Indians had separate holdings. I do not know under what tenure, but they had separate holdings, which appeared to be respected by the other Indians, and became the patrimony of the family. No doubt when the surveys took place, the different holdings were surveyed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the difference between the reserve commission and the survey?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The reserve commission is that to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and at its head was Mr. Sproat. I do not think the work of that commission can last long now.

Indians, Manitoba and North-West..... $850,784 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the First Minister should be in the House while this item is being discussed. It will be understood, if we waive his presence here, that if we have occasion to discuss an item on concurrence, we will be able to discuss the whole question in connection with it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does a decrease of $16,420 arise in the annuities?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The estimated decrease in the amount required to pay annuities to Indians in Manitoba and the North-West, is caused by the decrease in the Indian population of the Territory, consequent on many of the Indians having elected to become half-breeds. The estimate for 1886-87 was based upon the pay sheet of 1885, and at the time of the payment many of the Indians were scattered over the plains.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They will come back and claim the annuities, you may be sure.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Many of them have declared themselves half-breeds, and therefore have ceased to be considered as Indians, and that being the case, they do not receive the annuities.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand that in the judgment of the Department, the Indian population entitled to receive annuities is likely to be stationary, perhaps to decrease?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Department seems to believe, not that the Indian population is decreasing, but that a portion of those people that were considered as Indians have declared themselves to be half-breeds.

Mr. McLELAN. In some families, some elect to be called Indians and receive the annuity, while other members of the family take scrip as half breeds. The accountant mentioned, some two or three months ago, that in one district about 1,600 had gone off the list as Indians and had taken scrip as half-breeds.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I may say that while in the North-West, I enquired of many who were familiar with the subject—those who took the census and others who lived among the Indians—and their impression was that the Indian population, contrary to the general belief, was not decreasing, and if that idea is correct—and I believe it was based on pretty accurate information—I do not think we may look for any decrease of the Indian population as affecting the question of the annuities.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this item for seed grain, $19,244, a new item?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The note I have is to the effect that of this amount $3,452 are for Manitoba and $15,792 for the North-West. Two-thirds of the sum required for Manitoba will be expended under treaty No. 5, where, owing to the rigor of the climate, the saving of seed by the Indians themselves is very difficult, if at all possible. No vote was taken for the current year. It was hoped that the harvest of 1885 would be so plentiful that not only would the Indians be able largely to provide themselves with food, but would be also able to secure seed enough for next spring's sowing.

Mr. MULOCK. It has been purchased for this year of course. Who is the agent who buys the grain and distributes it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no information on that head.

Mr. MULOCK. Last year, at the outbreak of the rebellion, there was a statement in some of the North-West papers to the effect that one of the Idian agents had supplied defective seed grain to the Indians, and when he was remonstrated with the answer he gave was that it was good enough for the Indians. This was for 1884 and the crops were a failure that year, bad seed having had its results in bad crops, starvation, discontent and all that followed. I am not saying that that statement was sustained by the facts, but there is nothing that should be more carefully looked after than supplying good seed, if we are to do anything at all towards getting the Indians to engage in husbandry.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand that this grain will be altogether purchased in the Territories.

Mr. WATSON. I think a good deal of abuse is practised in the purchase of this seed grain, and last winter when the grain was purchased for this sowing in the western part of Manitoba, there seemed to be something like a job in it. I was at Birtle and Shoal Lake about that time, and the posters were not put up at Shoal Lake until the day after the tenders were supposed to be received. The posters were printed at the Regina *Leader* office, and it was impossible that they could get there by the ordinary mail route until after the tenders were opened.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This may have been the case in one instance, but I am informed that, as a rule, the posters and advertisements give sufficient notice. I have no doubt that what the hon. gentleman says is true, since he says it is so, but it is not the general rule, by any means.

Mr. WATSON. This is a matter which should receive the serious attention of the Department, as it is not fair to the country nor to the settlers who reside in the vicinity of these reserves. In this particular case parties living along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway had sufficient notice, and they received the contracts, the result being that a higher price had to be paid than it could have been supplied at by local tenderers. The same thing, I believe, happened with regard to cattle.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice by the Auditor General's report that very high prices appear to be paid for some of this grain and seeds. I notice that over a dollar a bushel was paid for potatoes. I notice also that 348 pounds of carrot seed cost $314.80 or nearly a dollar a pound. I notice further that the sum of $5,594 was paid for freight alone on grain after paying these prices. I notice, in addition to all this, that there is $128.24 paid as commission for the purchase of these things. I think some of the prices paid deserve the attention of the committee and the Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am unable to say whether these prices are too large or too small, but I am informed that all these supplies have been purchased by tender, and after having been purchased they have to be transported to the different Indian reserves. I have no doubt a large amount of these charges is for cartage, which cannot be avoided in that country until more railways are built.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the stuff had been carted during the recent war, judging by the prices paid then, these charges might be considered somewhat reasonable; but when you consider that $5,594 were paid for carting 7,000 bushels of potatoes and 12,000 bushels of grain to the different reserves, it must have been carried a considerable distance—half way around the globe.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman divides the amount by the number of bushels, he will see that it is not excessive, and he must recollect that the distances are very great, and the means of transport very imperfect.

Mr. McMULLEN. But you must take into consideration the enormous prices that have been paid. Peas, for instance, are charged at over $2 a bushel, without the cartage, and it is well known that seed peas could be bought in Ontario for 75 cents or 80 cents a bushel.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The ordinary merchants have to pay 2 cents a pound for freight from Calgary to Fort MacLeod, and 3 cents a pound from Calgary to Edmonton.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the Blackfeet get many peas, things like these are probably given to Indians who are more advanced, and who are comparatively near. Such charges as that for potatoes, which are very easily grown and exceedingly good in the North-West, appear extravagant.

Mr. McMULLEN. Twenty-four bushels of corn cost $61 or $3 a bushel, besides the cartage.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I would call attention to another item in the same connection. For treaty No. 4, some $454.35 were spent for garden seeds and artichokes, for treaty No. 6, $705, and for treaty No. 7, $388.45; altogether some $1,500. These charges indicate either a high state of cultivation on the Indian reserves, or an immense expense for which the report of the Department gives no evidence of any return.

Mr. McLELAN. These supplies were purchased as far as possible by contract, and the hon. gentleman must bear in mind the large number of Indians there are in the North-West and Manitoba, and the distance the supplies have to be transported.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The average number of Indians on these reserves in 1885 was 20,384.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to suggest to the Minister that these supplies could be obtained much more cheaply and satisfactorily if they were to be delivered at a certain point along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and separate tenders were obtained for delivering them on the reserve. At present only some large contractors are able to furnish the supplies, and they do so at prices yielding large profits. If the plan I suggest were adopted, there would be more competition among the manufacturers and produce dealers in supplying the goods, because they could easily ascertain the rates on the railway to the particular points where they would be delivered. They are unable to judge of the cost of freighting them to the Indian reserves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know on what principle ammunition and twine are purchased for the Indians? I see a charge for 3,911 lbs. of twine at $2,136. That is nearly 60 cents a lb. for twine. What kind of twine is that which costs 60 cents a lb.? It appears to me to be utterly out of the way as a charge for such an article.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is for the nets for the Indians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a great deal more than is ordinarily paid for twine.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That may be, but I know the twine for nets is a very special twine, and costs a great deal more than the ordinary twine.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be about the same price as good thread, and that is from 60 to 90 and $1 a lb.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend here (Mr. Kirk), who knows something about fishermen's nets, says that 10 cents a lb. is the price in Nova Scotia. I should think that any article of twine which would go into the Indians' hands ought not to cost 55 cents or 60 cents per lb. I am afraid, in a good many of these items, that, although there may be nominal contracts asked for, from some cause or other, exceedingly high prices are paid for the articles which find their way into the Indians' hands. Of course there is always at such a distance great risk of abuse, and the matter should be looked into as carefully as possible. I think the hon. gentleman should ascertain something about this twine, from what my hon. friend says as to the price being 10 cents a lb.

Mr. McLELAN. I know that in the Bay of Fundy we cannot get twine for nets for 10 cents a lb.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much do you pay?

Mr. McLELAN. From 30 cents to 50 cents, according to the quality.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If you pay that in Nova Scotia, it is not so unreasonable.

Mr. WIGLE. I remember getting some twine of that kind two or three years ago, which came from Boston and cost 50 cents a pound.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Under the item of $323,590 for supplies for destitute Indians, I desire to make a few remarks, even at the expense of taking some little time of the committee. The importance of the subject not only warrants it but necessitates it. It will be remembered that two or three weeks ago the country was startled—if not this House, the country was startled—by the statements and the speech delivered by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), with reference to the management of our Indians in the North-West by the present Government. At that time the hon. gentleman now leading the House thought it was unfair that the question should have been brought forward in the absence of the First Minister who, we all regretted, was at that time unwell. I regret also that he is not in his place to-night. I would have preferred had he been here, but we have to rejoice that he is not absent on account of illness on this occasion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to say a word on this, not to take his place, but to say that I know the First Minister is desirous of meeting the statement made by the hon. member for West Huron, and, therefore, as the First Minister could not be here, as he was unwell this evening, perhaps the hon. gentleman would be kind enough to postpone the remarks he has to make on this item till a similar item comes up on the supplementary estimates, and I will mention the matter to the First Minister, so that he may be in his place when the hon. gentleman makes his remarks.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very well. The item $52,500 for industrial schools seems to be a pretty large increase. Have any new industrial schools been started?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The estimate for the maintenance of the three Indian industrial schools established at Qu'Appelle, Battleford and High River is $32,500, or an increase of only $548 over that of 1885-86; some articles of household furniture having been replaced. The increase of $20,000 over that sum is to provide for the erection of two new industrial school buildings.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What do you propose to teach these youngsters? Are they for both sexes, or only for boys?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Both.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who has charge of them? Are they in charge of any of the religious bodies?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The principal at Qu'Appelle is Father Hugonard, at High River it was Father Lacombe, but I think he wishes to be relieved of that charge. The one of Battleford is under the charge of the Rev. Mr. Clarke, Church of England.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not disposed myself to object to a very considerable increase. If you are going to do any good with the Indians, it must be through the children, in my opinion, and, if the money is well spent, I do not think the House need grudge it, but let the hon. gentleman take a note. I should like to know how many Indians of both sexes are expected to be educated at these schools. I suppose they will teach them all handicrafts?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to a school that has been lately established by a few friends of the Indians at Portage la Prairie. It might be called an industrial school and a day school both. There is a young lady there who has volunteered her services, with the assistance of some pay from friends. I believe they have some thirty Indian children attending the school. They take about two hours in the middle of the day, and the young girls are taught to cook meals for the school, they have a kitchen in connection with the school, and the provisions are furnished by friends of the Indians in the village. I believe it would be well if schools of that description in small towns, where the friends of the Indians would look after them, received some assistance from this vote. I believe it is capable of doing a great deal of good, and last winter there were three or four Indian applicants to have their children attend the public school in Portage la Prairie. I hope the Department will take note of this and give assistance to schools of this description. They can be under the supervision of the Indian agent. Mr. Ogilvie, the Indian agent, lives in the town. These, of course, are not our own Indians in a sense. They are the children of the Sioux Indians, but I believe it is a good work and ought to be encouraged.

Mr. McMULLEN. In looking over the items in connection with the Battleford industrial school, I see that 4,200 lbs. of oatmeal were supplied at a cost of $14 a barrel delivered at Battleford. That is a high price for oatmeal. It is only worth from $5 to $6 per barrel in Ontario.

Mr. BOWELL. In many of these cases, it costs from 100 to over 200 per cent. for freight.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a considerable increase in the amount of $22,445 for farm maintenance. Is there any reason for increasing the vote for farm maintenance?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In wages there is an estimated deduction of $4,582. It must be remembered that a very large proportion of the estimated deduction in wages is due to competition, not more than one-third of it being due to the reduction in the staff. Some of the farm instructors are now classed as acting agents, but their salaries remain the same and they draw rations as formerly. The food supplied by the farms cannot, therefore, be at present lessened. Other necessaries are provided, such as flour, bacon, meat and groceries. Other articles for maintenance are liberally provided for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many Indian reserves are served by this?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. All the reserves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there a farm on every reserve?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, but the farm instructor embraces a number of reserves in his district.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman give me an idea as to the receipts of these various farms collectively?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is in the annual report, and when the other statement is furnished I will get it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is an item of $92,404 for general expenses. Unhappily this item, like other Indian expenses, is swelling all the time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This sum is divided thus: Manitoba, $5,044; North-West Territories, $17,809. Of course there is an office in Winnipeg, then agents, buildings, fuel, contingencies, stationery, some printing and so on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, but although last year it was very heavy, amounting to $69,000, it has now sprung up at one bound to $92,000, and there is nearly $24,000 wanted for agents and buildings besides. Now, if $69,000 was expected to be enough last year, *non constat* that $92,000 should be wanted this year, particularly as we are told that there are a good many Indians who, as the hon. gentleman says, have elected to be half-breeds, and are therefore supposed to be outside the jurisdiction of the Department. Here is an increase of over 30 per cent.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course I could go into all the details, but it would be tedious.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, but such a large increase must be a question of policy.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The salaries for 1885-86, in round numbers, amount to $12,000, and this year to $12,447. The increase is for a forest ranger, $700, interpreter, $250; then in travelling expenses there is an increase of $1,600; inspector and agents and their travelling expenses, an increase of $1,637; rents, fuel, medicine and medical attendance, increase $1,959; increase for contingencies, stationery, printing and other items of that kind, $1,500; medical attendance and medicine, $900. The estimated increase so far is $17,809, which may be classified as follows: Salaries, $1,250; travelling expenses, $2,970; rents, $200; light and fuel, $616; horses' feed, waggons, sleighs, stoves, &c., for all the agents, $1,973.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Still, the bulk of the increase is in salaries. Is it for agents at present holding office, or have new men been appointed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These are increases in the salaries of these officers in the North-West Territories. There is an inspector appointed at $1,800; an interpreter, who was not estimated in the previous year, $900; four clerks for transfers, $2,480 altogether; a clerk at Prince Albert, $600; an agent at Battleford, $1,200. These are new officers, or increases for promotion. Then, acting agent at East Hill, $730; storeman at that place, $540; acting agent at File Hills, $730; acting agent at Assiniboine, $600; another at $900; and a clerk at $360.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there has been a good deal of correspondence, the expense of postage was $1,339, telegrams, $1,058. These are many items which appear to be extravagant amounts.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I find there are several amounts paid to persons for superintending Indians fishing, and that is scarcely necessary when the Indians are peculiarly fitted for that occupation. The Department has exercised very great liberality towards newspapers throughout the country. They have given advertisements to no less than 106 newspapers, including every newspaper that I am aware of throughout Ontario and Quebec—of course all of one political stripe. Several papers in the

Province of Quebec contain advertisements for supplies to Indians. I presume that the departmental regulations in regard to advertisements have been followed, and that the consent of the Minister has been obtained to advertisements inserted. Such an expenditure in connection with the North-West is a misappropriation of the public money. I quite admit that the Department must have a good deal of advertising to do in the North-West, but it is quite useless to advertise in such a paper as the Hull *Despatch* for potatoes and seed grain for Indians. These expenditures amount to subsidies to the newspapers to which they are paid.

North-West Mounted Police..... .....$799,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The amount of pay is for about 1,000 men, I presume ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes

Mr. MILLS. How far are the Mounted Police supplying themselves with forage, firewood and other material of that kind. I understand those sums are charged for in the Estimates, and at the same time that the police force are engaged in cutting and hauling hay and cutting and hauling wood for their own use. Are they paid for that work, or is it part of their duty ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. All those articles are obtained by tender.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I desire to direct the attention of the committee to some purchases made by the supply officer of that Department during the past year. I find that authority was given for the purchase of some forty horses at Ottawa, the first cost of which was $160 each, and when delivered at Regina $172. There were $343 not accounted for by Mr. Coleman, the party authorised to make the purchase. I find that R. R. Pringle, of Cobourg, bought 51 horses, delivered 14th April, at $160, making $8,160, and that added to this there was $116 for the stabling and care of the horses, making $8,276. Mr. Joseph Bigaouette, Quebec, purchased fifty horses at $157 each and was allowed a commission of $10 each, representing $167 for each horse. Now, it seems that they were purchasing horses in the North-West at a much lower price than they were in the east, and at the same time those which were purchased in the North-West were much better adapted for their purpose than those purchased in Ontario and Quebec. It is rather significant that when these horses were being purchased in Northumberland, an election was going on in that county, and that the horses which were purchased there cost more than those purchased in the North-West for the Mounted Police, and it is well known that horses sent to the North-West are, for some time after their arrival, inferior to those which are native to the country.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. These horses could not be obtained at that time during the trouble; they had to be purchased, and therefore they were purchased in the older Provinces. More than that, although these prices seem to be high to the hon. gentleman, these horses cost a great deal less than if we had tried to purchase them in Winnipeg or any portion of the west, by $50, $60 or $80. It may be that those horses coming from the eastern Provinces were not so good as horses which might have been purchased in the North-West if the troubles had not existed, but it was impossible to get them, and so we had to purchase them in the eastern Provinces, even if we had to pay a higher price.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). If the hon. gentleman refers to the Auditor General's report, he will find that about 120 horses were purchased in the North-West for $22,021 or about $145 each, or something like $22 less than the cost of those eastern horses laid down in the North-West, so that the hon. gentleman's statement is hardly borne out.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex).

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The horses purchased in the North-West were saddle horses, while the other were team horses, and, of course, cost more.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I notice that the Auditor General draws attention to the fact that the advances made to Messrs. Bigaouette, Coleman, Pringle and Inspector Norman have not been accounted for except in so far as a return of the horses has been made. Mr. Coleman certifies on his honor that he purchased those forty horses for the Mounted Police and so on, and the amount appears to have been paid on his own certificate and the certificate accepted by the Department—an irregularity which the Auditor General points out, and at the same time draws his attention to the fact that there was at that time a balance unaccounted for by one of the parties charged with the purchase of these horses.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course the Auditor General does his duty in noticing these things, but I am informed that since then those amounts have been paid. The reason he so reported at the time was, that he had not the vouchers in his office. Since that time they have been sent in, and I have no doubt that in the next report he will take care to state that those moneys have been paid.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). In the certificate from the comptroller attached to Mr. Coleman's account, I find it stated that he certified that the account was correct, and that $160 per horse was the price agreed to be paid to R. R. Pringle. It would appear therefore that if that was the price agreed to be paid he was to make what profit he could on them, but in addition to that I find that he is also allowed a commission of $10 per horse. It appears to me that it was an advantageous bargain to one of the parties to it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It may have been so, but the purchase of horses was very pressing at the time, and the Department made an arrangement with that gentleman for so much a head for horses to be delivered at a certain period. Most likely he has made a profit out of them, but that could not be avoided.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that while the price paid in Cobourg in April last year was $160, in the North-West some were purchased at $100, some at $115, some at $118, some at $130, some at $135, some at $140 and so on. I cannot see why so high a price should have been paid at Cobourg, unless it was from the fact that an election was going on, for no doubt those horses purchased in the North-West would answer the purpose quite as well as those purchased in Northumberland. I suppose the reason all those horses were not purchased in the North-West was because no election was going on there. It looks very much like it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will be glad to know that the orders to purchase horses at Cobourg were given after the election.

Mr. HESSON. And the hon. gentleman will find that $195 has to be paid for horses purchased this year, after being advertised all over Canada, and no election is going on. He will find also that they are paying as high as $200 or $225 for certain classes of horses. I fancy they paid less for horses last year than they are doing this year.

Mr. McMULLEN. Surely, the hon. gentleman does not mean to challenge the Auditor General's report. I do not see how he can explain that it should be necessary to buy horses in Cobourg, when they could be got for less in the North-West.

Mr. HESSON. Indian ponies.

Mr. McMULLEN. They are not Indian ponies.

Mr. SPROULE. If horses were available in the North-West last year, why are they not this year, when we find people buying them in Ontario to ship to the North-West? You cannot get anything like a decent horse for saddle or general purposes short of from $175 to $250.

Mr. WATSON. The horses which gave the best satisfaction during the troubles last year were the native horses. The Major General, in his report, recommends them in preference to Canadian horses. That being the case, whenever the Government can purchase native saddle horses for the police, they should do so. They are much better adapted for service on the plains, and much less liable to disease or death.

Mr. SPROULE. The trouble is they cannot be got.

Mr. GUNN. There were very good horses bought at Calgary last year for $125.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I do not know how well adapted the horses were which Mr. Pringle bought; but his hostler was considered a very good general purpose man during the election, in Middlesex, of my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Cameron).

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I happen to have a statement from the Calgary *Tribune* which bears out what is said on this side of the House. It is as follows:—

"The North-West Mounted Police authorities at Ottawa recently purchased a number of Canadian horses and sent them to the North-West for the use of the force. This seems like shipping coals to Newcastle, as the imported animals are not equal to the native ones for prairie use. Besides, the selection has been poor, and a number of cripples can now be seen among the new arrivals."

That is the certificate given of Mr. Pringle's horses that were rather electioneering horses for Northumberland than horses adapted for the use of the North-West Mounted Police.

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say that if that is correct, it seems strange that buyers should be purchasing horses in Ontario at an average of $150 or $160 and taking them to Winnipeg and selling them at a profit. This trade has been going on for over five years. The report of these buyers is that these horses do not do well the first year until they get accustomed to their feed, but that afterwards they do better than the native ponies, because they are larger and stronger.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no desire to question the hon. gentleman's statement, but I know that in my section horses were purchased to be taken to the north shore of Lake Superior to work on the Pacific Railway and I have no doubt that the horses the hon. gentleman refers to were taken there and not to the North-West.

Mr. SPROULE. I saw the way-bills made out for Winnipeg, and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. GUNN. The hon. gentleman is speaking of farmers' horses; we are speaking of cavalry horses.

Mr. SPROULE. The standard Government horse is about 900 lbs. weight, and from fifteen and a-half to sixteen hands high. The average weight of the general purpose horse is about the same, and a number of these as well as of the heavy breed, are being purchased to-day for the North-West.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It is known to the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Gunn) and myself that one of the officers who went to the North-West returned to Ottawa with a horse which he got there, and which he considers much better value than a horse purchased in Ontario for the same money. But I do not know that a particular example like that mentioned by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) proves anything.

Mr. SPROULE. It shows that a horse purchased in Ontario is valued more highly in the North-West.

Mr. WATSON. The horses spoken of on this side of the House are not Indian ponies at all. They are horses which come from Montana, bred from native ponies; and we have the testimony of cavalry officers that these horses are better adapted for service in the Mounted Police than any Canadian horses. I do not know that the horse brought to Ottawa and driven around here cost very much in the North-West. I think it was brought down here free of freight, and was taken up there free of cost.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I find, under the heading of books and stationery, that an appropriation is made of $200 for the officers' mess of the Mounted Police, while the appropriation for libraries is only $50. I think that the committee generally will concur in my opinion that the vote ought to be reversed. We had some strictures on the North-West Mounted Police that may to some extent arise from the want of such occupation as books will afford, and I believe that, if the $200 was appropriated for books and the $50 for the officers' mess, furnishings and conveniences, it would meet the general purposes of the force better.

Mr. McLELAN. The same book can be read fifty times.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). But the same range cannot be had for $50 that can for $200.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not detain the committee, but I will make one remark for the Minister in charge and also one for the Minister of Militia. On many occasions, as far back as 1879, I called the attention of the head of the Department to the desirability, in my opinion, of providing this force with a larger number of light field pieces, and anybody who has paid much attention to the details of actions in the North-West knows that the bad quality of the guns in the hands of the Mounted Police on one occasion might have led to rather serious disaster. I am not going to say anything more upon the matter at present, but at concurrence or when this item comes up in another shape, as I think it has to, I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Government to see that these 1,000 mounted troopers have attached to them a reasonable number of field pieces. I think that similar services in similar places in the American service have a certain proportion attached, and I should like to know if it is intended to follow the same rule, and what the Government intend to do.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are six pieces now, and two more are being obtained.

Expenses of Government in the North-West Territories $74,400 60

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is a large increase; what is the cause of it?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The increases in this consist in the following items: For printing and advertising, last year $3,000 was voted; this year $6,000 is asked. The memorandum given me is that the increase of printing is necessitated by the reprint of the ordinances of 1881 and 1883, and the printing of the Journals of Council which, for want of funds, have never been printed. Then there is a small increase of $500 for stationery, telegrams, postage and telephone. Then for roads and bridges there is an increase from $10,000 to $12,000 and the memorandum is that, as the country settles, new demands are made for the opening up and improvement of trails and the bridging of streams. Then there is an item of $1,000 to build a vault, which is found to be very much needed for the care of the books of the North-West Council. Then for maps and indexes, registry offices and so on, there is an increase of $2,000. The increase in this item is intended to cover the increased expenditure consequent upon the opening of a new registry office at Edmonton. It is thought that the

Government will find it desirable to provide the Edmonton office with a proper registry office and vault, the same as at Calgary. Then there is an addition of $500 connected with the light, fuel and stationery of the deputy sheriff's office. For light and fuel for the Council Chamber and Government House, there is an increase of $350. For clerical assistance, there is an increase of $1,900, a rather large sum. The duties devolving upon the office through the operation of some of the ordinances have rendered additional clerical assistance necessary. There are now five permanent clerks in addition to the clerk of the Council, who is paid out of the consolidated fund, and temporary clerks have to be engaged during the sessions of Council and occasionally during pressure of office work. There is an increase under the head of incidental expenses of $1,300. Under this item will be paid constables' fees and expenses in criminal matters where the services of the North-West Mounted Police cannot be procured. Such accounts have been up to this time sent to the Minister of Justice, who now suggests that they had better be paid through this office, as well as those of the proceedings for the confinement of dangerous lunatics and inquests by coroners; for caretaker and messenger, there is an increase of $800. The maintenance of insane patients is increased $500, and contingencies $1,100 These are all the items which make up the difference, in fact, they make up an increase of $14,950, but there are two decreases—$3,000, one-third the cost of the mail service in the North-West, now transferred to the Post Office Department, and $2,000 for surveys which will not take place.

To put in force the Canada Temperance Act..... $20,000 00

Mr. WILSON. I would ask the Minister to explain how this amount of expenditure takes place? As I understand it, the Government do very little to enforce the Canada Temperance Act.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We know to what extent the expenditure is borne by the Government. I think most of the cost of the elections under the Scott Act is borne by the Government.

Mr. WILSON. Am I to understand that this expenditure is merely in connection with the elections, and not with enforcing the Act after it is carried?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We have nothing to do with the working of the Act itself. We attend to the elections, and pay the expenses. I cannot say it is money wasted, but I know that it is spent in pretty large quantities.

Mr. WILSON. I did not pretend to say the money was wasted, but I felt it was the duty of this Government to try and see that the Act they submitted to the people should be enforced by the Government.

Mr. McLELAN. On page 511, the hon. gentleman will see that $28,242 were paid last year for elections in connection with the Canada Temperance Act.

Payment of Mr. Fabre's salary and contingencies, $3,500 00

Mr. WILSON. The First Minister promised us last year a report as to the working of this department in France. Has that been brought down?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Last year a voluminous report was laid before the House and is in the blue-book. This year, Mr. Fabre has made another very valuable report, which has been sent to the Department of Agriculture and will be published.

Expedition by water to Hudson Bay..... $10,000 00

Mr. WATSON. How is this reduction caused?

Mr. FOSTER. It arises from the fact that there is an unexpended balance, it is an old vote.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Mr. McLELAN. Previous to this $100,000 were voted.

Mr. WATSON. I believe, along with others in the North-West, that the vessel in use for this purpose is not fitted to test the navigation of Hudson Bay and Straits. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated the other day that this vessel was sent more for the purpose of testing the navigation of Hudson Straits than to take provisions to the stations around the bay, and she was supposed to make annual reports as to the flow of ice, &c. Now I think that vessel is but litte more than a sailing vessel. I am informed she is only of forty horse power, and the engine simply acts as an auxiliary in some cases. If that is the case, she surely cannot make a practical test of the navigability of Hudson Straits. If the money is not all expended that was voted last year, I think the Government ought to employ a better vessel for this purpose. I believe, along with many in the North-West, that the importance of the North-West to this country depends largely on the feasibility of the navigation of Hudson Bay, and it is not right that the Government should claim that a vessel of only forty horse power is suitable to test that navigation. She can be little better than an ordinary sailing vessel that has to go with wind and tide, and if she gets into an ice floe, has to stay there for days. There cannot be power enough in the vessel to keep out of the ice in case of a high wind. I believe a powerful vessel ought to be put on for the purpose of making these explorations so that such results may be obtained as can be relied upon.

Mr. FOSTER. It is true that the nominal horse-power of the *Alert* is about fifty, but that does not give the rate of power that she really has. On account of the build of the vessel and the peculiar construction of the engine, she is really, when her full power is on, as I am informed, equal to a horse-power of from 250 to 300. She is a very substantially built vessel, and, when burning five or six tons of coal daily, she has a speed of from eight to nine knots per hour; of course there are times when a vessel, no matter what may be the power of her engine, or her speed, cannot make her way through the ice, especially ice as it is in the spring, when she first makes the attempt. If the ice was young ice it could be cut through by a powerful vessel fitted for that purpose, but when you get a vessel in ice ten to twenty feet thick no vessel on earth can get through it.

Mr. WATSON. I understand that, but I know a little about engines and engineering, and I know that no engine of a nominal horse power of forty, can run up to 250 or 300. That is impossible, and I do not think it is the case. If it was the case, and she uses six tons of coal daily, and I understand the vessel is only capable of carrying 275 tons of coal, she would only have coal to run forty or forty-five days, and that is not sufficient. It appears to me that the Government, to a certain extent, are trifling with the explorations that are supposed to be made, and as the interests of the North-West largely depend on the opening up of that route, the Government ought to place some more substantial vessel in order to make a thorough test. We know that this report has been made for three years. If this small vessel is not successful for the first three years, it will go to the world that this navigation is not feasible, which would be a great injury to the North-West and therefore to the Dominion.

Mr. McLELAN. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman finding fault with this vessel when she has been used and tested by the British Government and found so well fitted for the service of ice navigation that she was loaned to the American Government and used by them for that purpose. Lieutenant Gordon, who had command of her last year, says she was very well fitted for that service. If the hon. gentleman wished to injure the Hudson Bay route, and injure the interests the North-West has in it, he has taken

the very best means to do so by spreading the report that we have not a vessel fitted for the purpose of testing the navigation of Hudson Bay and Straits. We are doing the best that can be done, and taking the means recommended by scientific men to ascertain whether that route is practicable for commercial purposes, and I do not think the hon. gentleman is serving the country or serving that route, in making the remarks he has made.

Mr. WATSON. I have read the reports made by Lieutenant Gordon, and I should judge from them, and from his experience, that the vessel is not of sufficient power to make a suitable test. A vessel with only forty or fifty nominal horse power is not fit to make a thorough test, when ship engines of thousands of horse power are built. The idea seems to be absurd. I am only expressing what is said by people generally in Manitoba, and I feel I am here to express the views those people entertain. They have read the reports of Lieutenant Gordon for the last two years, and they feel that those reports are not so satisfactory and not so good as they might be if proper appliances were used.

Commercial Agencies..... $10,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has this amount been expended?

Mr. McLELAN. It was not expended last year, but it is the intention to arrange for the use of it during the present year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How?

Mr. McLELAN. It is proposed to establish agencies at points with which trade can be cultivated, and to send out gentlemen acquainted with the capabilities of this country to cultivate trade abroad.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What points have been selected?

Mr. McLELAN. No points have been positively selected by the Government. It is believed, however, that Australia is a suitable point, that another point will be in the West Indies and another South America; and it is proposed to employ some of the persons who may be in England during the Exposition to make their special business to cultivate trade and ascertain if trade can be opened up with the various colonies of the Empire, which will have representatives in London.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If this matter is attended to properly it is an experiment that should be tried. Situated as we are in Canada, if we hope to develop our foreign trade some means such as this should be adopted, employing the right men and not going into the scheme too extensively. It is well worth while making the test with Mexico and the British Colonies.

Model Farm..... $20,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the Minister decided where he is going to spend this money.

Mr. CARLING. No place has been selected yet.

Intercolonial Railway..... $2,400,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What deficit, if any, is to be expected this year?

Mr. McLELAN. The account stands something better than it did last year. There was a small deficit last year, but for the nine months covered by the last statement the balance was more favorable than for the same period last year, and it is hoped there will be no deficit in the present year.

Canals..... $460,000 00

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). In regard to the Williamsburg Canal is a man named Pollock now employed as superintendent of the masonry work? Is he at present employed on the canal? I am given to understand that he has been discharged and that another superintendent of mason work has been employed. My desire is to ascertain the reason.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think that is the case. Now that the hon. gentleman mentions the matter I remember hearing something about it. Mr. Pollock was in the employment of the Government, on some of the other canals, by the day, and when his time expired he was not re-employed. He was not employed at the Williamsburg Canal. That is my impression, but I do not of course give it as a positive statement.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 11.58 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 31st May, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CHIPPEWA INDIANS.

Mr. COOK asked, Have any petitions been received by the Government from the Chippewa Indians? If so, what has been done by the Government with regard to them? What wrongs do the Indians complain of? And what steps have been taken by the Government to have these wrongs redressed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The complaints made by the Chippewa Indians of recent date received by the Department are as follows: 1. The Chippewas of Nawash and Cape Croker complain that lands purchased by settlers in the Saugeen Peninsula have not been paid for; also that timber is being cut in trespass on these lands. The settlers have been notified to pay up arrears, and proceedings have been taken against trespassers on the timber. 2. The Chippewas of Saugeen complain that they have sustained loss in their fisheries through sawdust and slabs from mills being cast into the River Sable; also from white fishermen being granted licenses for part of the Sable Beach. The attention of the Department of Fisheries has been called to these matters. 3. The Chippewas of the Thames complain that the managers of the Mount Elgin Industrial Indian Institution have fenced in part of a road allowance on the reserve. The Indian agent and the inspector of Indian agencies have been instructed to look into this matter at an early date.

Mr. COOK. What about the Christian Island Indians?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The answer sent to me does not cover the case of the Christian Island Indians.

QUARANTINE REGULATIONS.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether the Government have received the following resolution adopted by the Board of Health of the city of Quebec:—

"That the steamship *Parisian* of the Allan line, on her last trip from Europe to Canada, brought to port a person suffering from small-pox. It is said that the port physician of Quebec did not only not force the steamer to return to Grosse Isle quarantine, but allowed the patient to land at Quebec and allowed the other passengers coming off the infected steamer to continue their route to Montreal, &c, without submitting them to the necessary disinfection, greatly to the detriment of the inhabitants of Quebec and Montreal. That it is Resolved, that this Com-

mission protest against the conduct of the Medical Inspector of the Port of Quebec, and that a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the Ministers of Marine and Agriculture, and praying that immediate steps be taken to enforce quarantine regulations, so that the public health may be protected. A copy of the above resolutions have also been sent to the Hon. Messieurs Laurier, McGreevy and Bossé, the three members for Quebec."

And is it their intention to take any and what steps to remedy that state of things, and prevent a recurrence of such acts of negligence?

Mr. CARLING. The Government did receive the resolution referred to in the question which has been put by the hon. member, and has caused an enquiry to be made into the allegations contained therein. It does not appear that any case of small-pox has been landed at Quebec, but simply a mild case of chicken-pox, which was not of such a nature as to give rise to any danger of contagion, and for which it would not have been proper to cause the return of the *Parisian*, with her numerous passengers, to Grosse Isle. The statement in the resolution that the ship proceeded on her voyage to Montreal without any of the necessary processes of disinfection is incorrect, as the part of the steamship where the lady was isolated so soon as the eruption on her face appeared was thoroughly disinfected, and, for special precaution, all the persons who came in contact with her were vaccinated. As respects the last clause in the question of the hon. gentleman, it is the intention thoroughly to carry into effect the quarantine regulations. In view of the pointed attack upon Dr. Rowand, the inspecting physician of the port of Quebec, contained in the resolution read before the House by the hon. member, it is considered to be due to justice to read Dr. Rowand's report in reply:—

"QUEBEC, 27th May, 1886.

"SIR,—In accordance with a request conveyed in a departmental letter of the 24th inst., I beg to state for the information of the Department that the statement contained in the copy of the Report of the 'Bureau Local de Santé,' which you were pleased to enclose with your communication, is devoid of foundation. The *Parisian* on her last trip from Europe to Canada did not bring to this port a person suffering from small-pox.

"The case of supposed variola was a form of chicken-pox. It began to appear on the face of a saloon passenger, Miss Dunn, of Quebec, as the steamship was approaching Rimouski, without any premonitory symptoms. The ship's doctor, Dr. Neville, an able and intelligent physician, considered it a case of measles, and desired the young lady to keep her room, and not to go to the table for dinner. The steamer arrived here late at night on the 15th inst. Before 6 a.m. the following day the ship's doctor and I saw the patient together. I considered it a form of chicken-pox, and I am still of the same opinion. The eruption was slight, pimples wide apart, and though quite recent were beginning to dry up already, which is not the character of variola.

"Although satisfied in my own mind that the case was one of chicken-pox, I ordered the lady's removal home as soon as possible, before the passengers were awake and moving about. She was well covered. She stepped at once into her father's private carriage and was driven home, accompanied by her family physician. Her father's house is separated and isolated, and none better adapted for an infectious case. She was placed at the top flat of this house.

"I have paid the young lady several visits, in order to watch the progress of the case. Four or five dozen of pimples have appeared altogether upon her face and body, getting quickly dry, and easily rubbed off, so much so that before the end of the week of eruption they had all disappeared, and this day she is perfectly well, without a scar, and no trace except an indication that some pimple had been here and there. If it had been variola it would have been at its height and greatest danger now.

"Without arrogating to myself any very extraordinary merit, I think I can in justice say that I am well acquainted with the disease of small-pox. I have always taken charge of the small-pox sheds at the Marine and Immigrant Hospital, of which I am the senior physician, with the view of further studying the malady, and I have had previous opportunities of doing so at Edinburgh, where I graduated, and in London, Paris, and Dublin. Had I mistaken the malady and ordered the steamer and passengers to return to Grosse Isle, and the facts resulted as they have in Miss Dunn's case, I would then have to acknowledge a gross error of judgment on my part; but the course I adopted, I am happy to inform the Department, was the correct one, and the facts connected with Miss Dunn's case show conclusively that she was not suffering from small-pox, and that she has not been a victim to variola.

"I desire to draw the attention of the Department to the fact that the Dr. Park mentioned in the report of the 'Bureau Local de Santé' is the same medical gentleman who accompanied Miss Dunn to her home from the steamer, and who left the steamer with her.

"It is a remarkably strange thing that this health officer, charged with public duty, should, if he were convinced that the case was one of small-pox, have allowed this lady to land, without remonstrance of any kind, or any intimation that the vessel and her passengers should be ordered to quarantine.

"I hope that the explanations which I have given will prove satisfactory.

"I have the honor to be, Sir, your most obedient servant,

(Signed) "A. ROWAND, M.D. &c.,

"*Inspecting Physician, Port of Quebec.*

"To the Honorable
"The Minister of Agriculture,
Ottawa."

COLLISION BETWEEN *LA CANADIENNE* AND *ALLIANCE*.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) asked, is it true that, on the 20th May, 1884, a collision took place in the port of Gaspé between the Government steamer *La Canadienne*, commanded by Captain Ludger Bolduc, and the brigantine *Alliance*, of Jersey? Is it true that, in consequence of such collision, an enquiry was instituted by the Government, and conducted by Captain P. A. Scott, of the Royal Navy? Is it true that, at the said enquiry, Captain Scott did not receive the evidence of Commander Wakeham, for the reasons mentioned in the following letter:—

"BOARD OF EXAMINERS OF MASTERS AND MATES,
"HALIFAX, 16th July, 1884.

"SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 12th instant, asking why Commander Wakeham's evidence was not taken at the enquiry into the collision between the Canadian Government steamer *La Canadienne* and the *Alliance*, I would say that Commander Wakeham informed me he was not on deck when the accident occurred, nor was he there after *La Canadienne* rounded the lightship. But he did say to me he saw a light which he afterwards supposed might have been that of the *Alliance*, and knew nothing further of the matter. As he was not present after rounding the lightship, his evidence was not taken.

"I am, &c.,

(Signed) "P. A. SCOTT,

"*Chairman of Commission.*

"The Deputy Minister of Marine."

Is it true that Captain Bolduc was dismissed on the 27th May, 1884, and that, on the 17th June following, Commander Wakeham was asked to give evidence which he had not given at the enquiry, and which he gave on the 27th June, out of the presence of the accused, in a simple letter which does not even bear the form of a statutory declaration? Is it true that Captain Bolduc has unceasingly demanded a fresh enquiry, in order to justify himself against the charge of negligence imputed against him in evidence given subsequently to the enquiry? Is it the intention of the Government to grant the enquiry demanded by Captain Bolduc in the following letter:—

"QUEBEC, 7th July, 1884.

"WM. SMITH, Esq.,
"Dep. Minister of Marine,
Ottawa.

"SIR,—I have received your letter of the 3rd July, informing me that no decision had been made to hold a second investigation, and that information had reached the Department that the light of the *Alliance* was seen from the deck of *La Canadienne* fifteen minutes before the accident took place. I expect that this information comes from people who would not like to see another investigation held. Further, if the light was seen, the chief officer was in charge of the look-out and was directing the wheel until a moment before the accident, and he left the bridge without notifying me. I am certain that if a proper investigation was held, as allowed to a captain of the merchant service, if the *La Canadienne* was found in fault for not having seen the light, the blame would not fall on me.

"Your humble servant,
(Signed) "LUDGER BOLDUC."

Mr. FOSTER. In answer to the first question, yes. In answer to the second question, it is true that Capt. Bolduc was dismissed on the 27th May, 1884, and that, on the 17th June following, Commander Wakeham was asked to give evidence which he had not given at the enquiry, and which he gave on the 27th June. This evidence, however, was

not considered material to the case. In answer to the third question, yes. In answer to the fourth question, if it appears to the Government that essentially new and important evidence is possible, a new enquiry may be granted.

GERMAN REPRESENTATION IN THE SENATE.

Mr. KRANZ asked, Whether the Government have considered the fact that each senator for Ontario represents, on an average, 80,000 souls, according to the last census, and that there were then over 200,000 Germans in that Province? If so, is it their intention to grant one or more representatives in the Senate to the German minority in Ontario?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government is fully aware of the value and the number of Germans settled in Ontario. Of course, I must give the same answer as I did before. The Government cannot properly state here the advice that they will tender to His Excellency on the point.

POSTMASTER AT FAIRFIELD.

Mr. WELDON asked, Has James A. Floyd been removed from the position of Postmaster at Fairfield, county of St. John, N.B.? If so, at what time, and for what reason? Has any person been appointed in his place, and at what time.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Floyd was removed from the position, and Mr. David Campbell has been appointed in his place. The change was made on account of the removal of offices to a more convenient place. The Inspector's report of the transfer of offices has not yet been received, and therefore the exact date cannot be given.

DISTRIBUTION OF MEDALS.

Mr. TASSÉ (for Mr. Royal) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to grant North-West rebellion medals to persons other than military men, having done duty as war correspondents during the campaign of spring of 1885?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to my hon. friend, I may say that it is not the intention of the Government to grant medals to persons other than military men, who have been engaged during the campaign of spring of 1885?

OUTRAGES IN ORANGEVILLE AND CLANDEBOYE.

Mr. McCRANEY asked, In view of the partial blowing up, on two occasions, of the house and business place of the police magistrate under the Scott Act, at Orangeville; the destruction of the house and office of the inspector at Clandeboye, North Middlesex, the burning of barns and other overt acts elsewhere; is it the intention of the Government to offer a suitable reward for the discovery of the offenders?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question involves a statement of matters of fact with which the House is charged. Therefore the question is irregular; but I would say that if the facts stated in the question are facts, it is the duty of the Government of the Province to attend to the punishment of the parties, and, if they think proper, to offer a suitable reward.

H. J. BEEMER—CLAIMS AGAINST GOVERNMENT.

Mr. KIRK asked, What was the amount of Mr. H. J. Beemer's first claim made against the Government for extras in connection with his contract for building the Dufferin gate at Quebec? When was the claim presented to the Government? When was it paid? Did he make any further claim? If so, when? And what was the amount thereof, and how much was paid him on such account?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This question was put to the Minister of Public Works two years ago by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), but, nevertheless, I have no objection to answer it again. There was only one claim made against the Government by Mr. Beemer; it was for the amount of $16,220.94. The claim was presented on the 12th November, 1879, and it was the claim of the previous contractor to whom Mr. Beemer succeeded on the 8th October, 1879. The balance of his contract was paid in October, 1883; this was $4,998.08. His claim of $16,220.94 was reported upon by the Chief Architect of the Department in February, 1884. An Order in Council was passed accordingly on the 25th February, 1884, by which the Government agreed to pay to Mr. Beemer $5,000 in full of his claim of $16,220.94, and the money was paid as above mentioned, that is to say, $5,000 in full of $16,000, on the 24th April, 1884, Parliament having voted the amount by the Supply Act, sanctioned on the 19th April, 1884.

HECTOR FABRE—AGENT AT PARIS.

Mr. COURSOL (for Mr. DESJARDINS) asked, Have the Government received, this year, a report from Mr. Hector Fabre, Canadian agent, at Paris; and if so, is it their intention to lay the same before Parliament?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I beg to state, in the absence of the Secretary of State, that the report from Mr. Fabre has been received this year, and it is the intention to lay it before Parliament.

FRENCH IMMIGRATION.

Mr. COURSOL (for Mr. DESJARDINS) asked, Have the Government appointed any person to carry on in France the work of Rev. M. Labelle in behalf of emigration? If so, is the appointment a permanent or a temporary one? Are the Government in possession of correspondence or reports as to the nature and progress of such work; and if so, is it their intention to lay such correspondence and reports before Parliament?

Mr. CARLING. The Government have temporarily employed Mr. E. Agostini, a member of the delegation who came out with Father Labelle. He has made a report, which will be printed and laid before Parliament.

BOUNTY ON PIG IRON.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the bounty of one dollar and fifty cents per ton on pig iron manufactured in Canada from Canadian ore, authorised to be granted until the 30th day of June, 1886, by the Act 46th Victoria, chapter 14, may continue to be granted by the Governor in Council until the 30th day of June, 1889; and that a bounty of one dollar per ton on pig iron so manufactured may, in the manner by the said Act provided, be granted between the 1st day of July, 1889, and the 30th day of June, 1891; and that the provisions of the Act above cited shall apply to the bounties which the Governor in Council is hereby empowered to grant.

Mr. BLAKE. To-morrow.

Mr. McLELAN. I had hoped that, this having been given notice of so early, it might have been allowed to go on to-day.

Mr. BLAKE. We have been in Session now three months. I am sorry the hon. gentleman was not able to make up his mind to that a little earlier.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman can give me the information now, well and good; if not, I will ask him to do so to-morrow—what amount of money

has been paid under this Statute up to date; what grants have been made or bounties paid?

Mr. McLELAN. I can give that to-morrow if we are not going on with it to-day.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That the further consideration of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 25) respecting the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company be transferred to Government Orders.

Mr. MULOCK. The Government have chosen to father this motion, but as yet they have not offered any reason why they should take the course they have chosen to adopt. It has been pointed out already during the debate upon this measure that a very extraordinary course was adopted in dealing with this Bill. It has been shown that, whether by accident or otherwise—and I am not, of course, able to say, but I must assume it was by accident—this Bill did not receive the treatment that such Bills generally do receive. It has been shown by admissions here that this Bill, when before the Railway Committee, was hurried through, and that the facts that ought to have been investigated were not investigated. It was submitted to the committee about five minutes before the hour for adjourning, and was, I may say, forced through the committee without consideration at all. The committee has never discharged its duties in regard to this Bill. The committee has never investigated the evidence on which this amendment is asked. The House has not the facilities for taking the evidence that is necessary and that, I think, should be taken before the amendment proposed by the Senate is concurred in by this House. There are grave questions of fact involved in this amendment. How does the hon. Minister, or the Government, or whoever advocates this course, propose to investigate the facts, a knowledge of which should precede a judgment. We have no evidence whatever on the matter. The House of Commons took no evidence on this point. The amendment originated with the Senate, not in this House. The Senate chooses to amend a Bill, alleging in their amendment a certain state of facts. What evidence did they proceed upon in investigating those facts? Had they that evidence which they ought to have had? They choose to allege in their amendment an understanding between the Government and this railway company. How did they come to know about that understanding? Did the Government inform them about that understanding? If the Governm nt informed them about that understanding, why did they not inform this House that there was such an understanding? When this Bill was before this House for hours, not a single member of the Government ventured to tell the House that there existed such an understanding as is alleged in the Senate amendments. The Government proposes that this House, without an enquiry, shall adopt the recitals set forth in the Senate amendment as a foundation for coming to a conclusion. I intend to move an amendment referring this matter to the Railway Committee. If that is concurred in, of course I have nothing further to say on this motion, but if it is not, of course I must discuss what it is proposed to refer to this House. The Senate amendment recites as follows:—

"Whereas, by the contract between Her Majesty the Queen and the Company set forth in Schedule B hereto, it is agreed that in the event therein stated the Parliament of Canada may cancel the lease therein mentioned and take over the portion of the said railway between Gravenhurst and Callander free from encumbrance, upon assumption of the bond or debenture debts of the Company to the amount of eight thousand dollars per mile of that section of the railway, and upon payment of any further sum of money beyond the said bond or debenture debt of eight thousand dollars per mile and the subsidy paid to the said Company, as the said railway may then be worth the value to be ascertained in manner therein provided:

"And whereas, in arriving at the said agreement the Government assumed that the expenditure of the Company in respect of the said section of its undertaking would not exceed twenty thousand dollars per mile; but the said railway being now nearly constructed, it appears that the expenditure will greatly exceed such sum, and it is expedient to provide that the right of Parliament to take over the said railway should, subject to the proviso hereinafter stated, be upon assumption of the bond or debenture debt of the Company, not exceeding twenty thousand dollars per mile of that section of the railway, instead of upon assumption of eight thousand dollars per mile of that section."

How did the Senate learn what the Government understood in 1884 when they entered into that agreement? If the Government so understood it, why did not the Government so inform this House when it was dealing with the question? Was it an after discovery, or in what form was the understanding of the Government, which is sought to be used as a lever for changing this agreement, communicated to the Senate? Was it through a member of the Government? I understand that there is only one member of the Government in the Senate. Was he the medium to convey to that body the understanding of the Government at that time? If not, was it communicated by writing, or how did the Government communicate that understanding? More, I ask what record there is of that understanding. The only apparent record is the sealed agreement. Is that the way this Government draws its bargains, its contracts, that it is going to wipe out agreements involving millions by some hazy understanding of what the Government may have thought when they entered into that agreement? I submit that contracts affecting the property rights and privileges of the people of Canada which are entered into under Order in Council, which receive the sanction of the Governor in Council, which are surrrounded by all the solemnities and formalities necessary to a contract, cannot be wiped out by a mere hazy statement to another body that the Goverment meant something very different when they entered into that agreement. What would we think of a private individual who came into court and asked to have a contract set aside because he thought differently, without assigning that there was a mistake or that there was any error, but simply saying he contemplated something different? If it was understood at that time that the right to bond this road should depend on the cost of the road, that would have been the agreement, and I submit that the agreement then entered into is the only agreement, that there was no such an understanding, that no record of such an understanding can be brought to light, or, if it can be brought to light, it is too late, after the company has received $1,320,000, which it has received on the faith of that agreement. The company themselves never asserted the existence of such an understanding in addition to the agreement. They received the money on their agreement, upon a contract set forth in that agreement. In no way whatever did they ever seek to protect themselves against the language of that agreement, at any stage in their negotiations with the Government. Since this matter was before the House, I have received what seems to me important information in regard to this matter. The Government seek to vary this agreement on the ground that the expenditure made by the company exceeds $20,000 a mile. I believe that is the ground on which they say they are justified in allowing this agreement to be varied. First of all, that was not the ground taken. First of all, the ground taken was what this road had cost, I do not know to whom, to a company or to whom, but what it had cost. But latterly we find the Government taking this ground that, whatever the expenditure has been upon that line, I suppose by the company with its contractors, to that extent at least this Government and this House ought to postpone the Government's right. That,

I think, is the position the Government takes. I submit that is not the test of the value of this road, that we are not justified in postponing our lien except on the terms of the agreement, which are to the effect that the value of the road is to be ascertained at a certain time, and that when the country chooses to take over that road it can do so at its then value, less the bonus the country has given to it. That is the position the agreement puts us in. Now, the Government say that that ought not to be the position, because the company has paid out more money than they ought to have done. To whom has it paid that money? Has the money it has paid out gone into the building of this road? I state, Mr. Speaker, that I have received information which I consider reliable; it comes from a sub-contractor; it is information that I think the Government is bound to investigate before it assumes that the cost of this road is the amount paid by the railway to these original contractors. I understand that in the process of the construction of this road a contract was entered into, as set forth in the memorandum distributed amongst the members the other day, and that these contractors sub-let the greater part of that work at prices far less than those they received from the company. If so, the prices that the sub-contractors were paid indicate the real amount of money expended in the construction of this road, and if to-morrow there was an arbitration to ascertain the value of this road, the question would be: How much was actually paid for the work done and the material supplied in the construction of the railway? That would be the issue, and we would then take into consideration the shave made by the original contractors. Now, I have received such information. It may not be correct, but I submit it is the duty of the House to investigate the state of the facts before dispensing with the taking of evidence and coming to a conclusion. I have information that the railway company issued a contract as set forth, and that the contract provided for the doing of the work, not at so much per mile, but by piecework. I have been furnished the following figures at which the company gave the contract to the contractors, and those at which the work was sub-let, viz.: That the earth work was let at 28 cents per cubic yard, and sub-let at 20 cents per cubic yard; that the rock work was let at $1.80 per yard, and sub-let at $1.30 per yard; that the pile driving was let at 40 cents per foot, and sub-let at 25 cents; that the grubbing was let at $200 per acre, and sub-let at $100; that the timber for trestles and culverts was contracted at $30 per thousand, and sub-contracted for at figures varying from $18 to $20; that the taking out of the foundation for the bridges and the culverts was let at $1 per yard, and sub-let at 30 cents per yard. Those figures are furnished to me, not by the sub-contractor himself, but by a person who knows this sub-contractor, who handed them to him, and assured him that they were absolutely reliable. When he gave them to me I asked him again to see the sub-contractor and be perfectly sure there was no mistake about it, and he came the second time and told me that these figures were absolutely reliable so far as his informant was concerned, and that his informant was a reliable person and thoroughly trustworthy. Under these circumstances, I submit that it is my duty to inform this House that if this is the kind of test of the value of the work, that value must be ascertained, not by the nominal price at which the work was let out, but by something like the real price which the men who really did the work contracted for. Now, does it not seem eminently proper, under the circumstances, that this state of fact should be enquired into before we proceed further, if it is necessary to proceed. If the Government say there is not time to refer it to the Railway Committee, there is one way by which they can proceed. A great deal of this matter will rest upon documentary evidence. I presume there is a written contract between the railway company and the contractor. There cannot be much difficulty in laying that before the House. I presume there are sub-contracts, and there can be no difficulty, no practical difficulty whatever, in all these documents being forthcoming before the House is asked to concur in these amendments. If the excuse that there is no time to refer it to the Railway Committee prevails, certainly there can be no excuse for saying that the documents should not be laid before the House before we come to a decision. For these reasons, I beg to move an amendment: That said amendment be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The speech of my hon. friend would have been more relevant if it had been made after this motion was carried. The motion is that these amendments made by the Senate should be put upon the Government Orders, so that it might be fully discussed. The House will remember the circumstances. There was only one hour allowed for private Bills by the rules, and when this was discussed, your attention was called to the fact that the hour had expired, and therefore the debate was not concluded. Therefore, considering the importance of this railway to the trade of Toronto and the western peninsula generally, that this Bill, although nominally a private Bill, was of so much importance to the general trade of Ontario, I thought, and still think, that the whole matter ought to be fully discussed, and in order to do so it must be put upon the Government Orders of the Day, otherwise it must be thrown over for this Session, and the request of the company contained in these amendments, could not, of course, be complied with, and the company will be, in fact, without funds to complete the road as it ought to be completed. They cannot raise funds to complete that great link between the Ontario trade and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it cannot be made perfect unless the relief that is asked for be granted. I propose that the hon. gentleman should allow this resolution to pass, that the amendment be put upon the Government Orders, so that the discussion can go on and be completed. Those who are in favor of the proposition will support it, as I will be prepared to support it, on the ground of public utility and of its great advantage to that part of Ontario; and those hon. gentlemen agreeing with my hon. friend will have an opportunity of discussing the matter when it is brought up as one of the Government Orders.

Mr. COCKBURN. I had an opportunity of observing some of the operations with respect to the construction of this road, and I think it proper to state what my impressions are with regard to it. I do not profess to know much about the cost of building railways, but I can say this, that the road is an excellent one. Of course, we expect that the contractors will have a margin over what they pay to the sub-contractors. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has spoken about a margin between what the sub-contractors and contractors are receiving; but I know from my own personal knowledge that a large amount of work has been performed by the contractors themselves and that a large portion of it could not be sublet, and further, that a large portion remains yet to be done. Not only have the contractors done much of this work, but the company itself has been doing part of it, and is doing work still. I had an opportunity of observing the management and the mode of conducting the work, and I have a strong impression that it has been conducted in a very business-like manner. I do not think the manager of the Pacific Junction could have been in collusion in any way with the contractors; on the contrary, I am of opinion that they have been dealing very honestly with each other, and I do not know of any grounds for suspecting collusion. I know from personal knowledge that a considerable amount of money will be required for sidings and curves to make connection

with the different waters which will be tributary to the line. I, therefore, think it desirable that the company should have sufficient means to complete the road and equip it as a first-class work. It is very difficult for anyone here to judge just how much money the company will require; they must be the best judges themselves. I am, however, aware that a very considerable amount will yet be needed to finish the road, provide equipment, make the sidings and water communications. I make these remarks from my personal observations of the work. I say that it is an excellent work, that it has been conducted in a very business-like way, and also very expeditiously, and I do not see any ground for supposing that collusion has existed between the company and the contractors. I think that Mr. Barker has watched the contractors' accounts very closely in the interests of the company. I repeat that it is desirable that the company should have ample means to complete the road properly and equip it as a first-class road, and this is desirable in the public interest.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think anyone disputes the necessity for the road, or its desirability. The country has willingly given $12,000 a mile toward its construction, and the argument of the hon. gentleman who has last spoken does not touch the merits of the question now involved. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has put forward certain reasons why the Bill should not receive the support of the House. I agree with him to a very considerable extent as to the objections which he has presented from a public standpoint. But the First Minister has put the case very fairly. He has said it is not desirable to discuss the question simply at a preliminary stage, and he has made the suggestion that the hon. gentleman should withdraw his motion in order that there may be a full discussion when the item appears among Government Orders. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman will be guided at all by any suggestion I may make, but I think it will be well to accept the suggestion of the First Minister, and let the subject be discussed when it is fairly up before the House on its merits, not upon a motion such as this.

Mr. MULOCK. It is perfectly clear to everyone that the suggestion of the First Minister does not meet the case. The suggestion amounts to this, that the facts shall not be enquired into, because the House has no facilities for enquiring into the facts. Supposing it should turn out that this road cost $1,000,000 less than it is allowed to be bonded for, would it be right to postpone our claim for that amount?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the hon. gentleman quite understood me. My idea was that the motion to refer to the Railway Committee should be made after this item is made a Government Order.

Mr. MULOCK. After the motion is carried, when can I make such a motion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This will be put upon the Orders of the Day, and, when it is called, the discussion can go on where it was prematurely closed the other night.

Mr. MULOCK. We do not know when the Government may take an Order up. This may be brought up at a late hour, when there are very few members present. I cannot consent to the proposition, unless the First Minister will say when he will bring up the motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are not so many Government measures on the paper as to cause the hon. member inconvenience. I have no doubt, from his well-known attention to the business of the House, that he will be present when the matter is brought up.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is all very well, but I hope we shall not be here very much longer, and the Order might be called at an unholy hour of the morning, when the hon. gentleman, notwithstanding his devotion to public duties—and he is a very constant member of the House—and those opposed to the proposal, might not be present. I would suggest to the First Minister that it would facilitate business to make an arrangement to take it up at some certain time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As soon as the Franchise Bill is through I will be ready to bring it up.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand that the motion to place it on the Government Orders will now be considered carried, and it will be placed on the Government Orders of the Day; and that the Franchise Bill will be proceeded with, and, so soon as it is disposed of, the next Order will be this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Amendment withdrawn, and motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

Order for third reading of Bill (No. 138) respecting the Electoral Franchise, &c., read.

Mr. THOMPSON. When the Franchise Bill was before the House in committee, the fact was mentioned that it might be necessary to revise two or three of the sections before reading the Bill the third time; and to give greater facility for that, I move that the present Order be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of reconsidering the same.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman, before making such a motion as that at this stage of the Session, and with reference to such a Bill as this, should state, while the Speaker is in the Chair, what the general nature of these proposals are, for, if it is to go back into committee at large in this way, it is possible we may hear of serious amendments in all quarters. If it is simply a question of revising two or three sections to carry out the agreed intentions of the House, that is another question. I understood that to be the hon. gentleman's statement; but certainly he will expose the Bill to further consideration by the general proposal he now makes. I should like to know what the general character of the changes are which the hon. gentleman is desirous of introducing into the Bill, before, for my part, I should feel disposed to agree to its reference back to committee.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have no objection to state what the proposals are. In the first section of the Bill, which deals with the franchise of farmers' sons and gives the franchise to the sons of tenant farmers, I propose a merely verbal alteration which will make the section read a little more plainly. In sub-section 3, section 2, there is also a verbal alteration merely. In section 2, sub-section 9, with respect to the fisherman's franchise, I propose merely to add the words "resident in the electoral district," because otherwise the clause would disfranchise a fisherman wherever he was. Then section 4 is the section by which these clauses which changed the franchise were suspended until next year; but on account of the state of the Bill it was impossible to give the numbers of these sections, so as to see what the sections were which should be suspended; and it is therefore necessary to specify them. Now, it says, "the two sections of this Act next preceding this section," whereas we must also include the section which gives the franchise to the sons of tenant farmers, and, in fact, all those sections which create a new franchise, but leaving the franchise on the same principle as that on which we agreed that the other sections should be suspended in operation. I intend also to move that the section which relates to procedure, and imposes certain penalties on persons who do not attend the final revision, shall likewise be suspended

until next year, for the reason that as many of those provisions are very close, and all of them will take place within a short time, we are imposing penalties of which the public will have no opportunity of acquiring information. In the place of section 5, I propose to offer a re-drafted section to meet some of the objections which were made to the language of the clause in committee; it will make no substantial alteration. It will be remembered that exception was taken to the language, in consequence of its seeming to be implied that the son had to prove residence with the father, even though his father were dead. The clause is re-drafted, enlarged and made plainer, but no substantial alteration is made. Then as to the oaths of qualification, I propose that instead of having one form with elaborate instructions to the presiding officer to change that form to meet the cases of farmers' sons who are absent in institutions of learning, and absent in various other ways, I propose to have a separate form for each class. The voters' list also requires a little alteration. The date was placed at the 1st of July, whereas we have made it the first of June. I wish also, in the voters' list, to alter the term "sub-division" to district, which is the word used in the Act. I would also ask the committee to reconsider the propriety of striking out the word "particular" before description. That was discussed in committee, and I think my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) was in favor of striking it out. I found, on enquiry, that in some of the Provinces there is no means of making a particular description of the property, without having to add a great deal more space than is intended. Then I propose to move an addition to the sections which we left in suspense—No. 11 of the original Bill—with regard to the preliminary list of this year. The object of that section is to confirm what the revisers have done with regard to the preliminary list. Instead of making a sub-division of a polling district and re-publishing their list in the first instance, I intend to declare that it is sufficient for the present year. Those are the only alterations.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. THOMPSON. I move that the following be inserted at the ninth line:

Farmer's son means and includes the son of an owner and actual occupant of a farm, or the tenant and actual occupant of a farm, under lease for a term of not less than five years.

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire to move an amendment in the interpretation clause, so as to make the definition of the word "owner" agree with the other amendments, and to meet the difficulty which was experienced in the Howland case, and other difficulties:

"The expression 'owner,' when it relates to the ownership of real property situated elsewhere in Canada than in the Province of Quebec, means a proprietor either in his own right or for his own benefit, or if such proprietor is a married man, it means a proprietor in his own right or in the right of his wife, or the person whose wife is such proprietor of a freehold estate, legal or equitable, in lands and tenaments held in free and common soccage, of which such person or the wife of such person is in actual possession, or in respect of which such person or the wife of such person is in receipt of the rents and profits.

"The expression 'occupant,' means a person in actual occupation of real property otherwise than as real owner, tenant, usufructuary, in his own right, or in the case of a married man, in his own right or in the right of his wife, or whose wife is in such actual occupation, and who or whose wife receives to his or her own use and benefit the revenues and profits thereof.

"The expression 'father' includes grandfather, step-father and father-in law, and expression 'mother' includes grandmother, step-mother and mother-in-law.

"The expression 'son' includes a grandson, step-son and son-in-law.

"The expression 'actual value' or 'value' means the then present market value of any real property if sold upon the ordinary terms of sale, provided that the assessment rolls as finally revised for municipal purposes shall be *primâ facie* evidence of the value of such property."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. I move to add to sub-section 4 of section 2, on page 2, at line 26, after the words "list of voters," the words, "so far as depends on the amount of rental." It is merely to show the proper qualification.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose to amend sub-section 6 by striking out the first words, which will make a very important change. The sub-section says: "Is a resident within an electoral district and derives an income of at least $300." I propose to strike out the words "resident of an electoral district," to be followed by another clause, so that an income voter may be registered either where he resides or where he earns his income. We found the other night that the clause I had prepared was inconsistent with these words, and I will leave out these words and follow up by another clause. The clause I propose to move will give the option to the voter of being put on the list, either where he resides or where he earns his income.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the voter is to be prevented having a vote in the place where he resides and also in the place where he earns his income?

Mr. McCARTHY. If a man has a vote in an electoral division as a freeholder, for instance, he goes on as a freeholder, and if he earns his income in another division, I want to allow him to go on the list there also.

Mr. BLAKE. The holder of a salary of $300 a year or the mechanic who earns that by his employment, and who lives in one ward of Toronto and labors in another, will have a vote in each.

Mr. McCARTHY. That would be the result. If he lived in the county of York, outside the city, and also inside the city, he would be entitled to a vote in the city.

Mr. MILLS. It is not the principle of one man one vote.

Mr. COOK. A laborer, domiciled in Ottawa, spends his winter in the woods. Would the income he earns in the woods apply here?

Mr. BLAKE. It would give him a vote in the county where he earned it; he gets his vote here as a resident.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know whether it is intended to allow income derived from an investment to give a vote. We ought to guard against that.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think we need trouble about that.

Mr. MULOCK. Strike out "anyone can vote who has an income derived from an investment." That is giving undue advantage to men of property who have invested money and get an income from it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think, practically, it will apply anywhere except in the cities.

Mr. MULOCK. A man has a debt due him of $5,000 in a riding, at interest; has he a vote on the income he gets from that?

Mr. McCARTHY. I would not call that an income.

Mr. MULOCK. The sub-section says, "derives an income of at least $300 annually from his earnings in money or money's worth &c, or from some investment in Canada." That would cover any debt.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, we will limit it to his calling, office or trade.

Mr. WELDON. The principle that prevails in New Brunswick is that a party who is assessed on an income in a place in which he does not reside has a vote there. Do you not think the section should read, on an income on which he is assessed in the electoral district?

Mr. McCARTHY. In the Ontario law there is no assessment on income. A man may earn $300 a year, and not be liable to pay assessment taxes. He is entitled to vote on pretty much the same qualification, but yet he is not assessed, and this spring there has been great difficulty. About 3,000 voters had to be put on the Ontario lists on the evidence which had been put together under this Bill, because they were not on the assessment roll at all.

Mr. BLAKE. What does the hon gentleman understand to be the present Ontario law as applied to this point?

Mr. McCARTHY. I suppose it is one man one vote, so that it would make no difference in that regard, but up to this time many people have enjoyed the privilege of voting twice. In Toronto, for instance, most of the business men probably earn their money in the centre division and live in the suburbs, and they have enjoyed the privilege of voting in the east or west and also in the centre, and they do not like to be deprived of that, when we have not adopted the plan of one vote for one man.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this is a very objectionable amendment. It will give the people in towns and cities the opportunity of voting twice while the people in the rural districts can vote only once. It gives an advantage to the towns and cities over the rural districts. There is another objection to it. There is a very strong inclination now on the part of people living in towns and getting a yearly income, owing to the high taxation in the towns as compared with the townships, to buy a small property outside of the corporation which they will get at a rate of assessment very much less than in the town. This will be an additional inducement to them to get a residence outside, as they will have a vote on their income inside the town and a vote on their residence in the other municipality, provided they are in two different districts. This, undoubtedly, will be an additional inducement to people to go outside of the city corporation in order to get a double vote, as there are so many facilities in all the cities, in the way of street cars and so on, for reaching their places of business. This is a wrong to the rural districts. It is giving the people who live in cities and towns two votes for one given to the farmers and farmers' sons. It is doubling the power of the cities against the rural districts. If you do this, you should give the farmer two votes, if he has the property.

Mr. SPROULE. I should think it would be an advantage to the rural districts, because it would make the city people move out and live there. Besides, it might be the other way. We have some farmers who have property in the cities, and they may move into the cities to get a vote there.

Mr. McMULLEN. The interests of the farmers and the interests of the cities do not lie in the same direction. If a question arises in regard to matters in which the cities are more deeply interested, such as we have had in the past and may have in the future, the farmers will be represented in this House only in the proportion of one against two. The cities will have two votes to one for the farmers.

Mr. SMALL. Does the hon. gentleman contend that this gives two votes in the one electoral district?

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; but we object that it gives property a vote instead of the individual. I believe there should be one vote for one man, and no elector should be allowed to cast two or three votes when another is allowed to cast only one. I believe the principle is vicious and the clause should be retained, providing that the voter should be a resident within the electoral district.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I understood the entire principle of the income vote was that a man should not be deprived of the vote because he had not property but had an income, but this goes further and gives him two votes. If a man pays $2 rental in one division, that gives him a vote, and if he works in another division, that gives him a vote on his income. We are getting away from the principle on which the income vote is given altogether, and are doing injustice to the farming community.

Mr. WELDON. We had a principle something like this in New Brunswick, but our franchise was based upon assessment, and there it could be applied, but it seems to me that the amendment in the direction proposed by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is a departure from the principle of the Act. This Act is based upon residence and property, not upon income or assessment, and it seems to me that the basis upon which the Act is founded, requires a man to have property or residence to obtain a vote. By the amendment you make it simply income. I think it would be far better to let it remain as it is.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think, as my hon. friend says, this is a departure from the principles of the Act. I consider that a clerk, or a laboring man, or a mechanic has just as much right to have a vote as a man who may be possessed of very large property, but it does not necessarily follow that a man with an income of $300 a year should have two votes when another, perhaps with $1,000 or $5,000 income from real property, would only have one. I think one is as good as another, as a man, but I do not see why he should be better, and I am one of those who last year voted, in what I believe is the right direction, for manhood suffrage virtually. That I believe is the correct principle, and this is a departure from it, and not exactly in Conservative lines, I think. It is giving the vote largely to a class who are not large holders of property at all, and they are not to be enfranchised because they are enfranchised before, and they have a right to be, but to have double the privileges their neighbors have. Those who live outside of cities because it is cheaper, are to have a vote there and another vote because they work in the city, so that they will have twice as much to say in the affairs of State as their neighbors. Is that right, or just, or equitable to those who are in the same class, in the same walk of life even, to say nothing of the other classes?

Mr. MILLS. We have been acting upon the principle, in a great measure, of one man one vote, and we ought to apply the principle consistently. The whole theory of this Act is, not that we are seeking to represent property, but that we are accepting property as evidence of the man's personal qualification, of his fitness for the franchise, of his ability to manage and take care of his own affairs, and, when you accept this evidence of his ability, you give him a vote. But my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) proposes to give certain parties, upon the accident of their having property in different places, two votes. If the intention was to treat all a man's possessions as stock in a bank, and say that so many hundred dollars should be counted one share and give one vote, you might multiply votes according to the wealth of the individual. But a man's having lots in six different divisions should not give him six votes any more than one who has six times the amount of property in one place. That is practically what the hon. gentleman proposes. There are many people in the vicinity of cities who have considerable income, and are taxed upon the income in the city, and have their residence

outside the corporation limits, and are assessed and will vote as residents of these outside districts. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes to so alter or amend the law that they will vote in the city upon their income and will vote outside upon the property they hold as residents outside. I do not think that is the proper rule. It is not right that people who happen to reside in cities and possess much more wealth than those who reside in the suburbs, should have but one vote, whereas under the rule the hon. gentleman proposes, and a man who has a small interest in the same business in two electoral districts, if he resides in a suburb, would have several votes. I do not think that is a sound rule. The tendency is to recognise the right to vote in the individual and not in the property. He is not treated as a shareholder but as an integer in the body politic, and as such he is entitled to vote. The First Minister laid down the rule last year that this Dominion was a unit, and that the Provinces were mere fractions thereof. Here you are altogether departing from the principle. If you recognise one man who holds property in three constituencies as three political entities instead of being one, I think we had better adhere to the Bill as it is, and allow the party to vote upon his income or his property in the electoral division in which he resides. We will, by doing this, have fewer cases of personation, and fewer instances of fraudulent voting.

Mr. McCARTHY. If we were dealing with the principle of one vote one man, a great deal of what has been said on the other side would have to be answered. But this Bill is founded on quite an opposite principle, that of property qualification.

An hon. MEMBER. Property and residence.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, not property and residence at all. If a man owns property in a dozen ridings he may have a dozen votes, but he can only reside in one place, therefore we are not dealing with the principle of one man one vote. The principle of the Bill is that certain qualifications give the right to vote. Now, if a man owns property in three ridings, he has three votes. If he earns an income, the power of earning is deemed to be sufficient to qualify him to vote. In one place he happens to own property and earns an income, and why should that man be in a different position than when he owns two or three different pieces of property in one riding? We have first said there are certain qualifications which give a man a right to vote. Then we say if he owns in more than one division, he shall have more than one vote. That is merely carrying out the principle of saying that if he earns this qualification in one riding, notwithstanding that he may live elsewhere, he may vote on that qualification. It seems to me this is in favor of the poor man, and the mechanic, and laborer.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Supposing he earns an income which is derived from five or six different electoral divisions, a portion of it comes from each; would he be entitled to vote in each electoral district?

Mr. McCARTHY. If he had $300 in each, I suppose he would, if he had property in each.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, take the case of a wholesale merchant who derives his income from sales that are effected in a dozen or twenty electoral districts. He can say clearly that his business is divided. He may have men selling for him in different districts, and his income may be derived from twenty or forty ridings. According to the hon. gentleman's principle he would be entitled to vote in all these cases. Is there any justice in that?

Mr. McCARTHY. Just as much as if you had twenty-four pieces of property in twenty-four ridings.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then we had better come down to the proper principle. Let my hon. friend come forward and lay down the proper principle, that a man shall vote because he is a man, a citizen, with an interest in the Dominion, liable to military duty, liable for defence and taxation, and let all stand on the same footing.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. member for Simcoe misunderstood me. I did not say property and residence, but the basis was property or residence. For instance, a party who owned property in four or five electoral districts should have that number of votes; that was the principle. Now, again, where a man voted on income, or as the son of a farmer, he would be obliged to be a resident. Therefore, a man who is a voter must be either a property holder or a resident. But the amendment destroys both these principles, it is not applicable to either. The principle laid down that property should vote is there not based on the qualification, therefore it does not matter where the party is resident; property in the electoral district qualified him to vote. If, on the other hand, he has no property, but he may vote on income or vote as the son of a farmer or fisherman, as suggested by the Minister of Justice, in that case residence is an essential part of qualification. Now the amendment proposed destroys both these principles, it is neither property nor residence.

Mr. CHARLTON. This is a most absurd proposition. We will suppose the case of a mechanic who earns $300 in one division, and that entitles him to vote upon income. He lives in another electoral district, and perhaps out of that $300 he pays $150 rent, and that entitles him to another vote. Suppose you give him another vote on the balance of that money expended for groceries, you might just as well do it. The principle is most objectionable. In nine cases out of ten where two votes are obtained under this section, one would be obtained out of a portion of the money upon which he is qualified to vote upon income, and the expenditure of a portion of that money for rent, if he is living in another place, would entitle that man to vote in another place. I hold that we should treat the franchise as being a right with which the individual is invested, the right of a free man, and not a right that one man should exercise in three cases, another man in five cases, and another man in one case. Perhaps a man exercising it in one case only may have a property qualification greater than that of a dozen men who are exercising it in three or four cases. It is at variance with the principle of human liberty. It is a scheme devised, possibly, for the purpose of gaining an advantage in such ridings as Toronto where, by judicious and proper manipulation, the mechanic, earning $300 or $400 a year, may have two votes instead of one, while property owners in the country, yeomen owning large farms, will have but one vote, although the farm may be of equal value to the property of a dozen mechanics. I hope this inequality will be reconsidered by my hon. friend. It is not in accordance with the principle of this Franchise Bill; it is not in accordance with the principle of investing every man with the right of the franchise, but is placing in the hands of one particular class an advantage greater than that possessed by others, and is unjust in its application and operation.

Mr. O'BRIEN. It is truly refreshing to hear sound Conservative doctrines enunciated on the other side of the House. I am particularly charmed to hear the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) talking about the "mere mechanic." However he may consider mechanics, for my part I intend to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe, because I think it will cause great confusion if it is carried into effect in many cases, and also because I think it is a little too democratic to meet my views. Now, while we have adopted the principle that the mechanic who earns $300 is entitled to vote, I must say that

I do not think we should go further and extend that qualification, as this amendment now proposes to do. I think it is to some extent laying down a doctrine that money means franchise, with which I certainly do not agree, because I think that while perhaps not a democratic doctrine, it is certainly not a Conservative doctrine. I shall certainly vote against the amendment.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I wish to explain just what I understand by the measure, and let hon. gentlemen opposite take the responsibility of it. Every member of the House knows that the vast majority of the people of Canada are men who own their own farms: that is the business of this country, superior to any other or all others put together, and the effect of this measure is simply to make the agriculturist just half the man that the man with an income of $300 is. The man who does not own one dollar's worth of property but happens to pay $2 a month rental in one division of a city and to work in another will have twice as much to say about public affairs as a farmer. That fact the agriculturist should be brought to thoroughly understand, and if the hon. gentleman insists on the proposal they will thoroughly understand the effect of the measure.

Mr. MULOCK. This amendment brings into play an entirely new principle. Until recent years the franchise depended entirely upon real estate. Later on that principle was departed from to a certain extent in the case of farmers' sons, but even in that case the franchise was given to a farmer's son because he was the son of an owner of real estate. Then later on in the Provinces, in Ontario at all events, the franchise was given to income voters where they resided. Residence and income were required.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is where the hon. gentleman is wrong. This is exactly on the line of the Ontario system that has existed up to the present time. The man was assessed for income where he earned it, and he was entitled to vote on income in one division and on his house in another. I have voted in Toronto in that way, on my residence in the west and income in the centre. That has been the rule in Ontario ever since the income vote has been allowed.

Mr. MULOCK. It suits the hon. gentleman to adopt the Ontario franchise to prove his case in support of argument, but he abandons it when it operates against him.

Mr. McCARTHY. I was only correcting the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. I accept the correction. I go a little further. It is true this proposal gives the franchise to a class of voters that have very little stake in the country. I am not objecting to their having a vote. But the clause goes further, and practically hands over a large portion of the franchise to the most wealthy classes. Take the case mentioned by the member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). The large wholesale merchants of Toronto and other cities carry on business all over the Province. It is true they would not be able to exercise the franchise in every riding when a general election occurs, but when there was a bye-election they could exercise it. Is it intended that wholesale merchants having business dealings in many ridings should have a vote in each. If it is, it is asking Parliament to adopt a measure for which there is no precedent. Under it the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) says he would have over forty votes, and there are some wholesale merchants who might vote in ninety-five different ridings. The section, as it is proposed to be amended, sets out that an elector shall have a vote if he derives an income of $300 a year from any profession, office, calling or trade. Is not the selling and buying of goods trade? The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says he does not mean that. But he is not to be the judge; that will have to be determined by the revising officers, who will be liable to give different rulings. If the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) proposes to hand over the franchise to wealthy people, let him say so, for that is the effect of this clause. It is to extinguish the comparatively poor man. Residence ought to be one of the conditions of the right to vote. The hon. member proposes to go on and add a clause. He is to have his option whether he is put on for income in one place or another. There is going to be great uncertainty in that. Take Toronto, for instance, where there are many men deriving incomes in the city, residing in the city, being boarders, and they can just skip across to the township, board there for about a week, at the time the revising barrister is going his rounds, and they can have themselves assessed as residents in that place, and can elect to have a vote in the country, and *vice versa*. I think the clause will open the door for great abuses, and that therefore it should not be adopted. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, this is a very radical proposition.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman desires to talk against the clause in that way I will withdraw it. Does he object to the principle?

Mr. MULOCK. I object to it entirely, and the hon. gentleman has no right to assume that I am objecting to it on any ground but its merits. I say that a proposition so important as this is one that should not be introduced here by a private member. It ought to come from the Government, or we ought to know if it is the wish of the Government. Is this a Government measure put in the hands of a private member, or is it entirely the hon. gentleman's own suggestion?

Mr. MACMASTER. The hon. member for Brant said that this amendment would give him thirty votes. I think he gave thirty good reasons for voting against the amendment, and for my part he has converted me and I shall vote against it.

Mr. SPROULE I think the interpretation suggested by the hon. member for Brant and the hon. member for North York is too ridiculous to be considered. To say because a wholesale man living in Toronto had agents outside who are sending orders to Toronto, which are filled and shipped at Toronto, that they shall have votes in the various ridings in which they sell goods, is, I think, an interpretation which no intelligent lawyer would give.

Mr. MULOCK. Who is to interpret it otherwise?

Mr. LISTER. I understood that the hon. member for Simcoe would withdraw this amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. If that is the sense of the committee, I will withdraw it.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. THOMPSON. In sub-section *b* of sub-section 7, I propose to insert in the third line, after the word "farm" the words "in respect of which the right to vote is claimed by or for him."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY moved that the words "within the electoral district" be inserted after the word "resident" in the first line of sub-section *a* of sub-section 7; also after the word "resident" in the first line of sub-section *b*; also after the word "resident" in the first line of sub-section *a* of sub-section 8.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. I move to insert in line 10, on page 4, after the word "owner" the words, "on the real pro-

perty in respect of which the right of voting is claimed for or by him."

Mr. MULOCK. That is a little different from the case of a farmer's son. If he is resident in the riding it is sufficient, not necessarily on the farm.

Mr. THOMPSON. He need not necessarily reside on the farm. He must reside with his parents. There are a few cases in which a farm owner lives just off the farm, but I think the case of a real estate owner is different. It is not intended to give him the right unless he lives on the property.

Mr. MULOCK. Suppose the owner is not living on the property he owns in freehold, but is occupying a rented property, and the son lives with his father. If the farmer's son is entitled to a vote on the ownership of a farm, simply because he resides in the riding with his father, I should think the same reasoning should apply to the case of the son of an owner of real estate. If there is a different rule made for the two cases, I think it is likely to lead to confusion.

Mr. LISTER. I think in the Ontario Act the fact of the father being an owner is sufficient to entitle the son to vote.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will withdraw the amendment in the meantime. In sub-section 9, on page 4, after the word "fisherman," I propose to add, "resident in the electoral district."

Mr. BÉCHARD. It will be remembered that the other day when the House was in committee, I called the attention of the Government to the fact that a certain number of persons in Quebec, who, under the old law, always had a vote, would be disfranchised under this measure. I refer to those persons who are called *rentiers*, those who, having attained a certain age, give their property to one of their sons, or a son-in-law, or even a perfect stranger—the property generally being farm property—and receive as a compensation an annuity which is paid the most part of the time in products of the farm, but may be paid in money or in both. Under this Bill, they cannot qualify on their income, because, as a rule, they do not receive $300 a year. On an average, they receive from $125 to $150 a year, and that class of people is more numerous than is generally supposed. This omission passed unnoticed last Session when this Bill was discussed. It is a state of things peculiar to Quebec. In every rural district in the Province of Quebec, there are some of those people. I have here a clause prepared to meet the case, which I propose should be inserted between the clauses in which are enumerated the different qualifications of voters:

Or is or has been, one year next before his being placed on the list of voters, or before the date of application for the placing of his name on the list of voters, a resident within the electoral district, and in receipt of a life annuity, secured on real estate in Canada, by virtue of a deed of donation, of at least $100 in money or money's worth, or in both.

I showed this to gentlemen on the other side, and one prominent gentleman was of the opinion that he considered a man receiving $100 in that way as well qualified to vote as anyone who earns $300 a year.

Mr. AMYOT. There are other deeds besides donations which amount to the same thing. I move that you insert "or other titles equivalent."

Mr. SPROULE. I think this principle is entirely wrong. If we compel a man to have an income of $300 to entitle him to a vote, we should not give the advantage to another class of voting because they have a life income of $100.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. THOMPSON. This section, on page 4, says: "The two sections of this Act next preceding shall not come into force, &c." I propose to say sections 1, 2, 3 and 12. This covers all the sections enlarging the franchise, and also those sections which describe penalties.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 5,

Mr. THOMPSON. I propose to amend section 5. There is no change in the sense, but the section as printed merely provides that the six months' absence of a farmer's son or son of an owner of real property, shall not disqualify him from voting, and the object of this is to prevent its disqualifying him from being put on the list on account of occasional absence before, or from voting in case of such absence after, he is put on the list.

Mr. McMULLEN. I suggest that you should add to the "mariner, fishermen or student" an apprentice duly apprenticed and learning a trade.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Is the clause with reference to annuitants to apply generally? Is it a new class of voters, or is it confined to those who have an interest arising from family relationship? If you are going to create a general class of voters who receive annuities of $100 secured on real estate, that is one thing, but, if it is only for a father who is provided for by his sons, that is in accordance with what I consider the very absurd principle of giving votes to the sons, because if you give the votes to the sons it is only right to give it to the farmers also.

Mr. BÉCHARD. It is not a new class, for these men have always been voters. By the present law, however, a man can only vote on an income of $300 a year, while the owner of real estate amounting to $150 is given the franchise. These annuities are based on real estate.

On section 19,

Mr. LISTER. There is a good deal of difficulty at present with regard to declarations necessary to put a name on the voters' list. Some revising officers insist on one form and some on another. I think, if a form were put in the Act, it would save a great deal of difficulty. In my county, a very simple form of declaration has been held sufficient by the revising officer, while in an adjoining county the same form was not accepted. There ought to be uniformity.

Mr. THOMPSON. I should have liked to give my attention to that had it been mentioned sooner, but it requires the preparation of six oaths, and I do not think I can undertake that this evening.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the Minister of Justice prepare a declaration to be used as the form on which the voters' names can be put upon the list.

Mr. THOMPSON. There may be some difficulty in consequence of it being so late, but I will consider it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is very necessary that something of this kind should be done. So far as my riding is concerned, the judge there has evidenced his willingness to do what is fair, and he has assisted in every way parties on both sides with regard to the preparation of names to go on the list by declaration. But if a judge is disposed to be exact, he might cause either party a great deal of difficulty, and I think it would be well to provide a simple form of declaration for putting names upon the voters' list to which no exception could be taken.

Mr. FAIRBANK. In the 36th line, clause 7, relating to copies being taken, I would ask for the insertion after the words "copies thereof," the words "or declaration upon which the additions have been made," so that the party

applying shall have a copy of the declaration upon which an addition to the list has been made.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman's object might be gained by making it read thus: "The revising officer shall furnish to any person requiring to examine the same, all notices, additions and declarations in support thereof."

McCARTHY. We know that tenants, especially in towns, frequently change their residence, they change their holdings within the year before they apply to be put on the list. Under the clause as it stands they must have one holding for the year, but I propose a clause which will enable the tenant who has had a qualification during the year, but on different holdings, to be put on the list.

Mr. McMULLEN. To be registered in the place where he resides?

Mr. McCARTHY Yes, it only enables the man who has changed his tenancy to vote on the tenancy he has held within the year.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. THOMPSON. I draw attention to section 18, which confirms the existing list, and provides that there shall be no default by the revising officers of the District of Algoma having had their districts altered subsequent to their having taken the oath of office, and it is desirable that revising officers shall be protected against any action. I move that the following words be added to the section:

No action or proceeding shall lie or maintain against the revising officer of the said District of Algoma for any penalty or penalties by reason of their acting as such after the limits assigned to them had been changed and new commissions had been issued to them without taking their oath of office anew.

Mr. LANGELIER. Has any action been taken up to this moment?

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

On form B,

Mr. LISTER. I think that as the principle of the law is that a man shall not be entitled to vote unless he is twenty-one years of age at the time he applied to be put on the list, he should be required to make oath to that fact before he is allowed to vote. I know that as a matter of fact many minors have been placed on the list in my own county, and they should not be there.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think it would be desirable, as the whole principle of the law is that the revising officer shall decide upon the qualification.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister what objection there is to adding simply a paragraph requiring the man who tenders his vote to swear that he is entitled to vote.

Mr. COLBY. I do not think that would be a proper clause to insert. It is not every voter who knows what the qualifications are.

Mr. MULOCK. He should not be there unless he has them?

Mr. COLBY. Yes, but a conscientious man might hesitate and might be driven from voting. You cannot expect men who are not able to read or write to understand these things.

Mr. THOMPSON. It would require a man to swear to a good deal of law, and I do not think we should call on a voter to do that. The qualifications may depend on very nice legal questions, and these are decided by the revising officer.

Mr. CHARLTON. As a man is not entitled to be put on the list unless he is twenty-one years of age when the application is made, I think he should be required to swear that he is twenty-one years of age at that time.

Mr. WALLACE (York). The assessors are allowed to put them on if they will be twenty-one years of age before the final revision. If they are twenty years and nine months old at the time of the assessment, they are legally entitled to vote under the Ontario Act.

Mr. MULOCK. Are you willing to follow the Ontario Act throughout?

Mr. WALLACE (York). So far as it is good, but we have a better one.

Mr. SPROULE. The declaration that he has to take when he is put on the list meets the difficulty.

Mr. LISTER. Some hon. gentlemen are fond of following the Ontario Act when it suits their purpose and abusing it when it does not, particularly the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace). No matter what the Ontario law is, this law says that a man shall not be placed on the list unless he is at the time twenty-one years of age. If the revising officer thinks proper to place young men on the list who are not of age, and who are therefore not qualified under the law, they should not vote. If it is thought that they ought to vote in case they come of age after the final revision of the list, make the law so; but under the law as it stands, surely we should have the power to ascertain whether they were qualified by being twenty-one years of age at the time they were placed on the list.

Mr. WALLACE (York). It is rather amusing to see hon. gentlemen opposite, who profess to want an extension of the franchise, objecting to every extension of the franchise proposed in the House.

Mr. LISTER. Do you call that honest? You may reconcile it with your ideas of honesty——

The CHAIRMAN. Order. Address the Chair.

Mr. LISTER. Hon. gentlemen opposite who have passed this Bill, have provided in it that only certain persons shall be placed on the list. Now, the hon. gentleman wants certain other persons placed on the list. Two years may elapse before this is used; in that case, young men who were placed on the list at the age of nineteen years would vote.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you make of the declaration? Is it worth anything or not? A man declares that he is twenty-one years of age, and that he is entitled by virtue of his qualification to be placed on the list, and he his placed on the list.

Mr. LISTER. Suppose a man is placed on the list; he does not make a declaration with the knowledge of the revising officer, who assumes that he is of age. It is the case within my own knowledge that no declaration has been made at all.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Then I would suppose the hon. gentleman would attend the court of revision and have the names struck off. The only point is to make the voters' list a finality. If you disturb that, you disturb the whole Bill. The qualification ought to be kept intact—make that a finality.

Mr. THOMPSON. It seems to me that the objection would apply to every qualification. This Bill provides that a man shall possess a certain qualification; and in the event of any person not coming up to that qualification in any particular, ample opportunity is given to have their names

struck off the list. If they are shown to fail in respect of age, I do not see why their names cannot be struck off just as well as if they failed in any other qualification.

Mr. CHARLTON. In my own riding I am aware that a good many young men have been placed on the list by the opposite side who are not twenty-one years of age. I have instructed my agents to conform strictly to the law, and to put no one on the list who was not of age at the time the application was made. The law requires that at a certain time a young man must be of age to be placed on the list, and if through the action of the revising officer or the agent of a candidate a large number of persons are put on the list in violation of that provision of the law, they certainly have no right to vote. If that has been done, it is a very simple thing to require those persons to state on oath what their age is, and if they are not of age at the time of the application, they are not voters under this Act. We all know that the making of appeals is a laborious and costly matter; in some ridings it will be attended to with more or less thoroughness, and in some it may not be attended to at all. I think that so far as possible we should see that the provisions of the law are carried out, and it would be very simple to put a clause in the oath requiring the voter to swear whether or not he was of age at the time the list was made, as he would know, and if he swears that he was not, he should not be allowed to vote, even though his name be on the list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How can a young man swear positively that he was twenty-one years of age at the time he was put on the list.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. On the same principle, how can he swear positively that he is when he comes up to vote? He will be just as likely to know it at one time as at another. Last year this House passed a Bill containing a certain qualification for voters. One of these qualifications was that they should be of the full age of twenty-one years. That remains the law yet. If we change the law, and require that a man need not be twenty-one years of age when he is put on the list, but only when he comes up to vote, then we have no more to say. But in the present case you are simply providing means by which the law we enacted a year ago can be evaded. If the law provides that a person must be of twenty-one years of age when put on the list, I can see no reason why he should not swear to the fact. The hon. Minister of Justice says it is easy to get the names struck off. It is not easy to do so. People are very shy of appealing against their neighbors, and besides it is a very costly matter. There is no valid reason why the oath should not be made to conform to the law as it stands, instead of providing a loophole by which the law can be broken.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). The age is only one of the qualifications of voters. There are other qualifications designated just as distinctly, and the object of the examination by the judge was to make the list a finality. If you have a right to swear a man as to age, you have an equal right to swear him as to the value of his property, that he was earning so much, and so forth. If you have a right to open up the question of age, you have a right to open up the whole qualification. Do that, and you disturb the whole law, and its whole usefulness is gone. For instance, take a man whose earnings make part of his qualification, and his keep another part. At the time of his going on the list, it might be considered a certain value to keep him, and twelve months later it might be considered a different value, and you would have just as much right to swear him as to that. If a man is permitted to go on the list after all the safeguards, and after it is finally revised by the judge, I consider that it is a violation of the law and good faith to disturb the qualification in any respect. You may test him as to citizenship, to property, and his personal identity; beyond that, I do not think you have any right to go.

Mr. WELDON. We have provided means by which the revising officer can ascertain the value of real estate, the rental, &c.; those means are available, such as the registry office and the assessment roll. But when you come to the question whether a man is twenty-one years of age or not, there are no records by which the judge can find that out. It would seem right and proper that, if it is in the knowledge of the party himself, whether he is of age or not, he should not be entitled to vote. When my hon. friend first brought in his Bill, he endeavored in schedule A to avoid that difficulty by putting in the age of the party at his last birthday. That was struck out. We ought therefore now to make him take the oath that he was of the age of twenty-one years when he was put on the list. It is clear it is not intended minors should vote or should be put on the list, and if, by accident, a minor got on the list, it was never intended he should be qualified merely because he was on it.

Mr. LISTER. If the law required that the person applying to be put on the list should make the declaration himself, there might be some excuse for the pretension that the list be final, and the person applying to vote be not obliged to submit to another oath. But one person may make a declaration for a great number of people, and swear to their qualifications from information he got from some friends of his. Wherever the parties make a declaration themselves, it may be taken for granted that they would not swear to their declaration unless it was true, but where the declaration is made by another party, abuses are certain to arise. You require here that a person should take the oath that he is a British subject by birth or by naturalisation. Well, he can swear to his age with as great certainty as to that; for if a person does not know when he was born, he cannot have a clear idea where he was born. If he is competent to swear he is a British subject by birth, he is surely competent to take the oath as to the time he reached his majority. The law does not intend that a person twenty-one years of age at the time the list was revised should not vote, and it is as easy to put in a clause requiring him to swear that he was twenty-one at the time, as to require him to swear he was twenty-one when giving his vote. This form of oath will permit people to evade the law.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This is due to an omission in the Act which the Minister promised to consider to-night, and, if possible, to remedy; namely, having forms of application in the Act and making all the applications uniform. If it was a personal declaration that was made by the young men, it would be superfluous to ask them to make a second declaration. But the law not being definite in that shape, the practice has been that in many cases the young man makes no declaration. The declaration is made for him by some one who says he believes that the young man has all the qualifications. It is because of that state of things, that the proposed amendment is required.

Mr. THOMPSON. The discussion has arisen incidentally on the form of the oath, but it is really not pertinent to that at all. Sections 31 and 39 provide that those persons only who are on the lists as finally revised shall be the electors, and that is made so emphatic that it is provided that even the judge trying the election case shall not be at liberty to dispute anything appearing on the list. No proposition has been made to amend or repeal those sections, and it would be inconsistent to make the returning officer, in the form of the oath, put a test which the judge is forbidden to put by sections 31 and 39.

Mr. CHARLTON. Might it not be an infringement on those sections to require the voter to swear he is a British subject?

Mr. MILLS. No one is disposed to call in question the rule that the voters' lists shall be a finality, but there is always a considerable degree of imperfection in the lists. If you cannot prevent parties being put on the list who are not really entitled to it, so far from that being an objection to the insertion of this provision in the oath it is really a reason for adding it. I mention as a fact very common on the western frontier that our young men leave the country, and it has been the practice to bring them back to vote in the first election after they had left, with the intention of becoming citizens of another country. I know of a constituency in which there was a special election in 1882, in which the list showed there were 166 in that constituency on the list who resided in Michigan; yet a large proportion of those, about 100, were brought back to vote. Is it the intention that those parties who have taken up their residence elsewhere should vote here? If the hon. gentleman's proposition is carried out, that is the intention of the Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are offering a premium to people disposed to be unscrupulous to act in that manner. The Act provides that a party must be twenty-one years of age in order to be put on the list. Any man who is so reckless of the consequences of a statutory declaration that he is prepared to present the revising barrister with the declaration that a certain person is of age, and the false statement is not discovered at the final revision, the party for whom he made the declaration will have a vote. We should come to an understanding that a man may be placed on the roll who is only twenty years of age, if you are going to allow that to be done at all; or else insist on his taking the oath that he was of age when put on the list. This provision is an injustice to those who are conscientious, and affords a means of fraud to those who do not hesitate to stretch a point in order to get a vote on the list.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think it would be possible for the Minister of Justice in the oath to devise some means whereby those who have not become naturalised citizens might become naturalised at the time when they appear to tender their vote. Take the case, for instance, of a person who has lived in the country for two or three years, who is the owner of property and entitled to vote by reason of property qualification, but who has not gone through the formula required by the Act to give him the rights of citizenship. I think a very simple and plain process could be devised in the oath by which this class of voters would not be disfranchised. There is a good deal of trouble in complying with the present law. These persons have to go before a magistrate and take the oath of allegiance and the oath of citizenship. It was the practice some time ago that they had to appear before the quarter sessions, and, if no objections were offered against them, they were allowed their rights, and then they had to file their papers and pay a fee. I believe that is the law yet. I think when they tender their vote they should be enabled to swear that they are the persons named in regard to the property, and have resided a certain length of time in the country, and they should be entitled to vote. Many persons will be disfranchised unless this is done, as they have not gone through all the formulæ. There are many Germans in this country, and they are an industrious, thrifty and sober class of people, and make good citizens. In the United States, it is much more easy to obtain the rights of citizenship than it is here, and I am told that is one of the causes why German immigration has been directed there. It is the duty of the Government and of this House, to throw no obstacles in the way of the settlement of those who are likely to be good and useful citizens of this country, and I think a very simple and expeditious method could be provided in the oath. I hope the Minister of Justice will devise some means by which these settlers can, in a less troublesome way than in the past, obtain the rights of citizenship, and be entitled to vote.

Mr. THOMPSON. It seems to me that can hardly be done in the oath they take at the polling booth. I understand that the hon. member intends to dispense with the qualification of the voter being a British subject, and that would be contrary to the spirit of the Act.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You should make him a British subject in the oath at the time, without his going through the performances which are now required. Let him take the oath of allegiance and citizenship, as he has to do by the other process.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is ample opportunity during the revision for the voter to become a British subject before the final revision. If he is on the roll and desires to qualify before the vote, he can become a British subject at any time before the polling day. I think it would be very inconvenient to have the presiding officer naturalising foreign subjects for the purpose of enabling them to vote, and making them a different class from those on the voters' list.

Mr. MULOCK. I agree with what the Minister says as to that, but I would call his attention to the difficulties now in the way of a person being naturalised, although he has been here for the length of time the law requires. Perhaps during the recess he might look into that law and provide a simpler method. It is a very cumbersome and a very expensive one now, and I think the Act which deals with the case might be amended so as to simplify the procedure.

Mr. WATSON. I would call attention to the importance of having some form laid down in this Bill for applications. In my county, Marquette, out of some hundreds of applications that have been made to be placed on the first list, there have been only three accepted, as it is claimed they were not in a proper shape, although they were in the very form accepted by the revising barrister,

Mr. THOMPSON. It is not possible to give atttention to that point now.

Mr. FAIRBANK. No doubt it would take some time to draw up a form, but it would take very little time indeed to frame a clause that additions should be made wholly upon personal declaration. The Minister may not be aware of the fact that two courses have been pursued heretofore, one by personal declaration on the part of the person who wished to be put upon the list, and the other system throwing them in *en bloc*.

Bill reported; on motion for third reading,

Mr. MILLS. I beg leave to move:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole to amend the same by providing that all persons entitled to vote in each Province for the election of members to the Legislative Assembly for such Province, and no others, shall be voters for the election of members to the House of Commons, and that the voters' lists in each Province for the election of members to the House of Commons, shall be the voters' lists that would be used for the elections for the House of Assembly."

I think that the experience the country has had during the past twelve months, shows the wisdom of the rule that was adhered to during the sixteen or eighteen years that preceded our tampering with the voters' lists by our legislation here last year. Sir, the hon. gentleman has had nearly twelve months' experience of his measure. He assured the House that it would cost but very little to prepare the voters' lists for this Dominion, but he finds now that he has to come down to Parliament and ask for the appropriation of $300,000 to meet the expenses during the past year. There is not a member in this House who is not perfectly aware that $300,000 will not at all be sufficient to meet the expenses that have been incurred. Sir, this expense has been a needless expense, and it forms but a small fraction

of the cost that has been incurred in the preparation of these lists. There is probably not a member on either side of the House that has not been put to a considerable amount of expense in order to see that these lists have been fairly made up; and at this moment there are a large number of gentleman in this House who know that a great number of these lists are most inaccurate. Why, Sir, I have been informed that in one constituency near my own, those lists that are being prepared contain the names of 200 minors, and 600 persons who are no longer residents in the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS. An hon. friend behind me remarks that certain parties are sitting on the other side who are well qualified to join the Salvation Army. I think, Sir, that they require a very considerable reformation, and they might make the proper material upon which the Salvation Army might operate, and if the Army could succeed in reforming their manners, they would confer a lasting benefit, not only upon this House, but upon the country. Now, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to detain the House with any further observations upon the amendment I put in your hands. It is perfectly intelligible, everybody understands it. I am sure that whatever may be the judgment of this House upon that amendment, there will be no doubt as to the conclusion that will be reached upon it in the country.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mills.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Dupont,	McCraney,
Amyot,	Fairbank,	McIntyre,
Armstrong,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gigault,	Mulock,
Béchard,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bergeron,	Glen,	Platt,
Bernier,	Guay,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Gunn,	Scriver,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Holton,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Springer,
Cartwright(SirRichard)	Kirk,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casey,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Langelier,	Vail,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Watson,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Weldon,
Cook,	Livingston,	Wilson.—54.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Ferguson(Leeds& Gren)	McGreevy,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Welland),	McLelan,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Fortin,	Massue,
Barker,	Foster,	Mitchell,
Beaty,	Gordon,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Grandbois,	O'Brien,
Benoit,	Guilbault,	Orton,
Bergin,	Guillet,	Paint,
Billy,	Hackett,	Patterson (Essex),
Blondeau,	Hall,	Pope,
Bowell,	Hay,	Pruyn,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Reid,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hickey,	Riopel,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hilliard,	Robertson (Hamilton)
Carling,	Homer,	Robertson (Hastings),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jamieson,	Shanly,
Chapleau,	Kaulbach,	Small,
Colby,	Kilvert,	Smyth,
Costigan,	Kinney,	Sproule,
Coughlin,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Curran,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Cuthbert,	Landry (Montmagny),	Temple,
Daly,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Thompson,
Daoust,	Lesage,	Tyrwhitt,
Dawson,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers(St Maurice)	Macdonald (Sir John),	Ward,
Dickinson,	Mackintosh,	White (Cardwell),
Dugas,	Macmaster,	White (Hastings),
Dundas,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Everett,	McCarthy,	Woodworth.—92.
Farrow,	McDougald (Pictou),	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel it necessary to make a few observations on this measure and to somewhat explain the vote I have given. It will be remembered that when this Bill came up during last Session I opposed almost every feature of it, except its principle. I sustained the course taken by the Government in bringing in a Bill to regulate the franchise which should control the election of members to the Parliament of Canada. I opposed being at the mercy of a Local Legislature for a franchise under which we would be elected, and, therefore, I supported the Administration of the day on the principle of the Bill. But I must say that the opinions I entertained and expressed on that occasion are confirmed, and it is clear that in all its features and details this Bill will be most difficult to work, of a most expensive and extravagant character, one most difficult to understand and one which I think will lead to an immense amount of litigation, trouble and confusion. Entertaining the view that the Franchise Bill which should govern the election of members for this Parliament should emanate from this Parliament itself, from the highest legislative body in the country, and that we should not allow any minor legislative body to regulate and control the elections of members to the highest Parliament, I could not support the amendment. I feel it necessary to make this explanation in justification of my vote. But on the third reading of the Bill I shall feel it also to be my duty, entertaining the views I do as to the dangerous character of the Franchise Bill as it stands, and being determined that no vote of mine shall in any way perpetuate the Bill which is destructive to its interest and likely to lead to an immense amount of litigation and trouble, to vote against the Bill. I will, therefore, vote against the third reading.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the third reading of the Bill passes I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to sub-section 2, page 6. The form J has not been provided.

Mr. THOMPSON. The section has been suspended for a year, and there can be no use for such a form until after the 1st June next year.

Bill read the third time and passed.

NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 25) respecting the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company (Mr. McCarthy), be concurred in.

Mr. MULOCK. I entertained the hope when the Government took charge of this measure that they would propose to offer some solution of it. I think a very sound objection was taken to the passage of this Bill without enquiry, and certainly it is due to the country that the Government since they have fathered the Bill should endeavor in some way to meet the objections taken. It is somewhat an anomalous position to find the hon. member occupying the position in which we find the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to night, when a week ago on the floor of this House he asserted his opposition to this measure as at present before us, and to-night he is advocating, as I presume he is, its passage. He came to a solemn agreement with this House that this measure should not go through in its present form. He admitted that it would not be right to have the Bill go through Parliament as he now asks it to be passed. He induced the House, or he yielded to the argument of hon. members and came to the conclusion the very opposite to that at which he is asking us to arrive to-night. How is it the hon. gentleman has so changed his views on that question? He has not ventured to give a single explanation of his change of front. I will quote for his benefit, and for the benefit of the House, what the hon. member for North

Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) stated in this House to be his position towards the measure on the 17th May. How comes it that on this the last day of May the hon. gentleman takes such a very different position to what he did on the 17th? I am told he used his influence outside of this Chamber and induced the Senate to arrive at the conclusion at which they arrived and passed the amendments which we are now called upon to adopt. It may not be true, but I am told that he used his influence not only to bring the Senate to that conclusion, but that he took a hand in framing the very amendments we are asked to consider to-night. How the hon. gentleman came to act so differently outside this Chamber from what he did inside deserves an explanation from him. On 17th May the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was told on the floor of this House that the Bill he was then asking the House to sanction would interfere with the agreement of April, 1884, when the rights of the Crown were protected. When he was told that, not one but half a dozen times, he voluntarily admitted that the measure would have, or might possibly have, the effect suggested, and in order that no mistake might happen he declared in this Chamber that he would assent to any set of words being introduced that would protect the Crown in its full right under the agreement of April, 1884. On page 1314 of *Hansard*, I find he is reported as having used these words:

"The hon. gentleman's arguments amounts to this, that if this enactment is now passed, the effect of the contract between the Crown and the railway company will be practically done away with, if not in law, at all events in good faith. All I can say in answer to that is, that if that is the effect of it, we can add in committee any words my hon. friend may add to neutralise that."

And the way he proposes to add his words is to neutralise the effect; he goes outside this House and outside of the Senate Committee to senators outside of the House and outside of the Senate Committee where he cannot be reported, and there in company with others assisted them in framing this amendment which contains the words I have read. That is the way that he is giving us words which will take care of the rights of the Crown. The hon. gentleman then goes on:

"That is not the intention of the promoters of this Bill."

If that was not their intention why is it that he is the mover of this amended Bill to-night? Why did he not rise, when these amendments were under consideration on Friday night last, and point out that he, the promoter of the Bill, as one whose advice should be respected, would not assent to the amendments of the Senate. By his silence he has given his sanction to the amendments, apart from what he did, as I am told, in producing those amendments. He goes on:

"I explained that to the Railway Committee, and I repeat it here. That is the whole object of the section, to make these bonds sectional' and if there is any doubt at all that passing this legislation would have the effect of nullifying the contract in any way, then an amendment can be put in, and I have prepared an amendment which I think will meet the view of the hon. member, which amendment is to the effect that nothing in the Bill contained shall interfere with the contract between the Government and the company."

Well, he cannot say that he used those words inadvertently at one time, because we find them all through that debate taking a similar attitude. On page 1316, I am reported to have said, speaking of the effects of this Bill:

"I hardly think the hon. gentleman has put the issue correctly. It is true, as he pointed out, that the Act of incorporation gives power to bond the road to the extent of $20,000 a mile, but subsequently their borrowing power was modified by the contract made with the Crown. It is the position of the Crown we are seeking to protect."

And the hon. member in answer to that observation replied as follows:—

"I will introduce a clause to cover that."

Then later on, at page 1318, he said:

Mr. MULOCK,

"As I have stated, I have no desire at all that the contract between the Government and the company should be in the slightest degree affected, and I propose to add at the end of the clause the words: 'Provided that this enactment is without prejudice to the agreement between the Government of Canada and the company, bearing date the 12th day of April, 1884, respecting the assumption by Parliament of the portion of said line of railway between Gravenhurst and Callander.'"

And why, if he proposes that this Bill shall be without prejudice to the agreement, is he here to-day to ask that that agreement shall be so modified that it shall prejudice the rights of the people to the extent of $1,320,000? He calls that, I suppose, not prejudicing the Crown in respect of that agreement. Further on he says:

"There was power to issue bonds to the extent of $20,000 a mile, and the bondholders took their chances as to whether the road at that date, would be worth $20,000 a mile or not."

At what date? The date named in the agreement, at the time when the Crown should seek to exercise its rights and take their line, in case it were in the public interest to do so. He goes on:

"The company do not, in the slightest degree, desire to affect its contract with the Government by a side wind, but understands that Parliament, should the company not do its duty by the public, may at some future time come in and redeem the bonds, and the bondholders will buy on that chance."

Those were the words of the hon. gentleman uttered in this House on the 17th of May when he induced Parliament, as as it did unanimously, to pass this Bill as it left this House, and here on the 31st of May, precisely two weeks after, we find him advocating a measure the very opposite in effect to that which he then sanctioned. So on throughout the debate we find the hon. member for North Simcoe telling this Parliament that the agreement referred to should in no way be varied. Now apart from his attitude—because I think it is due to the House that he should explain how it is that he has changed his view—apart from his position and his connection with this matter, which to me is inexplicable, let me turn for a moment to the effect of this measure. We are told by the Minister of Justice that there has been expended on this road up to to-day $26,208 per mile. He tells us it will cost to finish and equip it with some rolling stock $28,905 per mile. Well the company is not bound to equip its line with rolling stock. On the contrary, it has no right to do so. The Bill sets forth the lease, and the first section of that lease sets forth that this company is to construct its line, and when constructed is to lease its line to the Hamilton and North-Western Company and the Northern Railway Company in perpetuity. My hon. friend from North Simcoe, the other day, stated that this company was bound to supply rolling stock. There is nothing in this lease on which to found such a statement. Section 1 is, I think, conclusive on this point. This lease, it will be remembered, was made in pursuance of an agreement between the Government and the railway, whereby the railway got the bonus, and the agreement sets forth certain provisions of the lease, one being that the company was to build the line, and when built was to lease it in perpetuity to the Northern Railway and to the Hamilton and North-Western Railway, and accordingly the company on this agreement proceeds to enter into leases with the two leasing companies. Section 1 reads as follows:—

"The lessors shall and will commence the work of construction of their said railway before the first day of July next, and carry on the same with all reasonable despatch, and shall and will construct, build and, by the first day of May, one thousand eight hundred and eighty six, complete the same, with its stations, buildings, platforms, telegraph, signals, switches, sidings and other appurtenances, from the point of junction with the Northern Railway, at the said village of Gravenhurst, to its connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, upon the location and in accordance with the maps and specifications signed by the engineer of the lessors and lessees respectively, and also in accordance with the above recited provisions of the agreement between Her Majesty the Queen and the lessors."

Not one word there of supplying rolling stock. That is what the company agreed to do to build that line—the bare

right of way—with sidings and stations, and that property, so constructed, is by the second section leased to these two leasing companies in perpetuity. Section 2 goes on:

"The lessors agree to lease, and do hereby lease to the lessees, the whole of the said line of railway"——

That being the railway to be constructed under the provisions of section 1.—

"so to be constructed as in the next preceding clause mentioned, and its appurtenances, and all such branches and extensions thereof as may be from time to time constructed, and their appurtenances, and to place the lessees in possession thereof from time to time, as and when completed, so that the lessees may work the same in such manner as they may deem most profitable and advantageous, and so that the lessees may collect, receive, take and have to their own use, the toll, fares, receipts and earnings in respect thereof, to have and to hold the railway and premises so demised, or intended so to be, to the use of the said lessees."

Then it goes on to state how the profits are to be divided. Then my hon. friend tries to argue, because some vague reference is made to rolling stock in another section, that therefore this company is bound to equip the road. The section I have read is the only section calling on the company to do anything, and all that that section requires the company to do is to build the road, not to equip it; and why that company should now ask Parliament to allow it to bond the road as against the public for the purpose of spending money in a way in which it has no right to spend it, is something I cannot understand. It is bound to build a line of railway, and the very moment it is built, it is bound to lease it. It does not control the line, and therefore it would be a breach of trust in this company to spend any portion of its money in buying rolling stock, or in doing anything to acquire rolling stock except in so far as it is necessary to build the line in the first instance, and it is not pretended that the rolling stock shall be bought for the purpose of building the road. Taking that view, I find by the Minister of Justice's own figures, that this road has cost $26,208 a mile. We are told by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Cockburn) that the road is about completed, that it is in a finished state and is a very fine road; and I understand that the only reason why it has not already been handed over to the lessees is some difficulty apart from the construction of the road itself. The company was bound to have the road completed by the 1st of May, and I believe it has lived up to its agreement in that respect. Now, upon what evidence the Minister of Justice arrived at his valuation of the cost of the road, this House does not know; I presume they were based on statements given to him by persons connected with the company. Who was invited on behalf of the general public to value that road? What system did he adopt to check those figures? Probably vague statements, such as are made in the Railway Committee and elsewhere, were made as to this transaction. Would a man be willing to postpone a mortgage he has on any property on such testimony?

Mr. THOMPSON. The report of the chief engineer of railways?

Mr. MULOCK. The report of the chief engineer of railways might be satisfactory if he had time to investigate the matter. We know that the present chief engineer of railways is very loose in giving certificates; we know that it is one peculiarity of his, that he lacks that backbone which is necessary to say no when he ought to say no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You don't know him.

Mr. MULOCK. Those who have dealt with him, railway men, say so, and it is the general opinion of the public that certificates could be got readily from the deputy Minister of Railways. I will not say that he intends them not to be correct; but he is a man of yielding mind, and he certifies when a certificate is wanted. I do not know what the chief engineer said, or upon what evidence he proceeded. But what did the Minister of Justice tell us? He told us that $26,208 a mile was the amount that had been expended—not what the road was worth, but what had been expended. Expended by whom? Paid to the contractors under the contract made by the company with its contractors, and not with the sub-contractors. This afternoon I read a few figures which I am told indicate the contract price and indicate the real cost as well. I heard my hon. friend from North Ontario say this afternoon that all the work was not done under sub-contracts. I do not care whether it was or not; it is sufficient to know that sub-contractors did build a portion of the railway at prices which indicate the cost of the whole work. I repeat what I said this afternoon, that I am informed on what I consider reliable testimony that the contract for building this road was made between the railway company and the contractors at the following prices: Earth work, 28 cents per cubic yard, sub-let at 20 cents; rock work, $1.80 per cubic yard, sub-let at $1.30; pile driving, 40 cents per foot, sub-let at 25 cents; grubbing, $200 per acre, sub let at $100; timber for trestles and culverts, $30 per 1,000 feet, sub-let for $18 and $20; taking out foundations for bridges and culverts, $1 per yard, sub-let for 30 cents.

Mr. McCARTHY. Sub-let to whom?

Mr. MULOCK. I did not give you the name of the person.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, I want the name.

Mr. MULOCK. I cannot give you the name; I am not at liberty to give it to you. I make that statement on my responsibility here. The hon. member for North Simcoe may smile and throw himself back in his chair, and think to make it a point against me that I do not give the name; but I demand an enquiry before the Committee of Railways, and see if I cannot prove it. I do not guarantee the correctness of this statement, but I guarantee that I believe it to be correct. I am not in possession of the evidence, but produce your sub-contracts. I challenge you to an enquiry on the subject before you ask us to vote away one million and a quarter of the people's money. You cannot laugh this matter away; I demand an enquiry, and then we shall see if I cannot give some evidence on the question. These figures which I have given show that this work was let in the first instance at one-third more than the construction of the line cost. Whether the company did part of the work or not I do not care; so long as sub-contractors were found who did a portion of the work at these greatly reduced prices, that shows that the price for the whole work given under the contract was proportionately large. Taking, then, one-third from the $26,208 per mile, which the road was stated by the Minister of Justice to have cost, what do we get? We find that the actual cost of the construction of this line was $17,472 per mile. Sir Charles Tupper, while Minister of Railways, estimated its cost at $20,000 per mile. He knew what he was about; he has probably had as much experience in the building of railways as the hon. member for North Simcoe, and he then spoke under the advice of the same gentleman who is advising hon. gentlemen to-day. True, Mr. Schreiber has had a little advantage in the contractors giving him evidence; but that is not the only evidence the country ought to have. They say that this road is not quite finished. For argument's sake, I will suppose that it will cost about $2,500 a mile to finish the road; I do not believe it will cost anything; but assuming that it will, I will take $20,000 a mile as the total real cost of the road. Thus, the $12,000 per mile which the country has paid the company, and the $8,000 a mile which they were authorised to borrow, was sufficient to pay the whole cost of building this road. That being the case, for what purpose is this other $12,000 demanded? We are asked to-day to postpone our position

as first mortgagees of this road to the extent of $1,320,000, for that is our position, and allow as much more bonded debt to be put ahead of us before we can intervene and take control of that road. If my hon. friend had desired to conceive a plan whereby the bonds of this company might be sold and forced upon this Government, he could not have devised a better plan. Its mismanagement is a disgrace to railway management in Canada—that is the mismanagement of the lessees in respect of their present lines—and all they have to do apparently, to compel the Crown to assume this debt of $20,000 a mile is to repeat their practices over the leased line. Let them adopt the same tactics in regard to the new line, and the country will demand that the Government step in and take possession of that neutral link or build a new line. When we take control, what will we be met with? Instead of being met with a bonded debt of $8,000 a mile, we will be met with a bonded debt of $20,000 a mile; that is the prejudice that the country sustains. Are we justified in taking such a course that will bring about such a result? True the hon. Minister might say there is no time to make an enquiry. I cannot help that. An enquiry ought to have been made long ago. When this Bill was going through the Senate Committee the Government knew there was then going to be adopted an amendment which ought not to be adopted except after a thorough investigation. The Government ought to have known about it, and referred the matter to a proper committee; but instead of that, we are now asked, at the last days of the Session, when it is practically impossible to get evidence in time, even if the case was brought before a committee to deal with, as it would involve bringing in witnesses from a distance, and it is impossible to say whether they could be got here in time, we are asked to pass this measure. Surely, in the face of this position, the Government do not propose to allow the Bill to go through without providing some checks and safeguards before giving sanction to the measure. It may be possible, if the matter was referred to a committee, to make a thorough investigation; but if it is not, the responsibility falls on the Government; and it is the duty of the Government to provide means by which they will have still the veto power until they are satisfied, at least, in regard to this transaction. If such a provision as that were put in the Bill, it would not, in the slightest degree, justify any departure from the agreement. The agreement was made on valuable consideration. It is essential to the public interest that it should not be departed from, and here is no valid reason why it should be departed from. The hon. member for North Ontario dilated upon the value of the road, and so did the First Minister. I agree with them both that the road is a very important road, but that has nothing to do with the question. We have paid for a large proportion of the construction of the road; in fact we contracted for a line of railway for a large sum of money, and the contracting party is bound to supply that. We are not doing anything we ought not to do in withholding this legislation, for the contractors have no moral or legal claim upon this House for the kind of relief they are asking for, the refusal of which will not interfere with the public interest. On what principle in the public interest is this House asked to sacrifice its position now? No argument has been advanced; no hon. gentleman, with the exception of the Minister of Justice, has ventured to speak on the subject, and he merely stated there had been expended a certain sum of money under the contract, which was in its nature an extremely unwise and imperfect expenditure. For these reasons I beg to move:

That the amendments be not now concurred in, but that the Bill be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. HALL. If I understand the argument of the hon. gentleman who opposes the measure, it is based on the assumption that in the original contract made between the Government and this company, a sum was fixed, upon the payment of which the Government could take over this road and assume its control, and the assertion is made that any change from the sum named in the contract would be irregular and unjust to the country. The examination of the original contract would show that there is no fixed sum, on the payment of which the Government could take over the road. It is to be borne in mind that when the particular provision was made that the Government could, should certain contingencies arise, take over the road for the benefit of the country, the road was not even surveyed, it was not known what the difficulties of construction would be, and the sum named was purely nominal, the minimum amount under which the road could be constructed in favorable circumstances, $8,000 a mile, but the words were added:

"The Parliament of Canada may, if it see fit, cancel the said lease and take over the said railway free from encumbrance, upon assumption of the bond or debenture debts of the lessor company, to the amount of $8,000 per mile of the railway, and upon payment of such further sums of money beyond the said bond debts of $8,000 per mile, and the said subsidy as the said railway may then be worth."

So that whenever the contingencies arose, the Government would be under the obligation to pay whatever the road might be worth whether the $20,000, which we are now fixing as the lesser sum, or a greater or lesser sum.

Mr. MILLS. Oh, no.

Mr. HALL. The Government are bound to pay whatever the road might be worth at the time of taking it over, in excess of the $8,000 a mile which is merely a nominal sum. That provision with regard to the $8,000 a mile was a proper one at the time; in fact, it was the only one that could then be made. But the position is now changed, and while it was impossible then to fix a definite sum, and it is difficult now to do so, yet the necessity has arisen when we must come to a decision as to the amount. We know, from our own judgment, with what great energy the company have built the road; we have the evidence that these contractors have gone on in good faith and built a difficult road of 110 miles, within the limited period allowed by this contract, and we have the evidence of an hon. member living in that vicinity who said the road has been built energetically and well. There has been no difficulty as to unpaid contractors, there has been no difficulty with regard to unpaid right of way, but the whole enterprise has been conducted on thorough business principles, energetically and well. Again, we have evidence to show that the contract made was the best that could be made, after public tenders had been invited, and no less than fifteen tenders had been sent in, and, under the contract, the whole payment of the cost of building the road was to be, in addition to the Government subsidy, the bonds of the road at par. The road now being on the eve of completion, the contractors are entitled to their payment, and I am sure it is not the intention of the Government that they should adopt the principle that those contractors, who have put their money and labor into the work, should not be properly paid, and that the means should not be furnished by this Legislature in order that they may be paid. It would be contrary to the spirit of justice and fairness, if any other conclusion were reached. But I am sure that every hon. member in this House who has any experience in railway matters, and every man outside of this House who has any experience in railway matters, will agree with me that, under the uncertain conditions which prevailed in the original contract, these bonds would have been perfectly unsaleable, that they could not have been sold for 50 cents. on the dollar of their face value. Under the circumstances, it became a necessity that the sum should be settled. I admit the difficulty of settling it, but it was necessary that it should be settled, and I think the Government has exercised a wise discretion in arriving

at the amount of $20,000 a mile in addition to the bonus. That amount of $20,000 a mile is the usual amount for which roads are bonded. I venture to say that nine-tenths of the railway charters which have been granted during this Parliament have been on the basis of at least $20,000 a mile in the form of bonds.

Mr. WELDON. They had only a $3,000 bonus, not $12,000.

Mr. HALL. It is true, but we must remember that, when once the road was contracted to these parties, it became their property, and they had the right to exercise their own discretion in regard to it, and we ourselves gave to this company the power to bond the road for $20,000 a mile. There was no opposition, there was no criticism at that time, although we were giving the necessary power to allow these bonds to be issued, and to allow them to be sold to the public. There was no criticism as to the amount of $20,000 a mile.

Mr. MULOCK. I would point out to my hon. friend that that was prior to the grant of the bonus by the country.

Mr. HALL. I refer to it as the evidence of $20,000 a mile being the usual bonding power granted to railways by this Parliament. The Government had in addition to that a very important factor towards coming to a conclusion as to the amount. That was the concurrence of judgment of the company itself and of the contractors as to this being the proper limit. It is to be borne in mind that these parties were all interested in limiting the amount of the bond issue. The contractors were to have their payment solely in bonds, and every one will appreciate the fact that the less the amount of bonds the more saleable they were. The company had equally an interest in reducing the amount of bonds, because this company is made up of the shareholders of the Northern Railway Company and of the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company, and these two companies pay as the lease of this road the interest on these bonds. Therefore they were interested in limiting the amount of the bonds as well as the contractors themselves. When the Government saw that the $20,000 a mile was not only the amount fixed by Parliament but also by those who had an interest in reducing the amount of the bonds to the lowest possible figure, and had in addition to that the evidence of their own chief engineer as to the probable cost of the road, they were justified in assuming this figure. It is true that the chief engineer reduces the cost of the road rather below the amount of $20,000 a mile and the bonus, making together $32,000; but one has to consider two other important elements in connection with it. One is that the bonds could not under any circumstances be sold at par, but that they must be sold at a discount, and probably 10 per cent. would be a very moderate allowance, which would make of itself $220,000. Then there is the item of interest on capital expenditure while the work has been going on, and making a moderate allowance for these two items leaves about $3,000 a mile for the completion of the road, for sidings, for water tanks, for construction of stations and equipment. It may be true, as the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has stated, that the road is not obliged to furnish all its rolling stock. If it were, of course this amount would be much too small an allowance, but there is always an amount of equipment, fixed equipment, terminal facilities, and facilities at stations for receiving and discharging freight, which must be allowed for. Therefore I think that $3,000 would strike any man of experience as a very limited amount to agree upon, and, this necessity existing to which I have referred, I think the sum named, which has been accepted by the Senate and which it is proposed to submit for the acceptance of this House, is a reasonable and fair one. It is attempted, by comparing the contract with the sub-contracts, to show that the cost of the road has been excessive. I think by any one of experience the argument will be acknowledged to be a very unfair one. Of course, the main contract is over the whole extent of 110 miles, over the difficult portion of the road as well as the easy portion, over the mountainous portion, over the rivers which have to be bridged and every difficulty of that kind, and it is unfair to compare the contract over the whole road with a section which may be taken—and my hon. friend has undoubtedly selected the section most favorable—perhaps a level part of the road where no bridging is required and no rock cutting occurs. It is perfectly impossible to argue from a short section of that kind, perhaps of half a mile over the easiest portion of the road, that the cost of the whole road is at all excessive. Then it must be borne in mind that the sub-contractors receive their pay in cash as the work goes along, receive it at the expense of the main contractors who have to lie out of their advances during the whole course of construction and until the bonds are sold. These illustrations, I think, show that any attempt to make it appear that the main contract was excessive by a reference to the sub-contracts, is an unfair and improper one. There has been a good deal of reference this Session to the connection of members of Parliament with railway companies, and this measure has at one time and another brought up the same discussion. I do not share in the adverse criticism against members of Parliament identifying themselves with railway companies and with companies for the development of the resources of this country. I think it is to the credit of members of Parliament that they do so identify themselves. I do not go the length, nor would I go the length, of saying that they would have any right to make any improper use of their connection, nor do I admit that any such improper use is made, but the mere fact, which has been often criticised in this House, of the names of members of Parliament appearing as directors and shareholders being held up as open to criticism, is unfair; on the contrary, it is rather to their credit that it is so. I think the fact that the names of hon. members of the Opposition do not appear in our public companies is attributable, if it were investigated, not to their delicacy of sentiment, but to their caution, and I think it would be more to their credit if they would identify themselves more with these public companies which tend so much to the development of the resources of this country. In reference to the particular company under consideration, I am sure, as I said in opening, that the necessity existed for fixing a sum under which the bonds might be disposed of to the public, and I am equally sure that the amount that has been agreed upon is a fair and just one and will receive the approbation of this House.

Mr. McMULLEN I am not at all surprised at the remarks the hon. gentleman has made with regard to the members of Parliament being associated with railway charters, but, after the exposure we have had in this House with reference to the North-West Central Railway, I am rather surprised that any member would dare to say he has not been aware of improper acts on the part of members of this House in connection with railway charters. The hon. gentleman has referred to the matter of rolling stock. There is not a single item in the lease between the company and the contracting party with regard to rolling stock. There is nothing to compel the company to provide rolling stock, and, if this Dominion should find it necessary, in the interests of the Province of Ontario or in the interests of the Dominion at large, to repossess themselves of this line, they will have to pay over to the company $20,000 a mile, they would have to admit the amount of the bonded indebtedness, instead of only $8,000 a mile and the amount over that which the line might be valued at.

The House is virtually ratifying the cost of the road by permitting the issue of $20,000 a mile in bonds. We are admitting that the road has cost $32,000 per mile. There has been an amount of recklessness in connection with this whole matter. In the first place, the $12,000 that was granted as a subsidy was given as an off-set to the amounts which had been granted in aid of railways in the Province of Quebec and in the Maritime Provinces. The Province of Ontario is supposed to benefit largely by the construction of this road, and undoubtedly she will, but there has been altogether too much money devoted to the construction of this 110 miles of road—far more than is necessary. We had a vested interest in the road, and we could, if necessary, repossess ourselves of it by paying the actual cost of construction. But we are departing from that position, and acknowledging now, that if it ever becomes necessary to repossess the road, we will have to pay $20,000 a mile for it. Now, I may state, from information I have received from parties who went over every mile of that road, and one of whom was a builder on the Grand Trunk from the very day its construction was commenced west of Montreal, a man of extended experience in railway building, told me, when he had learned the amounts stated by the company, that there was undoubtedly a big bonanza in this thing for somebody. Now, I say it is unwise that we should permit this company to make a sale of the road, as their own property, at the rate of $20,000 per mile. We are permitting the present company, that has been charged with it, virtually to deal with this road as if it was their absolute property, and no doubt they are selling it and getting returned $20,000 a mile, less the amount that it will take to finish the construction, over and above the original amount granted. Now, I say we should have held a controlling interest in this road, and not have allowed it to pass into the hands of the company under these circumstances. The Government should not have acted in the reckless way they have done in connection with this matter. I can easily understand why the leader of the Government has made it a Government measure. A number of his friends are interested in it, and he is anxious to see them through the undertaking. I say it is unfair to this House and unfair to the country. I can fully endorse the view expressed by the hon. member for North York when he said that the amounts paid to the sub-contractors were considerably less than the original amounts paid to the first contractors. I have not a personal acquaintance with a number of those who were contractors on that line, but I have with some of them, and I am fully satisfied that the figures he has submitted to the House as the amounts paid to the sub-contractors are correct in the main, and I am certain that if the House would submit this thing to the Railway Committee and permit the hon. member for North York to adduce the evidence that can be adduced, revelations would take place in connection with that transaction that would be quite as surprising to this House and the country as those that took place in connection with the Manitoba and North-West Central. I am satisfied that money has been got in such a way, and that matters have been manipulated in such a way in connection with this road that money has passed into the pockets of men who would, in all probability, blush with shame if the way the matter has been handled were brought before the world. For my part I do not wish to make any insinuation against the hon. member in charge of this measure. His political career has been, I am glad to say, so far, such as to prevent me from making any insinuation in that connection. But he may, possibly, be used by these other parties who are experts in the matter of railway building and contracting. They may have found him a very convenient man to use in this Chamber to carry the measure through, exercising a very large influence, as he does, with the Government and the House. I know there has been a good deal of lobbying done in this matter. They have been down here week after week undoubtedly exercising an influence in favor of this Bill. I say that if the Government are prepared to act in the interest of the country, they should allow an investigation to take place and allow the hon. member for North York to present the evidence that he has in his possession, and if it shows that there are no objectionable features in the transaction, it will be time enough then to pass the legislation they now ask for. With regard to the course adopted by the Senate. I am sorry to think the Senate should permit themselves to be made, for the time being, the tools of those who are advocating the passage of this measure.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, have submitted to influences which induced the Senate to pass these amendments. I do not think they should have permitted it. The only Minister in the Senate who was there to guard the interest of the country, is the president of the Northern Railway, one of the lines most closely connected with this transaction, and no doubt he exercised a very strong influence in the Senate in favor of this transaction. Now, a remark has been made with regard to the Ontario Government subsidising roads, but I would say that in every case where aid was granted by that Government, the most searching investigation was made into the circumstances of the road, and they require specifications and statements showing the quantity of work done, before a single dollar is handed over. Sir, I think this Government should exercise a similar care in connection with this matter in order to protect the interest of the country; they ought to have instructed their engineer to make a thorough investigation and examination of the road. There is no difficulty now, with the information already possessed, for the Government engineers to make a very close estimate as to what it is going to cost. It is possible to come within $1,000 or $1,500 of the cost. When the Government ascertained the amount the road was likely to cost, they could have given a subsidy that would have enabled some company to undertake the construction. But in place of that they granted $6,000 a mile, then the next year they granted $6,000 more, and in this way they allowed parties to speculate in the matter. and now they come out with a declaration that it will take $20,000 a mile, over and above the amount the Government granted. Well, Sir, as I said before, I am satisfied that there is a big bonanza in this thing, and it would be well for the House to find out where the money is going.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There are some curious features about this transaction. I fail to understand how it was that these facts which are now alleged, were not known a fortnight ago when this matter was under discussion, and if at that time the hon. member for Simcoe and the Government were aware that this road required power to borrow $20,000 per mile, why it was not stated then. There was time then to have had a full discussion, and it appears to me that they must have known then all the facts that they are in possession of to-night. I have not yet heard any evidence to show that any new fact has been elicited which was not fully known to the Government and to the promoter when this matter was under discussion. Now, what is our position? When this matter was discussed in the House before we came to a decision upon it, a matter which is peculiarly within the purview of this House, inasmuch as we have to provide the money. After we had disposed of it and sent it to the Upper Chamber, a good many members who were interested in this question having gone away, we now find the Senate takes upon itself to alter an arrangement made by the Government of this country, and to add—because that is practically the effect of it—to the burdens of the people of this country. Now, that may be technically within the power of the

Senate, but practically this is not the kind of a Bill the Senate ought to be allowed by the House of Commons to alter after we have come to a decision. Another consideration is this. So far as I have been able to understand, no money at all of the lessees of the road is being put into the road by them, except a paltry $18,000 or $20,000. They got $12,000 per mile from this country, they got the power of bonding for $8,000, they now demand a further power of bonding for $12,000 making in all $20,000 a mile, and so far as I can see all the cash that the parties or the representatives of the parties put in was 10 per cent. on $200,000, or about $20,000. It does appear to me that there can be no reason whatever for requiring that the House should on such very imperfect information, and in face of the statements made by the hon. member for North York, depart from the resolution they came to after our first deliberation. If next year it should appear there was good ground for making a further concession, then after fair consideration in committee it might be granted; but after the statements made during the debate and after, as I understand, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) agreed that $8,000 a mile was sufficient as against the Government, this thing should not have been sprung upon us at this hour by amendment in the Senate, introduced, if the hon. gentleman is right in his statement, at the instance of a member of the Government, who has a direct personal interest as president of the Northern Railway in pressing this particular legislation.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not sorry that an opportunity has at length been afforded me to rise to meet the various accusations that have been made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) who has taken a very great interest in this matter, and who has now been endorsed by the member who has last spoken. Sir, it is true what has been represented as to the position and attitude I took in the House when the Bill was before it. I was discussing the legal character of the Bill with which I was entrusted, a Bill which I then presented to the House, against the accusation made by members on the Opposition side, that the effect of the legislation then proposed would be to do away with the Government contract and introduce a new term into it. I told the House then, and I repeat it to the House now, that that was not the intention of the legislation which I had in charge; that the object of it was simply to make the bonds sectional and alter the character of the bonds to be issued. I do not think any hon. member who has taken trouble to study the matter will say that that was an incorrect statement of the Bill then before the House, and I stated my willingness to put in any clause that might be suggested in order to make that which was clear to me should be made satisfactory to the House. So the Bill passed this Chamber. At that time the officers of the company, the people who are immediatety charged with the duty, were negotiating with the Government to do that which the Government had power to do. They were asking the Government to alter the contract because it was by the contract and not otherwise that this limitation in the power of the company, this right of the Government with respect to the $8,000 a mile of bonds, was stipulated. It was not by Act of Parliament, it was not in pursuance of any expression in Acts of Parliament, but the Government thought fit when the subsidy was granted to this company to say: If you do not comply with the terms of your charter, if you do not comply with the requirements, especially with clause thirty-four which obliges the company to afford all reasonable facilities for the interchange of traffic, and in order to secure the most perfect freedom and the most perfect fairness on the part of this company in the interchange of traffic, Parliament may, if satisfied at any time that this provision is not being complied with, acquire the road and take it over. Upon payment of what? Upon payment of $8,000 a mile as the minimum, and, as the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) has pointed out, upon the payment of a such further sum as the road may then be worth. With regard to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), who has taken a very peculiar position in this matter. I regret the fact, because I like to see a gentleman occupying his position acting from purely patriotic feeling, and I like to believe those are his sole motives. I regret to say that an imputation may be cast on the zeal of that hon. gentleman, because the whole of his trouble with the Northern Railway arises simply because that railway declined to give him and his friends going to his country estate, such rates and discriminations as would be, in their opinion, against the interest of the general public.

Mr. MULOCK. The statement is wholly incorrect.

Mr. McCARTHY: The cause of the hon. gentleman's trouble with the Northern Railway is, I say, and I am prepared to prove it, that that hon. gentleman applied for rates, which the public were not getting, for him and his friends to go to his country seat, and the manager of the Northern Railway did not think it in the public interest to grant them.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is wholly incorrect in his statements.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman has said so and I have made my statement. I have not far from me copies of the correspondence that passed, and if the hon. gentleman wishes it placed on the Table of the House I have no desire to refrain from doing so. I have read the correspondence within the last twenty-four hours. The hon. gentleman's zeal in the public interest against the Northern Railway, and his desire to force terms upon them, I regret to say does not all appear to result from pure and patriotic motives. Let me again draw attention to this. The question here is not, it never has been, whether there has been any liability on the part of the country towards this railway company. The Government granted $12,000 a mile, it is true; but in granting it to this link which was to connect Callander with the Ontario system of railways, the Government were only doing what the former Government, of which the hon. member for South Huron was a member, did for the Canada Central, to connect it with Montreal by way of Ottawa. The people of Ontario were entitled—and it was agreed unanimously by this House that a grant of $12,000 a mile under those circumstances was not unfair and unreasonable. But this Administration did choose to place terms on the Northern Pacific Railway Company, which the Government, of which the hon. member who last addressed the House was a member, did not think proper to impose on the Canada Central. They provided in the agreement that if at any time it was in the public interest to acquire that railway they had power to do so, and a step which they need not have taken, for the Government has always power to expropriate in their way as they have to expropriate a telegraph system. But Parliament has provided that while they should be bound to pay $8,000 a mile they could also be called upon to pay the sum the road was worth, $20,000, $30,000 or $40,000 a mile. But this is a very remote contingency indeed. We are not dealing with the present but the contingency that is not likely to arrive in our day in connection with this railway company, viz., that the Government would cause Parliament to acquire the road and pay the bonds. If that be so, then why is all this talk and what is the meaning of all these expressions of imposing burdens on the people? The people are under no burdens now. Parliament possesses the right, but Parliament is not bound to exercise that right unless it should be in the public interest. What are the possibilities? The possibility is that at some time or other this road will be so recreant to its duties and

responsibilities as to refuse to interchange traffic upon equal terms with all the other railways, and if such an event should happen, then, it is true that Parliament could take the road over, but not by paying merely $8,000 a mile, but paying whatever the road may be worth at the time. That is what Parliament is authorised to do. Now, what is the proposition before the House? And why was it that this proposition was made in the Senate? I will tell the House. As I said before, negotiations were going on between the manager of the road and the Minister of Railways with regard to an alteration of that contract which, strictly speaking, did not require the assent of Parliament. Negotiations were pending between the Government and the company, when, as hon. gentlemen know, unfortunately at that time the Minister of Railway became incapable of discharging his duties, and the negotiations were in abeyance. But after the discussion in the House upon the reading of this Bill, the acting Minister of Railways thought that, considering all that had been said with regard to this road, it would not be proper for the Government, behind Parliament, to enter into an agreement with the railway company, and, as the Bill had passed through this House, the Government authorised that to be done which alone was possible under the circumstances—to introduce the amendment in the Senate, knowing, of course, that it had to come back for the assent of this House. And what is the amendment? The amendment is that instead of the Government being bound to pay, in case they do what, as I have already said, it is most improbable that they will ever be called on to do—that is to assume this railway—that instead of paying $8,000 they shall pay $20,000 per mile. Now, is there any hon. gentleman in this House who honestly believes that that road will not, in the course of three or four years, be worth more than $20,000 per mile, over and above the subsidy? Is there anyone who does not know that if the road is kept up at all—for the road is, as we all know, a most valuable piece of railway—is kept up for three or four years, with additional buildings and sidings, &c., that that road will not ere long be of much greater value than $32,000 per mile. I ask hon. gentlemen to say whether the Grand Trunk Railway could be purchased for anything like $30,000 or $40,000 per mile. I ask hon. gentlemen to look at the Ontario and Quebec, one of the cheapest roads that was ever built in this country, and they know that it cost more than $30,000 per mile. We all know that a road is constantly increasing in value. A road cannot properly be operated without constructing sidings, and other improvements necessary for its working and traffic; and the proposition here is to fix that amount, $20,000 per mile, after an investigation, when we all know of a verity that that will, at least, be its value at any time the Government desire to take the road over. What is there in that? Let us see the evidence upon which the Government are acting. The matter was referred to Mr. Schreiber, the Government engineer, and he made this report, and although the substance of it has been stated to the House, I will read it at length:

"Having as required looked into the matter of the cost of the construction of the Northern Pacific Railway (Gravenhurst to Callandar) the following appear to be the facts:

"The company have paid the contractors, Messrs. Hendrie & Symmes, for work done up to the end of February, the sum of $2,582,896. The company have paid for right of way, $41,139; telegraph line, $4,540; have let contracts for buildings, $52,300; for engineering and superintendence, $77,000, or a total for work and services of $2,757,875. Estimated value of work remaining to be done: Semaphores, $2,880; engineering and superintendence, $10,700; rails and fastenings for sidings, $24,660; earthwork, $70,000; ballasting, $14,000; riprap $31,500; off-take ditches, $4,080; making in all, $2,915,695, or, with rolling stock, $300,000, added, a total of $3,215,695."

Or within a fraction of $29,000 per mile of actual expenditure, or expenditures agreed upon, up to the present date. Now what is that over and above the subsidy? It amounts to $17,000 above the subsidy. The Government are now agreeing—the difference between the two being $17,000 and $20,000—to assume that when Parliament exercises its option—if Parliament ever is called upon to do so—that the cost of the road will be at least $20,000 per mile. The Minister of Railways was asked in the first place merely to sanction an alteration in the contract to the extent of $17,000 or $18,000 per mile. But with his experience, he said: It is useless to be doing that to-day, for you will be coming back to-morrow to get a further extension. He said: I know if the road has cost $17,000 per mile now, over and above the subsidy, it is certain before the road can go into operation for any length of time the cost will be fully $20,000 per mile, and there is no use, therefore, in having two alterations of the contract; we may as well at once deal with it in this way, and he does so accordingly. Now what is the explanation? Mr. Schreiber says:

"In explanation of this I may say that the original estimate of $20,000 per mile did not include rolling stock, as it was said the road was to be operated with the stock of the Northern and North-Western Railway. Neither did it cover a length in excess of 110 miles, there being actually one and a quarter miles of additional length. There appears to be no doubt that the works which were originally covered by the estimate of $2,200,000 will, when completed cost a sum not less than $2,900,000, the country traversed being very much rougher and heavier than it was believed to be when the original estimate was made, and the bridging being of a much more permanent, durable and costly character than was specified.

"If the rolling stock is to be provided the cost will no doubt reach $3,200,000."

Now, these are the circumstances of the case, and I think I have satisfied every gentleman who desires to be satisfied, that if the actual cost of the road now is $17,000 per mile, before the road will be fairly worked it will reach to within a fraction of $20,000 per mile. Then the question is, is the the country to be benefited, is it to be put in any better position to compel this railway company to sell its bonds at what must necessarily be a considerable sacrifice? Now, I think the hon. gentleman, who once occupied the position of Finance Minister of this country, will, I think, admit that to put these bonds on the market with that Government contract and responsibilities would be almost next to impossible. I think he will agree that those bonds cannot be floated at probably more than two-thirds of their face value. Now will that benefit us, will it benefit the country or the traffic which is to go over the road? Undoubtedly the proprietors of this road will expect to make the interest on their bonds: and if the bonds bring 66 cents instead of 100 cents, and the interest is paid on 100 cents, it is not difficult to ascertain that the cost of the road will be much enhanced, and the cost of the traffic correspondingly so. Will it therefore benefit any person to say that the Government should not at once, instead of leaving it for the future, assume that this road will cost, whenever the country proposes to take it over, $20,000 per mile; and the Government are prepared to say that if ever Parliament exercises that power, they will be prepared to assume the bonded debt to that extent? The alternative proposition is to let the contract remain as it is, to let the company float their bonds, to let them sacrifice their bonds, and thereby increase the cost of the road, increase the cost of the traffic, and certainly not benefit the travelling or commercial community. In the event of Parliament being called upon to exercise its option Parliament will yet have to pay the value, whatever it may be, and that will be no doubt $20,000 per mile over and above the subsidy. This is the proposition which excites the ire of the hon. gentleman who is now taking his change out of the manager of the Northern Railway. The hon. gentleman is now taking his innings after the manager of the Northern has had his, and I have no doubt that gentleman now regrets that he did not give the hon. member for North York the benefit of low rates on the line, or a pass, or anything else, or would regret it, if he had known what terrible opposition he was bringing up and using against him. And now a word as to how the contract was

let. Much has been said as to how this was done. I asked Mr. Barker, the manager of the road, to write me a letter, above his own hand, to see whether Mr. Moss could verify the statement how the contract had been let, and whether there was any ground for the accusation so recklessly hurled across the floor of this House, and the insinuations cast upon hon. members on the floor and upon people who are not here, connected with the building of this railway; and what is the statement made by Mr. Barker, verified by Mr. Charles Moss, who was then president of the road, and who superintended the letting of these contracts? That statement has been printed and distributed, and was, I have no doubt, in the possession of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), when he spoke this afternoon and this evening. I trust that he read it, and if he did I trust that he understood it; and understanding it, I cannot comprehend his making the charges he did make in connection with this matter. He knows Mr. Moss, and he knows Mr. Barker; and whatever his feelings may be towards the latter gentleman, he will not pretend to say either here or elsewhere that either Mr. Barker or Mr. Moss would be privy to a dishonest or a dishonorable transaction. Mr. Barker may be a hard and close railway manager, and I believe he is; he may not be a popular railway manager, just for those causes, but that he is an honest man and would not stoop to do a dishonorable transaction, I challenge the hon. member for North York to deny. What does he say:

"On the 24th June, 1884, Mr. Chas. Moss, Q.C., then president of the company, Mr. John Stuart, of Hamilton, and myself were appointed a committee of the board to open and examine tenders and report thereon.

"On the 10th July, 1884, Hon. James Turner was substituted for Mr. Stuart, during the latter's absence in England.

"The committee reported that of the fifteen tenders received pursuant to the newspaper advertisements, the three best tenders were those of Manning & Peterson, Neelon, Carroll & Co. and Dawson & Symmes, and that Manning & Peterson would accept the company's bonds in payment for the work in excess of the subsidy at 90 cents on the dollar, while Neelon, Carroll & Co. offered to accept them at 95 cents and Symmes & Dawson at par.

"The question was then submitted to the board, and after very thorough consideration the work was awarded to Dawson, Symmes & Co. by unanimous vote, the following directors being present: Mr. Charles Moss, Q.C., president, Messrs. John Proctor, C. J. Campbell, Hon. James Turner, Wm. Ince and Saml. Barker. The question was really between Dawson, Symmes & Co., and Neelon, Carroll & Co., for Manning & Peterson's tender, as amended by that firm, was higher than either of the others, and they would take our bonds only at a discount of 10 per cent.

"The Messrs. Hendrie had also put in a tender for the work, but it was much higher than the tenders of the three firms above named, and was rejected.

"After the tender of Dawson, Symmes & Co. had been accepted, they took Messrs. Hendrie in with them, and so the latter gentlemen became partners in the work, but of course on the terms of Dawson, Symmes & Co 's tender."

Mr. Moss certifies to the above as follows:—

"My recollection accords with the statements on this and foregoing page. The matters referred to in the following papers occurred after my connection with the board had ceased.

"CHARLES MOSS."

I want to know what more could have been done. Tenders were called for by open advertisements; fifteen were received; all the tenders having been submitted to a committee, they reported to the board that the three lowest were those I have mentionned; Mr. Manning's became the highest by reason of his only being willing to take the bonds of the company at a discount of 10 per cent., while Dawson & Symmes were willing to take them at par, and the contract was granted to Dawson, Symmes & Hendrie, on the terms of Dawson & Symmes' tender. The hon. member has statements from some person, whose name he will not mention, as to the terms of the sub-contracts. I do not know what the railway company have to do between the contractors and the sub-contractors. The contractors performed their work, and having done so they were entitled to their pay, and what the company has to do with that matter perhaps the hon. member will explain. Now, the position is this. The Government never supposed that $8,000 a mile would build this road, and it took power to issue bonds to the extent of $12,000 per mile; and how have these bonds been disposed of. Mr. Barker replies as follows:—

"The bonds already issued are $12,000 per mile, that being all the lessees had consented to up to the holding of the recent meetings of the shareholders of the Northern and North-Western Railways."

Allow me to draw attention to that fact. No bonds can be issued on this road without the consent of the bondholders of the Northern Railway and without the consent of the shareholders and bondholders of the Hamilton and North-Western Railway. The interest on the bonds become virtually a charge upon these railways, and a negotiation has been going on for the purpose of making this interest part of the working expenses; and if that is done, it will be ahead of the bondholders' claims on both roads. Is it possible to suppose that the bondholders of the Northern Railway and the shareholders of the Hamilton and North-Western Railway are all privy to this scheme spoken of by hon. members opposite? They have to be satisfied before assenting that the bonds have been properly applied. Now, have these bonds been applied? The contractors have been given, on account of work done to this date, over $1,000,000; the banks, on securing advances for surveys, engineering expenses, purchase of right of way, the construction of station houses, &c., $227,000; and the Canada Life, as security for advances towards the purchase of rolling stock, $64,000, or say $12,000 a mile; and that is the amount of bonds which up to date the company had power to issue. Recent meetings have been held, not with recklessness, but with caution, and the company's shareholders have sanctioned the issue of bonds to the extent of $17,000 a mile. The accounts between the company and the contractors have not yet been adjusted; and although the evidence of Mr. Bailey, the engineer, appeared to satisfy Mr. Schreiber that the cost would be about $20,000 a mile, at present the shareholders have only sanctioned the issue of $17,000 a mile. But we know that the balance of the $20,000, or nearly so, will have to be issued. Now, the question comes back to a very simple one. Is it better that this company should be empowered to issue these bonds at their fair value, or that it should be compelled to go on the market with bonds having a cloud cast upon them by the agreement made with the Government in 1874? It has been said the company entered into that agreement with their eyes open, and ought not to be relieved. While that may be the case, it may still be expedient to alter a bargain, not merely in the interest of the company, but in the interest of the country; and I say it is in the interest of the country to enable the company to float its bonds on the best terms that can be got. The company must pay the interest; and if the bonds realise only two-thirds of their value, the greater burden they will impose on the road—the greater must be its earnings to pay the interest upon them. One word more, and I am done. It is said the contract does not authorise the company to purchase rolling stock. It is true, the contract is not very explicit on that point; but it was always the intention that rolling stock should be put on the road. I should like to know what would be the use of the road if there were no rolling stock upon it. The contract implies, because reference is made to it in one part, that rolling stock should be put upon the road. But, as a matter of fact rolling stock is being put on it, and is necessary for its operation. The mere rails between Gravenhurst and Callander would not give the people of the Province what they want without the rolling stock to do the work, and rolling stock is being supplied. Under the circumstances, I do not think this House will hesitate for one moment to endorse the action of the Senate in this amendment, which is brought in under the circumstances I have mentioned, and which could have been dealt with behind

the back of the House by an alteration, if the Government had thought fit to adopt that course; but it has been brought before the House to be discussed openly, so that the full merits and demerits of the transaction may be seen.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has demonstrated to the House that it is a very simple matter to build railways in this country, and in fact that it requires no capital whatever to become a railway owner. A few gentlemen can associate together; and if they have sufficient influence with the Government, they can get enormous bonuses, bond the road, sell the bonds, get whatever more money is necessary to build the road, and they become owners of the property. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), said he saw no harm in members of Parliament promoting railway enterprises by taking stock in the railway companies. There is no harm in that, but when a man consents to become a member of Parliament and then seeks favors at the hands of the Government for enterprises with which he is connected, he is placing himself in a false position, one which enables the people to say that he is compromising or may compromise himself. What do we find here? Half a dozen members of Parliament go to work and get a railway charter from Parliament. These hon. gentlemen have sufficient influence with the Government to get the Government to give them enormous bonuses for the construction of their road. They get authority, in the Act which incorporates them, to bond the road, and they are the owners of the road. Does the hon member for North Simcoe think he can persuade the House that he and his associates have been doing this work for nothing, and solely out of patriotic motives. Do hon. gentlemen sitting in this House, who are promoting railways from one end of the country to the other, think they can convince us that they are not acting in their own interest, but solely in the interest of the country? If they think so, they are relying too much on the credulity of the people. What are the facts in connection with this road? The hon. member for North Simcoe was one of its incorporators. These hon. gentlemen—I refer to the hon. Senator Smith and the hon. Senator Turner and the hon. member for North Simcoe—are stock-holders in the road. In some way that stock has been transferred, and it is now held for the benefit of the two leased roads. When was the consideration given? and what was the consideration given for the transfer? Is it true that these two roads, the Northern and the Hamilton and North-Western, paid a large sum of money for the control of that stock? Rumor says they did. Who was it that got the money? Hon. gentlemen opposite smile. They may well smile because they are as deep in the matter as many others we are speaking about. That stock is transferred, and is held in trust for these two companies. When was it transferred? What was the consideration? Did the original corporators of the Northern and Pacific Junction receive a consideration from these two railways for the transfer of the stock? Or were Senators Smith and Turner and the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) animated entirely by patriotic motives in getting this road incorporated and turning it over to these railways? There is a rumor in the country that the men who are connected with the original corporation of that road have received a large sum of money for transferring the stock and control of it to the two railways I have mentioned. Is that true? It has never been contradicted, so far as I have learned, by any hon. gentleman in this House or out of it. Whoever may have made money by this transaction, one thing, however, is certain, that the contractors have made enormous sums of money, reaching to the millions. Is the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Monck) a partner in the concern? Are there any members of this House sleeping partners in the concern? Mr. Barker is, I believe, an honorable man, but he may think this is a perfectly legitimate transaction, and it may be so far as he is concerned. But if there is an hon. member in this House involved in this transaction, he is not entitled to and should not hold his seat in Parliament. I do not charge the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) with having anything to do with it, but it is stated that the corporators in the original road received a large sum of money for the stock they held in it, on their assigning that stock to the lessor companies, giving them control of the road, control of the charter, and control of the subsidy granted by Parliament. This road may be of benefit to Canada, but when we are dealing with it, on a contract entered into, we must look at the possible consequences of the action of Parliament to-day. This road entered into a contract with this Parliament by which we have the right to take control of it anytime it is not operated satisfactorily, and if we find it necessary to exercise that power, we have no right to grant to this company power to borrow more money than the road will be fairly worth when we take possession of it. The contract was that the company could borrow $8,000 a mile; now they propose to borrow $20,000 a mile and ask of this Parliament power to do so. But if we do, we will—should we desire to exercise the right—have to take control of the road, have to assume the additional liability involved in giving them power to borrow $20,000 a mile. The hon. gentleman may say that event will never happen, but he has no right to say that. It may not happen or it may, and we have the right to see that the contract is carried out according to its terms. The contractors have received a million dollars more than the work is worth; the road is therefore worth a million dollars less than the company is paying for it, and that we will have to pay for it if we have to pay contract rates. That is the position we are in; and the Government in assuming control of the matter assumes all the responsibility. It is very well for my hon. friend to say he is now content to have this measure as it was when it came before the House, but we know perfectly well, from information from the hon. gentleman and the senators, that this matter had been arranged among them after the Bill left this House.

Mr. McCARTHY. The measure was exactly as I have stated. There was communication going on between the Government and the company to have the contract altered, and the contract could have been altered without legislation. Owing to the illness of the Minister of Railways, negotiations were left in abeyance. But on account of the discussion in the House, the Minister of Railways thought the proper way to do it was, not by contract, but by discussion of the Bill. I do not think the hon. member could find fault with that.

Mr. LISTER. Certainly not, but did not the hon. member know that when it was before the House?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not pretend to say I did not. I knew it was under negotiation, but the negotiations were not completed. The matter was being negotiated between them, and the railway engineer was taking evidence. What course the Government would take I did not know.

Mr. LISTER. Very Well. In a matter in which this country is so deeply interested, it was the duty of the Government, and it is the duty of the Government to-day, to have this whole matter referred to a committee, and, if it is not as we hear, if everything is clear and straight, there will be no occasion, there will be no opportunity of reflecting upon any hon. gentleman in this House or upon any man outside of this House. I feel these hon. senators and everyone connected with this road owe it to themselves and the country to have a thorough investigation into their whole dealings with this road, from the time they transferred the stock to these two railway companies down to the present moment. It is a matter this country is deeply interested in, and in the interests of the country, in every view you can take of it, this matter ought to be investigated.

There is a feeling, and my hon. friend must have heard of it, because it is all over the Province of Ontario, that the men who were interested in this work have made an enormous fortune out of it. Everyone who has ever heard anything of this Northern and Pacific Junction for the last six or eight months must know that in Toronto, and in other places in the Province of Ontario, the feeling is that these men have made an enormous fortune out of it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Which men?

Mr. LISTER. The contractors, and it is intimated that more than one member of Parliament is interested in the contract. I may say that my hon friend from Welland (Mr. Ferguson) is stated to have an interest in the contract. Whether that is true or false I do not know, but it is common rumor, and it is a duty he owes to himself that this should be cleared up. I say this system of members of Parliament craving from the Government bonuses to aid them in these schemes in which they have put none of their own money is pernicious and demoralising; it is demoralising to members, and it causes members of Parliament to be looked upon with suspicion throughout the country. It ought to be stopped. There is too much of it. You would not hear the clamor you do throughout the country, you would not see members getting up and denying these things, if they were right in themselves. If they were right, you would not find people throughout the country condemning them, and you can scarcely find one person who will justify them. No member of Parliament should have anything to do with a railway which is bonused by the Government or the Parliament of which he is a member. I say again that this should be thoroughly investigated. The value put on the road by Mr. Schreiber, a perfectly honorable man, no doubt, must be very superficial indeed. His valuation cannot be regarded as any criterion of what the value of this road is. I think the charge which my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) made against the hon. gentleman from North York (Mr. Mulock) was quite unworthy of that hon. gentleman. I am sure, if he was in his calmer moments, he would not make such a charge against that hon. gentleman.

Amendment of Mr. Mulock negatived.

Senate amendment (first) concurred in.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think we ought to have yeas and nays on this.

On the second amendment,

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice gave us some figures the other evening. This evening the member for North Simcoe has given us some figures which differ from those furnished by the Minister of Justice, if I followed the latter gentleman correctly. The Minister of Justice, in his deliberate and accurate way, gave us I have no doubt the precise figures furnished to him, and he stated that the expenditure upon the road up to the time—I suppose the time when he had received his certificate or instructions from the chief engineer—amounted to $26,208 per mile. He further added that it would cost in all $28,905 per mile to complete the road and equip it with rolling stock. Now, I will give them the benefit of their own figures. The Minister of Justice tells us that the completion of this road and the equipping it with rolling stock, which it is not bound to do, will cost $28,900. That being the case, it is asked to allow this road to bond itself to the extent of $20,000 a mile, which, with the bonus of $12,000, makes in all $32,000 a mile. Deducting from that the gross cost, we have a balance of $3,095 a mile. They now ask to bond this road for $3,095 a mile in excess of everything they say it will cost, even in excess of the equipment which they are not obliged to supply. In other words, they ask to be allowed to bond it for $340,450 in excess of their strongest imagination as to its cost. The hon. member for North Simcoe states that, when this Bill was under discussion before, certain negotiations were going on between the Government and the railway. I think it was due to this House that he should have informed the House, at the time it was discussing that Bill, that these negotiations were going on. It certainly was the understanding in this House that the agreement itself was to be lived up to, and that the proposed legislation would leave the agreement intact, and that the agreement would continue to be binding. I submit that there was a want of candor on the part of the hon. member for North Simcoe in telling us he was elsewhere endeavoring to procure that legislation, that whilst we were endeavoring to guard against its effect, at that very time negotiations were going on in another quarter which would have rendered our whole argument abortive if those negotiations were successful; and now we are told, as an excuse for this matter coming before the House, that, because Parliament is sitting and the Minister of Railways was at that time unable to discharge the duties of his Department, therefore the case should be thrown into Parliament. Well, that seems to me an attempt on the part of the Government to relieve itself of responsibility. If it has the power under the agreement to modify it, it could only modify it after a proper case being made out to its entire satisfaction, and the Government itself would then be answerable to Parliament for any mistake. It has the proper means of enquiry and the proper means of satisfying itself. It can do so deliberately, without undue haste, without accepting hearsay evidence, but after a careful and actual examination. That has not been done. It cannot be done in this Chamber, and the Government, which is able to deal with the case or which ought to be able to deal with the case, throws this question into this tribunal, which cannot possibly make all these enquiries which ought to precede legislation. But my hon. friend from North Simcoe argues, or tries to draw from my criticisms the inference, that I attack Mr. Barker or Mr. Moss's integrity. It is nothing of the kind.

Mr. McCARTHY. No, I said you would not.

Mr. MULOCK. I said I considered the contract an improvident one. That is the word I used.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would the hon. gentleman say how they could have made a contract otherwise than they did?

Mr. MULOCK. I am not the railway company. I say the results have shown that it was improvident. I have furnished figures showing the actual and real cost of the work. No one has ventured to contradict them.

Mr. McCARTHY. You will not give us the names.

Mr. MULOCK. These gentlemen know whether the work was let or not at these prices, and they will not venture to say it was not. They have the sub-contracts, no doubt; at all events, they are in existence, and we have telegraphic communication with all parts, and all they had to do was to telegraph to Hamilton and the information could be furnished. It was not done. We must draw the same inferences, and there can be but one inference, and that is that these figures are substantially correct. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) says that perhaps this sub-contract was let only for some light work. Well, I hardly think that explanation will do, because it is to be remembered that the whole work was let by piece work, and I presume that the cost of moving a cubic yard of earth is practically the same whether it is in the hill or otherwise. Then I stated that my information was to the effect that a very large proportion of the work was let at the rates mentioned in the memorandum I furnished to the House.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). It is a very difficult place to build a road, any way.

Mr. MULOCK. For these reasons, if the Government has power to deal with the matter, let the Government deal with it, and then we will have some one who is responsible, but to force the matter through this House is relieving the Government of the responsibility it ought to assume, and casting it upon a body that has not the facilities at this date to deal with the matter. For these reasons I beg to move, in amendment:

That the amendment be not now concurred in, but that it be referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

House divided on amendment.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Anger,	Forbes,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Mitchell,
Béchard,	Glen,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Guay,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Gunn,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Holton,	Scriver,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Landerkin,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Langelier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Vail,
Charlton,	Lister,	Watson,
Cook,	McCraney,	Weldon,
Fairbank,	McIntyre,	Wilson.—45.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Dundas,	McCallum,
Amyot,	Everett,	McCarthy,
Bain (Soulanges),	Farrow,	McDougald (Pictou),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	McDougall (C. Breton),
Beaty,	Foster,	McGreevy,
Bell,	Gordon,	McLelan,
Benoit,	Grandbois,	McNeill,
Bergeron,	Guillet,	Massue,
Bergin,	Hackett,	O'Brien,
Billy,	Hall	Orton,
Blondeau,	Hay,	Paint,
Bourbeau,	Hesson,	Pruyn,
Bowell,	Hickey,	Reid,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hilliard,	Riopel,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Robertson (Hastings),
Campbell (Victoria),	Jamieson,	Shanly,
Carling,	Jenkins,	Small,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Kaulbach,	Smyth,
Chapleau,	Kilvert,	Springer,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Sproule,
Colby,	Kranz,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Temple,
Curran,	Lesage,	Thompson,
Cuthbert,	Livingston,	Tyrwhitt,
Daly,	Macdonald (King's),	Ward,
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (St. Maurice)	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Dickinson,	Macmaster,	Wigle.—90.
Dugas,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	

Senate amendment (second) concurred in.

SUPPLY—CUSTOMS SEIZURE AT MONTREAL.

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

Mr. HOLTON. Before this motion is carried I desire, with all possible brevity, to direct the attention of the House to a matter which, within the past few weeks, has aroused intense excitement in business circles in the city of Montreal, and in which the mercantile class throughout the country is deeply interested. I refer to the recent conflict between the special agents of the Customs Department and the wholesale importing firm of Patterson, Kissock & Co. The matter was briefly alluded to the other evening by the hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault); but it being my wish to refer to some points in the case which were not then touched upon, and considering the importance of the question involved, I feel justified in again bringing the matter forward, and in doing so I trust it will be believed and understood that my action is in no sense

prompted by sympathy with violations of the revenue laws, for I have none, whoever the offenders may be. In my opinion such offences, when clearly proved, should in every instance be most severely dealt with, as well for the protection of the honest importer, as for that of the revenue. My object in again bringing this matter up is, in the first place, that the Government may have an opportunity of explaining how far these officers, be they special or others, are entrusted with such powers as were sought to be exercised in Montreal the other day, and then that I may be enabled to make some remarks on Customs regulations generally. I am, of course, aware that the revenue authorities are possessed of very great powers, necessarily so, no doubt, but having obtained them, whatever their extent, from this Parliament, I submit that upon a reasonable and respectful demand, the Government is bound to explain to Parliament the manner in which such powers are being exercised. It is an exceedingly important matter, for in it are involved the rights and liberties of citizens of a presumably free country. As the majority of the members of this House are familiar with the incidents of the Customs seizure to which I refer, it will not be necessary for me to enter into them further than to state briefly a few of the more important points, which are believed to have been fully substantiated. It would seem that on the 6th or 7th of this present month, two special agents of the Customs Department appeared in the warehouse of a wholesale dry goods firm in Montreal, and after a deal of official bluster and swagger, and an unreasonable—and many think an illegal—demand for the books of the concern, which they proposed to remove from the premises, not merely to examine, and without having charged the parties with any specific offence against the revenue laws, or indicating any particular goods or invoices as having been irregularly passed through the Customs, seized and actually sought to remove from the premises, the whole stock, amounting in value to $175,000, and composed largely of goods, which, being of Canadian manufacture, were in no event liable to payment of Customs duty or forfeiture. This high-handed proceeding was naturally and justifiably resented by the firm, when, although no forcible resistance was offered or proposed, these special agents insulted and treated with contempt the writ of the Superior Court under which at least a portion of the stock was ordered to be held, and one of them, revolver in hand, threatened the life of the officer of that court who was charged with the writ in question, and who was as much a Queen's officer, and as fully armed with Her Majesty's authority, as his assailant. Subsequently, this same special agent, in the same manner, threatened the lives of other citizens who were quite within their right, in being upon the premises, and in doing or saying what they may have done or said upon the occasion. These proceedings were followed a few days later by a criminal prosecution of one of the members of the firm for perjury, in connection with one or more Customs' entries made by him nearly two years ago. The circumstances of this case, as well as of others of recent occurrence, have set our merchants a thinking, and aroused in their minds feelings of distrust and indignation which it will be difficult to allay; and naturally enough it is so, for they feel that under the prevailing complex and intricate Customs laws and regulations, which are doubtless among the evils consequent upon a high tariff, it is possible for the most honest and well meaning of them to be guilty of some irregularity in passing their entries through the Customs; and if these special agents have the enormous powers which they claim, what might follow to such innocently offending merchants? A visit from these officials, a revolver at their heads, their whole stock bundled off, their business wiped out and themselves ruined. They thus have a right to know, and they demand to know, what the claims and pretensions of the Government are in these matters, and whether the recent proceedings

in Montreal must be accepted and considered as an interpretation of them. I will only say now with regard to the general and wider question which this reference brings up, that in the opinion of those who best know, for their knowledge is practical and gleaned from daily experience, that the present system of espionage, and of special agents armed with such extraordinary powers, and moved by such extraordinary inducements to make seizures, justly or unjustly, is odious and vicious in the extreme, and that with it the principle of allowing the seizing or informing officer any share of the plunder, as well as the other pernicious principle of compromising with the offender, should be at once abolished to give place to a more modern and less one-sided method. It is also thought, and I wholly agree with the proposition, that in all cases of offences against the revenue laws where the offending goods have once passed from the hands of the authorities, the Government should have no other remedy than that which it can obtain through the courts of the land. Amendments to the law in the direction I have indicated would, I am convinced, be approved by the people at large, though I suppose it must be confessed that the special agents and others to whom the present system is the source of such great profit might object. I beg now to read a short article from a recent issue of the Montreal *Herald* referring to this case, and which so well and ably expresses the opinion of the people on the subject that it should commend itself to Parliament. It appeared in the *Herald* of the 8th May, and is as follows:—

"On whichever side the wrong may lie in the particular Customs case which excited business circles in the city yesterday, one thing is abundantly clear. If the special agent of the Customs Department has the powers he claims, he has quite too much; and if the Department has the power it claims it is high time its wings were clipped. It would seem that under the laws and regulations, and according to the practice of the Department—as claimed by the Department—no business man's reputation, or property, or credit would be safe, and the credit or interest of one man is another equally unsafe. The Department, without laying a specific charge or entering into details, may carry terror and ruin and commercial death into any mercantile establishment in the land. While all reasonable powers should be given to the Government to enable them to protect the revenue, it is very clear that the official practices of late indulged in savor of despotic rather than constitutional government. Things have come to such a pass that it is possible under the forms of law to do things which are practically lawless, and in the name of honest government to commit acts similar to those for which pirates have been hung at the yard-arm. In the case which so excited the city yesterday, the officers of the Superior Court were defied; the orders of the court were treated as null and void; a pistol was drawn on a Superior Court officer by a Customs agent; the removal of the entire contents of a dry goods store, without any evidence of the goods being forfeited being produced, was begun; and but for the common sense of the lawyers employed on either side, the most serious consequences might have ensued. Whether such things are legal or not it is for the courts to decide. We repeat that if they are, then let us, once for all, abandon the false pretence that we are living under a free government, and admit that we are holding our liberties and property at the mercy of our masters. We cannot believe that such acts are lawful; we know they are opposed to the rights of manhood; and we shall do what we can to put a stop to conduct so arbitrary and so harmful to the public weal."

When this article appeared the case referred to was before the courts, but the Government or its representatives having since compromised the matter with the alleged offenders or suspended it, we will not have a decision upon the questions which were involved in the case submitted. It is most important, therefore, that the Minister of Customs should give the House the explanation for which I have just asked; and I think he should also inform us why proceedings against the offending firm, including the criminal charge, should have been withdrawn or suspended, and a virtual compromise effected with the offenders, if, as the special agents who were charged with the matter have publicly alleged, they were possessed of evidence amply sufficient to convict the firm of the fraud charged against them. I venture further to suggest to the Minister of Customs, that a statement of the seizures effected by these officials during the past eighteen months, and compromised by them or their superiors, as also a statement of the total amount paid to them as their share of the loot, would materially aid in the consideration of the questions I have just raised.

Mr. MACMASTER. I happen to have a personal knowledge of the case to which the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) has just referred, and it may be that it would not be competent for me to vote upon the matter if it should come before this House. But the subject-matter has come up several times by way of question and answer, and I do not think it would be proper to withhold some matters that may aid members in coming to a correct conclusion upon the subject. The case, as the hon. member has said, has attained great notoriety, and has created a great deal of excitement in the city of Montreal. That excitement was brought about, to a large extent, owing to a conflict between the officers of the Dominion Government and the officers of the Province of Quebec. It came about in this wise. The special agents of the Customs Department entered the warehouse of Patterson, Kissock & Co., in the city of Montreal, and took proceedings looking to the seizure of the whole of the stock of the firm, in virtue of a search warrant which is provided for by the Customs Act. That warrant authorises the officers to enter any premises during day or night, and to search for and seize any goods liable to seizure or forfeiture. In virtue of those search warrants, the officers seem to have power to seize the whole of the stock of a merchant, and that has been the interpretation placed upon these search warrants in Montreal in the past. The officers, therefore, claimed to exercise the large power of seizing the whole of the stock of the establishment and afterwards sift out such portions as were liable to forfeiture for violation or neglect of the Customs law. That was the position taken by the Customs officers. The firm of Patterson, Kissock & Co., acting upon such legal advice as they chose to take, were advised that the officers of the revenue had no such authority; that their authority was restricted by the terms of the Statute in virtue of which the certificate had an existence, and it simply went to this extent, that the officer might enter an establishment, might search for and having found such goods might seize such goods as were actually liable to seizure, but that he had no authority to go beyond the Statute and seize goods properly imported, which had paid duty in accordance with law, much less had he any authority to seize goods which were not liable to duty in any respect. The firm owned a stock in the neighborhood of $200,000, a perishable stock, one that depended upon the market for five or six weeks succeeding the seizure. Had their stock been tied up and subject to the long and perilous ways by which decisions are reached under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Customs, the firm might not have only lost the market, but might have been ruined; and having been advised as to what was their legal right, they notified in writing and verbally the officers of the Customs that those officers had no authority to seize the whole stock, but they might seize such portion as they could fairly show were subject to forfeiture under the provisions of the Customs laws. The officers of the Customs Department did not adopt that view, and acted upon the assumption of the authority that had been previouly exercised, and they were preparing to make a seizure of the whole of the stock, and in fact did make a nominal seizure of the whole of the stock. At that time, Messrs. Patterson, Kissock & Co. invoked the aid of the civil courts, and issued a writ of replevin or revendication, as is the term in the Province of Quebec, and sued back for the whole stock of the establishment as if it were in the hands of the Collector of Customs, for it was practically in the hands of the Customs, they having seized it. The officers of the civil court arrived on the scene shortly before the Customs officers on the following day, and while the bailiffs of the Superior Court of Montreal were

proceeding with the seizure, the Customs officers appeared on the scene and interfered with the seizure on the part of the civil officers, a collision in words, a collision in conflict and almost in arms supervened. So close did the contest become that not merely was a revolver drawn on one side, but the aid of the Dominion police was invoked; the establishment was not only invaded by interested sympathisers and friends of the firm, but at a later stage of the evening a *posse* of Dominion police were brought into line at the entrance of the establishment and even in the establishment itself. At that stage an appeal was made to the civil courts in Montreal for an order to stop those proceedings until the Department at Ottawa could be communicated with. Mr. Justice Taschereau, to whom the application was made, stated that he did not make the order because he had not then before him the search warrant by virtue of which the officers of the Customs Department assumed to act. He did not wish to make an order which might have the effect of prejudging the case. But he gave an intimation of opinion to the counsel on both sides, that it might be well that a stoppage should at once take place of the removal of the stock by the Custom house officers, until the lawyers acting on behalf of the Government should communicate with the Department, and the whole matter be further investigated. Up to this particular point, as I have every reason to believe from the legal gentlemen engaged in the case, there had been no direct communication with the Department as to the particular method in which the seizure should be carried out. Two or three days afterwards the matter came up for argument before another Judge, Judge Doherty, but no decision was arrived at. In fact, I believe an application is now before the honorable judge, because decisions are not rendered as speedily in the courts of the Province of Quebec as in the courts of some of the other Provinces of the Dominion. I know that the counsel for the firm, on the day when the application was made to Judge Doherty, pressed hard for an order that the officers should be stopped from interfering further with the stock of the firm, but the judge said that he desired to take further time to consider the application, and he took further time. The judge, however, made this intimation on that occasion—and I think it was a reasonable and proper intimation—that inasmuch as there had come certain officers of the civil courts of Quebec, armed with the Queen's writ, which was certainly an equally good authority with that upon which the Custom house officers acted, it would have been proper for the Dominion Government and the Provincial Government as representing the Queen to have quietly made their seizures, and not have risked the conflict and commotion which took place. However, a commotion took place in the contentions of the parties for a moment, but I think the counsel on both sides agreed that the remarks of Judge Doherty in that respect and the previous remarks of Mr. Justice Taschereau were entirely in keeping with the spirit of the law and would have produced most satisfactory results. Well, as I have said, the most interest attaching to the matter is as to the question of the jurisdiction of the Dominion and the Provincial authorities, and as to whether particular officers representing those particular jurisdictions on that occasion exceeded their powers or not. In that respect there was great excitement and commotion in Montreal. The honorable judge has not decided that question yet. Later a consultation took place between the counsel as to the actual position of affairs. My hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) in reading a very ably written article from the *Herald* has given it a certain amount of credence, and very proper credence; but if I may not be accused of undue delicacy in repeating the statement here, I may say that if it had not been for the common sense of the lawyers engaged in the case, there might have been a serious collision. When time for reflection came, it was allowed that probably both parties had gone too far; that probably the Dominion officers had assumed to go too far, and probably had not sufficient ground for the distance to which they went. On the other hand it must be said, that there was something to justify their action and that they were not entirely censurable in the course which they adopted. Then, as I understand, this course was determined upon: that the solicitors on both sides in the city of Montreal should make a careful investigation together into the actual circumstances of the case, and that in the meantime, pending the decision, a deposit of $2,000 should be made to await that determination. I do not desire to express any opinion as to what the facts on one side or the other may justify. I only say, being tolerably familiar with what happened on both sides, that the course pursued was a wise one under the circumstances. Whether the results will in the end justify that or not I do not attempt here to pronounce, but looking at it from every point of view, I must say from such facts as were brought out it appears that the Minister of Customs took a prudent course in throwing upon the lawyers—able and skilled men—acting for the Crown, the responsibility for the decision ultimately arrived at. With regard to the law, I thoroughly agree with the hon. member for Chateauguay that there is a necessity for an amendment to the law. I believe that those who framed the existing Customs laws, in their desire to place everything in the grasp of the Customs officials, actually over-reached themselves, and that the law practically defeats itself. I had it in my mind with such experience as I have had in Customs laws, to take some steps this Session to secure an amendment of those laws—though, perhaps, it might more properly emanate from the Government—in the direction of securing a more prompt, efficient and just administration of the law. I am free to say that the law, as it exists at present, is as much calculated to defeat justice as to secure it. I say that that law may operate greatly to the injustice of the honest trader; it may become an instrument of injustice, so as at times unduly to bear upon the honest trader; and I do think, as the hon. member for Chateauguay suggests, that the determination of these matters, which are peculiarly within the domain and the office of a judge, should not be committed to the Commissioner of Customs, to unskilled or prejudiced hands, but to a judge who will not be swayed by the evidence or the promptings of those who may be deeply interested in the finding. I do further think that, until it has been demonstrated in this country that the courts of justice are incompetent to determine such questions as these, their speedy, and final, and proper decision should be left to the regular tribunals of the land; or if it can be shown that the regular tribunals are not sufficient for the attainment of such decisions, then I say that the sooner this country constitutes tribunals on which there would be, if you will, men experienced in mercantile affairs, but above all things men trained in legal affairs and accustomed to weigh evidence, without interest in the matter, the sooner such a tribunal is established the better, I think, it will be for this country. I trust that during the next Session of Parliament the hon. Minister of Customs will introduce a measure founded on his past experience, on such experience as may be communicated to him by his officers—for what is more important than that those associated with him in the administration of Customs laws should set themselves to attain the most important and valuable information in that respect—I do trust they will set themselves to work in order to put a more perfect measure for the decision of Customs cases upon the Statute-book, and one that will be much more in keeping with the progress of the age and with the speed and promptness which is essential in the determination of important commercial matters, that come up for adjudication. A firm or an individual might be ruined while these cases were being determined by the existing methods; and if some step is not taken in the next Session of Parlia-

ment to make some improvement in the Customs laws in this respect, I will take the responsibility myself of introducing a measure, with the intention, by the assistance of the right thinking members of this House, of placing it upon the Statute-book.

Mr. BOWELL. I am sure neither the House nor the Government can complain of the manner in which this subject, which is of so much importance to the commercial interest of this country, has been brought before us. I, as the head of the Customs Department, frankly say I am glad the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) has brought the subject under the notice of the House; and I am still more pleased at the manner in which he has introduced it. Had he left out a few hard terms and a few of the rather severe criticisms upon the action of the officers and upon the motives which actuate them in the performance of their duty, it would have been as well. If the hon. gentleman had a little experience in administering the Customs laws of the country, with the number of officers under his charge that the Minister has, he would perhaps be a little more charitable in the manner in which he refers to them in the performance of a most disagreeable duty. The question whether officers should be allowed a certain proportion of the net proceeds of seizures after condemnation, is a question into which I shall not enter at this moment. There are many objections to it, and there are many arguments in its favor. If we live until the next Session of Parliament, and a measure is not then introduced to meet the views expressed by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster), and he takes the responsibility of introducing such a measure, that question can then be more properly discussed. I have simply to say that in the administration of the Customs laws, it has been the endeavor of the Government to protect as far as they possibly can all honest importers, no matter what part of the Dominion they may reside in; and in order to accomplish that very desirable object, they have employed what are called special agents to ferret out violations of the law. These agents have certain powers, but not more than are held and exercised by every Customs officer in the Dominion. A special agent has no more power than the collector of Customs at ports in the Dominion. The only reason why these agents are selected upon occasions of this kind is that they are the instruments through which frauds are brought to light, and if they have exceeded the powers vested in collectors of Customs, they have not done so with the consent of either the collectors under whom they act, or the Department at Ottawa. The particular case to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and which has caused so much excitement in the city of Montreal, is simply of this character. Evidence was in the possession of the special agents that certain irregularities had existed in the entries made by the firm referred to. This evidence was of such a character as to justify an attempt to ascertain the extent to which these frauds had been committed; and when the special agents waited upon the firm, they found that the manipulation of the different entries made was of such a character as to necessitate an examination of the books of the firm in order to ascertain the extent to which the frauds had been committed. My hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) says that had it not been for the coolness and calmness and good sense of the lawyers who were called in to assist in this particular transaction, the results might have been very much more serious. I do not say it disrespectfully to the legal profession, but I say this, believing it to be true, that if the legal profession had not interfered and given advice, no difficulty would have arisen. But apart from that, the officers demanded an examination of the books of the firm. Acting under advice, the firm refused to surrender its books. There was no alternative left at that period of the proceedings except for the officers to take the extreme course of making a seizure. I will not argue what is the strict legal interpretation to be placed on the clause to which my hon. friend from Glengarry referred; but if it be the correct interpretation of the Customs Act, that an officer entering an establishment can only seize those goods which are supposed to have been smuggled, then there would be very little use in his going to the establishment at all. Take, for instance, the article of feathers, one of the articles supposed to have been improperly entered. The officer finds on the shelf $1,000 worth of that kind of goods. It is true, the firm may have imported $10,000 worth during the two or three years preceding. The answer to the officer would be at once, these are not the goods under the invoice on which you are professing to make a seizure; these have been sold a long time since. If we are only to seize the goods mentioned in the invoice as improperly entered, then I fear the revenue would suffer severely. The law giving power to the officer to demand an investigation of the books, and that being refused, there is no other course than to seize the stock in the establishment, or to shut up the establishment.

Mr. MACMASTER. The law does not authorise that.

Mr. BOWELL. Then, in the protection of the revenue and in the protection of every honest importer, the law should be so amended as to give power to the Customs Department not only to compel an investigation of the books, but to shut up the establishment until such investigation has been made. But I readily admit that there should be sufficient evidence in the hands of the officers of the Department before they attempt such extreme measures. The hon. member for Chateauguay says that the law should not permit any Customs official or the Customs authorities to follow an importer after the goods have passed out of his hands, other than through the ordinary process of the law. If you adopt that principle, if I am to judge from the results of going into the courts in the different Provinces where Customs cases have to be decided, I fear there would be very little chance of either punishing the offenders, or securing for the revenue that to which it is entitled. Let me give the House one or two instances: We had a case in one of the Maritime Provinces in which a pilot had imported goods for a merchant there from St. Pierre. The bargain was that these goods were to be landed on the wharf, and the pilot was to receive a certain remuneration for the landing of the goods, his responsibility then ceasing. When the vessel was seized and these facts were ascertained, we thought it would be a good opportunity to punish the merchant who had subsidised the pilot, instead of the pilot. We took the case into court, and the sapient grand jury made a presentment that it was the duty of the Government to punish the pilot and that we had no right to interfere with the merchant. To come to a point nearer home. My hon. friend knows we had a case in his city in which a gentleman of high standing in the community made entries and swore to them, in which the invoices covered $8,000, for a lesser amount, by changing the figures of the invoices. That case was taken into court, the accused was prosecuted criminally, as we thought it a case in which an example should be made, and the judgment rendered was, that as the man who had made these entries and had sworn to them, false as they were, was not individually interested in the saving of the money, though he held a large amount of stock in the company to be benefited by these false entries, he could not be held legally culpable, and the case was dismissed. This case happened in Quebec, but in Ontario we had a case in which a man attempted to bribe one of the officers by an offer to him to become a participator in the profits, if the officer would enter into smuggling transactions with him. As soon as that was brought to the notice of the Department, I said;

Here is a case which should be prosecuted under the Audit Act, which imposes a penalty and imprisonment. The case was clearly proved, but the wise magistrate decided that as the man did not take the bribe, he did not come directly within the meaning of the law—the bribe being offered and not accepted—so he was fined 10 cents and sent to gaol for ten minutes. These are veritable examples that have come to my notice; and I fear, unless we have a special court for the purpose of trying these cases, as suggested by my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) we will stand very little chance of enforcing the provisions of the Customs Act, and protecting honest traders who pay their duties regularly to the last shilling.

Mr. KIRK. Reduce the tariff.

Mr. BOWELL. Quite true. If there were no duties, there would be no smuggling, but I suppose we would have difficulty in imposing direct taxation, which, no doubt, our free trade friends would like to see, on the property of the country. If the hon. gentleman and his friends would like to go to the country on that principle, I have no objection to meet them. I would like to contest any constituency in the Dominion against the hon. gentleman on the principle he suggests.

Mr. KIRK. Be less extravagant and you can lower the tariff.

Mr. BOWELL. If members of this House would assist in protecting the law, and I refer particularly to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, instead of apologising for those who break them, the Customs Department would not have so much trouble in enforcing its regulations. I have but one or two other remarks to make, my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Macmaster) having made a very clear statement of the case as it stands, and they are with reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) on the subject of compromises. I know of no case in which a compromise has been made, unless the hon. gentleman wishes the House to understand that when an act of smuggling has been discovered and certain penalties imposed and fines paid, that constitutes the compromise. I confess, if we should prosecute every offender against the law, under all the different clauses which the Customs Act contains; if we should shut up every establishment where seizures have been made, and in addition to that send the offender to gaol for a number of years, there would be less frauds committed, provided of course we could get the magistrates and those before whom the cases are brought to put the law in force. In the case of Patterson, Kissock & Co., there has been no compromise. I thought I had made that sufficiently clear the other night.

Mr. HOLTON. I withdrew "compromise" and suggested suspension.

Mr. BOWELL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He spoke so low I did not hear him. There has been no compromise, but there have been cases in which the fullest amount of penalties have been imposed other than those of a criminal character. I believe the sooner those portions of the law which impose the penalty of imprisonment in penitentiary are enforced, the better; but there are so many circumstances surrounding the question that it requires to be dealt with equitably as well as according to the strict wording of the law. Take the case at Montreal which was settled the other day, in which a deliberate but unsuccessful attempt at fraud was made. A man has three invoices; he has a correct invoice which he receives from Europe; he makes out two others, upon one of which he makes his entry. The second he files away for the present, to show to the Customs officer in case he should come and demand the production of the original invoice; and the third, the original invoice, is either destroyed or hidden away carefully. A case of that kind occurred the other day. When the demand was made, the information received by the officer turned out to be strictly correct; a duplicate invoice of the invoice which had been presented to the Customs Department was handed to the officer as the original. The officer asked: But where is the third invoice, the original one from which these two were copied? The merchant denied having it, and, when asked to produce his books, said he had no books. How are you to reach a case of that kind, unless you punish the man for perjury, or compel him to produce that which he says he has not? Take the firm to whom the hon. gentleman refers. It is clear the revenue has been defrauded, but the only way which officials can arrive at the evidences of guilt is by securing, if possible, a duplicate or a copy of the entries in the books of the English, French and German merchants from whom these parties purchased. When we have instances of this kind, will the House or the country condemn the officers for demanding the only evidence that can be properly adduced to establish the guilt or innocence of the accused. The council of the Board of Trade have earnestly considered this matter for some time, and they have complimented the Customs Department for the manner in which they are carrying out the law, and they demand, in the strongest possible language, that the fullest investigation that can be made shall be entered into in order to arrive at the truth and to punish the guilty party in every instance. If this be not done, there will be no safety for the honest importer or those who regularly pay the full amount of duties. It is not so much a question of the amount of duties as suggested by the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), but the protection of the honest man who carries on business alongside of a dishonest one, and makes the regular entries, pays the full amount of duties, while his neighbor makes out false invoices and false entries, and is therefore at the mercy of the latter; the prospects of the dishonest man are greater, and he can sell to the retail trade throughout the Dominion at a much cheaper rate than his honest competitor. I can truly say that the Government have no desire, nor have they attempted, to harass any class of men or any class of business. What they desire to do is to enforce the law as it stands upon the Statute-book, to punish as much as possible and in every possible case those who have transgressed the law, and to protect those who are endeavoring to carry on an honest business in the country; and I can assure you and the House that, as long as I am at the head of that Department, I shall take every possible course that is open to me in order to accomplish these objects. I do not wish to say, and I do not desire to have it understood, that there are not many cases where seizures have been made which have proved a hardship, and the great difficulty in arriving at the question of valuations has placed the Department in a position in which they have had to give the advantage to the importers where they had not the most positive evidence that undervaluations had taken place, but, under the law as it exists, in the interests of the revenue, and in the interests of the whole importing community, I think the House will agree, and I am sure the country will justify the acts of the officers of the Customs Department in trying to put an end to these frauds.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to say a few words on this question, not with reference to the particular case that is under consideration at the present time but in reference to the whole subject. We all admit that there are difficulties connected with this subject. The Minister has pointed out very clearly on his side the necessity of the Government being clothed with considerable power in order to secure the proper payment of duties and for the prevention of fraud. The whole House will agree with him that

that is a matter of very vital consequence. It is a matter of more vital consequence, perhaps, not looking at it from a revenue point but from the interests of men who are trading and who are making honest entries as against those who may be attempting to make dishonest ones. But there is another side to the question, and that is that the powers which are possessed by the Customs Department are very arbitrary, they are almost despotic. They are powers so great that, unless you were sure that you had men at the head of the Department which would give every case the most careful consideration and who were actuated by a desire to do justice in all cases, it would be most unsafe to leave them in their hands. The case is rendered more difficult from the system we have adopted of making the Customs officer, who is instrumental in causing a seizure, a participant in the fines. The House must at once admit that that is rather a perilous position, I might almost say, to place an officer in. It would require on the part of the officer a very great deal of uprightness of conduct to prevent him from being swayed in a matter when his own financial interests are involved in it, and I do submit—while I am not taking the ground—for the Minister insists upon it so strongly and I am not prepared at this moment to combat him altogether—that it ought to be seriously considered whether it ought to be in the public interest. It is stated that in that way only can we make our officers vigilant, can we make them detect frauds, and it is necessary that frauds should be detected. If it is an absolute necessity, it should be borne, for the honest importer must be protected against the dishonest importer; but is it true that we have men in the employ of the Government, in the possession of large salaries, who will not do their duty in this respect without being made participants in the fines imposed? Are we to take that estimate of our officers? Are we to suppose that gentlemen who are in the receipt of $1,800 per annum will not be vigilant in the discharge of their duties, that they will not prevent erroneous entries being made, that they will not save the revenues of the country, save and except the extra inducement be held out to them? If you are sharp, if you detect an invoice that is improper, there will punishment follow, fines will be imposed, the goods will be confiscated, and you will be entitled to a share of them. I felt it incumbent upon me a year ago to move for a return of seizures made at one port alone in this Dominion, the port of Winnipeg. The return was brought down. It covered but two years, and yet I venture to say that the disclosures of that one port should be enough to make us hesitate on the question as to whether it is wise to let the officers share in the fines that are imposed. The seizure numbers are given, and I see they run from fifty-six to 100 during those two years. I suppose that the prior numbers had been made in years prior to this date. We find in almost all the cases—I do not say all—that the decision was confirmed. In about all the cases the importer was wrong, and the distribution took place. I find in No. 56 there was a fine imposed of $133.87, and $44.62 of it went to an officer who is in the receipt of $800 per annum, and $44.62 went to another officer who is in the receipt of $1,000 per annum. Then there were some smaller amounts in which $5 each was paid to two officers. Then in another, $16.67 was paid to each of two other officers. Then there was another case in which $33.33 was paid to two other officers, and another case in which $6.66 was paid. In another case, $123.66 was paid to a gentleman in the receipt of $1,700 of a salary, and $123.66 to another gentleman in the receipt of a $1,000 per annum salary. In another case, $833.33 went to one gentleman in the receipt of $1,700 per annum, and $833.33 as the result of his share of one seizure went to another officer in the enjoyment of $1,000 salary. Now, it does look as if that is supplementing salaries pretty largely.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will allow me to explain that there are a great number of cases in which these officers who receive these large or small amounts have to pay a large amount to the informers who give the information. Parties come and inform the officer that smuggling has taken place. That officer becomes the seizing officer, and he has to pay out to the informers, whose names do not appear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In these cases I have given the names and amounts are under the head of "fines imposed," but there were other cases where fines were not imposed, but the goods were sold and the money was distributed, and I think the Minister will see there is a distinction there made between the officer and the informer. In one case, $59.42 was distributed to officers. In another case, $333.32 was distributed to officers. In the catalogue I am giving now the names of the officers are not given, and it is only under the head of "fines imposed" that the names are given, and not under the head of "goods sold." I intended to get the names in both, but they are only given in one. In another case, $16.66 was paid to officers; in another, $97.33 to officer, and same to informer; in another, $10.17 to officer, and same to informer. Then follow two or three cases not disposed of. Then $212.03 to officer, and same to informer.

Mr. BOWELL. There are many cases in which the Department know nothing about who the informer is. We do not exact that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister will see that the officer got that amount and the informer got the same amount.

Mr. BOWELL. That is a case where we knew, I suppose.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In another case $39.74, and the officer the same as the informer; in another case $997.87, and the officer the same as the informer; in another case $268 to the officer, and the same to the informer, that is the record of two years at one port. Now, I have pointed out how some of these officers' salaries have been supplemented by hundreds of dollars during these two years as the result of their share of the fines. They are in receipt of salaries varying from $1,000 to $1,800 per annum, and this is the way in which their salaries are supplemented. Now, I submit that seizures taking place elsewhere in commercial circles, taken in connection with this affair in Montreal, call for investigation, and for some change in the law. While I have no sympathy whatever with those who have perpetrated frauds on the Customs, and while I would endorse their being severely punished, you must remember that when entries are made, not with fraudulent intent, but through error, through misinformation, and yet they are necessarily treated as frauds primarily, by the Department, and an innocent man making an entry which he supposes to be perfectly correct, and he may not be correct according to the interpretation put on the invoice by the Customs Department, yet he may be considered guilty of fraud. Then it is adjudicated upon in the Department at Ottawa, and it is the consequence in most cases that the Department stands by its officers. I am not censuring the Department for that, it is natural the Department should place reliance upon the statements of their officers. But there is this other feature about it, that when the Minister receives these petitions from the parties whose goods have been seized, if they petition to have the goods restored and the fines remitted, the course he must take is to send back to get his information with reference to the fraud, as it is termed, and of the seizure, to the officials who made the seizures, to the officials who are participants, financially in the seizure, and benefit if it is maintained.

Mr. BOWELL. No, no. For instance, take the case you alluded to, take Mr. Maingy, the collector at Winnipeg, who made all these seizures to which the hon. member referred. He is not entitled to any of them. He made the report upon the whole of them, but of course he does it upon evidence.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That explanation does relieve the matter somewhat.

Mr. BOWELL. No officer receiving $2,000 a year is entitled to any moiety of the seizure.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But the collectors do participate in the seizures.

Mr. BOWELL. Not if they have $2,000 a year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It may not apply in this particular case but I know cases of officers who get that sum, and who are pecuniarily interested in making the seizure. We know cases where honest entries have been made, cases where I believe the men to be incapable of committing a fraud upon the Department, but by the ruling of the Department the goods are seized, and the Department fixes the value of the goods, they themselves being the sole judges.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not so. It is not the ruling of the Department, it is the law.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, it is the interpretation of the law that is put upon it by the Department. When a person presents an invoice of goods that he has purchased, he has bought an article at $100, he believes that is the fair market value of it, his invoice shows that, he his not cognisant that it is not sold at that price in the market from which he bought; more than that, he produces affidavits from the persons from whom he purchased, showing that it is the selling price, heads of responsible firms swear that it is correct, and in the face of all this, there are cases in which the fines have been imposed and have not been remitted. Well, the parties say, we will seek redress, we will take this matter into the courts. How are they to get it into the courts? The Minister may say that he will not allow them to go into court, and while the investigation is pending, the time within which they could take it to court would elapse, and they would be shut out under the law from going to court. They have a certain length of time, I think thirty days, in which to apply. Meanwhile they are working with the Department, presenting their case, looking for justice, but the time elapses, they get no answer, the time for entering the courts has elapsed, and the doors are barred against them.

Mr. BOWELL. You are wrong again. He has a certain length of time after the decision is given, my present recollection is thirty days after the decision.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think I know a case in which, before the answer was received, the time had elapsed, and it could not be done. However, I do not press that too strongly, because I think the Minister, in the cases I have known, has expressed his willingness that they should go to court.

Mr. BOWELL I may say there is scarcely a case in which a man has asked to go into court after the lapse of thirty days. But if you have a case you can go and fight it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But suppose you go into court. Here is a rule of the Department with reference to the valuation of a certain article. The goods have been brought in for years at a certain figure. By-and-bye the Department finds that under the law the values that had been taken had not been real, and that there should be an amount added to them. The officers come forward and claim not only the amount of the importation that has just arrived, but they go back over that merchant's invoices for years back, and find how much he is short. If the merchant goes into court, what is the result? Believing he has been wronged, he goes into the Exchequer Court, where one judge sits. He soon finds it is a very serious matter to enter a case against the Crown. If he wins his case he simply gets his fine paid back to him; but if he loses his case then the decision of the court places his previous importation within the category of frauds, and his importations for months or years are not merely liable to pay extra duty but the merchant is liable to be obliged to pay their full value. So the Government will find that there is not only in Montreal, but in other cities, a deep-seated feeling that under the operations of the Customs Acts many men doing what they believe is right have had their goods taken from them when they should not have been taken, that money has been taken from them where it should not have been taken, and, with that system of seizing-officers profiting by seizures, the idea has settled down in their minds, whether rightly or wrongly, that this has had something to do with the fact that they have been treated as they have been treated. It is well that the subject has come up. It is well that those in charge of the Department and the officers who have to administer the laws should sometimes learn what the public expect from them; that the public desire that while all legitimate means shall be taken to detect fraud, a distinction should be made between those who commit fraud and those who make entries in good faith, believing them to be honest entries, but which, under the interpretation of the Customs Acts, proved to be irregular.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has fallen into the same error as is frequently made in discussing this question of arbitrary values. The Customs officers have not the power to make arbitrary valuations in regard to goods. All they can do is, if it is ascertained through their officers or by any other means, that an article is sold for home consumption at a certain price in the United States and is entered in Canada at a lower price than that for which it is sold for such purpose in the United States, under the law it is the duty of the Department to value for duty at the price at which it is sold in the market in which it is purchased. The officers have no power beyond that. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that many persons purchase goods at say $100 when they are to be sent to this country, but the same article may be sold in the United States at $125 or $130. Then the merchant first makes an affidavit that that is all the amount he paid. That is quite true. He then produces an affidavit from the seller that that is all he asked. That is true, no doubt; but that does not meet all the requirements of the law. The affidavit must contain these words: That is the value of the article at the time of importation when sold in the country where it was purchased for home consumption. It is very easy for a merchant desiring to flood a country with a stock of goods or to crush out any particular industry to have export and home consumption prices. We have constantly these price-lists placed in our hands and it is under those we act and not under any arbitrary prices which the Customs Department desires to place on these articles.

Mr. VAIL. I am sorry to say that the Minister of Customs did not always act on that principle, as I pointed out last year. At that time I showed that a Montreal merchant had $7,000 or $8,000 returned to him on account of a cargo of sugar, which it was contended was entered at a higher rate than it was purchased at. I brought the case before the House and I pointed to parties in Halifax that had made similar applications and were refused. So I am quite satisfied that the Minister of Customs and his Department do not always act on that principle. I,

too, am very glad this case has been brought forward and hundreds of people in the Maritime Provinces will also be glad of it. I have no sympathy with smugglers. It is quite right that in the interest of the country and the Customs Department there should be a strict law against smuggling. It must necessarily be so; but in its administration where the power is placed in the hands of certain parties outside of the Customs Department who act largely on their own authority and construe the law for themselves, it is necessary that those men should be men of integrity and of somewhat high character. We know that the man who smuggles is considered by the Department a rascal. But you appoint a man who is an old smuggler to one of those positions in the outside service, in order to detect smugglers; so as a matter of course, and as the natural sequence, you have a dishonest man placed in a position which should be filled by a man of integrity and principle. If the merchants in Montreal and in the cities of the Dominion, who are importers of goods and have a certain number of clerks under their control, do not know what entries are made from day to day, he fails to attend to his duties and he must suffer the consequences. How different it is with us. Almost all the people along the shores of Nova Scotia trade with the United States, and all our small merchants own vessels running to that country. They of course have to depend altogether on the men they employ on the vessels, and over those people they have no control. It is true that an owner may control a master, but he cannot control the mate or seamen. A vessel running to the United States brings back certain goods. The vessel is seized. The Custom house officer goes to the owner and informs him that such and such goods were taken in at Boston and not entered here. The owner says he knows nothing about it. He subsequently makes enquiries and finds that such goods have been brought in by the mate or by the men, and in order to get out of the difficulty the individual is obliged to pay the officer $200 or $300 rather than have the vessel seized or tied up two or three months before the Department decides the matter. I say we have had a system of terrorism going on for the last two years, and continuing to the present day, in the Maritime Provinces, which has injured our trade and which will, if continued, ruin it. There is no remedy for this except an alteration of the law which will oblige the Department to appoint men to those positions who are paid a certain salary—men of integrity, men who will be disposed to do their duty without looking to the proportion to be received from any particular seizure. I hope the hon. Minister of Customs will take the advice of the hon. member beside him (Mr. Macmaster), and will next Session introduce a law which will protect the honest trader as well as the interests of the revenue.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I wish to say a few words on this subject. I have experienced, in my own county, some of the beneficial effects of these Customs detectives. They were through the county of King's and that whole valley, and we know pretty well what they did. Sometimes there were some very loud complaints, but, strange to say, there have been no complaints made here in Parliament. None of them ever asked their representatives to expose their cases before Parliament, and considering the multitude of cases which the Department have to adjudicate upon, the instances are infinitesimally small where the parties themselves have asked an investigation before the light of day. That being the case, I say that the system of protection which we have got in this country must be very fairly administered, or else we should have a larger number of cases coming before the people's tribunal here. If hon. gentlemen opposite would go to France, Germany or the United States, which are protected countries, they will see that the cases of such hardships here are the smallest imaginable in number, compared with what they are in these other countries. I noticed by the reports that the other day a large glassware manufacturer, a millionaire in the city of New York, who has been in Sing-Sing for the last number of years for infraction of the Customs laws, got out the other day on the plea of ill-health. If anything of that kind had happened in Canada the House would have resounded with the lamentations of the hon. member for Digby and the hon. member for Brant. Did Congress take up that matter? No; Congress said there was a law passed, as a law was passed by this Parliament.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That was a case of fraud.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I know there were cases of fraud, but will the hon. gentleman say that the criminal tribunals must be swept away because there are some isolated cases where an honest man's fortune or good name is placed in jeopardy. You cannot have a law of this kind and not administer it; and you must not blame the Minister of Customs and his employees for administering the Department under the law. If the law is wrong, amend it; but it is a question to me whether you should amend it or not. I have not considered whether you should pay those informers or not, or how you are going to get at smugglers without giving the detectives a percentage. That is a matter for consideration, but the object is to keep people from smuggling if possible. The hon. member for Digby said there were hundreds in the Maritime Provinces who would be glad to hear of this debate, but I do not think some of them would like to hear their names mentioned in this debate. I know of one firm in a certain village in my own county, who said to one of these Customs detectives, when he came in: "How dare you come into my shop; who are you?" He replied: "I am a Customs detective, and I want to look at your invoices, &c." "What do you take me for?" asked the other. "I do not take you for anything," said the detective, "I just want to visit you, that's all." The other said: "Do you know how high I stand?" "I do not care," said the detective. "Well," said the other, "ours is the first name morally, financially and commercially in this county." Yet, before the detective went out of the shop that man had signed the most abject apology and confession; he agreed to pay a certain amount of money for his smuggling, and he paid it before the detective went out of his office. Did that firm want their names brought up here in Parliament?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What was done with the money?

Mr. WOODWORTH. I do not know.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Had he power to settle in that way?

Mr. WOODWORTH. I venture to say, if it can be shown to the Minister of Customs that his men have violated the law, he will bring them back. I tried it in King's county; I fought him for months and we hardly spoke, but when he ultimately found that his officers were wrong, he dismissed them at once. It is his duty to protect his agents until they are proved to be unjust, dishonest or fraudulent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As I understand that case was not referred to the Department; it was not subjected to an investigation, but the officers went in, made a certain charge and settled the matter upon their own responsibility.

Mr. WOODWORTH. No; but subject to the approval of the Government. Those men never asked for an investigation, and that is the case with a great many such people, because the amounts they pay are after all a mere drop in the bucket. That is the reason there are not more cases before Parliament. It is not the cases which are caught but those which are not caught. How many cases of smuggling have the representatives of the people been called

upon to bring before the House, and if these men were honest would they not be called upon to bring them forward. I have been in Opposition, and I know what it is to make a cry against the Government of the day, but I say, give the Government fair play, and in this case you are not giving them fair play in bringing them to task for administering the law under the law as you yourselves passed it while in Parliament. There may possibly be some cases where the law enables men to act arbitrarily, but it must be remembered that the Customs law is very anomalous and must be so. Under it a man is almost supposed to be guilty until he is proved innocent, contrary to the usual rule of English law. First his goods are seized, and then he must prove that he did not smuggle them. But you passed that law; we all passed it, but anomalous as it is, it is the law, and you should not find fault with the Department for administering it. Mr. Wolf's name has been mentioned. I happen to know Mr. James Wolf, of Montreal, and I do not believe a more conscientious, efficient, or industrious officer is in the Dominion to-day.

Mr. MACMASTER. A very excellent officer.

Mr. WOODWORTH. He has a very unpleasant duty to perform, but he does it marvellously well, keeping the good name he has earned, and the friendship of the very men whose goods he has seized. I know case after case where they have thanked him for the kind, affable manner in which he has discharged his duty. These officers are not represented in the House, but let them have fair play. I thought it was only proper that I should state what I knew about this matter.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary.....$80,949 50

Mr. LAURIER. Has any step been taken to have an investigation into the causes of the recent outbreak?

Mr. THOMPSON. There was an investigation in the ordinary course of justice by the coroner's inquest, and subsequently there was an investigation made by the inspector. I may call that a preliminary investigation, because it is not intended that it should be a final one. I have determined, as early as possible after the close of the Session, and after the recovery of the warden, which I hope will not be long, to make as full an investigation into the affairs of the penitentiary as can possibly be made. I understand that it was stated in another place, in answer to an enquiry put there, that a commission would be issued. I think, perhaps, that was not an accurate statement. I do not know that a promise that a full and searching enquiry shall be made, necessarily involves that a commission shall be issued; but I do stand committed as the head of the Department to having a full and thorough investigation.

Mr. LAURIER. The Minister of Justice is probably aware that investigations have not been wanting in the past. There has been investigation after investigation, but for some cause these investigations have always been barren of any practical result. The conviction is becoming settled in the public mind, at least in the Province of Quebec, that the real cause of all the failures of justice that have taken place at St. Vincent de Paul, has been that the establishment is conducted simply on politics. The feeling prevails that the whole *personnel* of the establishment is composed of creatures of the Government. I do not know that this remark applies to all the employees, but I believe, and I have, perhaps, some authority for saying, that it applies to the large number of the *personnel* of the penitentiary. I believe the present warden, Mr. Laviolette, is, as far as a man can be who has not had a special training for such a position, a very competent man; he has proved himself in the late outbreak to be a very courageous man; and I believe he is a man thoroughly devoted to duty. The only fault with him is that when he was appointed he had not received the training necessary to qualify him for the duty he had to discharge; but apart from that I give him the testimony quite cheerfully that he has always been willing to do whatever was in his power to discharge the duties he had to discharge. On the other hand, I understand—and I make this charge subject to correction—that he has not been properly supported by his subordinates. The men immediately under him had not the same devotion to duty that he had, and were not better qualified otherwise than he was. Under such circumstances, we must not be surprised if matters in the penitentiary have been going from bad to worse; and it will not be sufficient to have such investigations as we have had in the past. There must be a thorough overhauling of the whole system. Not simply by the officers of the Department, but by parties outside of the Department, who would be thoroughly impartial and determined beforehand to give justice wherever justice is due, and to put the blame wherever the blame ought to be put.

Mr. THOMPSON. In answer to what the hon. gentleman has just said, I will say a very few words, because it would be indelicate in me, pending the enquiry which is to take place, to advocate either one side or the other of the question—to say that any officer is to blame, or to vindicate any officer. But since the outbreak has taken place, I have gone over the records of the enquiry, and I must say that I have not reached the conclusion the hon. gentleman has formed, that the difficulty is due to the fact that the officers of that institution are creatures of the Government and are actuated by political feeling in the discharge of their duties. The staff, as the hon. gentleman is aware, is a very large one, and the warden has the absolute appointment of all his guards—in fact, nearly all the officials of the institution. When I say the absolute appointment, I mean not only that he has the right to appoint, but he is not interfered with in the slightest degree by the Department, even by suggestion, in the way of nomination to any position. The principle of the law which clothes him with the responsible office, considers who he has the right to appoint, and is vindicated to the fullest extent, and he is left entirely uncontrollable as to the choice of the persons he will have about him, except in the case of superior officers, who are appointed directly by the Department, and the faults occasionally charged against the discipline and management of the institution have been in relation to the guards and the minor officials, whom the warden has the right to appoint. I dare say that political feeling, to some extent, has interfered with the proper management of the institution. I am strongly inclined to think, however, that the political influences have come from the outside rather than from the inside, and while I admit, and in fact claim with some degree of pride, from what I have heard of him, that the warden is a brave, honorable and upright man in every sense of the word, I think he has been, to some extent at least—it would be indelicate in me to say how much—misled by advice from persons not qualified to give advice, and that he has put confidence in persons who prophesied evil in relation to the present management there and did their best to make their prophecies good.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand the hon. gentleman would feel some reticence imposed upon him with regard to this trouble, but the fact is this penitentiary has been, for some years, almost constantly in a state of crisis. It has been the habit of that institution to be in that unfortunate condition, and I regard it as one of the blemishes on our administration of justice that for so many years, off and on, and as a general rule, there should be something going

wrong in the management and discipline of that important institution. There must be something radically wrong. Warden after warden has been appointed, other officers have been changed, yet you find things going wrong, with an interval of better results, perhaps, but going wrong again and again. I have nothing to say with reference to the present warden, not being sufficiently master of all the circumstances, but if I rightly remember it was this warden, of whom the inspector spoke in certainly not very favorable terms in his annual report, shortly after the assumption by this gentleman of the office. In that report he commented on the report of the warden himself. However that may be, if there is not fault with one officer there must be with another. There has been long continued and very gross neglect of that proper care and vigilant supervision which is necessary in order to prevent such events, such as that which startled us the other day, from occurring. I would ask if a special enquiry has been made as yet into the extraordinary circumstances of the escape of Viau from the prison, almost immediately after the outbreak; and in this connection, for I believe it is the only opportunity I will have of doing it, I would ask whether the attention of the Government has been directed to a circumstance, which, I observe with great regret, was stated in the papers the other day, that the warden of another penitentiary—Mr. Warden Bedson—had been concerned in some speculations or transactions in real estate with the inspector. I am not concerned in the particular character of those transactions, of which something was said in the paper in other respects, some allegations being made as to which I know nothing about the political nature of the transactions, but it seems to me it is not a prudent—I will go further and say it is an improper thing—for the inspector of penitentiaries to have any relation whatever with any warden. The inspector is an officer to whom the Government and the country have practically to look for the keeping in order and subordination the various officers of the penitentiary. He is superior even to the warden, and that he should be arranging for investments in land for him, or acting for his agent, or partner, or associate is very likely to lead to very uncomfortable circumstances.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The leader of the Opposition has mentioned the reports of the inspector,and judging from the tone of those reports he must have felt that he would not be in a condition to impartially act in any enquiry that would take place to find out the exact truth in those matters.

Mr. BLAKE. I must confess that the tone in one passage of the report did not strike me very favorably.

Mr. THOMPSON. In answer to the hon. member for West Durham, I would say that a special enquiry has been made with reference to the escape of Viau, and it was found that one of the guards was to some extent blameable in having neglected what was a very necessary duty at the time. As regards the guard in question, at the request of the warden, and pending a fuller enquiry, his case has not been fully dealt with yet, but special enquiry was made into all the facts connected with the escape. I have not had my attention called until this moment to the statement which, the hon. gentleman says, appears in one of the papers with reference to transactions on the part of the inspector and the warden. I quite agree that enquiries should be made, if such a statement has appeared, and that it is quite inconsistent with the duty of an officer, who must be depended on, as the inspector must be, to have business relations with any of the wardens. With regard to the subject of impartiality, it is necessary that the enquiry should be made by some other inspector, and that is the inspector's own desire for the reason that he has for some little time past been in a position of antagonism, if I might so call it, to the warden on account of differences of opinion regarding the management of the institution, and especially in view of the fact that the comments which have been made since the outbreak have to some extent reflected on him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that under the head of maintenance of convicts, there are 325 convicts in St. Vincent de Paul and they cost $29,125 to keep them. At the Kingston Penetentiary which has 580 convicts, the cost is $36,780. Therefore the average expense of St. Vincent de Paul is much larger in proportion than that in Kingston. The smaller number would account for some increase, but the increase is much more than can be accounted for in that way.

Mr. BLAKE. And this, notwithstanding the fact that a number of the convicts at St. Vincent de Paul are usually at large.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am not aware of any convicts being at large.

Mr. BLAKE. They escape from day to day.

Mr. THOMPSON. They do not. One escaped a day or two ago, and was retaken immediately afterwards. We estimate this year a decrease in the maintenance of $2,400.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Still, the hon. gentleman will see that unless it can be accounted for in some way, the disproportion between the case at St. Vincent de Paul and the case of Kingston is very great. At St. Vincent de Paul, the maintenance of each convict costs nearly $100; at Kingston, it costs a little over $60; and at St. Vincent de Paul, it would be about 97 cents. So, the difference is very material, and I know of nothing in the relative cost of living at the two places which would account for so large an expenditure. The dietary and all the rest of it is the same.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is a difference in the maintenance, as the hon. gentleman will see by a comparison on page 64 of the Auditor General's report. The average daily cost in Kingston is 53 cents and in St. Vincent de Paul 81 cents, the maintenance is $63.05 as against $100.01. I am not in a position to account for it at present. I only know that all the supplies are obtained by contract, and that it is by competition we are able to ascertain that this year there will be a considerable difference in the cost. I fancy that some of the expenses which are charged to other heads in Kingston, are charged to maintenance at St. Vincent de Paul, but I will make particular enquiries in regard to that.

Mr. BLAKE. I think and I hope it is not due to the circumstance the hon. gentleman has suggested. Some years ago, arrangements were made to cast the accounts of all the penitentiaries on the same principle. The dietary was arranged to be precisely the same, and the same set of accounts was arranged for all, for the very purpose of having a check on the cost at one by the cost at another. We have had discussions on the excess of cost of St. Vincent de Paul over Kingston before now, and the only difference it has been possible to ascertain has been the difference caused by the penitentiary lying some little distance out of the city of Montreal, which is the market, I presume, were most of the supplies are purchased. The cost of transport from the city to the penitentiary must be really the only difference, and that the supplies should cost half as much again as they do in Kingston is not intelligible unless it be that the political relation to the penitentiary which the hon. gentleman eschews inside the penitentiary applies to the contracts outside.

Canadian Pacific Railway, Port Arthur to Red River, $72,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A detailed explanation of that was to be given.

Mr. McLELAN. I stated before, when this was under discussion, that there had been a final estimate made by the

chief engineer of $2,864,159.89, which covered the first award of $45,000. Then there was a subsequent estimate made by the chief engineer of the final cost of the whole work, of $2,934,308.68 an increase of $70,148.79. Then there was awarded by the arbitrators for damages $395,000, making $465,148.79. The amount that was asked for was the amount of the award only, $395,600, and that was paid, leaving a balance of $70,148.79, and the chief engineer says there are some small items amounting to $1,002.81, for transport and such things, making a total of $71,151.60. We ask for the net sum of $72,000 to meet all that is possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At the time that that very large award was paid, under circumstances with which the House is familiar, and which it may be remembered were circumstances which caused the award to be very much objected to, we certainly understood that it closed the whole account, that there was nothing left.

Mr. McLELAN. The engineer reports otherwise, that the award was mainly for damages which they claimed but not for the works proper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must say that, if we had been informed at that time there was to be an additional sum to be paid on that award, the House, I think, would have been very indisposed indeed to vote the money for it. It must be remembered that that award was rendered under circumstances which I have already referred to, and which showed that our own arbitrator expected and intended that it should be brought before the courts. We were told when the money was voted that it would be brought before the courts, and we found, when the accounts came down next year, that, on some pretext which I have never heard sufficiently explained, no reference was had to the courts and the whole sum was disposed of; and we have never been able to get the communication made by Judge Clark to the then Minister of Railways, though he admitted it was in his possession; and now to have a further $72,000 paid to these gentlemen is very astonishing.

Mr. WELDON. At the time of the debate the Minister of Railways certainly assured the House that that was the whole amount, and was the last of it, and he went into an elaborate calculation to show that, even with that amount, by the reduction in the contract there was not a large amount of money saved, but there was no mention of anything outstanding except the $45,000, the amount of the first award and the amount of the second award.

Mr. CASEY. The explanation given to-night is quite different from that given the other night. That was that the engineer's estimate included the amount of the award, which I pointed out was absurd.

Mr. McLELAN. There was a first reward of $45,000 and that $2,934,000 covers that.

Mr. CASEY. The explanation given to-night is more rational, because it does not claim that the engineer's estimates include the award. It was because the estimates did not include the amount of the award that there was an arbitration. Now, it is well known that all the matters in dispute between the contractors and the Government were submitted to arbitration. Everything that could properly or improperly be claimed was settled by the award. That was a final settlement of all matters in dispute between the officers and the Government. If there has been a subsequent estimate obtained from the chief engineer giving $70,000 more, it shows the matter has been reopened by the Government after the final award was made by the arbitrators. It shows the matter has been reopened for the purpose of allowing the contractors to put in extra claims and to give them extra payment beyond the award. The result of that reopening has been to give the contractors $70,000 more than the arbitrators awarded to them, and the only conclusion that the House can form is that the Government have been, to say the least of it, very slack in their duty. It will be remembered that one of the Government's own arbitrators on the board reported that even the award given by the arbitrators was excessive. The Government took the opinion of counsel about the validity of the award, and when we asked for returns upon that subject, returns were brought down after frequent demands, that were incomplete, and we were left in uncertainty as to the opinions of the counsel. We were refused the material submitted to the counsel upon which their opinion was based. We got the opinion of the counsel, but we were not given the material submitted to them upon which they based their opinion, and we do not know whether proper material was submitted to them or not. We are inclined to believe, from the conduct of the Government in the whole matter, that a very imperfect case was submitted to the counsel.

Mr. WELDON. It was understood that the arbitration settled all the matters in dispute by the parties. The Government then strongly pointed out that even if this amount was paid, a saving was effected. No reference was made that any further amount was demanded.

Mr. McLELAN. The late Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper), claimed and showed that there was a saving from the original estimate, of about $700,000 or $800,000, even with the award of $395,000. That award, as I understand it, was mainly for damages occasioned by the reduction the Government engineers' admitted in the work.

Mr. CASEY. The work was finished when the arbitration took place. There were no other claims then in, except those submitted to arbitration. If there is an extra payment now, it shows that new claims have been allowed to be put in since the arbitration, and have been acknowledged without contest. That is, the Government have, on the face of the matter, failed in their duty and allowed new claims without investigation, made after the whole matter had been settled. Now, there is more than that. I remember that the contractors charged for building an elevator at Port Arthur, and one of the items in the claim of the railway company, who took the road over afterwards, was $112,000, or thereabouts, for building the elevator. We found, in the returns I asked for, that the Government had allowed for this elevator to the contractors. Now, when such a transaction occurs, when an elevator is paid for twice, nobody can be surprised if we feel suspicious about an item of this kind. We all know what the relations between the contractors and the Government were stated to have been—that the Government obtained from the contractors funds for use in an election pending at the time, on the condition that extras were to be allowed them on their contract. I was informed of this by rumor some time before the final arbitration took place, and of the amount of extras which the contractors expected to receive in consideration of having advanced moneys to the Government, and by a strange coincidence the amount settled at the arbitration was almost exactly the amount that I was informed the contractors expected to receive in extras. All these things tend to make us very suspicious about the accounts of section B, and the Minister cannot expect the House to be satisfied with his explanation.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman may bring it up again on concurrence. We will try to take concurrence when the Minister is present himself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would call attention to the facts as stated by Sir Charles Tupper, on 16th April, 1884. He speaks first of the $45,000 on which he says the arbitrators were unanimous. Then he speaks of this next contract and says:

"After the best defence the Government could make, two of the arbitrators awarded the contractors $395,200 for damages. That award

the Government have not decided to pay. We think it prudent to take a vote, but at this moment the matter has been referred to the Department of Justice as the question is a large one and as the amount is a large one and greatly exceeded that which the Government considers they should claim by any possibility. It is proposed before paying the award to take the opinion of the ablest counsels at the command of the Government who will carefully examine the whole question."

Now the final estimates of all the work done by the contractors was $286,300. The Department intimated to us then, when this award was being voted, that that was the sum total, which, the Minister will observe, is as near as possible the difference between the sum we are now asked to vote and the engineer's report. I would suppose from that, although the whole matter is not over clear, that there was no doubt then that we would not be called upon to pay $50,000 or $70,000. There is another consideration. Why was it deferred to this day? I thought all that business had been finished two years ago.

Mr. McLELAN. The date of the final certificate is 5th July, 1884.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Hon. gentlemen opposite want a little light, and I will furnish it. The amount in the estimates now and the discussion has nothing whatever to do with the amount or questions involved in the arbitration. This amount is what is known in engineering language as the final estimate, which is given on the completion of the work, and the items in that final estimate were not involved in the question before the arbitration, were not discussed before them and had nothing whatever to do with them. There were certain specified questions before the arbitrators, and on the evidence laid before them the arbitrators awarded the sums voted in a former Session of Parliament. After those sums were paid, and they were paid principally on two heads, first, classification of material, and second, damages for the non-completion of section 15, there remained the ordinary adjustment of account which gentlemen who have any experience in these matters know is described as the final estimate. That was under discussion for many months between the engineers and the contractors, and finally it was adjusted at this particular amount, and does not influence any part of what was covered by the arbitration, and is the final estimate given the contractor on the balance of the account, the settlement of the drawback and the whole winding up of a very extensive contract. I speak from my knowledge on this subject, which hon. members know I possess, and I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that this particular item is the ordinary balance which a final balance sheet gives, and does not include any part of the items involved in the arbitration. The Minister said that the final estimate was given in July, 1884, but he must have been in error, because it is within my knowledge that it did not take place till some time in February or March.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is as I have stated. I called attention that the final estimate for all work done under the contract was $2,863,000. I call attention to the fact that Sir Charles Tupper, in his capacity as Minister of Railways, on 16th April said that the whole estimate for work done on the contract was $2,863,000.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The Government engineer's final estimate when made out was a little over $50,000. The contractors claimed a considerably larger sum, and finally the amount was adjusted at the amount placed in the vote.

Mr. CASEY. The information is certainly valuable. It corroborates exactly what I said, that this vote for $70,000 is not for amounts that came before the arbitrators.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). You were stating the opposite a moment ago.

Mr. CASEY. These claims have arisen since.

Mr. McLELAN. The chief engineer called one a progress estimate and the other the final estimate.

Mr. CASEY. Give the dates of both those documents?

Mr. McLELAN. I have not the dates here.

Mr. CASEY. There was a final estimate given before the date of the arbitration. The arbitration was not spoken of as between the Government and the contractors till rumors had gone abroad, and the Government thought it necessary to clear their skirts by going through an arbitration. The arbitration was held, and the arbitrators gave in their award as a final settlement of all accounts between the contractors and the Government. It appears by the statement of the member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) that there has still been questions between the Government and the contractors.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I am afraid the hon. gentleman has not the necessary technical knowledge to enable him to discuss this question with intelligence. The hon. gentleman does not understand what a final estimate is. There could not possibly have been one before the arbitration. The question involved in the arbitration were questions of damages. That arbitration was not given by the Government.

Mr. CASEY. Partly damages.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Wholly damages.

Mr. CASEY. No, not at all.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Damages and a claim for an alteration and for a wrong classification of the character of the work. The questions involved in the arbitration were in no respect the same questions as those involved in making up the final estimates. The final estimate my hon. friend speaks of as a matter of compromise. It was in one sense a matter of compromise, but it was a compromise based on facts and figures. It was not a compromise jumped at, but it was based on a settlement of the question of the different quantities and allowances which had been previously based on the progress estimates, and which on the final settlement had to be corrected by the actual quantities of work on the ground. They were settled in the manner I have stated, and the arbitration was not agreed upon as a matter of policy on that part of the Government or to clear their skirts in any way. My hon. friend shakes his head, but I think that his knowledge of the subject is very superficial, and if he thoroughly understood it he would not have made a great many of the remarks which he made upon it. The settlement was not made to clean the skirts of the Government. They have nothing to clean as I am aware of, because as far as my knowledge goes I am not aware of any set of contractors who were worse used by the Government, and by their officers and engineers than those contractors were. I am not aware of any concession made to them, of any advantage given to them or any favors shown to them. On the contrary, from first to last, every possible difficulty was thrown in their way, and the fact that their chief engineer who gave this estimate reported—and it is on record as a matter contained in his official report—that the contractors could not finish the work within the time and under the contract, and recommended that the work should be taken off their hands. They disputed the right of the Government to do anything of the kind; the work was not taken off their hands; they finished the contract in time and within the strict letter of the contract, and asked or received no favors from the Government and got nothing but bare justice from them. The hon. gentleman speaks of this being done to clear the skirts of the Government. The Government, as a matter of policy, in order to have that portion of the work finished in time, in-

sisted in altering the character of the work to such an extent that the contractors declined to go on with it on the ground that it was so changed in its character that they had no right to go on with it. The Government agreed with them that if they would go on they would leave the question of the compensation to which they were entitled for that change of the work, and any other claims they had, to arbitration, when the Government thought the position of the work was such as to justify it. That was covered by an Order in Council, which is on the Table of the House, and it was in pursuance of that Order in Council, made two or three years before the arbitration took place, that it did take place. The arbitration took place and settled those claims, but it did not adjust in any way what is technically known by engineers as the final estimate. That final estimate was arrived at this spring, and that is the amount now in the estimates, and it does not include or embrace the matters in question in the arbitration in any way.

Mr. CASEY. I never said that it did, and that is just the point. The hon. Minister was therefore mistaken in telling us the other night that it did include these matters. The hon. gentleman says I have no professional knowledge to enable me to understand this matter or discuss it intelligently. Well, I am not an engineer to be sure, but I never knew that the hon. gentleman was either. He has had a knowledge of this matter in connection with his legal and other duties—his political and parliamentary duties. I have not, of course, had such a deep and thorough knowledge of the true inwardness of this settlement as the hon. gentleman no doubt possesses, but I have carefully gone through all the documents laid before the House, and those are the only documents on which we can form an opinion, and the conclusion from them was that, so far as the final estimates were concerned, and the final re-measurement of the work on which to base the final estimates, it was begun in the fall of 1882 and continued until the spring of the following year. The final estimate based on it was brought down last February. Now that is a strange state of affairs.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). What year did you say?

Mr. CASEY. 1882.

Mr. CAMERON. Oh, no.

Mr. CASEY. It was put in in 1884 and brought down either that Session or the beginning of last Session. The hon. gentleman says that these contractors were the most ill-used lot of men he ever knew, and never got any favors from the Government. One of these contractors wrote to the newspapers in Toronto pointing out that they had complained of the conduct of the engineer in charge, that he was too severe upon them, and on their demand that he should be removed, he was removed. That was one concession they had. I questioned Sir Charles Tupper about this removal, and asked him if Mr. Jennings was removed for inefficiency, and he said no. He admitted that he had given him the highest recommendation to Mr. Onderdonk who wished to employ him, and he bore high testimony to his professional capacity and his personal character. We have the fact then that the engineer who was set to watch the contractors for that work was removed from that work and sent to British Columbia, at the request of the contractors who thought he was too severe. When I questioned Sir Charles Tupper he refused to answer whether Mr. Jennings was removed for that reason or not, but our heads are not so thick that we had any doubt about that point. The removal was made after the demand and, no doubt, because of the demand, and because Mr. Jennings was watching the contractors too closely. Immediately afterwards a re-measurement was made by two engineers whose names I have forgotten. The final re-measurement was made so long ago as February of 1884. I understand that the final estimate is based upon that final re-measurement. That final re-measurement was made long before the arbitration took place; and the points submitted to the arbitration were not merely questions of damages, as the hon. gentleman has stated, but questions of classification, as he has admitted, in regard to excavation outside of the "prism," as to what constituted "loose rock," "earth," and so on, were submitted to the arbitration; and the result of the final estimate was submitted. The question was then stated by the Minister of Railways to be finally settled, and we now find it again reopened by the Minister of Railways. New claims have been made, and a compromise has been effected, as the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), who seems to have a professional knowledge of the case, tells us. It was settled by a compromise between the engineers and the contractors, and he tells us it was based on facts and figures. A compromise cannot be based on facts and figures; it must be arrived at by allowing larger quantities or larger prices. There was a compromise, probably not between the engineers and the contractors, but between the Government and the contractors, upon the hon. gentleman's own statement, and he appears to speak here as their authorised agent in some way, by allowing them $70,000. I do not want a severer indictment against the Government than that.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I wish to enquire what engineer made the final estimates.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Mr. Schreiber, the chief engineer, who I do not think has the reputation of favoring contractors very much.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Is that the engineer who some time previously reported that the company would not be able to complete the work within the time specified?

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I should like to know whether the amount of the arbitration was included by the chief engineer in any estimate, or whether it was put independent of his estimate?

Mr. McLELAN. Put independent of his estimate.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the final estimates could not be dependent in any way on the arbitration?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, the arbitration not having come into the engineer's estimate at all, how is it, the work having been completed in 1883, it is not until now that we are voting the payment. Was it not as a final estimate that the sum of $44,000 was granted in July, 1884?

Mr. McLELAN. That was a sum allowed for some special work at that time.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, the work having been completed in 1883 and the final estimate being entirely independent of the arbitration, what has delayed the matter till this time?

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). No final estimate was made anterior to the arbitration, and no final estimate could be made until the arbitration had taken place. When the arbitrators settled the quantities, it was necessary for the chief engineer to adjust his final estimate based on the finding of the arbitrators. The award showed the quantities of the different kinds of work, and until the award was made it was impossible for the engineer to make up his final estimate. He made his final estimate in the neighborhood of $50,000. As invariably occurs in every case of this kind, the contractors contended that the chief engineer had not done them justice in several particulars, and they furnished evidence of it. One item was earth filling and another trestle work. The engineer obtained evidence under oath such as the contractors could furnish, and instead of allowing the prices they claimed, he

only allowed them what he thought fit, which was more than he had originally allowed them and less than they had originally claimed. In that sense I said it was a compromise, not a compromise arrived at by agreement, but arrived at by the engineer himself, upon evidence furnished by his own officers upon more accurate calculations. There was no compromise by the contractors on one side saying we will take so much, and the Government saying we will give you so much. Perhaps the word compromise was the improper term for me to use. There was an adjustment of accounts, based, so far as the engineer was concerned, on the most rigid evidence and cutting down of the contractors' claim, as far as he should have cut them down, and I consider further.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has told us the final estimate was based on the result of the first arbitration, which dealt with the first classification of the work, and the arbitrators reported merely the amount of work.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I did not say merely.

Mr. CASEY. And the engineer, taking that as the basis of his calculation, made that a final estimate.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). He had to correct his figures.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman's memory fails him. The arbitrators reported, not only the amount of work properly coming under each head of the classification, but they moneyed out, to use a technical term, the total amount due at the contract prices. The engineers and arbitrators had nothing to do with settling the prices; the prices were settled by contract. All they had to do was to find out how many yards of filling came under such a heading, and they reported the amount due, which came in all to about $45,000. That was the final settlement of all the questions involved in that classification. If the hon. member wishes us to understand that this present payment of $70,000 has anything to do with the question of classification and with the contract quantities found by the arbitrators to be excavated, he is undertaking a hopeless task. The question of the quantities excavated, of the filling, of the classification of those quantities, was definitely settled by those arbitrators, and the amount they allowed was about $45,000.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It was nothing of the kind, there was no such sum.

Mr. CASEY. We will settle that on concurrence, when the definite report of the arbitrators will be before us. If there has been any question since that of classification or of the applications of prices to the quantity settled by arbitration, there has been a reopening of the whole question after it had been legally and finally settled, and the Government have unduly favored the contractors by allowing that.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Finance Minister if this is the last final settlement?

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). This is the final settlement of everything in connection with section B.

Mr. MITCHELL. Have we got a new Minister of Finance?

Mr. CASEY. I have one further remark to make, and that is upon the presentation of the case by the Minister of Finance. In future, when he is dealing with railway matters, I hope he will call on the Railway Department to give him information that will enable him to explain the matter intelligibly, because in this instance he has shown an utter ignorance of the subject.

Privy Council for Canada..... $1,450 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand it, the hon. gentleman proposes to add one second class clerk and one messenger to the Privy Council office. The number of officials there is increasing very fast, and I cannot understand why they should require five second class clerks and six messengers in addition to the doorkeeper and messenger. Seven distinct messengers for the Privy Council office is out of reason and proportion to any possible work these men would have to do.

Mr. McLELAN. The second class clerk was in the estimate for last year, but by mistake he was dropped. He was put in the estimates as a supernumerary, and when we came to look over them, his name, at the request of the President of Council was dropped, because it was not understood how it came to be there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I just call the attention of the House to this because this department is increasing in expense out of all proportion. In 1879, twelve officers were required for this department; now twenty-one are required. In 1879, we had three messengers; now we have six. Two senior second class clerks did all the work then; now five are required. How can the work in the Privy Council have increased so much? There are no additional charges devolving on the office that I know of.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The memorandum I have is that the work of the Department of the Privy Council has increased very much. During last year, the President of the Council had to borrow from other Departments two officers, and as the necessary funds had not been voted, and seeing that the work continued to be heavy and the officers were required, the Privy Council thought, under these circumstances, they should ask for an additional officer who is a second class clerk. The salary is as mentioned because the man appointed was formerly in the permanent service of the Government, and being transferred from another Department had to remain at his present salary. As to the messenger, the hon. gentleman will remember that Grenier, the only French messenger, was very old, had ceased to be able to walk, was becoming blind, and therefore had to be superannuated, and the Government decided to take a new one in his place, and that is the French messenger who has been added. There was no salary provided for him for the current year, and therefore we had to ask now for $100 to pay for the time he has been there up to 30th June. The money will afterwards be voted in the other estimates.

Department of Secretary of State..... $540 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that extra work performed in the Department?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It was performed to my own knowledge as night work, and at a time when two officers were ill, and we had not taken new officers for the Franchise Act.

Mr. McMULLEN. This system of allowing for extra work is going wild. By the Auditor General's report, last year we paid clerks now in the Departments $59,233.85 for extra work. If the clerks find the Government are disposed to allow them for extra work for every day and every hour they are engaged beyond their regular hours they will make a charge for it, probably they have got so used to that that they do less in their regular hours. This is increasing every year, and I think Ministers should begin to carefully enquire into the operation of this system. Last year 140 clerks got about $412 apiece for extra work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this $250 for salary of J. F. Waters?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He is an officer for whom we have provided in the regular estimates at $1,000. He was employed in the Department of Inland Revenue at that salary, and was transferred to the Department of the Secretary of State in April. His salary was provided for

on the 1st July, and this is to cover the three months between April and the 30th July.

Department of Fisheries $400 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does this amount for S. P. Bauset come to be proposed?

Mr. FOSTER. It is properly a revote. It was voted last year, but the name was not inserted, and the Auditor General refused to pay it.

Department of Agriculture..... $508 33

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this allowance to H. H. Bailey at the rate of $100 per annum for?

Mr. CARLING. He was appointed as extra clerk and patent examiner, with the rank of a second class clerk.

Administration of Justice..... $47,190 14

Mr. McLELAN. I propose to amend this by inserting the name of J. A. Côté, $187.60.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does Mr. H. Roy come to figure so frequently? As I understand, he is an officer of the Secretary of State's Department. He receives a regular salary, and, looking back to a previous vote I find he receives $73 for extra work, and here he receives $266.25. This plan of giving $300 or $400 extra to gentlemen who are sufficiently well paid, for the most part of them for the work they perform, for all kinds of services, is very objectionable and leads to great irregularity and great waste of the public time. Very few of our officers work more than is good for their health, and it is a very dubious piece of policy to allow them to charge 50 cents or a dollar an hour for all the extra work they do. If they were in the employment of a private banking firm, they would have to work many hours extra for a much smaller salary, and many people would be willing to take their places if they objected.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I agree with the hon gentleman entirely. As far as the officers of my Department are concerned, I am sure the amount this year is, first, very small, and second, I hope it will not be repeated. I agree that it is not a good custom or one that I desire to encourage in my Department. As for Mr. Roy, he is innocently put as the object of the remark of the hon. gentleman. I think his account is only $16 or $17. The work done by this gentleman was copying the whole of the records in the trial of Louis Riel, all the copies sent off for printing, the whole of the translation of it, and the whole of the correction of the proofs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like some general explanation of the large sum here required. What is it for?

Mr. THOMPSON. Most altogether for the exceptional expenses in connection with the administration of justice in the North-West, the numerous trials, expenses for witnesses, and maintenance of prisoners. Up to the 28th January, 1886, there had been voted $35,000 in the ordinary and Supplementary Estimates of last year. The expenditure up to that date had been $45,000 so that we had exceeded by about $10,000 the amount voted the previous year.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to draw the attention of the Government of the need of having the clerks in the various Departments work longer hours during the Sessions of Parliament. We find it very difficult to do business with the Departments. In the first place a good many of those officers do not come to their business until 9 or 10 o'clock in the morning, and as the committee meet at 10:30 or 11, we can get no work done before the committees meet. Then after dinner we have very little opportunity of doing business before 4 o'clock, at which hour the clerks leave the office. I think it is not requiring too much of the clerks to work till 6 o'clock, and on Saturdays till at least 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like some explanation about this sum paid to Sheriff Chapleau, $1,190. I notice that he gets $1,200 as sheriff of the North-West, and $500 for travelling expenses as inspector of public works.

Mr. THOMPSON. This officer receives $1,200, and an allowance has been fixed at $800 for travelling expenses. That sum has been paid him for the last two or three years out of the vote for the administration of justice. The allowance, however, had not been fixed up to the date mentioned here, up to the 1st January, 1885, and nothing had been paid on account of it. Instead of paying the arrears of travelling expenses it was thought better to ask Parliament for a vote to cover the whole period.

Mr. McMULLEN. He gets $500 a year for acting as inspector of public buildings in the North-West, and $4 a day for travelling expenses.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I know he receives $500 for that work, and he does it well. For travelling expenses he receives $3.50 or $4 a day, the usual allowance.

Expenses connected with the Franchise Act... $200,000 00

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to have very much a statement as to what this Franchise Act is going to cost us altogether for the year. It was stated when the Bill was brought in last year that the expenses would be very moderate. Some gentlemen stated it would amount to $250,000, others, $400,000, others, $500,000, and I have been told by some members of the House who are well posted, that it will amount to $750,000, I think it is one of the most extravagant Acts that ever was placed upon the Statute-book.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the expenditure for printing up to the present date?

Mr. McLELAN. That is not known.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much has been paid, so far?

Mr. McLELAN. Nothing has been paid yet?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then can the hon. gentleman tell what has been asked?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. All the accounts have been referred by me to the Auditor General. Nothing has been paid, and the printers have been found very patient in waiting?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Could the hon. gentleman tell us what is the aggregate of the printing bills thus far?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I could not say. I know it is very high, certainly as much as $100,000, for printing alone. That includes printing the voters' lists and assessment rolls.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The time has now come, I think, when the House ought to be put in possession of the views of the Government as to the salaries to be allowed to the revising barristers, also to the clerks and bailiffs employed under them. It is now a year since the Act was passed, and it is time the scale of salaries was made out. Has the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Finance ascertained what the charges will be for the revising officer for each constituency?

Mr. THOMPSON. No scale has yet been decided. The work of revision has not yet been completed, and it is difficult to tell yet the precise period from which an allowance ought to be made. Certainly the allowance this year will

be in excess of what will be required hereafter, because the work of preparing the first list will be far greater than that connected with subsequent lists. A regulation was adopted in regard to clerks and bailiffs, the allowance of the former being $2 per day, and the latter $1.50, with a low scale of travelling expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman give us any idea of the number of days' work that a revising officer will have to perform in an ordinary constituency?

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am informed that the work will be likely to occupy fully three months. In many cases in Ontario a single judge takes two constituencies. From what I know, I would propose that at the very least the judge would require to spend sixty or seventy days on the work.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is a very important question that has been raised in connection with the Franchise Bill. A good many people entertain the idea that we are going to have an election this summer. Some people suggest that if the Quebec elections are successful there will be an election certainly. I think we are justified in demanding from the Government that they should come down to the House and submit a statement of the approximate cost of the Franchise Act. It is a right we have before we vote money to have this explanation from the Government. If we are to have an election this summer—and it is quite on the cards—I want to be able to tell my constituents something about the cost of the franchise measure. I do not want to say, as some members say, that it will cost $1,000,000 or $750,000, or between $400,000 or $500,000, which is my estimate, but we are entitled to obtain a proper estimate from the Government.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think that the Government have any good reason for supposing that the cost of printing the voters' lists will this year be any more than in future years. The list will require every year to be revised; it will be necessary to obtain copies of the assessment rolls because the property very largely changes hands, and ten per cent. of the names will have to be changed. So there is no reason for supposing that there will be less labor this year than last year. It is true that if we had adopted the principle of manhood suffrage, to which our friends in Quebec so strongly object, there would have been less difficulty, because the question as to property would not have arisen. Last year the First Minister had a clause in the original Bill making an appropriation for revising officers. The clause was struck out, and the hon. gentleman said that the Government would acquire sufficient experience before Parliament again met to decide upon the salaries of revising officers. We are now meeting twelve months after the measure was introduced and we are no nearer solving the question yet. There should not be very much difficulty in arriving at what would be a reasonable amount, and how is the Government to arrive at an approximate amount, when they are unable to tell the House the amount of money that this revision will cost. I think when we go to the country we should know what the measure is likely to cost us. The hon. member for Northumberland says we are going to have an election.

Mr. MITCHELL. I merely give my opinion; I cannot tell.

Mr. MILLS. I do not know that the Government can tell any more than the hon. gentleman, and I am inclined to think that if they do go to the country we will not only have a provincial election in Quebec but in Ontario, where we have a great many questions which will come up as issues between the Government and the Province of Ontario. There is the question of their interference with provincial legislation, the boundary question, the plundering of the territories belonging to the Province. These are all important and interesting questions, and they show the great necessity of having further information upon the item now before us.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I hope the hon. gentleman, when he considers the question of the salaries of the revising officers, will not forget those who have to deal with the unorganised townships, because in my constituency the revising officer has to originate the lists in some forty townships. Now, whatever may be the effect of the Franchise Act in other constituencies, it will give us in that constituency a fair election for the first time. We have never had a fair one yet, by reason of various influences used by hon. gentlemen opposite, and for the first time we will have under this Act a fair legitimate election. The revising officers there will have an extra amount of work to do which will be fairly considered when the salaries of these officers are fixed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the revising officer there a Mr. Mahaffy?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes, and he has done his duty to the satisfaction of opponents as well as friends. There has not been a single complaint against his conduct or the way he has done his work.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the hon. gentleman give me any idea of the remuneration of the revising officer of the North Riding of York?

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot.

Mr. MULOCK. It is stated that the clerk will be allowed $2 per day. What does that mean? The Act of Parliament went into force on the 1st January, 1886, and I suppose from that time until the final revision he is more or less engaged.

Mr. THOMPSON. No; the clerks do not commence work until long after that time, and I should be surprised if they were to charge for collecting information. It is for actual work while under the instructions of the revising officer.

Mr. MULOCK. Who is to be the judge of the work they do?

An hon. MEMBER. The judge.

Mr. THOMPSON. There will be the certificate of the judge, but that may not be conclusive.

Mr. MULOCK. When do the bailiff's duties begin and and when do they end.

Mr. THOMPSON. As a general rule they will begin at the time the first court is held, and will only continue while the courts are being held, and while they are posting and serving notices under the direction of the revising officer.

Mr. MULOCK. If the revising officer does his duty in enquiring who should go on the lists, he will have to do a good deal of travelling. Is any provision to be made for travelling expenses while collecting this information and attending the courts?

Mr. THOMPSON. Certainly not for getting information, but I cannot say whether he will be paid for necessary travelling expenses in attending courts.

Mr. MITCHELL. My county is about 100 miles long by 100 miles broad, and I must say that if the hon. gentleman's statement is correct, it is rather extraordinary treatment on the returning officers. I think that this item should either be allowed to stand for further information or passed with the understanding that on concurrence full information shall be supplied so that we may be prepared

to give our people information, as to the cost of this extraordinary Franchise Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it would be a misfortune if the hon. gentlemen were to allow so small a sum to the judges as to disgust them with the work. We had very great objections, as the Minister of Justice probably knows, to the appointment of revising barristers by the Government at all, and I have never changed my opinion that it was a most dangerous usurpation. But the point which removed a good deal of onus from the Government in the eyes of the people of Ontario, at any rate, was the employment of the judges, who had been, to a great extent, performing the same functions before. I take this opportunity of saying that I think the Government will commit a very serious error if they reduce the sum to be paid to the judges to such a miserable pittance, in view of the very serious amount of work they have to do, as to disgust these gentlemen with the office. The county judges in Ontario have from various causes of late been very hardworked, and the amount of additional work thrown upon them by the Franchise Bill has taxed their strength and time severely. Although I am not in favor of paying unreasonable salaries to them or to anybody, I think a fair allowance ought in all conscience and justice to be made to those gentlemen, and I trust that the Government will see fit to do it.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to continue my enquiries a little further. The Minister of Justice states that the revising officer is not to be paid for doing his duty in gathering information.

Mr. THOMPSON. I said they were not to be paid for travelling expenses in going about and collecting information, and I am sure they do not go about collecting information. I know that the revising officers of Ontario adopted a resolution which absolutely precluded that course, in which they stated their intention of acting only on stated evidence or their own knowledge, and not on their own motion, beyond using the means placed in their hands by the assessment roll and the list of electors. I am sure the revising officer in Northumberland has not gone about collecting information, but has waited until proper evidence was offered of the rights of parties to be put on or taken off the list. Of course some allowance must be made for travelling expenses in the gross sum to be paid.

Mr. MITCHELL. In reply to what the hon. gentleman says in relation to the revising officer in my county, I say the information I have got is that he has travelled around in some parishes, and by gaining personal information has endeavored to get up his list. If he goes into all the parishes his travelling expenses will be very considerable, and I think it would be wrong to refuse to pay the travelling expenses of these officers when they do travel. I quite agree with the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) that the duties of those revising officers are very important, and they should be paid fairly well. I would not argue giving them high salaries, but I would pay them what would be considered fair, handsome remuneration for the services they perform. I have no doubt they will do their duty fairly well, and I would not want those who have to travel around such an extensive county as mine not to be paid their travelling expenses. I think it would be a gross injustice to them.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Justice seems to misapprehend the functions of the revising officer. He supposes he is a judge. It is true he is in one sense; but he has to prepare the case for the judge as well. He is not to sit quietly in the court and hear claims and adjudicate on them. Such is not the spirit of the Franchise Act. His duty is to find out who are entitled to the franchise; he is not to wait in some quiet nook until they call upon him.

Mr. MITCHELL.

The theory is that the man entitled to a vote will seek his right, which is very good as a theory, but does not work in practice; so that I think the hon. gentleman will find that sooner or later he will have to meet the claims of these officers for travelling expenses. I would again ask whether any provision in this estimate is intended for the travelling expenses of the 211 clerks that are to be travelling about the country. If so, what is the *per capita* allowance to them?

Mr. THOMPSON. There is an allowance made for travelling expenses for each clerk. I cannot state the allowance per head, because it is a *per diem* allowance during actual employment, and it has not yet ceased.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman state what number of days are estimated for each clerk?

Mr. THOMPSON. Averages are very unreliable and very difficult to make.

Mr. MULOCK. I then come to the bailiff. I put the same question, and am I to consider I have the same answer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. Having got this satisfactory information with regard to these officers, I now come to a more important functionary, and I am sure he will not be treated in that cavalier way in which bailiffs, clerks and judges have been treated. I come to the ruler of our country, the printer. I would ask whether there has been any tariff arranged in respect to the printing.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. 12½ cents per name, including the descriptions; and for all additions 12½ cents per name. That figure covers the three lists, the preliminary and the revised and the final.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there any estimate for rent of offices or court houses where the courts of revision will be held?

Mr. THOMPSON. None.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the estimated cost of procuring certified copies of the lists? and revised assessment rolls, according to the Franchise Act?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It varies from 75 cents to $5. I do not speak of cities.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It will cost a great deal more than that.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the average?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I cannot say.

Mr. MULOCK. I am thoroughly satisfied now that the Government have the most conclusive data on which to invite the House to vote a specific sum of $200,000, as the full amount necessary to put this Act in force.

Mr. MITCHELL. They do not seem to give it to us if they have.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is very unreasonable not to be satisfied with the lucid explanations we have had. Could the hon. member inform the House of the estimated cost to the country of procuring to the support of the Government each bad vote under this Act?

Mr. CASEY. The Government are treating the House with anything but respect in asking us to vote $200,000 with such an utter lack of information as they have shown. The Minister of Justice said it was impossible yet to settle the salaries of the revising officers. There is no reason why they should not be settled now, for we can form a very fair idea of the work at present and the time it takes. The Minister of Justice knows well how much a judge expects to be paid per day for his time, when he is actually employed. I am not prepared at all to believe that the county

judges and other gentlemen who have accepted the position of revising officer have done so under the loose promise that they would be paid according to their work.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not the slightest information has been given them.

Mr. CASEY. Then they are more careless than I would have expected them to be. The result will be that, as their pay will depend largely on the amount of work they have to do, they will make work for themselves, as the revising officer has done in my riding, so as to get as much pay as possible. The revising officer in my riding rejected, on the most ridiculous grounds, a number of applications to be put on the primary list, with the idea of making work for himself in the final revision, for which he would charge the Government. How can the revising officer act independently of the Government, when his salary is not fixed. We were told these gentlemen would be independent as judges, that their position would be fixed, and now we find they are working on the job system and are utterly dependent on the Government. You cannot imagine that these people can be looked upon as independent while they are in that dependent and slavish situation, with regard to the Government, when the whole question of their salary depends upon the favor of the Government, and if they offend the Government their salary may be put down to a beggarly pittance. Several of them have acted fairly, and my own revising officer in Elgin has acted with more fairness of late than he did at first, in fact with complete fairness, as far as I know. But they cannot be looked upon as independent when the Government have kept them under their thumb until the list is finished. It is a disgraceful proposition to make that they shall be kept under the thumb of the Government until the revision is finished. Then, with regard to the clerks, the Minister has stated that they will be paid $2 a day for the time they are actually employed, but he took good care not to say what actual employment meant. If it means the total number of days, that the total number of hours they are employed would amount to, it is absurd. Most of them are lawyers in practice, and you cannot hire a lawyer in practice for $2 a day. If it is to be any remuneration to a lawyer, it must be calculated from the time they begin to the time they finish their services as clerks.

Mr. THOMPSON. If they were lawyers of any credit, the longer they were at it the more they would lose at $2 a day.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister has shown the absurdity of his first statement by that. That is exactly the point I was making. Therefore they will be paid for some suppositious period.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to have some information from the Government as to whether they intend to adopt the suggestion I made, and give us, on concurrence, an approximate statement of the probable cost. I think we are entitled to have it, and I have three times called attention to it without getting any answer.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have already explained, that until the revision is more advanced, it is impossible to state the expense. The courts for final revision have yet to be held, the printers' bills are not all in, and the assessment rolls are not all printed yet.

Mr. MULOCK. I agree that it is impossible for the Government to give any information. It is unreasonable for my hon. friends to expect any more information than we have received. We have had such a satisfactory financial statement, what more remains for any paternal Government to do?

Mr. MITCHELL. I suppose I shall have to put up with the information we have got. I certainly did not expect much information when I asked for it. There is one thing, however, they might fairly do. They state how much they allow a clerk and a constable per day, and I think it ought not to be so serious a matter to say how much they allow the revising barristers a day. However, as it is likely to embarrass them, I will withdraw my demand.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 3:35 a. m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 1st June, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. EDGAR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, there is a matter to which I may be allowed to refer. I stated last week, during the debate on the Franchise Bill, that in the riding of East Toronto a number of names had been put on the preliminary voters' list of persons who are not qualified under the law, as it stands, and that the revising officer's clerk, when his attention was called to this, said that the law would be altered at the next Session so as to qualify those voters. My statement was questioned by the hon. member for East Toronto on that occasion. I saw by the papers in Toronto yesterday, that on Saturday, in the House, the hon. member for East Toronto had read a letter from the revising officer's clerk formally contradicting my statement, and I took occasion to enquire of my informant as to the correctness of the information he had given me. He not only stated that what he had told me was correct, but he said he was willing to furnish me with a statutory declaration to that effect, and I have the declaration here, which I will read to the House:

"I, Daniel Hugh Allen, of the city of Toronto, in the county of York and Province of Ontario, gentleman, do hereby solemnly declare as follows:—

"1. Soon after the publication of the parliamentary list of voters, under the 'Electoral Franchise Act,' for the city of Toronto, my attention was called to the fact that, while in the lists for the electoral districts of Centre and West Toronto, for which His Honor Joseph E. McDougall is the revising officer, there were comparatively few names as on income at their places of business, there was a large number of those on the lists for the electoral district of East Toronto, for which John Boyd, Esq., is the revising officer.

"2. My attention was specially attracted to the large number of such cases, in said Ward of St. Lawrence, in said electoral district of East Toronto; there being no less than sixty-three on the list, as at the City Hall, in polling sub-division No. 9 of this ward.

"3. Soon after making the above-mentioned discovery, being in the office of the said revising officer for East Toronto, and said revising officer not being in his office at the time, I called the attention of his clerk, Mr. Walton, to the above mentioned facts, saying that unless all those parties who had their names so placed as on income at their places of business, would have them changed on revision of the list, they would all be disfranchised.

"4. Mr. Walton at once replied that the Act was to be amended before the revision of the list would be completed, so as to make good all such votes.

"5. I was surprised and indignant at this information, and so expressed myself to Mr. Walton, who appeared to realise he had made a slip, and declined answering further questions as to his grounds for the statement he had made.

"6. I afterwards mentioned what Walton informed me to Judge McDougall and others. Judge McDougall thought no Act would be passed which would affect the lists of the present year, as it would greatly add to the labor and expense connected with the preparation of the same; and I believe there are over a thousand names wrongly placed in the St. Lawrence Ward alone. And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act

passed in the thirty-seventh year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled: 'An Act for the suppression of Voluntary and Extra-judicial Oaths.'

"Declared before me at Toronto, in the county of York, this thirty-first day of May, A.D. 1886. (Signed) "D. H. ALLEN.

(Signed) "THOS. P. GALT,
"A Commissioner, &c."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Orders of the Day are gone into, I feel called upon to speak with regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) respecting my great criminality in dealing in public lands. I was not here when the hon. gentleman spoke, and I was rather surprised when I was told that I had been put in the category of those concerned in public plunder. I was particularly surprised at this, because, whatever my sins otherwise might be, I had never dealt in any lands, or scrip, or limits of any kind from the time I came of age until this moment. Never did I apply on behalf of myself or of any client that I can remember for any lands or privileges from the Crown in any way, and, therefore, I could not understand how I could be implicated in the charges brought by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron). I, therefore, could not well understand how I was implicated, but, upon reading the hon. gentleman's speech, which I did since I was well enough to do so, I found that my sin was in having a son, that my son was practising in the North-West, and his sin was in having for a partner the son of Sir Charles Tupper, and that these two gentlemen, practising lawyers, had actually committed the great sin of dealing in lands and speculating and making applications as others did in the North-West. The language of the hon. gentleman is most extraordinary, and I was going to say, if it was parliamentary, most infamous. This is his language:

"Now, Sir, I find that the son of the First Minister of this Dominion, and the son of Sir Charles Tupper, have for years been using their all-powerful influence with this Administration, in order to secure large slices of the public domain and the public resources of this country. For years they have been trading on and speculating in that influence, and in the resources of the Dominion secured thereby. I say the startling disclosures that have been so far made in the equity side of the Court of Queen's Bench in the Province of Manitoba are enough to arouse the indignation of any people in any country."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this charge, if it means anything, means that my son and the son of Sir Charles Tupper, using their influence with their parents, had secured slices of land improperly in this country. Now, I state here, in my place as a member of Parliament, and on my honor as a gentleman, that neither of those two young men ever addressed me, or spoke to me, or approached me, directly or indirectly, upon any claim or application that they were about to make, and I would further venture to say that both Mr. Stewart Tupper and Mr. Hugh John Macdonald are honest and honorable men, and I am quite satisfied that they would not do anything which would disgrace their parents or disgrace themselves. They are, I am happy to say—because I am interested in my son's prosperity—doing very well as lawyers; they have a very considerable business, and they deal, as all other legal men are doing and have a right to do, and as everyone does in the North-West, with land purchases. It is their affair altogether, and it is too much to say that, because their parents happen to be public men, they alone of all Her Majesty's subjects in Canada should be precluded from doing legitimate business if they choose to do so. I said that I was perfectly ignorant of any one of the transactions mentioned here, but, being satisfied that the honor of these gentlemen was without stain, I caused enquiries to be made. It appears that the statements that were made by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) were based on certain exhibits filed in an equity suit in Manitoba. The firm of Macdonald & Tupper had two partners, Mr. McArthur & Mr. Dexter. The partnership was severed, there was a difference between the partners as to the accounts, and they have gone into chancery to settle the accounts between them, and these papers which were laid before the court were published in one of the newspapers, and hence the hon. member for West Huron gathers these facts, which he utterly distorts, utterly misstates, and grossly and malignantly insinuates as being dishonorable and discreditable to these two young gentlemen and to myself and to Sir Charles Tupper. Now, here is the first case, which he refers to in the following language:

"From the evidence, so far as it has been submitted—and it has only been partially submitted—these two young men appear to have secured a timber limit on the Swan River in the name of one John McMahon. Several partners were interested in that limit, and these two young men had a ninth blind share in it. But that was not sufficient to compensate these two young men for the valuable services they had rendered in securing the limit, and so the Order in Council granting it was cancelled. A new deal was effected; a new Order in Council was issued, granting the timber limit to T. P. Walsh, for T. P. Walsh, John McMahon, the Hon. Edgar Dewdney, and Macdonald & Tupper, and in that timber limit Macdonald & Tupper held a three-fifths interest; and the Hon. Edgar Dewdney, pet and friend of this Administration, offered to sell his interest in it for $50,000. I have always been amazed and astounded, considering the charges that have been made against Edgar Dewdney by the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite in Parliament and out of Parliament, who have denounced this man as utterly unfit for the position he occupies—I say I have been surprised that a man so described by the Government's own friends, should have been retained in his place until a rebellion broke out, to some extent through his instrumentality, and even after it broke out. The mystery is no longer a mystery, this litigation has unravelled it."

I sent over to the Department of the Interior to find out all about this John McMahon and his grant, and these are the facts, as conveyed to me by the officers of that Department:

"On the 18th January, 1883, an application from John McMahon was received in the Department for a timber limit on the Swan River. This application was originally signed J. B. McArthur, but McArthur's name was erased and John McMahon's substituted therefor. On the 16th March, 1883, an amended application was received from John McMahon by his attorneys, Macdonald & Tupper. This application was granted on the usual conditions, which McMahon found so onerous that, on the 15th November, 1883, he surrendered the limit, having paid $250 ground rent thereon. On the 19th December, 1883, the same limit was granted to T. P. Walsh. Walsh never complied with the conditions, and has therefore no longer an interest in the limit, which remains in the Crown."

That disposes of that. The next case is this:

"Macdonald & Tupper also applied for, and were able to secure in the name of John Apted, a timber limit on the Rolling River, in which they held a fourth blind share, and for which a firm of manufacturers offered $25,000, although it cost these young men, I suppose, but $250, if they paid for it."

The memorandum which comes from the Department is this:

"Apted, through his solicitors, McArthur & Dexter, applied on the 24th August, 1883, for a limit on the Rolling River. Order in Council, 27th October, 1883, granting Apted limit on usual conditions passed. On 25th March, 1885, Hugh J. Macdonald applies, on behalf of his client, for an extension of time in which to make the survey. He is informed that, upon the receipt of one year's ground rent ($250), his request will be complied with. This was paid on the 14th August, 1885, and Apted notified accordingly to his address, Niles P. O., Michigan. The Department has had a good deal of correspondence with Apted, who is clearly a *bonâ fide* applicant, acting for himself alone."

This is all on that. Then:

"These same young men, in the name of Alexander Moffatt, secured the passage of an Order in Council on the 20th August, 1883, granting them a timber limit of fifty square miles in the disputed territory, in which they held one-fifth blind share. They also obtained a limit on Swan River in the name of someone unknown, in which they had one-fifth blind share."

In regard to that, I have this:

"On the 8th November, 1882, Moffatt applied for a limit on the Leaf River. This limit was afterwards found to be in the disputed territory. In accordance with the then policy of the Department, it was granted, but no license has been issued since the decision of the Privy Council. Moffatt is a member of the firm of Moffatt & Caldwell, bankers, Winnipeg. He is a responsible man, and there is nothing to connect the firm of Macdonald & Tupper with the application beyond the fact that Hugh Macdonald wrote a private letter to the Deputy Minister"——

That is Mr. Burgess ——

"—telling him who Moffatt was, and later McArthur, owing to Moffatt's absence in England, applied for extension of leave within which to make survey."

Then again:

"These young men appear further to have secured section 32, township 21, range 20, and section 36, township 21, range 21, west of the fourth principal meridian, 1,280 acres of coal lands at the Blackfoot Crossing, where, it is alleged, the best coal lands in the country are, and these worthy representatives of worthy sires had one-half blind share in that little deal."

In regard to that:

"J. M. Dufresne, of Montreal, is the person with whom the Department has had all the correspondence in relation to these lands. Dufresne was informed that the land would be sold to him and his associates, among whom was J. B. McCarthen, for $10 an acre, cash."——

That is the price for which all coal lands are sold in the North-West, at which they are put in the market.—

"They never paid any money and never got any land."

The next charge is:

"These worthy sons of worthy sires do not appear to have limited their operations to coal and timber lands. They were willing to turn a penny in any way out of the public resources of the country, over which their fathers then had full control, and so they applied for the salt springs flowing into Lake Winnipegoosis, and Mr. Hall, of the Department of the Interior, wrote them that those lake salt springs could be had at $5 an acre. These young men appear to have had a blind share in that little deal also."

Now, Sir, they had a perfect right to apply for these springs if they could get them. The reply to that charge is this:

"On the 29th August, 1883, Macdonald & Tupper applied, under instructions from their client, Mr. Peter Barclay, of Birtle, for a salt spring on Lake Winnipegoosis. They were informed that if their client can establish priority of discovery, he can get forty acres at $40 an acre on the prescribed conditions. He was called upon to prove his discovery in three months. This was more than a year ago, and the Department has heard no more about it."

The next charge is:

"When the late Minister of Railways fixed the terminus of the railway at Port Moody, the son of the Premier and the son of the Minister of Railways applied to this Government, over which their fathers wielded unbounded sway, for four hundred acres of the foreshore at Port Moody. Whether they got it or not I do not know, but it is very likely they did not complete the contract because the Canadian Pacific Railway changed the terminus of the road."

The answer to that charge is this:

"In August, 1883, J. W. McKay and Albert J. Hill, of New Westminster, applied for certain tidal lands situate at the east end of Port Moody. The application was referred to Mr. Trutch, who, on the 7th November, 1883, reported that, as these lands adjoined the terminal station of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they were of considerable present value and prospective importance. He, therefore, recommended that the application should not be entertained. Hugh Macdonald wrote, on the 4th November, 1885, asking if Mr. Trutch had reported on his clients' application, and on the 24th December, 1885, he was informed of Mr. Trutch's report, and told that in consequence thereof no action would be taken on McKay's application by the Department."

These, Sir, are the charges that are brought. The hon. gentleman happened to see the statement in the newspaper and he took occasion to found thereon, to found the most malignant and serious charges against myself, against Sir Charles Tupper, and against these two young gentlemen, who never did him any harm, who had the full right, not only to make such purchases and such speculations, but to make such assertions to the Government as they thought proper, but at their own risk. Now, Sir, you will see that every one of these statements are proved to be untrue, that there never was in any case a favor granted which ought not to be granted, a favor granted to these gentlemen that would not have been granted to the son of any man in this House, and it is insufferable that for mere political malignity, for a political purpose, that gentleman—I cannot call him an hon. gentleman except by parliamentary courtesy—to attempt to smirch the characters of men as honest or honester than himself, for the mean, base, low purpose of making political capital.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD When an hon. member of this House gets up and charges another hon. member with dishonorable conduct, the latter has a full parliamentary right—and I appeal to the House, and I appeal to your sense of rectitude, if it is not so—to reject and repudiate the charge with all the indignation of which he is capable, and the strongest language he can find in the English dictionary.

THE REVISING OFFICER OF EAST TORONTO.

Mr. SMALL. I just wish to reply to some remarks made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) about the working of the Franchise Act in Toronto. The revising officer's clerk of east Toronto is prepared to revise and verify the affidavit he made to the House the other day:

"I would like to know on what ground Blake and Edgar attacked the East Toronto franchise management; it is the first I have heard of any complaint being made; on the contrary, Major Allen, who was the counsel for the Grits at the preliminary revision of lists, publicly thanked and congratulated the revising officer for the strict impartiality shown and the satisfactory manner generally in which the whole business was conducted. The Conservative representative expressed himself similarly, and I fail to see where either Blake or Edgar can find fault. I now confirm what I said yesterday, and would have no hesitation in affirming the same under oath if necessary."

PROROGATION.

Mr. COLBY. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I beg to ask the right hon. Premier if he is in a condition to inform the House as to the probable date of prorogation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government are exceedingly anxious to close the Session, now becoming rather protracted. They had thought last week that probably we would be able to prorogue to-morrow, but I think that is almost impossible, looking at the work that is still before this House, and at the necessity of the business, when finished here, going to the other Chamber. But I would certainly hope that we would make such progress that Parliament may prorogue on Friday, as Thursday is a *fête d'obligation.*

Mr. MITCHELL. Everything will go on sweet now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. *En suite.*

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state whether it is in the contemplation of the Government to introduce any further propositions for the consideration of Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I think not. I think we have exhausted the hon. gentleman's patience.

FISHING BY FOREIGN VESSELS.

Mr. FOSTER moved the second reading of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 136) further to amend the Act respecting fishing by foreign vessels. He said: There were three amendments made. By the first there was left out in section 3 of the Bill as it passed this House the words from "by" to "treaty" in the following phrase: "or has entered such waters for any purpose not permitted by the law of nations, or contrary to the treaty or convention."

Mr. BLAKE. They leave out the law of nations.

Mr. FOSTER. One page 1, line 33, they leave out "to" and insert "by." That is simply substituting one proposition for another, so as to make it read properly with the preceding clause. Then the third amendment is to leave out all that part of the schedule which relates to the Act of the Legislature of the Province of Prince Edward Island. It appears that the Dominion Fisheries Act of 1868 had not been applied to the Province of Prince Edward Island, so, if that had been repealed, there would have been no law left for the Province of Prince Edward Island. That clause is left out, and it leaves the law of Prince Edward Island as before.

Mr. BLAKE. I deplore the summary manner in which the Senate have dealt with the law of nations as it was found on our Statute-book. It is quite true that Parliament failed to obtain any explanation of it when the Bill was here before; still the phrase sounded well and looked large. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would tell us, first of all, why he put it in, and, secondly, why he has allowed it to be taken out again?

Mr. FOSTER. I explained fully why it was put in; the reason for taking it out remains with the hon. gentlemen in the Upper House.

Amendments concurred in.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Bill (No. 146) to authorise the granting of the subsidies therein mentioned for and in aid of the construction of certain railways, was read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Railways agreed to bring down a statement, showing the total amount now due by the country on account of the several subsidies granted to the various railways. Has the hon. gentleman that statement?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not the statement here; but I can say, in round figures, that the total amount of subsidies granted from 1882 amounted to a little over $6,000,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Does that include those of the present Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. It does not include such grants as that to the Chignecto Marine Railway or the subsidies of the present Session. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that, after what has been paid, $6,000,000 will cover the several grants remaining, exclusive of those for the present Session and the Chignecto Railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. The total amount granted by Parliament for those subsidies has been a little over $6,000,000. Of that, we have paid, so far as I can recollect, about $3,000,000. There are now companies going on with work which, if completed, will cause about $1,400,000 to be paid. That will make about four and a-half millions. About $1,600,000 remaining will lapse. That covers the subsidies, but not the amount voted for the Chignecto Marine Railway and the subsidies of this year.

Mr. BLAKE. Does that cover the Short Line subsidy?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No. A full statement will be submitted.

On section 1,

Mr. BLAKE. I have a single observation to make with respect to this clause, which really comprises the Bill. It will be in the recollection of the House that the time before the last on which an application was made to the Government by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for an alteration and further accommodation in respect to their contract and arrangement, they proposed, as a concession for granting that further aid, that they would arrange for the completion of the western road through the western portion of Ontario giving that competition and those facilities required by a large portion of the Province. I wish to know whether a step is now being taken towards the accomplishment of that object, not in the accomplishment but towards the accomplishment of it, by one of the grants, namely, that given to a line to run from Ingersoll to Chatham, but which it has been already stated is intended to be continued to Windsor in order to connect with the American system. Has any application been made to the Canadian Pacific Railway by the Government to fulfil their promise made on the occasion to which I refer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; I am not aware of any such application having been made by the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it the understanding that the present organisation is an organisation intended to be worked in the interests of, or by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or is it to be an independent line?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no understanding on that point.

Mr. BLAKE. I judge, from the statements made and from current reports, however, that is the case, and that under the name of the Western Pacific Junction, or some name of that kind, this extension is going to be completed and worked as a part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Ontario system. If that be not so, the railway facilities may not be so successfully attained; if it be so, this country is called upon to pay $3,200 a mile or $256,000 to accomplish work which at the time to which I refer the Canadian Pacific Railway undertook to accomplish free of expense, if we did what we did do.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not improbable that it will be worked, as the hon. gentleman says, by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but we know nothing about it.

Mr. VAIL. Has there been any application for an extension of the time of the grant for connection between Annapolis and Digby, which will expire on the 1st of July? What is the policy of the Government with regard to that?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not expect this question to-day, because it was not included in the Bill. I will, however, most likely be able to give the hon. gentleman an answer later on in the day or to-morrow.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. At the special request of the Minister of Railways, I would like to move an additional clause as the second clause of the Bill. There is a subsidy given to the Lake Temiscamingue and Long Sault Railway. Last year a small subsidy was also given for the building of that railway, and the clause which I have the honor to propose is simply to give power to the persons building the railway to get a charter for its construction by letters patent. The clause is as follows:—

For the purpose of incorporating the persons undertaking the construction of the railway from Long Sault to the foot of Lake Temiscamingue, and of the wharves and landing stages on the line of the said railway mentioned in the next preceding section, the Governor may grant to them, under such corporate name as he shall deem expedient, a charter conferring upon them the franchises, privileges and powers requisite for the said purposes, as the Governor shall deem most useful or appropriate to the said undertaking; and such charter being published in the Canada *Gazette*, with any Order or Orders in Council relating to it, shall have force and effect as if it were an Act of Parliament.

This is the power which was granted last year in the case of the Temiscouata road.

Mr. BLAKE. This is, of course, a very small affair, and I could not understand from the papers under what authority these individuals were acting. It seems probable that some relief ought to be given to them, but I cannot but say that I esteem it a most objectionable way of conferring this particular class of corporate powers. We have thought it expedient not to allow corporate powers to be granted to persons for the building of railways under the Joint Stock Letters Patent Act, although, if we did so, we would, of course, prescribe a limit to those powers very precisely in the general Act. But legislation of this description gives the Executive power to confer any corporate powers they please by letters patent—powers of expropriation, perhaps, differing altogether in extent and character from those that we ordinarily grant. It seems

to me to be legislation of a most entirely objectionable description. It is still more objectionable that it should be introduced at the last stage of the Bill. It is practically legislating by resolution. It should have been introduced by a Bill, so that we might have had an opportunity of judging it. It is also open to the objection that there is a possible interference with private rights, and that the usual precautions which we take when we propose to interfere with private rights are not in this case taken, inasmuch as the usual notice given is not given, the usual time is not allowed, and the usual facilities afforded for appearing before the committee and contending against the granting of those powers, which, indeed, it is impossible to measure, because we do not know what powers may be granted by Order in Council.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would not have proposed this amendment at this time were it not that I know and can state to the House in two words the position of this railway. It is more of the character of a narrow gauge railway or tramway, and the road is only six and a half or seven miles in length, connecting the foot of the lake with the Long Sault. There is no interference with public rights, inasmuch as the expropriation has been made out of public lands by the settlers organised under *La Société de Colonisation du lac Temiscamingue*, at the head of which is that zealous gentleman who was mentioned by the Minister of Railways in his remarks in presenting this measure, Rev. Father Gendreau. This road is built, or almost built, and power is being asked to build wharves and landing stages on the lake. It was only at the last moment that Father Gendreau, who is at the head of the enterprise, was informed by some of his friends that the working of the railway, when built, would require that some such power should be granted. It was only last Saturday that the rev. gentleman came to me and asked me to see the Minister of Railways, and although this power may seem an extraordinary one to ask at this time, I hope that the smallness of the road, although the colony which is beginning to be planted there is a very important one, would be a reason for obtaining the indulgence of the House to have this provision added to the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I admit that the child is a very little one, but if it is not legitimate it is hardly usual to accept that as an excuse.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It cannot be legitimate, considering its father.

Mr. KINNEY. Before the committee rises I wish to offer an objection to the Bill—not to any of the features of the measure, but because of the absence of any reference to the Western Counties Railway of Nova Scotia. I do not wish to call the attention of the committee to this matter but for a few moments, as it is of a strongly local character and cannot, therefore, have much interest for the majority of the House. At the time of the confederation of the British North America colonies, the Province of Nova Scotia owned two lines of railway, which did not belong to the trunk line or Intercolonial Railway line from Quebec to Halifax. These two lines were fifty-two miles of railway from Truro to Pictou, and thirty-two miles from Windsor Junction to Windsor. It was clearly enunciated, as the intention of the Dominion Government, that the Dominion Government would give those two pieces of road as bonuses for the eastern and western railway extension in Nova Scotia, and in 1873 a resolution was submitted to the House by the right hon. the First Minister, to this effect:

"That the Government be authorised to enter into negotiations with some reliable association or company, for the transfer of the railway from Windsor to the trunk line from Halifax to Truro, upon condition that such association or company extend the railway from Annapolis to Yarmouth, subject to the approval of Parliament at the next Session."

At the next Session, the Dominion Government passed a Bill authorising the transfer of that piece of road to any company that would extend the railway system of Nova Scotia from Annapolis to Yarmouth. A company, which had already been formed, called the Western Counties Railway Company, chartered under an Act of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, and to which a liberal subsidy had been given by the Nova Scotia Government, offered, by means of that subsidy and the piece of road I have spoken of, to build the railway desired from Annapolis to Yarmouth. At that time, the Western Counties Railway, by virtue of an Act passed, issued a loan of £280,000, and went on the London market to float it, but found, to their dismay, that the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company claimed the right to the Windsor branch for twenty-one years from 1872. The case was taken into court, and after several years of litigation it was finally settled that the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company had a right to the Windsor branch, because, amongst other reasons, the Act did not recite that the lease to the other company had been cancelled. Under these circumstances, the company was left with a road just commenced, with the bridges unfinished, with neither money nor credit, and with the whole thing in disorder—all owing to the imperfect legislation of the Dominion Parliament. In the meantime, the Nova Scotia Government again came to the rescue and subdivided the original loan of £280,000 into two liens, making the one a lien upon the road from Annapolis to Yarmouth, and the other a lien upon the Windsor branch, the Nova Scotia Government guaranteeing the interest upon the £65,000 secured upon the western end of the road, which sum enabled the road to be completed from Digby to Yarmouth; and that portion of the road has been running ever since under that arrangement. That was in 1879. In 1881 the Nova Scotia Government undertook to treat with the joint stock company to complete the entire railway system of Nova Scotia, and entered into an agreement with this Government, which was ratified both in the Provincial and Dominion Parliaments. The Local Government went out of power, and the incoming Government defeated the intention of their predecessors, so that the Bill proved inoperative. The road has been remaining ever since 1881 in that unfinished state, with only eighteen miles of the road graded, and which will cost something like $700,000 to complete, nearly half a million dollars of which must be expended for bridges alone. This is all left in this chaotic state because of the legislation of this Parliament, by which the Government were prevented from handing over that property to the Western Counties Railway. Under those circumstances it was rightly claimed by the Western Counties Railway Company, that inasmuch as Parliament had failed to carry out their intentions, and had left the people of the western counties of Nova Scotia heavily in debt, the company involved in great difficulties—and I may state here that, which is an exception in the Maritime Provinces, the municipality of Yarmouth invested $100,000 in this enterprise for which they are paying $6,000 a year interest, and for which they have received no direct benefit whatever. Now, the trouble has been existing for years; in fact that railway is in, and has been in, a chronic state of trouble, until the present Nova Scotia Government have undertaken to complete the system; and one reason why, I assume, the Western Counties Railway Company is not mentioned in the Bill is because this Government have observed and must know, by the correspondence which has taken place between them and the Nova Scotia Government within the past year, that it is the intention of the latter to finish the road, and, consequently, the Dominion Government thought it hardly necessary to step in and interfere with any arrangements that might be made by the Provincial Government. To show the committee that the plan recently devised by the Nova Scotia

Government should not be ratified by this House for several reasons, if I show the committee that plan should not be ratified, that it is impossible to carry it out, and that this Government should not assist in the endeavor to carry it out, I show good reason why the Western Counties Railway Company should be looked after immediately by the Dominion Government. The Bill which has been passed by the Nova Scotia Government, and the agreement it contains, is here. Hon. gentlemen who may not have read that Bill may be interested in knowing that the intention of the Nova Scotia Government, under the provisions of that Bill and agreement, is to hand over to a foreign company ninety-nine miles of railway equipped and running in Nova Scotia, that cost upwards of $3,000,000, for $120,000. That is all they are paying for the road. The Nova Scotia Government have swamped the $500,000 private capital, $100,000 municipal funds, the £145,000 floating and the £65,000 of bonds guaranteed by the Nova Scotia Government, and all they get in return is $120,000, less the $64,000 expected from the Dominion Government, which makes $56,000 net, or less than $600 a mile, and the Nova Scotia Government boldly asked this Parliament to sanction that transaction. This is a plain, unvarnished statement of the conditions of this Bill. There is a precious document issued by the Legislature of Nova Scotia and called "The Western Railway Consolidation." It appears that the Nova Scotia Government, after having invited tenders to build the railway system of Nova Scotia, and after having entered into communication with two or three different companies, shunted them all off with the exception of one. The hon. member for Digby, no doubt, has one of these documents, and on page 67 he will find there was an offer from a party in Yarmouth to build the railway system and retain for the Government their lien of £65,000 and pay the bondholders 50 per cent. of their bonds. The Premier of Nova Scotia says on page 67 that he fears that the offer must be modified—he cannot accept it. But by turning to page 94, you will find that another offer to complete the road was refused, because, as the Provincial Secretary said, it was not made by a banking house of unquestionable character. But, by turning to another part of this history of railway consolidation, we find that the Government of Nova Scotia, although it refused one offer because it was not made by a banking house of respectability, accepted an offer to negotiate with this precious joint-stock company of London upon the bare assertion of a notary public of London that one Charles James Watts was to be secretary and manager of a company to be formed in the following year. It is evident all the way through that the Nova Scotia Government was bound to make this particular arrangement with one company, whoever it might be, and the Government of Nova Scotia did not know who the company was until seven days previous to the contract being ratified by the Legislature, when they officially asked who were to form this company and when it was to be formed. It shunts off another offer by stating officially to the London joint-stock company that "You are the only parties authorised to treat with us." There is something else very fishy in this transaction, because we find that, under date of the 23rd of October, the joint-stock company of London wrote to the Provincial Secretary in reply to a letter that does not appear in the volume. All the way through this document it is evident that the intention of this Government was purely and simply to treat with one company. There is another very peculiar feature in this matter. This joint-stock company proposed to the Government of Nova Scotia, in their first offer, to pay a debt of $50,000 which was due by the company to the Government. The agreement is signed, and the Provincial Secretary declines to take the $50,000. I merely make this statement, which any member of the committee can verify for himself. The Government of Nova Scotia also insisted on wiping out an obligation which they were under and robbing the trustees of the bondholders of $40,000 in their hands.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. KINNEY. I am speaking to the question. The question was that the committee rise. I object to the committee rising until I show that its work is incomplete. There is a Bill before the House for the building of railways all over the country; but I object to the Bill in its imperfect state.

Mr. BLAKE. The question is, that the committee do rise; but it seems to me that what the hon. gentleman is doing is taking a rise out of the committee.

Mr. KINNEY. That is a matter of opinion. We will excuse the hon. gentleman's facetiousness at this particular time.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is a serious subject to you.

Mr. KINNEY. It is a serious subject to me and to Western Nova Scotia generally; and if I am in order, those who do not wish to listen to me may go out. The Local Government of Nova Scotia to-day, through their agent, who is now in the city, is asking the Dominion Government to hand over the Windsor Branch Railway, worth $1,250,000, without paying one dollar for it. The hon. member for Digby, I think, approves of this Bill. Judging by some observations which have dropped from him, and I do not wonder at it, because, viewing the history of this railway from its beginning up to now—I am sorry I cannot say to its end—I find all the way through one interest interfering with the completion of that railway. I will not point out that interest; perhaps it would be unparliamentary for me to say that the hon. member for Digby is interested. Fourteen years ago, when the Nova Scotia Government was negotiating for the completion of this road, there was this proviso put into its legislation—that it would be imcomplete until the Windsor and Annapolis Railway recouped to the county of Digby and the county of Annapolis their interest in the land damages. The counties of Digby and Annapolis claimed that the Western Counties Railway Company should pay their interest on the money until the road was completed; and the Nova Scotia Government, out of the paltry $120,000 they are willing this company should pay for 100 miles of finished railway, compel the company to put by a sum of money to pay interest on some land damages for the county of Digby; and while the hon. member for Digby may approve of the Bill, because of that one feature in it, I doubt if the people of Digby generally are willing to sacrifice the interests of Yarmouth for that purpose. As this Bill and this agreement are absurd and iniquitous in another point, they cannot be approved of by the Dominion Government and this Parliament. In 1882, when the Nova Scotia Government made a bargain with the Dominion Government to ratify their legislation to complete the road, there was this clause inserted in the Act, that it must be approved of by the Western Counties Railway Company and the bondholders. It has not been approved of by the railway company, the bondholders or the municipalities. Hence the Government cannot assent to it, unless they pass some legislation more favorable to this scheme than the last. During the first stages of this debate, on the 29th of May, the hon. Finance Minister made these observations:

"My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Kinney) thinks otherwise, that it cannot be done without doing great injustice to the municipality of Yarmouth and the Western Counties Railway.

"Mr. VAIL. The municipality of Yarmouth has no objection."

This, coming from a gentleman occupying the position the hon. member for Digby does, may seem to some to have a semblance of truth in it; but I wish to state that I have the

honor of representing the municipality of Yarmouth at the board as a director.

Mr. VAIL. Not now.

Mr. KINNEY. Yes, I do now. That is a queer statement for the hon. gentleman to make. Under the Act by which the Western Counties Railway was incorporated, one of the provisions was that if a municipality had stock in the railway, it should have a representative at the board, and I represent Yarmouth to-day; and that county has unanimously instructed me, as its representative at the board, to protest against the provisions of this Bill; and the assertion of the hon. member for Digby that the municipality does not object to it is very much out of place, to say the least of it. It does object to it most strongly for various reasons, the most important of which is that it is taking away $100,000 from it, and not giving it a dollar in return. Why would they not object?

Mr. VAIL. They have not taken a dollar of it. The hon. member does not understand the Bill.

Mr. KINNEY. The hon member for Digby (Mr. Vail) says I do not understand the Bill. I should be pleased to take a lesson from him in the history of the Western Counties Railway, and, I venture to say, in five minutes he will not understand what he is talking about, and, worse than that, nobody else will, for he has not the slightest idea of the whole thing. The hon. member was Premier of Nova Scotia when that company was incorporated, and, I venture to say, he knows as much about it now as he did then. I do not wish to be personal in my observations, but I trust that any gentleman who is constantly opening his mouth and putting his foot in it, will not attempt to show that he knows more about what I am talking about than I do myself. I would say further that, in addition to all the attempts to rob the Western Counties Railway Company of their property, there is a document which has been sent around among the members of this House signed "R. Gervase Elwes, M. Inst. C. E.," and "C. A. Scott," with the like title, in which members of this House are threatened, on behalf of the Province of Nova Scotia, as to what the Province of Nova Scotia will do. They assume to be delegated, not only by their joint-stock company and themselves, but by the Province of Nova Scotia, to threaten members of this House that, if certain things are not carried out, they will go back and take possession of the road. And they make another statement in this memorial or threat to the House of Commons, in which they say that the Government of Nova Scotia have fixed no price which may be paid for the Western Counties Railway property. True, they have not fixed the price, but they have fixed a limit to which it can be paid. They say in the Bill of incorporation, section 31, subsection *d*:

"They shall pay such sum, if any, as may be agreed upon between the Government and the company, not exceeding $120,000 for the acquisition of the Western Counties Railway, if such railway be so acquired."

These two parties who are threatening the members of this House with what the Government of Nova Scotia are going to do, state that the Province of Nova Scotia does not fix the sum. Here they fix the limit at $120,000, if anything—not more. Not only that, but they provide that out of that amount $40,000 shall be paid for some other liabilities. The history of this railway enterprise is such that, were it earlier in the Session, a whole afternoon might be employed in trying to tell its story, but it is so late in the Session that I will not touch it from a Provincial standpoint, or I could show the indebtedness in which it is attempted to involve the Province of Nova Scotia, at the same time that the Province is appealing for better terms and wishing to make its financial position better. If any hon. gentleman went into this, he would find that the debt which is intended to be saddled on Nova Scotia is larger than that Province is capable of bearing, and, while I claim that the Bill is not perfect, at the same time I have a very strong hope that the Government of Canada will not allow our rights to be bartered away for nothing, will not allow the municipality of Yarmouth, which has invested $100,000 in this enterprise to lose it without any compensation, and will not allow any joint stock company or any other corporation in London or in any other place to come here and take ninety-nine miles of running railway for $565 a mile.

Mr. VAIL. I am not disposed to take up the time of the committee, but, after the extraordinary speech of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Kinney), it seems necessary that I should say a few words in reply. I think the House has been very kind to him in allowing him to make this speech, seeing that the Bill is not in connection with the Western Counties Railway, and, in fact, I fail to see what this House has to do at all with the action of the Local Government in their arrangement with a certain company to complete the Western Counties Railway. The hon. member in the first place referred to the action of the Dominion Government in 1873, when they passed an Order in Council authorising the transfer of the Windsor branch to any company that would complete the road from Annapolis to Yarmouth. That Order in Council was not acted upon at the time, but, after the Mackenzie Government came in, they passed an Act authorising the transfer in accordance with the Order in Council passed by the Government of which the present First Minister was Premier. The transfer of that road was made to the Western Counties Railway Company with the view of assisting them to complete the road, and they held that road until the present Government came into power again in 1878, notwithstanding that they had not carried out their contract; and the present Government, in view, as they considered, of having done wrong in passing the Order in Council in the first place, and in view of the claims of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, thought proper to take it out of the hands of the Western Counties Railway people and place it back in the hands of the Windsor and Annapolis people. If my hon. friend from Yarmouth has been finding fault with the present Government and stating that, in consequence of their action, the Western Counties Railway people had not been able to complete their contract, I could have understood him, but why should he blame the Nova Scotia Government for the action they have recently taken with the sole view of getting that road completed which has been in an unfinished state for seven years through the inability of the Western Counties people to perform their contract? He has stated again in his speech that the Western Counties Railway people offered to complete the road and proposed a better arrangement than the present company have, but what confidence could the Nova Scotia Government have in them when they could not complete their first contract and left the road in an unfinished state for seven years, notwithstanding that, in order to assist them, the Local Government have loaned them money from time to time, until they have now a debt of $300,000 and a claim against the company for the amount which they have advanced to assist them in the completion of the road. The hon. member for Yarmouth has referred again to an arrangement made with the Digby and Annapolis, whereby the Western Counties became responsible to pay that railway damages for the time a portion of road which they had failed to complete was in an unfinished state, that is for the right of way. The Government of Nova Scotia have carried out the arrangement made by the present Minister of Justice, when he was Attorney General of Nova Scotia. It was he who made the agreement and bound the Western Counties to pay this amount of money till the road was completed. Why should the member for Yarmouth find fault with the Local Government for

carrying out the agreement entered into by the present Minister of Justice? I give the Minister of Justice credit for having insisted on their making themselves liable for the payment of this amount, but they have never paid a dollar of it; they have never paid anything they agreed to pay. They borrowed money, and they have not paid interest on it, not even the small amount for which they were liable to the counties for land damages. And yet the member for Yarmouth asks the Dominion Government to step in and occupy a position which I contend they have no right to occupy, that is, to insist upon certain rights, which, if they had any in the western road, are fully protected. In fact, the company which proposes to build the road is made up of the president and another prominent Yarmouth gentleman, besides some four or five in Halifax, who are directors or incorporators of this very company. I do not see why the hon. member should make these charges against this company. I venture to say that Mr. McLean, of Halifax, and Mr. Fuller, of Halifax, and Mr. Burns, of Halifax, and Mr. Esson, of Halifax, and a number of other responsible men who are connected with this company whom I could name, are as responsible men as we have in Nova Scotia. Mr. Baker, of Yarmouth, the president at that time of the Western Counties Railway, and Jacob Bingory, of Yarmouth, two of the leading men of that town and amongst the most respectable and honorable men of Yarmouth—surely my hon. friend does not want to cast reflections upon them? Mr. Jacob Bingory was one of his own supporters, and I fancy was a good friend to him at the time of the last election. My hon. friend has referred to the amount that is due the county of Yarmouth, for the $100,000 stock they took in this railway. Let me tell him that the county of Yarmouth is fully protected; in fact, their position is improved. They loaned their stock in the new road, and it will be worth more in the new company than it was in the old. Besides that, the Yarmouth people never took stock in that road with a view of getting their money back again, but with the object of encouraging the company to build a road, because they expected to benefit by having the terminus at Yarmouth. I have letters from Yarmouth informing me that nine out of every ten men are anxious that this railway should go on, that the Dominion Government should give the president of the company every assistance to enable him to go on and build the road, but for some reason which I do not understand the hon. member for Yarmouth opposes it. I know very well that he is not acting in the interest of his own friends in Yarmouth when he proposes to throw obstacles in the way of the completion of this work. I know nothing about the present company. It is enough for me to know that the gentlemen who are associated in this undertaking are men of the highest respectability, and who are quite able to finish the link themselves without asking a dollar from anybody. I think the hon. gentleman might allow a company of that kind to go on and build a work so necessary to his own county, to the western part of Nova Scotia, and, in fact, to the interests of Nova Scotia as a whole. I cannot understand the action of the hon. member. I am surprised at the course he has taken to-day, and I am sure it will not result either to his credit as a member representing Yarmouth nor to the interests of his county.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) fails to understand what connection the Dominion Government has with the legislation of Nova Scotia with regard to the Western Counties Railway. The connection is this: That the Local Government has sought the co-operation of the Dominion Government in this scheme, and if this scheme is not in the interests of the people, I hold it should not be sanctioned either by this Government or by the Legislature of Nova Scotia. There are some reasons in addition to those which have been brought forward by the hon. member for Yarmouth, why this measure does not meet the approval of the people of Nova Scotia. It does not contain equitable provisions for the completion of that line of railway. I think the Bill is not generally known in Nova Scotia, but only to the supporters of the Local Government in this House. The members supporting the Dominion Government have not been favorable to the Bill. I had a few hours perusal of the Bill on Saturday, and an examination of it convinces me that it is a measure which should not be entertained by the Government of Canada. In the first place it imposes on Nova Scotia a liability of $100,000 a year (after allowing for deposit) on the security of the net earnings of the line. The company in addition to that demands the free ownership of the Windsor branch, which cost about $1,500,000, also the Dominion subsidy of $64,000. The Western Counties Railway is to be handed over for not more than $120,000 out of funds raised on the guarantee of Nova Scotia—a railway which cost Yarmouth and the local and foreign investors over a million dollars. The guarantee should realise for the company at least two millions, or two millions and a half, over and above the deposit which has been placed with the Government as security for the guarantee. The company do not require to pay a dollar of their own means. And after all this large outlay, what is the company to do for these concessions, and this burden of $100,000, possibly for twenty years to fall on Nova Scotia, whose resources are already taxed to their utmost? What does that company propose to accomplish? It is only bound to build the Digby gap, eighteen miles of railway, and equip the line; there is no further obligation for all this vast expenditure of money. The company is not required to build some four other branches which are allowed. There is a provision made to complete the Nictaux line—only to lease or acquire it, at the option of the company. These I think are enormous concessions for such meagre results. I do not say that the provisions are not ample to complete the line, if they were equitable. It would be idle to say that such enormous subsidies should not complete eighteen miles of railway, but in view of the representations made by the hon. member for Yarmouth and the equities involved in the case, and the heavy liabilities that it is proposed to impose on the Province of Nova Scotia to secure such meagre results, I think it is the duty of the Government to look very closely into this matter and to deal equitably with the company, and if the measure should fail in the accomplishment of the railway this year, the Dominion Government may deal with the Western Counties Railway hereafter in such a way as that the missing link may be completed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I wish to state in answer to some questions of the leader of the Opposition, who I see is not in the House, that the amount of subsidies granted by Parliament was $5,587,500; the amount paid out of them was $1,130,33?; balance unpaid on roads under contract, $2,847,668; unpaid on roads not yet under contract, $1,609,700, leaving a balance unpaid of $4,457,368. In this sum the vote for the Chignecto Railway is not included, nor the subsidy to the Gravenhurst Road, nor that of the St. John Bridge in Nova Scotia.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do I understand that the sum unpaid on roads already commenced is $2,847,000? Those amounts will be used on the roads that are under construction?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Most likely.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And we are liable for the $1,130,000 already paid, and the $2,847,000 unpaid on roads that are commenced?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

LAND SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), moved the second reading of Bill (No. 147) to authorise the granting of certain subsidies of land for the construction of the railways therein mentioned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A statement was also promised in this case.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman asked for statements as to the amount of land granted to the different railway companies. The quantities are as follows: Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 18,000,000 acres; Manitoba and North-Western, 2,722,000 acres; for the extension provided in this Bill, 166,400 acres; Manitoba and South-Western, 972,000 acres; North-West Central, 2,880,000 acres; North-West Coal and Navigation Company, 414,200 acres; Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Company, 128,000 acres; Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Steamboat and Navigation Company, 8,500,000 acres; Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle, 1,536,000 acres;—total, 34,948,600 acres.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Is the grant to the North Western Company included in the statement?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Has the North-Western Railway Company completed its engagement made in the Bill. That engagement expires to-day, I believe?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The North-West Central, so far as I know, has not yet completed its engagement. The company has to-day in which to complete it; they have not yet given satisfactory security to the Government. I propose, in obedience to the suggestion made to the House, to add a clause empowering the Government to incorporate another company for the purpose of building that railway.

Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. EDGAR. Before this clause is passed, some information has reached me which I think I should communicate to the House. The information comes to me by mail, and it appears to be genuine, and it is of such a character that I think it ought to be laid before the House at this stage of this Bill. It comprises two statutory declarations, and in them there are some allegations in which the name of the Minister of the Interior is introduced. But I want to say at once that there is nothing in these declarations, although the name of the hon. gentleman is referred to in them, which warrants me in making any charge against the hon. Minister. His name was used apparently by an hon. member of this House, and, I have no doubt, without any warrant whatever. The hon. gentleman took office on 5th August, and an Order in Council relating to this railway was passed on 14th August, extending the time for its completion, and reducing the miles to be built within a certain time from fifty to twenty-three, and I suppose that Order in Council is what is referred to. But while I do not think there is anything in this information to which any weight should be attached as affecting the Minister of the Interior, I cannot help feeling that these two declarations show that another hon. member of this House, who is prominent in connection with this company, as its president I believe, and who has, until this day expires, an opportunity of getting control of this land grant, so acted that the Government should pause before they think of entrusting the construction of the railway and the grant of land to that gentleman either under the charter as it is extended or under the new charter which it is proposed to create. The first document is a declaration headed "In the matter of the North-Western Central Railway and James Beaty, M. P." It is a declaration by David M. McConachie, of the city of Hamilton and is as follows:—

"I, David McConachie, of the city of Hamilton, in the Province of Ontario, do solemnly declare that at the time I saw James Beaty, M.P., at Toronto, in the month of September, A. D. 1885, for the purpose of negotiating for the contract to build the North-West Central Railway, and proposed to deposit the sum of $125,000 in the Canadian Bank of Commerce, as stated in my letter to D. B. Woodworth, M.P., and read by him before Committee of the House of Commons, he, the said James Beaty, repeated the expression: 'But you see there is nothing in it for the boy,' too often to be easily forgotten. And that in reply to my question in reference to his certainty of being able to get the charter extended and also the time for the completion of the first fifty miles, he said: 'In the event of your obtaining the contract and building the road you need have no fear; the new Minister of the Interior is my intimate friend, and I have only to ask and what I want in that way will not be refused.' And that the said James Beaty also then referred to his power in the House, he having so many friends among the members. These expressions he volunteered as an inducement for me to agree to his terms. And further, during said conversation he, the said James Beaty, said that it would be desirable to give the Hon. Thomas White, the Minister of the Interior the sum of $100,000, part of the said sum of $15,000 per mile which he claimed. And said James Beaty justified said payment to the hon. Minister of the Interior upon the grounds that said Minister had renewed the land grant in this matter voluntarily and without waiting for Parliament to meet.

"And that said James Beaty further stated at said interview that after payment of said $100,000, and after other members of the House associated with him in this matter were 'shared with,' his portion of the $675,000 would be small, considering his personal time given and means spent in furthering the project.

"Made and subscribed before me at the city of Hamilton this 31st day of May, A.D. 1886. "JAMES OSBORNE, J.P." } "D. McCONACHIE.

An hon. MEMBER. Anything further?

Mr. EDGAR. Yes; there is one from Edward Anderson Craig Pew as follows:—

"I, Edward Anderson Craig Pew, of the town of Welland, in the county of Welland, do solemnly declare:

"That I was present when the interview took place between James Beaty, M. P., and David McConachie, Esq., in the office of the former in the city of Toronto, in the month of September, 1885.

"That I heard said James Beaty then say, after reading over the proposition of said David McConachie to build the North-West Central Railway, that 'there is nothing in it for the boy.'

"That during the conversation which followed at said time the said James Beaty stated that he would have to pay a large sum of money out of the $15,000 per mile which he demanded for giving the said contract, to wit, the sum of $100,000 to the Hon. Thos. White, Minister of the Interior.

"That said James Beaty then also stated that the new Minister of the Interior was a particular friend of his, and would do anything that he asked of him. And to make this apparent to Mr. McConachie, he cited as an instance that Hon. Mr. White had only a few weeks previously renewed the land grant to the said company, which had lapsed on account of the company failing to comply with the terms of the Order in Council granting the same. And further said James Beaty then also stated that it would be desirable to have the Minister who controlled the land department favorable to the interest of the company, as it might be necessary for the company to ask further favors in the future.

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act passed in the thirty-seventh year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled: 'An Act for the suppression of voluntary and extra-judicial oaths.'

"Made and subscribed before me at Welland, in the county of Welland, this 28th day of May, A.D. 1886. "J. P. WILSON, J.P." } "E. A. C. PEW.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those declarations seem to be very clear as to the extraordinary notion which the hon. member for West Toronto had as to what his duties as a member of Parliament and a supporter of the Minister of the Interior were. He certainly does not say or suggest that the Minister of the Interior even asked for $100,000, but he suggests that it would be a very good thing to give him it, and he accounts in that way, and also for thinking it desirable to distribute the money among other members, for what he was to do with the $675,000 which he seemed to think was to be had out of that enterprise. I think, at any rate, with this and with what has occurred before—what has been

stated in the committees of this House by his fellow members of this House, that these documents will certainly make the Government hesitate a long time before they will grant public lands to a company presided over by that hon. gentleman.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I quite appreciate the wisdom of the hon. gentleman in saying at the outset of his remarks that there was nothing in these affidavits affecting me. What these men may have said or may not have said is a matter of little consequence; but I am bound to say that I would require better testimony than the oath of either of them, one the employee of the other, before believing any statement they made with regard to any hon. gentleman in this House.

Mr. BLAKE. With regard to this clause, it was understood that the hon. gentleman would explain what steps the Government were going to take in fulfilment of the pledge made in the Railway Committee.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I intend to move a clause giving power to incorporate a company to carry out this work.

On section 5,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I beg leave to move the following as the 5th clause of the Bill:—

And whereas it may be necessary for the construction of the railway in respect of which the granting of a subsidy is authorised by the second section of this Act, that a company should be incorporated with the powers requisite for such construction, and for making financial arrangements for the purposes thereof; therefore it is hereby enacted as follows:

For the purpose of incorporating the persons undertaking the construction of the said railway, or of a railway from a point on the Manitoba and North-Western *viâ* Rapid City, westward, and for the incorporation of those who shall be associated with them in the undertaking; the Governor in Council may grant to them, under such corporate name as he shall deem expedient, a charter conferring upon them the franchises, privileges and powers requisite for the said purposes, which shall be similar to such of the franchises, privileges and powers granted to railway companies during the present Session, as the Government shall deem most useful or appropriate to the said undertaking; and such charter, being published in the *Canada Gazette* with any Order or Orders in Council relating to it, shall have force and effect as if it were an Act of Parliament: Provided always that in the event of a company being so incorporated, it shall be provided in the charter that such company shall be subject to all the present legal obligations of the North-West Central Railway Company in relation to the said railway.

That proviso was put in to protect the interests of the people who have been working on the road.

Mr. BLAKE. I would merely say that I repeat the observations I made, with reference to the exceptional character of this legislation, on the Bill which preceded this one. I think it would have been better to have introduced a separate Bill, and I think the legislation is in itself of an objectionable character.

Mr. WATSON. Can the company, under these powers, start the road from any other point than Brandon?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not know. I fancy if they can supply that section of country in any other way, and cannot get a company immediately to go through Brandon, we would be consulting the interests of the country by incorporating a company to cover the ground. The great object is, of course, to give railway facilities to the people of that district.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but they may be restricted, because the Bill mentions "a railway for the whole distance from Brandon to Battleford."

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, of course, if a new company were incorporated it would be incorporated in the lines of this one. But if we fail to make arrangements with a company, and the Manitoba and North-Western have a charter which would enable them to do the work, we might give that company the grant.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think, under this clause, it would be competent for the hon. gentleman to give to any other railway company a grant for any other railway than a line from Brandon to Battleford. That is the clear interpretation of the clause, so that if the hon. gentleman wants more powers, he had better take them.

Mr. HESSON. A railway from Brandon is exactly what is required, and I am surprised that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) should object to having a provision for starting the road from that point. It will serve that part of the country, which has petitioned for railway accommodation. I have been over the ground and I know every rod of it, and I hope the Government will adhere to that provision.

Mr. WATSON. If some provision were inserted in this Bill giving the Government power to make this land grant to a company that would afford railway facilities to Rapid City and to the country west of that point, it would be satisfactory. I want to see the road built; but clause 2 of this Bill does not authorise the Government to give a land grant to any company except a company building from Brandon. If that company should fail, and it should be impossible to get another company, I believe the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company are prepared to build this road.

Mr. MITCHELL. The objection I have to this section of the Bill is this: We have had a great deal of discussion in relation to this North-West Central Railway Company and the parties who have been promoting it in this House. There has been a great deal of discussion in the press and throughout the country about it, and it has aroused a great deal of unpleasant feeling in the public mind. The decision of the Government was to put through the Bill, and allow the promoters until the 1st day of June to place in the hands of the Government such assurance as would satisfy them that they were prepared *bonâ fide* to carry out the work. We are informed by the Minister of the Interior that those assurances meant a deposit of $50,000. Now, Sir, this is the evening of the last day on which those gentlemen had the privilege of depositing that money with the Government, and it strikes me as very singular that we should provide in the second section of this Bill:

"The Governor in Council may grant to the North-West Central Railway Company or to such other company as may undertake the construction of the railway, Dominion lands to the extent of 6,400 acres for each mile of the company's railway."

Why should we grant a land subsidy to a company which is practically defunct? I think it would be giving an endorsation to the course pursued in relation to this matter, and therefore I most decidedly object to that section of the Bill. I want to see the bonus given for the purpose of having that road built; I want it put into hands that are clean, and that the public is satisfied are able to build the work. But afterthe exposures which have been made, I do not want to see an Act of Parliament passed granting 6,400 acres a mile to that very company, and I think the Government should alter that clause or let it stand till this evening, in order to see whether the money has been paid up or not.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will see that the Bill cannot take its third reading to-day, and by to-morrow we shall know whether the money has been paid or not; and then, if it has not been paid, we can strike out the provision making a grant to the North-West Central Railway Company, because then it will be at an end.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think these words inserted after the words "company's railway," would probably meet the case: "Or a railway along the same route from Rapid City westward, but with different termini from those provided in relation to the railway hereinbefore referred to and for the incorporation of those associated with them in the undertaking."

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman explain the object of saying different termini? Does he propose to alter

the westerly terminus? Because we have Battleford stated. If all you want to do is to provide that the railway shall go from Rapid City along the same route, there is no need of making any alteration with regard to the westerly terminus. I would suggest the wording be "a railway from a point on the North-West Central, *vid* Rapid City along the same route."

Mr. HESSON. I hope this committee will not give Brandon the go-by altogether.

Mr. BLAKE. I would be very sorry we should take away the chances of Brandon or any other place. The object is, inasmuch as it is not known what road can be arranged with to do this, to give a larger latitude to the Government. If the Government can make it one way it will do so; if it cannot, it will do it the other way. There is nothing in the clause which will prevent the Government carrying out the scheme of giving it from Brandon to Battleford.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). We are in this position, that the company incorporated for the construction of the railway have not yet got their title to be permitted to go on with the railway. If they fail, it becomes our duty to arrange some other means to build the line, and we take power to incorporate a company to build the railway exactly on the line proposed. We want to supply the country with railway facilities, and we take power to start from a point on the Manitoba and North-Western instead of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but if we can get a company to go from Brandon we will do so.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the gentleman connected with the promotion of this company fails to-night to put up the money, when the Government issue a new charter to any other gentlemen—they should exclude all the names on the present charter, which has created so much scandal.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Parliament has decided this road should start from Brandon and go *vid* Rapid City to Battleford. I can hardly understand therefore how we can alter that, and build the road from another point entirely, not touching Brandon.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Parliament did not particularly decide that Brandon should be the starting point. Brandon was decided upon in the Order in Council. The Government refused to give a land grant to a line starting from Melbourne, on the ground that fifty miles of the railway would run through a district already supplied with railway facilities. The one thing that is important is that the people of Rapid City and Battleford should be supplied with railway communication, and in case the company which has the charter to build from Brandon should fail to carry out the preliminary conditions, we want to take an alternative plan, because we know that the Manitoba and North-Western have expressed their willingness to construct this railway from the north. Therefore, if we fail to build the road from Brandon, we will be still able to supply this country with railway facilities.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The contractors will build railways where it suits them best, where there are less coulées to cross and bridges to make. Brandon, everybody knows, is the point west of Winnipeg which is bound to become a rival city to Winnipeg. The two cities of the North-West are Winnipeg and Brandon.

Mr. WATSON. What about Portage?

Mr. MITCHELL. They send a representative.

Mr. WOODWORTH. It is however only, as the name signifies, a portage, a nice quiet little place, and it sends a good, sturdy, vigorous representative here; but Brandon is destined by nature to be a centre. Portage, even if it had the natural facilities, is too near Winnipeg ever to become a very great city. But the other city, some eighty miles west of Portage, is enabled by its distance from Winnipeg to be a city, with the natural advantages it has got, and any one who has visited the city of Brandon knows that its location is most beautiful to behold, that its situation is there by nature, with a drainage that is unsurpassed, with water as fine as you can find in the North-West, and with a fertile country north, south, east and west, all round it, pouring into the city of Brandon its grain; and there are three elevators there now—I do not know if there are not four.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Five.

Mr. WOODWORTH. There are five elevators now in the city of Brandon, showing in its infant state, what the country is around it. And now it is proposed to strike this off when it has petitioned Parliament, when it has sent petition after petition, and when it has been the will of Parliament, when it has been expressed by the Government that they should start from Brandon, when the Minister of Railways, when asked the question by my hon. friend from Marquette, said they would start from the city of Brandon; and now they say the road may be built, because the Manitoba and North-Western has sent a written communication here—the Minister of Interior says he does not know whether it was written or not—to tap the Manitoba and North-Western, and clear away back through to Rapid City or to anywhere else, in space, into that infinite space, leaving Brandon, the real point of starting and the real city of the North-West, out in the cold. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior certainly does not wish to create any more dissatisfaction in that country, and their minds resting upon that—when the news goes to them that they are to be shut out, it is making an unnecessary grievance in the North-West or in the Province of Manitoba, and it will be a grievance that will not be easily allayed. It is unnecessary to make this grievance, to tell Parliament now that the contractors can build a railway somewhere else, and leave a great gap, and leave Brandon out in the cold and unconnected. A railway charter was asked this winter, to extend from Brandon towards Devil's Lake in Dakota, tapping the south, and with this railway running to the North-West, it makes Brandon what it is designed to be, a great centre, a great grain centre, and I hope and believe it will be a great manufacturing centre. Why alienate the affections and destroy and blast the hopes of that city and the surrounding country merely because we are experimenting in legislation? It really seems to me a most unnecessary departure. I can see no reason for it. I do not see what representations have changed the minds of the Government. Having visited that country, I know something about its inhabitants. The Minister of the Interior has been over it, and he knows how excitable they are, how tenacious they are of any existing rights, and to take this, which they hoped and prayed for and expected and were promised, away in this manner will cause more heart burnings and discontent than the expenditure of $500,000 will allay.

Mr. WATSON. I think the hon. member is mistaken as to the intentions of the Government and the House. I think this is intended to afford the farming community the railway facilities which they need. Brandon had no hope of being the starting point a year ago. Melbourne was to be the starting point then.

Mr. WOODWORTH. It was two years ago.

Mr. WATSON. Well, two years ago. Melbourne had the promise. Why disappoint Melbourne? I understand the object of the Government is to give a land grant to any company which will afford railway facilities to Rapid City and the west. Brandon has railway facilities to-day, and, while we all know who have visited that city that it is a very fine place, I do not see why other places are not to be

considered as well. If this road is tapped on the Manitoba and North-Western, this trade will flow into what the hon. gentleman calls this little town half-way between Winnipeg and Brandon, Portage la Prairie. The great object is to afford the farming community the facilities they need, and to develop that country which has been without railway communication so long. I do not wish to say anything against Brandon or for the Portage in preference to Brandon, but I think the Government ought to have it in their power to grant any company, that will undertake the work, the land, and that is why I suggest that such a change should be made that the Government should have the power to give the grant to the Manitoba and North-Western or any other company.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The cat is out of the bag at last. The hon. member has made a frank confession. He lives in Portage la Prairie. That is his home. The Manitoba and North-Western runs from there. He wants to bring the trade, to bring the grain down to Portage la Prairie, and that, he thinks, is a capital object—Portage la Prairie, situated sixty miles west of Winnipeg.

Mr. HESSON. On a side track.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Yes; and, without making any disparagement to that little town, everyone knows it is not the healthiest place to live in. There are swales there. where—I will not say beasts of midnight howl, and the sad raven finds her haunts and there the screaming owl, but there are sloughs back of that which, if it were not for the strong constitution of the hon. gentleman, would carry him off with diphtheria in three weeks.

Mr. WATSON. Oh, no.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I have been there, and I know it. There are portions of Portage la Prairie where there is good, fine, hard land, and I have no doubt he has pitched his tent there, with the wisdom born of experience and sagacity and personal protection; but back of him is that slough where the green on the top of the water speaks of lizards and all crawling reptiles and things—yes, and they have not got it drained yet; they cannot get it drained, and it will require a good deal of provincial money to be spent before it is drained. But there is that bit of good land where good looking people like the hon. member stay, and where the Manitoba North-Western goes, and he wants to bring the grain of the North-West down there and leave Brandon out in the cold. I am surprised that the Government have not seen the trick before, and that they will now, for the purpose of giving little Portage la Prairie, sixty miles west of Winnipeg, this little advantage, destroy the hopes and expectations, and not fulfil the promises which have been kept at least to the ear, but are now being broken to the hope, of giving Brandon the point of departure. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) knows that his own paper, the paper on his own side of politics, the Brandon *Sun*, he knows that all the papers of the west, not leaving out his own paper of Portage la Prairie, have stated over and over again that Brandon was destined to be the great railway centre of the North-West. It is contiguous to the Souris coal fields, and, if it were not, it has Medicine Hat a little distance beyond, with millions of tons of coal. It is destined to be a manufacturing place, and its agricultural capabilities are unsurpassed in the North-West. I spoke of its location, its sightliness, and its position, sitting on a hill that cannot be hid, and, in spite of those natural advantages which have been placed there by the great Architect of the Universe, the hon. gentleman says, reverse all this to little Portage la Prairie, and force, like forcing a root out of dry ground, force a fictitious position on Portage la Prairie by giving it this road. It is the most monstrous proposition I ever heard. I know my hon. friend from West Durham is ready to rise. He is true as steel to his friend from Marquette, and I like to see that. When he sees a friend in difficulties, he sticks to him. He wants to help his friend. He has not been there. He has not heard the frogs croak and seen the lizards crawl.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not necessary to go there for that.

Mr. WOODWORTH. He knows nothing about the locality. All he knows is that his friend for Marquette has property there, that the Manitoba and North-Western goes from and to there, and that, if they tap this up near Rapid City and leave Brandon out, they will get the grant and it will help the member for Marquette. Well, I do not know, but I would almost do something if I were in the member for West Durham's place, but while he does that, Parliament ought to see that that little bond of affinity and connection between the gentlemen, is not effected.

Mr. BLAKE. I was anxious before to rise in order to point out to the hon. gentleman and to the committee an argument in his favor more potent than any argument he has addressed to the committee. Having regard to the temper of this Parliament and Government, I consider the most potent argument that could be addressed to the committee against the proposal of the hon. member for Marquette and in favor of the views of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), is that the proposal of my hon. friend from Marquette was to deprive the Canadian Pacific Railway of ninety miles of the freight from the west, and the stuff it carries down to Rapid City. If it goes to Minnedosa it will come down on the Manitoba and North-Western—Portage la Prairie, if it comes south it will go on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Are we going to bleed the Canadian Pacific Railway to that extent?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). There is no reason why you should not help the Canadian Pacific Railway with ninety miles of freight carriage when you are at the same time helping the farmers by a saving on the freight for 400 miles. The great objection to the amendment is that starting from Rapid City and connecting with the North-Western road, will deprive the people between the two roads of competition in freight. It is in the interest of the farmers in that fertile belt lying between the North-Western and the Canadian Pacific Railway, to have an independent outlet. They should be able to choose on one side between the Canadian Pacific Railway proper, and the North-Western on the other side, and if you tie that city to the North-Western, the North-Western has control of the whole of the carrying trade.

Mr. HESSON. I have had the honor of presenting numerous petitions in this House, and I received numerous letters from that part of the country and from Rapid City south, and I am satisfied that none of the settlers would be content with the change that it is now proposed to make in this land grant. The intention of the people was that they might have connection with the main line, and that Brandon might be the point. Now, I hope the House will not depart from that view. The hon. member for Marquette is certainly wise in his generation. Considering where he owns this property, and the people that he lives amongst, I think he is perfectly right, but I trust the House will not agree with his proposition. The only interest this House has to consider is the interest of the people who have petitioned for the construction of that road, and they have never asked this House to give them communication from Rapid City to Winnipeg, diverting the trade out of its regular course, and depriving them of the competition that would be afforded by connection with the other line. I have no doubt that in due time connection will be made with Rapid City by the Manitoba and North-Western. In the meantime I am convinced that the people of Rapid City are most anxious that connection should be made with Brandon. Now, as has been said, Brandon is

certainly the most promising city west of Winnipeg. There is no more beautiful place to locate a city. If we give it a fair chance it is sure to become very prosperous in a very short time. It would be disastrous, and make the people feel discontented, if the Government should now alter all its previous plans and views in reference to the construction of this road. I protest against it and hope the Government will not make the change. Even if the present corporation fail to carry out their intention and construct that road, or failed to make their deposit, I cannot see why it should not be built by some other company, and that within the time specified by the conditions. I feel that can be done, and that it will be done, if this company fails to take up and complete the work. It will be a mistake and create discontent to alter the whole of the arrangements and make a new starting point elsewhere than at Brandon.

Mr. TROW. The change contemplated by the Government in my estimation is a proper one. I never could see why the road should start from Brandon simply because they had the Manitoba Southern. I have been in Brandon, probably, as often as my hon. friend, and can speak with as much knowledge of its wants. I am sorry that hon. gentlemen on either side of the House should decry their country. I have been in Portage la Prairie, and I consider it is the garden of that country.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I did not decry the country. I spoke of a certain slough which the hon. member for Marquette knows.

Mr. TROW. I know parties who have been residing there for the last twenty years, and I never heard that malaria was prevalent. It is true that there is want of water communication, but there is no green slime, that my hon. friend pictured out. I am surprised that my hon. friend who has been in that country frequently, should try, as he has done, to keep settlers from going into that great country by making such rash and unguarded statements.

Mr. WOODWORTH. My hon. friend and his friends behind him, ever since I have been in Parliament, have been speaking about the bad land in that country, and because I spoke of a single slough near a little town they think it is a most unpatriotic thing. No doubt, the hon. member for Marquette has listened to the songs of the frogs there day after day and night after night, and he knows all about the slough, and when I mentioned it, behold the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) lifts his hands in holy horror and says I am decrying the country, but this slough is in a place where nobody can live.

Mr. WATSON. No, no.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Of course the people build their houses on dry land away from this slough, but it extends nearly the whole length of the city of Portage la Prairie. There are two parts of Portage la Prairie, an east and west end, and the slough extends along the side of it at both ends. I know that contractors have been ready to build this road from where the Government stated first by Orders in Council. I stated in the Committee of Railways and Canals that I knew of railway companies who are ready and willing to build this road and start from the city of Brandon. I say they are ready and willing to-night to build this road and start from Brandon, and that being the fact, I do not see why the Government at the last hour should come forward with this proposition. I am surprised, I had no intimation of this departure, and I think it is a very great mistake.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I am responsible myself for the drafting of the clause, and I had an impression that we had the power under this clause to incorporate a company that would in less than two years, supply that country with railway facilities. It must be remembered that we are not giving the railway grants to Brandon. I have very pleasant recollections of Brandon and its people, and I would not be willing to do an injury to one or the other; but the grant of land is not given to the city of Brandon, it is for a line running from the district of Rapid City westward, between that point and Battleford. There are no claims on the part of Brandon, no possible claim, or on the part of any other place, and the people cannot be disappointed if the railway does not happen to go that way. There is no suggestion that the railway should go from any other place than Brandon. This road has been asked by the people of the North-West, and they have not yet succeeded in obtaining it. We have had a number of statements made that there were contractors ready to undertake the road; but unfortunately the road has not yet been undertaken, except, so far as regards the first fifty miles, where there was some grading done. All we propose is simply that we shall have alternative powers, so that if we do not find a company really able to give us the assurance that they possess the means to carry out the work, starting from Brandon westward, we shall not be tied up and the people of the North-West deprived for another year of railway facilities, but we shall be able to make arrangements with other people who are able to supply the country with these railway facilities. That is the only question. If what the hon. gentleman said is true—I hope it is true and I have no reason or right to doubt it—that there is a company prepared at once to offer the Government satisfactory security to justify their being incorporated and given the land grant to build the road on the old line, the chances are altogether in favor of such company getting the work, because those are the terms of the charter. But if it should turn out that there is no such company, we simply provide against a contingency by obtaining the right to incorporate another company so as to supply the people of the North-West with those railway facilities. I ought to say with respect to Portage la Prairie, that if the railway is built from the north, it will not go from that town, but about eighty miles west, more likely from Minnedosa. Portage la Prairie will not derive any advantage from it. Brandon will do so, because it will be the point of junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway. But this is not a matter of rivalry between Portage la Prairie and Brandon, but it is simply a question of getting a railway built through that part of the country, and providing those railway facilities which the people have asked for and which Parliament has decided to assist in providing.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Does the hon. Minister deny that the point of junction would be the same at Portage la Prairie, where the Minnedosa and North-Western strikes the Canadian Pacific Railway, as at Brandon? The junction will be just the same. There can be no doubt that the through line of the Canadian Pacific Railway will be reached at Brandon just the same as at Portage.

Mr. WATSON. I desire to contradict some statements made by the hon. member from King's, N. S. (Mr. Woodworth) about the section of country round Portage la Prairie. Every gentleman who has ever travelled through the country knows that the statements made by the hon. member for King's are not true, and that so far as that section of the country is concerned it is one of the finest sections, and is admitted to be so, in the whole North-West.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Did I understand the hon. Minister to say that if there is a company ready to build this road starting from Brandon it will have that privilege?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not think the hon. gentleman should ask me to answer the question. Parliament has incorporated a company to build a railway from Brandon

vid Rapid City westward. A land grant has been given by Parliament for the purpose of assisting the enterprise. It is the wish of Parliament that such a road should be built, and the Government may fairly be trusted to carry out the wishes of Parliament.

Committee rose and reported.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. The third reading should not be taken until to-morrow, by which time we shall know whether the North-West Central Railway Company is really in existence; and if it is not, some changes in the Bill might become necessary.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is desirable that we should see whether the promoter of the Bill is able to carry out the arrangements or not. If he is not, I hope the Minister of the Interior will strike off the name of the company from the Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is really no necessity for any amendment in such an event, because under this Act the charter would lapse.

Mr. MITCHELL. It would be a disgrace to Parliament to have the name of that company in the Bill after the experience we have had.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At this period of the Session I think it is a matter of urgency that the Bill should be read the third time.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think so. Why did not the Bill come down at an early period of the Session? There is even now considerable business to be done, and there is no necessity for giving this Bill the third reading to-day. I think I shall have to discuss the matter further after six o'clock.

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

After Recess.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. As I stated before recess, I object to this as a departure from the proper order of the House, and also under the special circumstances of the Bill, that is that circumstances may occur between now and to-morrow which may make it fitting that the House should deal with the Bill in a different manner from that in which it is prepared to deal with it to-night. The question of whether the deposit is made by the railway company, and the local position of the railway, have to be considered, and there is no reason, therefore, why we should press this Bill through at this sitting. There is also another reason. In the committee the hon. member for Northumberland was engaged in a discussion of this very question of what would be the proper course which should be taken in case the deposit was not made, when I interposed and pointed out that the third reading should not be taken to-day but to-morrow, by which time we would be in a position to know what had taken place. If it had been the intention of the Minister to move the third reading to-day, he should have informed us of that intention at that time, and then the discussion would have gone on in committee which was intercepted by me in good faith, with the idea that time would be saved by postponing until to-morrow a discussion of that question. I think, under those circumstances, that it is not consistent with that good faith and fair play which should prevail amongst us in such matters that the Minister, having received the advantage of my suggestion in the curtailment of the discussion in committee, should afterwards deprive us of the opportunity on which he took that advantage.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was in the House at the time the hon. gentleman speaks of, and I did not hear what the hon. gentleman has just said, though, as he has said it, I am bound to take his word for it. Even then, if the hon. gentleman makes a statement of that kind to another member, that is no reason why the House should deprive themselves of their right to go on with a measure of this kind, especially at this time of the Session. Besides that, the hon. member for Northumberland was in the House at that moment as well as the hon. gentleman opposite, and therefore the hon. member for Northumberland would not complain, and could not complain, because he had an opportunity of speaking on the Bill. Besides, the hon. gentleman knows that, at the request of the hon. gentleman, on his question when the Government intended to recommend the prorogation of Parliament, the First Minister stated that he hoped this House would be able to complete the business to-morrow night so that we might prorogue on Friday. But if we are going on to day as we went on yesterday, it will be impossible to do so, and for that the responsibility must rest on the hon. gentlemen on the other side, who would not allow this Bill to have its third reading now. It is a customary thing at this time of the Session to go on with the Bills which have already been considered several times by the House and to give them their third reading. Besides, the hon. gentleman knows that this Bill has not been considered by the other House, and if we wish to have this early prorogation, as it seems to be the desire of hon. gentlemen on both sides, we must get it through the Senate in time for them to consider this measure. If we delay it until to morrow, we will not know any more about it, and the Senate will not be in a condition to consider it to-morrow. It will have to go on till Friday, and then we will not be able to prorogue on Friday. Besides, this measure being considered this evening, and a debate arising upon it, the time that we should employ in discussing the Supplementary Estimates will have gone in debating this measure, which I must say has been perfectly well debated already. The hon. gentleman said another reason which should induce us to delay the third reading until to-morrow is the fact that to-day is the last day on which the promoters or shareholders of a company, which was incorporated the other day, could make the deposit under the proviso that if on or before the 1st of June they did not satisfy the Governor General in Council that they are in a position to build fifty miles of their road within a certain period, then the Bill would not take effect, no proclamation would issue, and we would have the right to incorporate another company. Now the right for incorporating another company is given by the House of Commons, and I have no doubt will be given by the Senate—that power is given to the Government to incorporate a company. What can be gained by delaying this Bill until to-morrow? What other provisions can we put in this Bill that we had not put in it. The provisions put in this Bill for that purpose are the provisions put in the laws of last Session to the same effect, and, therefore, I believe the hon. gentleman should not delay the business of the House by preventing the Bill being read the third time.

Motion agreed to; and Bill read the third time and passed.

BOUNTY ON PIG IRON.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the bounty of one dollar and fifty cents per ton on pig iron manufactured in Canada from Canadian ore, authorised to be granted until the 30th day of June, 1886, by the Act 46th Victoria, chapter 14, may continue to be granted by the Governor in Council until the 30th day of June, 1889; and that a bounty of

one dollar per ton on pig iron so manufactured may, in the manner by the said Act provided, be granted between the 1st day of July, 1889, and the 30th day of June, 1892; and that the provisions of the Act above cited shall apply to the bounties which the Governor in Council is hereby empowered to grant.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Mr. McLELAN. The object of this is to afford encouragement for the manufacture of pig iron in this country. The deposits of iron, as hon. gentlemen know, are very numerous and valuable throughout the country, and it requires some encouragement to enable parties to undertake the manufacture of iron largely in this country, and render ourselves to some extent independent of other nations for the supply of iron. Three years ago Parliament adopted the policy of giving a bounty by way of encouragement, rather than increasing the duty upon the imported article, for the reason that the material iron enters so largely into the manufacture of various other articles that it was deemed expedient to give encouragement in this way rather than by increasing the duty.

Mr. BLAKE. Why?

Mr. McLELAN. The decline in the price of iron abroad has operated very considerable against its manufacture in this country by discouraging capitalists from engaging in its manufacture, but at present the opinion is gaining ground that prices have touched bottom and that they will increase very soon. There are a number of iron companies which are being established, among them the International Iron and Smelting Company, Manitoba, which is erecting works for the smelting of iron in the North-West, and there are also several companies in the eastern part of the Province of Ontario. Mr. Haycock, of this city, is at present endeavoring to form a company for the purpose of manufacturing charcoal iron; at Three Rivers, Mr. George MacDougall proposes to put up a furnace, and an effort is being made to build a blast furnace in Cape Breton. It is believed that with the encouragement of $1.50 per ton on pig iron proposed in this resolution, a number of these gentlemen will be able to carry out their designs and produce pig iron within the country. The hon. member for South Huron, I think, asked me to give the quantity that had been manufactured during the past year. It was 24,000 tons.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where has that been manufactured?

Mr. McLELAN. The greater portion of it has been manufactured in Nova Scotia.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At what works?

Mr. McLELAN. At the Acadia Steel Works.

Mr. VAIL. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLELAN. I may say to the hon. gentleman that that company got into difficulties a number of years ago at the outset, owing to a manager who was rather extravagant in his ideas and ran the company deeply into debt; and it was only through the instrumentality of this bounty that that company has been able to continue in operation at all, and it is hoped that it will be able to completely reconstruct itself.

Mr. VAIL. Why does the hon. gentleman not give a bounty on sugar too? Some of the sugar industries have been in difficulties.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman knows that there is a protective duty on sugar.

Mr. VAIL. There is a protective duty on iron.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the exact amount of duty on the class of pig iron on which this bounty is granted?

Mr. McLELAN. $2 per ton.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So that, for getting 24,000 tons of pig iron manufactured we practically pay $48,000 of duty and $36,000 in bounty, making together about $84,000.

Mr. McLELAN. You get the duty as revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, we do not get the duty; if the article is manufactured here, the hon. gentleman loses at both ends; so much less iron pays duty. There is $48,000 less of duty, and he pays a bounty besides of $36,000, so that there is $84,000 paid out of the Treasury for the manufacture of 24,000 tons. As this is an industry in which the hon. gentleman used to be concerned, if I am not mistaken——

Mr. McLELAN. Not in the sense you mention—not to the value of a fraction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought the hon. gentleman was a stockholder.

Mr. McLELAN. Oh, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would be better pleased if he was, because then he could tell me more accurately. In the production of that quantity, can he tell me what is the value per annum to each operative employed?

Mr. McLELAN. I think twenty-six days' labor are employed in the manufacture of a ton from the ore to the rolled bars.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that each man in this factory only produces on the average twelve tons of iron per annum?

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman must not understand me as saying that the furnaces are run at their full capacity. They are engaged in smelting a portion of the time and also in rolling At all times during the past year two or one furnace has been idle. They run them alternately.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is familiar with the species of industry. I do not ask him to be precise within a ton or two; but does he not know himself what number of tons are supposed to be produced annually by each hand in a large establishment, supposed to be conducted on modern principles? That is something we ought to know when we are considering the bounty.

Mr. McLELAN. The memorandum given to me says that it requires about twenty-six days' labor from the digging of the ore to the production of the rolled bars.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would only give twelve tons per annum, which is a very small production.

Mr. BLAKE. I should like to know from the hon. gentleman what proportion of the bounty that has been paid has been paid to the Acadia steel works in the current year, and what to other establishments?

Mr. McLELAN. During the past year there has been paid to Nova Scotia, $29,000, and I fancy the most of that went to the Acadia Steel Works, and $7,000 has been paid in other parts of the Dominion. That is for the current year, to the 1st of June, 1886. The total amount paid as bounty on the production of pig iron in the Dominion was, $36,580.89.

Mr. BLAKE. The whole of that $29,000 practically went to the Acadia Steel Works.

Mr. McLELAN. I think so practically. At Pictou there were some few tons manufactured.

Mr. BLAKE. In the other parts of the Dominion, does one establishment take the bulk?

Mr. McLELAN. The memorandum sent me by the Customs Department does not separate it.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps at a later stage of the proceedings the hon. gentleman would give us the division of that. For 1885 I think the amount of the bounty was $36,654.91. Could the hon. gentleman say how that is divided—how much the Acadia Steel Works got?

Mr. McLELAN. I think they had about the same proportion.

Mr. BLAKE. And for the year 1884, the first year, the amount of the bounty was $44,089.91. What proportion had they that year?

Mr. McLELAN. The years run about the same proportion all through for the three years in which it has been in operation.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the production altogether, and the production of the Acadia Steel Works in particular, has been diminished, and is not increasing?

Mr. McLELAN. In the last year, and in the previous year, the production was nearly the same, but not so much as in the year before, because the company became involved and went into liquidation a few years ago. I think the production has fallen from forty-four to twenty or thirty during the last two years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many men are employed there for all purposes?

Mr. McLELAN. From 500 to 700, in the manufacture of bar iron and car wheels and other works.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I believe they manufacture very good car wheels, but they manufacture a good many other articles besides iron. The bulk of this bounty was paid—20,000 tons apparently were provided, so that there is some extraordinary discrepancy between the estimate the hon. gentleman made just now, that twenty-six days of labor were required to produce one ton of iron and the actual result.

Mr. McLELAN. The men may be employed in other work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then they would not use twenty-six days for the production of a ton of iron.

Mr. McLELAN. The men employed in the manufacture and transportation of the ore to the furnace and in the work of smelting, consume about twenty-six and three-quarters days' labor per ton altogether. Then, in the manufacture of car wheels and other work, other men are employed, about from 500 to 700 men altogether being employed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You say twenty-six and three-quarter days are employed to produce a ton of iron?

Mr. McLELAN. That is what they give.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At the usual rate of wages at such manufactories, the process would prove a very expensive one.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. Minister refers to rolled iron.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the cost in labor of producing a ton of pig iron? It would be satisfactory to know, so that we might compare results in Nova Scotia with results in the establishments on the Clyde and other places.

Mr. McLELAN. I have not got a statement of that.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the statement the hon. gentleman is not able to find at the moment is one that runs out the details, and gives the labor in getting at the ore, in transport and conversion into pig or rolled iron or bar iron.

Mr. McLELAN. I have a statement of that kind, but cannot lay my hands on it at present.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman may be able to find it before the final passing of the measure. It is unfortunate he has not got it now. I recollect when this bounty was proposed, glowing statements were made as to the largely increased production that would result from it. All that the hon. gentleman is now able to point to as accomplished is apparently that the Londonderry Works have been kept open by it and were not forced to shut down. I understand they have been run by liquidators in the interests of the creditors.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; but it is believed that in the present season a new company will be formed. A gentleman from Glasgow is now in the country negotiating to form a company to take over the works and liabilities and furnish the necessary capital.

Mr. BLAKE. Have any new works been actually started since this bounty was established?

Mr. McLELAN. I am not able to say that any have been established. The great decline in the price of iron has prevented capitalists from going into that business.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sensibly aware of the misfortune which this country has experienced through the decline in the price of iron. I hope it will rise soon. May it become dearer, and then we can get on. The hon. gentleman has said that, inasmuch as iron is a raw material for many manufactures, it was thought expedient to afford this further encouragement by a bounty instead of by a duty. Why?

Mr. McLELAN. We have been in most cases, wherever practicable, admitting the raw material free of duty. The hon. gentleman will see by the trade returns that a very large proportion of our imports for the purpose of manufacturing are now admitted free of duty. Cotton, for instance, and other articles that are worked into different manufactures are admitted free.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With the exception of the article of tea. We do not import anything for the consumer, but everything for the manufacturer.

Mr. McLELAN. Who is thereby enabled to produce the manufactured article at that much less.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But he does not give us the benefit.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state why it was considered preferable to encourage this by a bounty instead by a duty?

Mr. McLELAN. On the same principle that we have admitted various other goods free of duty or at a low duty, that enter into the manufacture of the various articles we require.

Mr. BLAKE. It is then because the duty increases the price to the consumer?

Mr. McLELAN. It may increase the price to the manufacturer.

Mr. BLAKE. To which? The manufacturer of iron? Then it is because it was thought expedient that, instead of increasing the cost to the manufacturer, which must increase the cost to the ultimate consumer, we should pay out of the general taxes a portion of the increased cost.

Mr. McLELAN. There might be a temporary increase of price, but if the hon. gentleman had given study to this question, he would know that in the United States——

Mr. BLAKE. Hear hear.

Mr. McLELAN—where there has been a very high duty on iron to encourage home manufacture, the price has now become very low. There was a time when the duty did increase the price, but prices there now are lower than here.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has told us in tones lugubrious, as consorted with the character of the announcement, of the unfortunate low price of pig iron for some time. What is the average price of pig iron, analogous to that made in the Acadia Steel Works, in Scotland and elsewhere?

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know that I can give the prices exactly as they have gone down, but as a fact they are lower, and that decline has prevented capitalists from going into the manufacture of iron. All iron is considerably lower in price than it was three years ago.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the price of pig iron now?

Mr. McLELAN. I will get the quotations and send them to the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe last year a curious illustration of the great benefits of protection to the United States; and I can possibly refresh the hon. the Finance Minister's memory. A certain class of iron which was required to be laid down at Galveston, in Texas, was offered to be furnished by the English houses at $21 per ton delivered there. The American works were able to supply it at $39 per ton. There was just a difference of $18 per ton between the price the American works were able to supply it for, and the English works; and the English manufacturers were able, after paying the duty of $17 or $18 per ton, to get the contract. That is the result of the great fall in classes of iron extensively used in the United States, and they have had a protection for 100 years.

Mr. McLELAN. A ton of pig iron represents 10¾ days' labor per man. The conversion of the necessary quantity of pig iron into bar iron represents 16·67 days' labor, making together 27 days' labor.

Mr. BLAKE. But there is an extra duty on bar, I think.

Mr. McLELAN. Bar iron is 17½.

Mr. BLAKE. I have not lately looked at the relative prices of American and Scotch and English pig, but the last time I did so, which was not long after this duty was imposed, I found that they ran very close upon the prices of the English or Scotch pig, duty and freight being added, that there was just a narrow margin between the two. I do not remember what changes have been made in the American tariff lately, but at that time I believe the duty on pig was $7, and the cost of the American pig of the same grade was just that much more than the cost of the Scotch or English pig, and some grades of Scotch and English pig were being imported into the States, notwithstanding the duty. At that time also, I ran over the results, for several months, of the imports into Montreal and some other Canadian ports, and I found that the prices in the principal markets of sale in Canada for pig were equivalent to the prices of those commodities on the other side, adding freight and duty.

Mr. CHARLTON. It would seem from the statement made by the Minister, that 10¾ days are required to produce a ton of pig iron, that the facilities of producing pig iron at this point are exceptionally good. If my memory serves me, that is as small an amount of manual labor, or a trifle smaller, than is required upon the Clyde, in Scotland, and I do not think there is any point in the United States where pig iron is produced at a less cost or number of days per ton than 10¾ days. I should infer from this that the facilities at this point are exceptionally good. The Minister referred to the beneficial effects produced by protection in the United States, from the fact that that country now produces iron at a very low rate. We must bear in mind that the taxes paid by the consumers of iron in the United States for the past twenty-five or thirty years have amounted to an enormous sum in the aggregate, and that the reduction in the price of iron in that country in late years has been due to over-stimulation followed by over-production. There is over $100,000,000 invested in useless plant in the United States, in blast furnaces that are standing idle, and have been standing idle for years, and, if we take the interest at 6 per cent. on that amount, it makes an annual waste of $6,000,000, and add that to the other outgoes under a protective system, I think we will arrive at the conclusion that the nation is paying a pretty large price for its iron, even if of late years it has been offered at tolerably low prices. The iron industry of the United States is unable to stand in the open markets of the world, with the iron industries of England or Belgium, and it has been found necessary to protect it by duties. The fact that it is lower in price than in former years does not prove that the iron industry of the United States is on a more healthy footing than it was when there were no duties at all. Before the excessive protective duties were imposed, the iron industry in the United States made substantial, healthy progress. When those duties were imposed, there was a rapid, and abnormal progress, the profits were very great, and that was followed by over-production, stagnation, and the sinking of this immense amount of capital. It strikes me that, with an ability to produce pig iron by ten and three-quarter days' work a ton, we ought to have an industry that should be able to stand alone. I doubt if there is any place in the world where it can be produced with less manual labor.

Mr. CASEY. This bounty of course will cost the country something, but I do not know but that the investment may in one sense be looked upon with some degree of pleasure by that portion of the public who have believed with us all along that the National Policy was a humbug, because, in connection with this bounty, we are placing on record, by the solemn action of this House, a confession that the National Policy has been an utter failure and a humbug, so far as the iron trade is concerned, at all events. It is almost worth what it cost, or the amount of the bounty, to have this solemn confession put on the Statute-book by the authors of the National Policy themselves. We were told that, when the National Policy would come into force, iron smelting would be greatly developed all over the country. The ridiculous failure that has followed need not be expatiated upon. I understood the Minister to say that there is only one smelting works at present in operation, though two others are projected. That is the result of the National Policy for all these years. Before the National Policy, we had several smelting works in operation. Now there is only one, in the Minister's own Province, and that one is in such a glorious and magnificent state of prosperity that the Minister, who comes from that Province and knows the affairs of that company, tells the House that they are unable to manufacture pig iron at a profit without assistance. He is afraid to give them that assistance by a further increase of duty, because he confesses that it would increase the price to the consumer of pig iron, and, although a general increase of prices may have seemed desirable in 1878, he knows that the public will not put up with it just now. He cannot give the assistance in that form, so he must give it in another form, and he gives it in the form of

a bounty. In other words, the glorious National Policy has so prospered this industry in his own Province that they cannot manufacture with any profit, that he cannot give them that profit in the shape of a duty for fear of unpopularity, and that the public must pay the manufacturers the profit in order to enable them to continue to manufacture.

Mr. BLAKE. The practical result of this, as it affects the Acadia Steel Works, appears to be that they are to receive in bounty $30,000 a year upon their present production, and are to receive, under the benefit of the other branch of their favor, their protection, $40,000 a year by means of the enhanced price caused by the duties. Thus we are giving them in the shape of a direct bounty out of our taxes a sum equivalent to the interest at 4 per cent. on three quarters of a million of capital, and we are giving them in protection a sum equivalent to the interest on one million of capital, or we are giving them altogether in duty and bounty an amount equal to the interest at 4 per cent. on one million and three-quarters of capital. I am glad to hear that, with these provisions, they are actually able to get along in the hands of the liquidators.

Mr. HESSON. It is clear that the consumers are getting iron at a much lower rate than ever, and they are getting a superior quality of steel. The works we have are not sufficient to produce the quantity the country requires, and we are still importing, and those who are investing their money in that no doubt are not more successful than many others who have tried to develop the industries of the country. I wish to inform the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that good steel rails can be laid down in this country now at $21 a gross ton, less than one cent per pound.

Mr. MILLS. Where are they made?

Mr. HESSON. In England. Does it follow, then, that we must allow industries that are being established here in order to give employment to our people, to be crushed out because the people have put their money in them? I say that the consumers are getting cheaper iron and steel to-day than they were in the days of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman tells us that everything is cheaper in consequence of the National Policy, and the Minister of Finance tells us that in consequence of things being so cheap, it is necessary to give a bounty to these manufacturers. Now, if the hon. gentleman is right, why don't he have the duties taken off so that the prices will come up? The hon. gentleman assures the House that the effect of these protective duties has been to bring the prices down, and the reason these people cannot manufacture here is because the prices have gone down. If the hon. gentleman is right, all he has to do is to have the duties taken off and then prices will go up and we will not have to pay $40,000 out of the Treasury to sustain a bankrupt industry. I would like to ask the Minister to explain how it is that he proposes to pay one industry a bounty while he imposes an Excise duty upon another industry, the manufacture of coal oil. Let the hon. gentleman explain why one portion of the community should be taxed upon their productions, and another portion should be paid out of the produce of our revenue.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not one of those who sympathise with the hon. gentlemen opposite who condemn the National Policy. At the same time there is a *juste milieu* to be followed, and there is such a thing as running it into the ground, as was done in the coal duties and flour duties. Now, while I am in favor of giving protection to our industries, I am in favor of giving it only to those that can be prosecuted with a reasonable prospect of profit. That is where I draw the line in relation to the National Policy. I am not in favor of taxing the people all over the country in order that a few coal mines in Nova Scotia may be kept alive. I am not in favor of taxing the people on their bread in order that the farmers of western Ontario, or Manitoba, or wherever else they produce a surplus, shall have a profit on their wheat at the expense of the people in other sections of the country who are purchasers and consumers. Therefore, while I disapprove of the deprecatory remarks of the principle of the National Policy, I must say that there is a great deal to be said, and a great deal of fault to be found with the National Policy from my standpoint. Now, Sir, we are running the National Policy into the ground in another respect, in the shape of protection upon pig iron. What is going to be the effect of this? We already have a duty upon pig iron imported into the country. Every worker in iron throughout this Dominion, every blacksmith, every foundryman, every farmer who uses a plough, every man who uses a waggon, every lumberman who requires his sleds to be shod, every person who uses iron in any shape, is already contributing largely to the enforcement of the National Policy by the import duty which is imposed upon iron and steel. But while that is the case, the Government seem not to be satisfied, and now they actually propose to impose additional duty upon this article of common use. I will take again an illustration from my own county. What is going to be the effect of this policy upon the county of Northumberland? The effect will be that, in addition to all the duty that every blacksmith and consumer of iron throughout the county has to pay upon iron, there will be an additional charge upon him for his share of the revenue from which is taken this bounty to protect and support an industry which cannot be sustained under existing circumstances. Sir, if I could see a prospect that in a year or two, or in five years, this iron industry would become self-sustaining, with a reasonable protection, such as to warrant the belief that there was a prospect ahead of us, with what we know of the prices of iron in Europe, and in view of the efforts that have been made in America to cultivate that industry, I would go in and support a moderate duty, although I am not in favor of bounty, I would in some shape endeavor to encourage that industry, but I see nothing but failure in a policy of this kind. We know that the price of iron for the last ten years has been steadily going down until to-day we can land iron and steel rails, with freight and charges, on the wharf at Montreal for something like $21 a ton. Now, Sir, what prospect is there of our establishing the iron industry of this country on such a basis that it can compete against old established industries which enjoy cheap labor, and with the facilities for production which exist in Scotland and England, and which exist in Belgium? I believe we are taking a false step in encouraging a bounty upon the product and manufacture of iron in this country. My hon. friend the Finance Minister is not satisfied with imposing a duty upon the coal which is produced in his Province, and making the other Provinces like my own pay for the production of an industry that seems not to be self-sustaining without it, but he now asks us to put a duty upon iron which is produced in his Province also. What will come next? I suppose the silver and the gold mines that are just barely paying working expenses, will have a bounty put on them next, in order to encourage the gold and silver mining industries of the country. Sir, I think we have carried this thing far enough. The charges upon our people, and the revenue we require to raise to meet our increasing liabilities, require that, in addition to the economy it is necessary to practice in order to maintain our credit, we should not take the false step of encouraging industries that cannot be sustained under any reasonable protection; such being the case with the iron industry in this country, I feel bound to vote against this resolution.

Mr. PAINT. This industry we are now asked to protect has cost some $3,000,000, and I believe that if we continue to foster it, we will by-and-bye build our iron ships in this country.

Resolution reported.

WAYS AND MEANS—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means.

On item 1, oilcloth.

Mr. McLELAN. At the present time the duty on oil cloth is 30 per cent. It is found difficult to collect this on account of constant undervaluations, and the duty does not protect the manufacturers. This is not an increase in the duty, but it is to prevent undervaluation.

Mr. BLAKE. The proposed duty is 10 per cent and 5 cents per square yard. So collecting 5 cents per square yard will be equal to a duty of 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. The specific duty is, therefore, on this calculation, two-thirds of the whole duty.

Mr. McLELAN. The tendency of this change will be to prevent undervaluation.

Mr. BLAKE. And also to prevent the importation of the cheapest classes of goods.

Mr. McLELAN. It will prevent the very cheapest classes—at all events it will have that tendency. It will give more protection upon the low-priced goods than upon the average classes.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state what the variations in prices are; what is the lowest price of the imported article and what is the highest?

Mr. McLELAN. No, I cannot give the variations of prices.

Mr. BLAKE. A specific duty which amounts to 20 per cent. may be a very serious drawback to the importing of the low grade, and therefore give a higher protection to the manufacturers of the lower grades.

On item 3, straw board.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is this supposed to represent on straw board?

Mr. McLELAN. That is on the average value of the article imported; 20 per cent. is the present duty.

Mr. BLAKE. Why is the change made?

Mr. McLELAN. It is believed that it is undervalued for purposes of duty. For years the value has been running from $40 to $50 a ton, and latterly lots have been invoiced at apparently below their real value. The specific duty is about equal to an average price of $40 a ton.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the manufacturers here have represented that it was undervalued for importation.

Mr. McLELAN. No, the appraisers have done so; and on many occasions they have increased the valuations for duty. Three years ago the value was $60 a ton. The average value is now $40.

Mr. BLAKE. Then a progressive decline has been going on?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; during the last three years it has declined from $60 to $50 and $40.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the imposition of this specific duty is to arrest the decline as far as possible, and this is being done so as to prevent our having the benefit of greater cheapness.

On item 4, earthenware, &c.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This means a very considerable increase in the coarser articles of earthenware and stoneware. It may be, and very likely is the case, that there is no special increase on the medium articles, and perhaps a slight diminution on the best class; but on the inferior articles, those which come into common use, there is a decided increase.

Mr. McLELAN. On manufactured earthenware of all kinds there is a certain proportion which comes from the factory imperfect, and these goods are known as seconds and thirds. These goods are sent in largely from the United States from factories near the frontier, and they interfere largely with the legitimate manufacturers of goods on this side. A number of manufactories have been started in this country, which are turning out the better kind of ware at very reasonable prices; but the seconds and thirds from the American factories are sent across here and sold at nominal prices, and tend to injure our manufacturers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is going to be a very heavy impost on the coarser article, almost amounting to prohibition in some cases.

Mr. BLAKE. We know that seconds and thirds are also turned out by our Canadian manufacturers. The real object of this change is that our manufacturers may obtain a higher price for their common goods, that is the practical result of it. Would the hon. gentleman tell us what would 2 cents per gallon be on the prices of seconds and thirds as they sell in Canada.

Mr. McLELAN. The value of the seconds and thirds would be from 5 to 6 cents and the better class would be about 7 cents.

Mr. BLAKE. So that at 5 cents, the rate of duty would be 40 per cent.—a protection of 40 per cent. to the Canadian manufacturer of seconds and thirds which the poorer classes buy as against 30 per cent. on the dearer class. Then it is also to be remembered that with reference to these cheap and bulky goods the cost of packing and the transport very largely enhance the cost.

On item 5, rubber belting, &c.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the difference amount to on this rubber belting, hose, packing, mats and mattings.

Mr. McLELAN. The appraisers believe that this will not increase the price on the medium class. They report to the Customs Department that these goods have been greatly undervalued, and this change is to avoid frauds in the revenue.

Mr. BLAKE. That may be so, but is it not the fact that for at least two years the manufacturers have been asking him to make those changes.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know that they have.

Mr. BLAKE. Now, application was made to the Government last year. I was communicated with during last Session on the apprehension that it might come forward, and the fact was made public that applications were being made. The correspondence I have received indicates that it is not only the suggestion of the appraisers, but it is also the suggestion of the manufacturers, that has induced this change.

On item 6, carriage hardware.

Mr. McLELAN. That is to make the duty on carriage hardware uniform Parts of carriages are now charged 35 per cent., but at some ports these parts are entered as hardware at 30 per cent., and it is named as carriage hardware in order to make the duty uniform.

Mr. BLAKE. Why should carriage hardware be charged 35 per cent., and other hardware 30 per cent.?

On item 7, soap, perfumed and toilet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This increases the duty apparently?

Mr. McLELAN. The memorandum given to me by the Customs Department states that this will remove serious difficulties arising out of the undervaluation of goods, which it is almost impossible to check on the present tariff of 30 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. What will be the result of this?

Mr. McLELAN. The result will be about the same duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just call the attention of the hon. Minister and of the House to one fact, which does not apply, perhaps, so much to the article of soap as to other goods. We all know that the whole tendency of modern improvement in manufactures is to reduce largely and progressively the cost of the manufactured goods, and therefore the substitution of specific for *ad valorem* duty is nothing more than a large increase.

Mr. SHANLY. A correspondent writes to me that some of the materials used in the manufacture of soap are imported at high duties, like 30 and 35 per cent., so that the change made in this is simply a countervailing advantage to the manufacturer, to put him on a fair footing.

Mr. BLAKE. I would appeal to my hon. friend whether he does not think it unkind in the Government to place any difficulty in the way of their friends and followers to keep their hands clean.

Mr. BOWELL. It might be, if a coarser quality of soap were used on the tongues of gentlemen who are accusing others. It would be just as well for them to clean their own tongues and their own hands before they throw so much dirt at others. A very careful calculation was entered into when this change was made. The American duty at present is 15 cents per lb. The result of an investigation of no less than ninety-five different brands of toilet soap is the adoption of the duty of 10 cents per lb. and 10 per cent. Had we adopted the American system exclusively, we should have been placing a very heavy duty upon the cheaper kinds of soap. We thought it more equitable and equally protective for the manufacturers to adopt the mixed rate upon the particular kinds of soap now manufactured in this country, which will be about equal to 30 per cent. On the higher grades it will be less than 30 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the hon. gentleman does not dispute my statement that in the case of manufactured goods in which improvements are likely to take place, the specific duty tends constantly to grow into a very much larger *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. BOWELL. Not unless the article falls in value.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does not apply so much to this article, because the raw material, which is produced in the country, forms a large proportion of the value of the article. But I speak generally with respect to this system. When the goods are sold more cheaply than they are to-day, this specific tax will become a very much heavier relative tax.

Mr. McLELAN. If it is found that there is a decline in value, the specific rate may be lowered as in other cases.

On item 8, union collar cloth paper.

Mr. McLELAN. This is a duty of 5 per cent. on unfinished union collar cloth paper, intended to give the Canadian manufacturers the work of finishing the cloth.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a reduction, I suppose?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, a reduction on the unfinished article. The duty of the finished article is but a little higher.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the present rate?

Mr. BOWELL. Under the old tariff the duty on both kinds of union collar cloth paper was 5 per cent. Since the adoption of that tariff our paper makers have been glossing and finishing it in rolls and sheets. While we allow the union collar cloth to remain at the old 5 per cent. duty, we place the finished article on the 20 per cent. list.

Mr. BLAKE. The mills are able to produce the finished cloth under the present tariff and they are actually producing it. Why increase the duty?

Mr. BOWELL. If they were producing it, we should not have changed the tariff. They have placed in their mills machinery for the glossing and finishing of this paper, and they are now doing it.

Mr. BLAKE. If they are doing that, why put the duty on the finished article except to raise the price for the public?

Mr. BOWELL. That is not our experience, nor the experience of the country.

Mr. BLAKE. Under this plan is it supposed that the paper not finished or glossed shall be imported and finished and glossed in the country, or that the paper will be produced in the country?

Mr. BOWELL. The present supposition is that large quantities will be imported at 5 per cent., and finished and glossed in this country.

Mr. BLAKE. The article will be imported at 5 per cent., and then they will get 15 per cent. protection for simply putting it through the rolls, glossing and finishing it.

On item 10, paper hangings, &c.

Mr. McLELAN. I would ask to amend this resolution by adding the words "eighteen inches wide" after the word "per roll of eight yards." That is the length and width of paper upon which all the undervaluations are found. With regard to the other widths, twenty-one inches, nine and twelve yards, &c., there is no ground for complaint as to undervaluation; but this description of paper is often sold in job lots at one-fourth of the ordinary market value.

Mr. BLAKE. These, I suppose, are the cheap goods?

Mr. McLELAN. No, they are not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are the goods that are sold cheaply?

Mr. McLELAN. No; they are the better class of goods that are not produced in the country at less than from 6 cents to 10 cents per roll, but very often the manufacturer will have 500 or 600 rolls of different kinds on hand, which he will sell in job lots, much lower than the usual price, and they are entered at the Customs at the reduced price. There is a description of paper, twenty-one inches wide manufactured in England, which is sold at the low price of 1½d. to 2d. Of this, there is no complaint of undervaluation. In the United States, there is no paper manufactured below 5, 6 and 7 cents per roll, and in England, at times, the manufacturers have odd lots of that 6 to 8 cents paper, which they sell sometimes as low as 2 cents. It is to meet that, I wish to insert the words "eighteen inches in width."

Mr. BLAKE. It is to prevent the chronic occurrence of lots of cheap paper of this class coming to the country.

Mr. McLELAN. There is cheaper paper both manufactured in the country and imported, but this is to prevent a higher class of paper being entered under value, and the importer paying duty on that under value.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend will find I am correct. It is not to prevent cheap goods being introduced, but goods of higher class at cheap rates.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Minister has misunderstood me on several occasions. When I speak of cheap goods, I do not mean inferior goods, but goods of very good value for the money. We are subject to the misfortune frequently of having very good paper brought in cheaply, which is a great misfortune and it is quite right to prevent it.

On item 11, felt.

Mr. McLELAN. This is to make the duty uniform. Felt is charged 7½ cents a lb. and 20 per cent., and 15 cents and 10 per cent., and is also let in free, according to the purpose for which it is imported. This resolution is to charge it a uniform duty of 17½ per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. Why does the hon. gentleman not make it uniformly down instead of putting it at 17½ per cent?

Mr. McLELAN. This is a medium rate.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the reason the delightful combination of specific and *ad valorem* has been abandoned in this case, that combination which has such charms for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BOWELL. It is applied in a great many cases, but it is not necessary to enforce it in every one. The reason for making this change is the fact that there is one class of goods which could only be rated at 20 per cent. when imported for certain classes of manufactures, and when imported for another class it is charged 15 per cent., when imported for ordinary trade purposes it is charged at 7½ cents and 10 per cent. Importations were made for specific purposes, say for boot makers or glove makers, and then the felt was placed in the market and sold for other purposes. The merchants represented that this was placing them in an uncomfortable position, and it would be better for the trade generally to make a uniform rate. By that means, the manufacturer will pay 17½ per cent. and buy the goods from the merchant instead of having to import them. It will do away with the fraud of entering for one purpose and selling for another.

Mr. BLAKE. In more than one case I have expressed my approval of changes in the tariff, and in this case, as the duty stood, it was a frightful temptation to fraud; but the question I put is, why is the principle of combination of specific and *ad valorem* duties, which the Government appear to be adopting more widely every year, and which already existed in this case, departed from?

Mr. McLELAN. Felt often comes in a bale with other goods, and we have to open the bale and ascertain the weight, so as to charge a specific duty; and it is simply to do away with that difficulty we make the duty *ad valorem*.

On item 12, stereotypes and electrotypes.

Mr. McLELAN. I want to add after the word "metal" the words "and not elsewhere specified."

Mr. BOWELL. Stereotypes and electrotypes for standard books are now 10 per cent. *ad valorem*, and stereotypes and electrotypes for commercial blanks and advertisements, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. This item is put in to prevent a difficulty which has arisen in regard to what they call the patent newspaper column, which is being imported from the United States. These columns are stereotyped out upon plate, and sent back again. Great difficulty has been found in arriving at a correct value, and it is thought better to make a specific duty of 5 cents per pound for this particular kind of plate which is used in newspapers for serial stories and that class of literature. At present, it might be ruled at 20 per cent. Some of our collectors have thought it would come within these two items, and, after full consideration as to its value, and arriving at as equitable a duty as possible, we propose this, which is about equal to 20 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. So it is to cost 20 per cent., while the other class specified will cost 10 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. One class for standard books is 10 per cent., and that for advertisements is 20 per cent. This is a new item.

Mr. BLAKE. To cover the serial stories?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. So it puts them at a disadvantage as compared with standard books by a double duty.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. That is a stroke at the hon. gentleman's old compatriots, the newspaper publishers.

Mr. BOWELL. But it is in the interest of the printer who sets the type, the labor of the compositor in this country.

Mr. BLAKE. What about the standard books?

Mr. BOWELL. They are not printed here to any extent.

On item 13, scythes.

Mr. McLELAN. The present duty is 35 per cent., but scythes are imported and entered at fictitious values, as is found by the Custom house officers, and the duty will not put an increase on the proper value of good articles.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does the hon. gentleman propose to ascertain, to use his own words, the proper value of a good article? Surely that is liable to alter all the time, as improvements in manufacture are made.

Mr. McLELAN. I think it is found now that what is called a good article of scythe that a man should use—and it is only the best that a man should use—is worth $9 or $10.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, to-day, but what may it be a year hence?

Mr. McLELAN. They were more than that formerly.

Mr. BOWELL. There is a manufacturer from Oshawa behind the hon. gentleman who says we have lowered the duty on scythes, so that it is not so great a protection to the manufacturer as the old duty. The great difficulty was this: In the United States they receive a drawback of $1.50 to $2 a dozen on scythes which they send to this country, and the great difficulty in ascertaining the exact values has arisen from that fact. A specific duty will prevent that.

On item 14, wire covered with cotton, &c.

Mr. McLELAN. This is to make uniform all classes. At present wire covered with silk would be 30 per cent., and covered with cotton, 20 per cent., and it is proposed to put it all at 25 per cent.

On item 15, stove bolts and nuts, &c.

Mr. McLELAN. Wood screws are now 35 per cent. Stove bolts are very similar in their manufacture, and it is proposed to put them at the same rate of duty.

Mr. BLAKE. What are stove bolts and nuts at present?

Mr. McLELAN. We are making nuts and bolts part specific and part *ad valorem*, taking out only stove bolts and small bolts.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the equivalent of the present duty?

Mr. McLELAN. The present duty is 25 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. So it is an increase of 10 per cent?

Mr. McLELAN. It is 25 per cent. on all bolts, large and small, and this is putting these at the same rate as wood screws, and making the others part specific. We have by another resolution put them part specific and part *ad valorem*.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not find any other resolution.

Mr. McLELAN. It was passed previously.

Mr. BLAKE. Why should it be that some portions of the bolts and nuts should be specific and *ad valorem*, and at one rate of duty equivalent to about 25 per cent., as the Minister thinks, and these should be raised to 35 per cent.?

Mr. McLELAN. There is a great deal more labor in one description than in the other. In one, it is very little more than the iron, there is very little labor required to convert it into a bolt or nut, but in a pound of stove bolts or of bolts of the smaller make there is a great deal more labor. Stove bolts are very similar to wood screws, with the addition of a nut.

Mr. BLAKE. And it is found, I suppose, that 25 per cent. does not keep the foreign article out?

Mr. McLELAN. We have not tried that yet.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, the hon. gentleman has tried it, because he says the present duty is equivalent to 25 per cent.

Mr. McLELAN. We are changing both, the hon. gentleman will see, and the present duty did not work satisfactorily either with the manufacturers or the Custom house.

Mr. BLAKE. But how much was it equal to about?

Mr. BOWELL. Thirty per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. So it is an increase of 5 per cent.?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Or a-sixth added to the duty. To tell us that, because stove bolts and nuts are very much like wood screws, we ought to put the duty up to 35 per cent. seems to be not a very adequate reason for increasing the duty. Thirty-five per cent. is a very high rate of duty, and when we know the conditions on which wood screws are manufactured in the countries in which they are chiefly manufactured, I do not think the arrangements are very much calculated to induce one to raise the price of any articles by duties.

On item 16, handkerchiefs.

Mr. McLELAN. This is for the sake of uniformity. The present rates are 20 and 27½ upon the different kinds of handkerchiefs, whether linen, cotton, plain, or printed, and it is proposed to make them uniform at 25 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. That raises it somewhat on the cotton and lowers it on the linen.

Mr. BOWELL. Just the contrary.

Mr. McLELAN. Printed cottons are now 27½, and the officers have been charging printed handkerchiefs 27½, and plain 20.

Mr. BLAKE. That is what I was speaking of, plain and printed.

Mr. McLELAN. Plain and printed are different, and linen are different, and we are making it uniform.

Mr. BLAKE. It raises the plain.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, and lowers the printed.

On item 18, nail plate, iron or steel.

Mr. McLELAN. Steel plate is $3 per ton and 10 per cent. Iron nail plate is less, and it is claimed that very often steel nail plate is imported under the name of iron plate, and it is proposed to place all at one rate. Iron nail plate is now 12½ to 17½, according to size.

Mr. BLAKE. What is this $3 a ton supposed to amount to, on current prices?

Mr. McLELAN. I think it would be about $67 a ton. The current price is £6 to £7 sterling a ton.

On item 19, repeal item 353, Revised Statutes of Canada.

Mr. McLELAN. Ultra-marine blue is not manufactured in this country, but all the other colors are. Ultra-marine blue is left still on the free list, while a duty of 20 per cent. is placed upon all the other colors.

On item 20, repeal item 428, Revised Statutes of Canada.

Mr. McLELAN. The change is making jute cloth two inches narrower, it was limited to forty-two inches, and it is now limited to forty. It is proposed to allow jute yarn, whether plain or colored, to come in duty free. It is largely used in the manufacture of mats and matting. At present the duty on jute yarn is 20 per cent. Optical instruments for schools and colleges, not manufactured in the Dominion, are free.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that restriction ought to be taken off. To impose a duty on philosophical instruments imported for education, is brutal and barbarous, whether they are manufactured in this country or not.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I think the Government will get into difficulty in imposing a duty on philosophical instruments. It would be far better to leave these goods still on the free list. Only about $10,000 worth were imported altogether, even when they were free. With a duty on those that are not manufactured in Canada, there will be a constant difficulty in ascertaining, when these articles are imported, whether like articles are manufactured in the country. It is alleged, as a reason for the imposition of this duty, that the raw material for these articles is dutiable, and consequently the manufacturers are placed at a disadvantage. But hon. gentlemen opposite have alleged more than once that the effect of a duty has not been to increase the price of the article; here is a case where that principle could be carried out, and the duty remain as it was. I know that although the total amount of importation is small, it will be a considerable tax on education, and so far as I am concerned, I am ready to place the interest of the children of Canada who are being educated above the interests of the manufacturers in these or any other instruments. I think this duty will be a hardship. I can state from experience, knowing the difficulty that has existed in many high schools in procuring these instruments.

Mr. BLAKE. Before this resolution passes I would ask the hon. gentleman to state what addition to the revenue he anticipates on these twenty items of change here?

Mr. McLELAN. It is not anticipated that there will be any change in the revenue. In no case is there anything important, and on the whole there will be no perceptible increase.

On resolution 2,

Mr. WELDON. I hope the Minister will agree to what he partially agreed to the other night, viz., to place a specific duty on cordage, which would prove much less inconvenient.

Mr. McLELAN. After considering the variations in price between the best hemp, manilla and the poorer qualities, I think it is better to leave the duty as proposed.

Mr. WELDON. It is better to encourage the importation of manilla than sisal.

On resolution 4, sugar.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not rise in the hope that I will be able to accomplish anything in the way of altering

the Government plan in dealing with the sugar question. It appears that a slight change has been made in the original resolution submitted. The wholesale merchants who have visited this city have prevailed on the Finance Minister to strike out the word 13 and revert to the number that was in force for some time, No. 14. I think it was scarcely necessary for so many important gentlemen to come here to accomplish so little. But I think it is desirable that there should be an appeal from this House and from this Government to the country. We feel that the country must be made aware and the country must be informed on this subject. I now propose, in a very brief manner, to give some figures that will show the operation of the tariff in respect to sugar. I propose to do it in such a clear manner that every member of the House and every man of intelligence will be able to figure the matter out for himself. It has often been said that this is a very difficult question and that the people do not understand it. I simply ask hon. members to take down the figures as I give them. They can satisfy themselves as to the correctness of the market quotations and easily work the result out for themselves, and if I am wrong I ask to be set right now and here, because I call the attention of members to the fact that it will be important when they are on the platform, addressing the electors with respect to these matters, that they should be in a position to say that these figures were given in Parliament in the presence of the Finance Minister, and he did not challenge or at all events he did not prove their inaccuracy—if he does not do it—and if he does do so, I shall be glad to be corrected and to be set right. We will deal with the matter as per 100 lbs. to make it simple, and we will take the article of granulated sugar which is a uniform test and standard, and therefore one that may safely be adopted. I take the price of granulated sugar a few days ago, but as these are comparative quotations and taken at the same time, if the prices have varied a little in New York they have also varied in Montreal, and so there is no difference in result. The price of granulated sugar in New York, long price, is $6.25 per 100 lbs. The Canadian purchaser would obtain a drawback of $2.79 per 100 lbs., and also one-half per cent. discount for cash, making together $2.82 per 100 lbs., which would be taken off the price of the sugar. That would leave the net price in New York $3.43. The Canadian duty at present is as follows:—Specific at $1.50 per 100 lbs., $1.50; and 35 per cent. *ad valorem* on the long price of $6.25, which would amount to $2.18. Those two items, specific and *ad valorem* duties together, would raise the duty to $1.68 per 100 lbs. But that is not enough for our Finance Minister. He adds to that amount 7½ per cent. on the duty, which on $3.68 makes 27 cents, which brings up the total to $3.95 duty on each 100 lbs. of sugar, which cost in New York $3.43. I propose now to show the price at which sugar could be brought in and used under the Cartwright tariff in order to show the people—for there was a duty on sugar and the people were taxed highly—how greatly the burden has increased. Under the Cartwright tariff the price in New York would be, long price, $6.25 per 100 lbs. There would be a drawback of $2.82, leaving the net price $3.43. There was a specific duty of 1 cent. per lb. and 25 per cent. *ad valorem* on the net price, not on the long price of $3.43. The duty on that sugar under the Cartwright tariff would be $1.86 per 100 lbs., instead of $3.85 per 100 lbs. as under the present tariff. The total amount, putting the specific and *ad valorem* together, is 115 per cent., while under the Cartwright tariff it amounted to 54 per cent. *ad valoerm*. I desire now to make a comparison of prices. The price of granulated sugar in Montreal is $6 50 per 100 lbs. There is a cash discount of 2½ per cent., being 16 cents, leaving the net price $6.34 per 100 lbs. Let us ascertain what that sugar would have cost at New York under the Cartwright tariff. The net price would be $3.43. To that amount must be added $1.86 duty, making the amount $5.89. In other words, we would be able to obtain granulated sugar at $1 05 per 100 lbs. less than at the present time from New York. In making such a statement gentlemen sometimes remark that it can make no difference how we raise the revenue as we have to raise a certain amount, and if we did not have a high tariff on this article it would have to be increased on something else. The point to which I desire to draw attention to is, that while we would under the Cartwright tariff obtain granulated sugar at $1.05 per 100 lbs. less than under the present tariff, actually less duty goes into the revenue of the country by the present tariff than there was under the Cartwright tariff, as I will establish very clearly. The duty derived from 100 lbs. of sugar brought in for refining purposes is, according to the Finance Minister himself, $1.60 per 100 lbs. Now then it takes twelve and a half pounds extra of raw sugar to make 100 lbs. granulated, and therefore you must add one-eighth more to the duty. That makes 20 cents or altogether $1.80 as the duty which goes into the Treasury under the tariff now in force, on the sugar which would make 100 lbs. granulated, while I have pointed out that under the Cartwright tariff $1.86 would go into the public Treasury; so that you have a loss of 6 cents per 100 lbs. in revenue, or a loss of $1.05 per 100 lbs. in the consumption of sugar. Now, what does that amount to? The importations of sugar amount in round numbers to 200,000,000 lbs., or equal in granulated to 175,000,000 lbs. Let us call the $1.05 the even dollar, or 1 cent a pound, and that on 175,000,000 lbs. would be equal to $1,750,000. That is a serious loss, I submit, if we are really losing it, but when we are dealing in millions the people do not understand what we are talking about. Therefore it is well that we should bring it down to their comprehension, and I know of no way in which we could do that better than by the way in which hon. gentlemen opposite are in the habit of doing, in pointing to the benefits which we are supposed to derive by this exorbitant rate of protection, from the fact that we are giving employment to a certain number of men in our own country. That is true, and I do not want to close the refineries or drive workingmen out of the country. But I want to ask the House and the country if we are not paying too much for these men, and if there is not a way of getting them cheaper. According to the census of 1881, we had then four sugar refineries in the Dominion, employing 723 hands, and their yearly wages was $363,000, or, in other words, about $500 per hand. Since that time another refinery has been opened in Halifax, and therefore we will raise the number of hands from 723 to 1,000, as the result of sugar refineries being established in our midst. Now, what would $1,750,000 do for 1,000 men? It would pay every man of them $500 to do nothing, to be in the country and consume the eggs, the butter, and confer all the other blessings which they are supposed to confer on us. That would amount to $500,000, and we would have left $1,250,000 with which we could pay for a house and lot for each family at $1,250, and give it to them, and we could repeat the operation every year. And the amount, as I have shown to you, going into the Treasury by way of duty, is still less. Now, it will not do for hon. gentlemen to answer that in a general way, by saying that sugar is cheaper now than ever. That is an argument too silly—if I may use the expression—for any gentleman to use in this House. I might reply by saying that barley never was cheaper than it is to-day. Did the duty on barley bring the price down? Wheat never was cheaper than it is to-day, but did the duty on wheat reduce the price? If it did, hon. gentlemen are responsible for a great loss of money to the country. No, Sir, that style of argument will not do. It is a question of values and quotations, and it

must be met on these points. I ask the hon. gentleman to meet them and to prove either that the quotations I have given or the deductions I have drawn from them are not correct. But it is sometimes said, as was said by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), who understands this question pretty well, that it is not fair to take granulated sugars because they do not comprise by any means the largest bulk of the sugars which were dealt with in this country, and if you take yellows it would not be the case. I submit that you have to take the granulated basis to have a standard, because, generally speaking, yellows are nondescript, and you cannot get them equal. But even if you take the yellows, I will give them figures from actual transactions given to me by one of the largest wholesale grocery firms in the west, and if it is any satisfaction to hon. gentlemen opposite, I may tell them that every member of the firm to which I refer is a staunch Conservative. Now, here are the figures which they have sent, of an actual transaction which took place since the tariff resolutions were moved by the hon. Finance Minister. They have an importation from Porto Rico, and the value of the importation from there was $1,556. They had to pay on that a duty of $1,657, or 105 per cent. People sometimes wonder when you tell them that owing to the duty on sugar they have to pay $1 for sugar which should only cost them 50 cents, but in this actual transaction, as I have said, the duty actually amounted to 105 per cent. Let us take it again on yellow sugars, if you will, that might come from England, and I take it on actual samples of my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Gunn). On this sample the price was 12s. 9d. per 112 lbs., or say $2.80 per 100 lbs. Add the duty paid by the refiner, $1.60 per 100 lbs. and you have $4.40, and that sugar is sold in Montreal at $5.25, or 85 cents per 100 lbs. more than the English yellow. If you take off 10 cents per 100 lbs. for freight, though in many cases you can lay sugar down from England almost as cheaply as from Montreal—but take off 10 cents, and you have a loss of 75 cents on every 100 lbs. This would amount, on the 200,000,000 lbs. which we consume—and in this case there is no waste—$1,500,000, which we pay more than we need to. Allowing five to a family, this would give 3,000 families $500 per annum each to do nothing except to live in this country in idleness and make a home market. In other words, you could have a city of 15,000 souls doing nothing out of this $1,500,000. I give the figures of an actual transaction; there may be weak points in the argument, but I give them in all sincerity, and nobody will rejoice more than I if they can be proved to be wrong. I invite the Minister to do so, and if he cannot, I hold it is our duty to bring the facts before the country, and to appeal to the people, not to stamp out this industry, but to say that no such excessive burdens should be laid on the people on an article of such prime necessity as the one now under discussion.

Mr. McLELAN. I shall only say a few words in reference to the remarks of the hon. gentleman. He has given the quotations for refined sugar in New York and in Canada. The hon. gentleman quotes refined at $6.25 in New York, and $6.34 in Montreal; so that at the hon. gentleman's own figures, the Canadian consumer is not paying more than 9 cents per 100 lbs. for his sugar more than the consumer in the United States. The hon. gentleman made a calculation on the supposition that the price of sugar to-day is the same as it was under the Cartwright tariff.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, I am applying the Cartwright tariff to present prices to show how it would work if it were in force now.

Mr. McLELAN. But the *ad valorem* Cartwright tariff, applied to sugar that was double in value, gave a very much higher duty. At all events, the proof of the tariff is in the working of it. The following statement will show the state of our importations, and the duty collected in 1877 and 1878, under the Cartwright tariff, as compared with the importations since 1881, under the National Policy :—

—	Quantity.	Value.	Amount of Duty.	Duty per 100 lbs.
	Lbs.	$	$	$ cts.
1877	94,509,009	5,147,712	2,208,646	2 33
1878	105,215,279	5,982,078	2,515,656	2 39
1881	136,406,513	5,110,993	2,459,142	1 80
1882	135,329,697	4,846,006	2,299,762	1 69
1883	152,729,569	5,091,530	2,467,731	1 61
1884	173,742,477	5,509,429	2,609,609	1 50
1885	200,011,541	5,100,478	2,544,921	1 27

Now, the House will observe that in 1885 we imported 200,000,000 lbs. of sugar against 94,000,000 in 1877, while in 1885 we collected only $300,000 of duty more than we did in 1877; so that the decline in the price of sugar has lessened the tax from $2.30 per 100 lbs. in 1878, under the Cartwright tariff, to $1.27 per 100 lbs. under the National Policy in 1885. These two facts, taken in connection with the hon. gentleman's own figures show a difference of only 9 cents between the price at Montreal and the price at New York, prove that the National Policy is not very burdensome, and is not taxing the sugar of the country as much as the Cartwright tariff did.

Mr. GUNN. The duty on sugar imported into New York is one-half a cent a pound more than on the sugar imported into Canada, and yet the sugar is about the same price in the two places, so that the statement of the Finance Minister proves nothing. The duty on the 200,000,000 lbs. of sugar imported last year, at an average of $1.27½ per 100 lbs., amounted $2,550,000; the new tariff at $1.60 per 100 lbs. will produce a duty of $3,200,000, an increase of duty of $650,000. The price of granulated sugar in Montreal on the 30th of March last was 6½ cts per lb., less 2½ per cent. discount; the price of granulated in New York on the same date was 6¼ cents per lb., less ½ per cent. discount. The value at these rates of 175,000,000 lbs. of granulated, the equivalent of the 200,000,000 lbs. imported, would be at Montreal $11,090,625; and the value at New York at 6¼ cents per lb, less ½ per cent. discount and less $2.79 cents drawback, is $3.43 cents in bond; add our new duty of 35 per cent. and 1½ cents per lb., plus 7½ per cent, amounting to $2.90, making a total of 6·33 cents, giving a total value of $11,033,333, or $57,292 less than the price at Montreal. But instead of getting a duty of $3,200,000, you would get a duty of $5,075,000, a gain of $1,875,000. If you gained the duty as well as the reduction in price, there would be a gain to the country of $1,982,281, almost $2,000,000, which is similar to the conclusion of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson). But you refuse this duty of $5,075,000 by prohibiting American sugar, you ignore the drawback, and you claim the duty on the long price, that is the price of the sugar coming in—35 per cent. on the long price, plus 1½ cents per lb., and 7½ per cent. additional duty, making a duty of 3·97 cents, almost 4 cents per lb., on 175,000,000 of granulated gives $6,947,000, almost $7,000,000 or $3,800,000, being 125 per cent. more than will be collected. This is from the wholesale or importing point of view, and it shows a loss of, within a fraction, of $2,000,000. Take, however, another view. Take the cost to the consumer, the housekeeper, the taxpayer. The immigrant from Europe is amazed to find sugar so dear in this country, and is puzzled to know why it should cost almost double what it costs at home, in the Old Country. In England the retail cost of brown sugar is 1½d. or 3 cents;

here he must pay 5½ to 6 cents. In England the retail price of white sugar is 2d. or 4 cents, while here he must pay 6¾ cents to 7 cents, or an average of 2¾ cents more than in England, making on the 200,000,000 lbs. of sugar consumed in this country a loss of $5,500,000 to the consumer, or, deducting the duty of $3,200,000, a tax of $2,300,000 goes to the refiner. The immigrant is puzzled to know why he cannot get his sugar at 3 cents or 4 cents, and he will be told the Government tax for Customs is 1⅝ cents per pound, making brown sugar 1½ cents dearer, and white sugar 1⅞ cents dearer. That makes the price of yellow 4½ cents, and of the white 5¾ cents, adding the duty to the English price. Where does the rest go? It is farmed out like the taxes in Turkey; it goes into second hands whose share is 1⅛ cents; or, on the quantity consumed, $2,250,000. There is another feature of this new tariff. In the proposed tariff, we say 15 per cent. may be brought in by the refiners over No. 14 and may be entered by the polariscopic test. At a test of 92, that would be a duty of $1.73 per 100 lbs.; 15 per cent of the entire consumption is equal to 30,000,000 lbs., and at the rate of $1.73 per 100 lbs. that would give $519,000. The rate on similar sugar to other importers is 35 per cent. and 1½ cents per pound, making a cost of 3½ per cent., or equal to $2.73 per 100 lbs., amounting to $819,000. This, therefore, gives 1 cent more duty to be paid by the importer than by the refiner, or an increase of $300,000. If we compare the enormous protection given to sugar, as compared to the protection given to other things, in which labor is more employed, we will find that the refining industry is protected beyond all reason. Take the case of locomotives built at Kingston, the constituency I have the honor to represent. A locomotive costs on an average $7,500; the duty imposed is about $750 or that much protection. The labor in getting out a locomotive is 50 per cent. of the outturn, or $3,750 in value, so that this labor value of $3,750 has a protection of $750 or 20 per cent. The cost of a locomotive in the United States now is $6,000, and the duty is 25 per cent., or $1,500. Compare this with the protection given to sugar, at 6 cents a pound, it would take 125,000 lbs. of sugar to equal $7,500, the price of a locomotive. The duty on that at $1.60, which is a little higher than the Department expects to get—but I will give them the full benefit of the tariff and it may be produced at that, if properly tested—would be $2,000. The duty on the same quantity of American sugar at 4 cents would be $5,000, or, at the exact rate of $3.96, the actual duty would be $4,950. Now the labor employed in the refining of sugar is not more than 10 per cent. of the output; that is, $750 on an output of $7,500. This gives a protection to labor in the sugar refineries of 400 per cent, or twenty times that given to labor in locomotive works. Our locomotive works have been closed up for the last two years, lying idle, at Kingston, but they have resumed work very recently to the extent of one-third of their capacity, and this may be said in their favor, that, besides employing so large a percentage of labor, they furnish a school in which young men will learn the highest mechanics, and after four years apprenticeship will go out and be able to earn high wages. I cannot understand, therefore, why the Government should not protect such works, if they are to carry out their policy of protection, more especially as this is an article which can well stand the tax, while the other article is an article of consumption which should not be taxed.

On resolution 5, export duty on logs.

Mr. McLELAN. I propose to amend this by striking out after "spruce logs, $3," and inserting "$1 per thousand feet," being the same duty as at present. In pine logs, I propose to strike out the figure "$3" and insert "$2." And I propose to amend the proviso that the Government may, by an Order in Council, at any time, increase the duty or strike it off. This is to enable us to meet circumstances that may arise in our relations with other countries in this connection.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman has probably done wisely under all the circumstances in abandoning the proposition to increase the duty to $3 a thousand on pine logs, and I have no objection to offer to his suggestion for reducing that, but I doubt very much the propriety of the Government retaining in their hands the power, without the consent of this House, to increase the duties. That appears to me a very objectionable proposition, and against that I must protest. No doubt the hon. gentleman, like many other hon. gentlemen in this House, has received very strong remonstrances from the trade and those concerned in it as to the effect of his proposed legislation, which I took occasion to tell him at the time was dangerous; and I am glad to see that the Government have on second thoughts, wisely I think, abandoned their proposition in Parliament. I trust they will be still wiser, and abandon their proposition in part to keep in their hands the somewhat unconstitutional and certainly unusual power of increasing the export tax on these articles. That, if done at all, should be done, I contend, by consent of Parliament, and is not a fit and proper thing to depute to the Executive.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, but, Mr. Speaker, the proposition as laid before the House originally was that the duty on pine logs should be $3, and the House would no doubt have sanctioned that. For reasons which the hon. gentleman no doubt quite appreciated, the policy of the Government is, on second thoughts, as the hon. gentleman says, to make it $2. The $2 per thousand duty on pine logs is not at all a protection against our forests being swept away and the logs being carried off from our own mills to another country. There is a possibility of restrictive legislation elsewhere in this regard, and it is well to leave us the power the House would have given us originally to levy the tax.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the House has not given the power. The hon. gentleman proposes to take it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am very much gratified that the Government have seen fit to reduce the export duty to $2 per thousand, a sum equivalent to the American import duty upon lumber. I do not think the Americans can object to that rate of duty. One duty equalises the other. Logs are introduced into the United States free of duty and lumber is charged a duty of $2 per thousand, placing Canadian lumber at a disadvantage of $2 per thousand, so that this export duty on sawlogs will equalise it. The Government have acted wisely, and I have no doubt they have received from the trade in nearly all parts of the Dominion representations as to the fear entertained by lumbermen that the imposition of a duty of $3 might be considered a discriminating duty and might lead to trouble. It is always considered inadvisable to fool with the heels of a mule, particularly if you are doing it with a stick, and we might have realised the truth of that adage if we had carried out what was originally proposed. The hon. the First Minister says that the duty of $2 is not a protection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not sufficient.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am unable to agree with the hon. gentleman in that respect. The fact is that practically we have no trade in the export of sawlogs at the present moment. The total exportation of pine sawlogs last year was 380,000 feet, and the duty collected was $380. That practically is no trade at all. The total revenue from export duties was $12,305. This was largely derived from spruce, to the extent of $11,165. From pine, $380 was received, and $756 from shingle bolts. Now, the fear enter-

tained by our lumbermen that sawlogs would be exported in great quantities is, I think, a groundless one. Under a $1 per thousand export duty, which has been the duty for many years, I think since 1879, the trade has only assumed the proportions calling for an exportation of 350,000 feet, yielding a revenue last year of $380. It is true there have been representations made to the Government, no doubt, that Michigan parties were engaging in the business of exporting pine logs. I am aware that there is one firm, and one firm only, that has embarked in that business, the firm of Emery Bros., of Towas, Michigan, and with them or with others this is purely an experiment, and I believe it will be a disastrous experiment. My knowledge is a practical knowledge in regard to towing timber, extending over a period of twenty-five years, and I know that the towing of short logs is an exceedingly hazardous business. Even on short routes of forty or forty-five miles in Michigan great losses are sustained, and whoever attempts to tow short logs across the Georgian Bay, up Lake Huron, and up Saginaw Bay, I believe will be content to retire from the business and not incur the losses which would be incurred in more than one season. I do not believe that the business will grow to anything at all, and I think it will be time enough to impose a retaliatory duty when we see that it has attained large proportions.

Mr. O'BRIEN. What about the long timber?

Mr. CHARLTON. The towing of long timber is an entirely different business from the towing of sawlogs. Trade in long timber is done to the extent of about 40,000,000 feet a year from the lower end of Lake Erie, and probably 25,000,000 feet from Ohio ports. It may be carried on by the same party, as the lumber trade is a profitable and legitimate trade, and does not interfere at all with the lumber trade. It is sold in New York at $3 per thousand more in the log than the logs would bring at the same spot. It is used pretty much for the same purpose as our square timber. Large bills are procured from Michigan at lower rates than it can be from this class of timber. I think it would be well to exempt from the operation of these duties timber over 50 feet, because that is not for the purpose of being sawed into lumber, and will not interfere with the operations of our saw mills. I place that limit, because it might be possible to take timber 32 feet in length, which would make two saw logs, and evade the law by cutting it into sawlogs after it reached the other side; but timber of 50 feet and upwards costs so much more to handle and put into the water, that there is no fear of its being used in that way. It would cost $2 a thousand more to put it into the water.

Mr. MITCHELL. And it is much more valuable.

Mr. CHARLTON. And it is much more valuable, so that its disposition would not interfere with the safeguards we seek to establish for the prevention of the export of logs to American mills to be converted into ordinary merchantable lumber there. The Minister, I think, ought in any event to change the phraseology here from logs to sawlogs, because a mast, spar, or stick of timber for piling is a log, though not a saw-log, and it will give rise to confusion in the interpretation of the Act. One collector may hold that a raft of masts or spars may be logs. Another collector may hold that, if it is not designed to be converted into lumber, it is not. I find that the exportation of masts and spars last year was considerable, but very small from Ontario. From Ontario the exportation was only six pieces; from Quebec, 655 pieces; from Nova Scotia, 15,500 pieces; from New Brunswick, 109 pieces, and from British Columbia, 1,043 pieces. This was not liable to export duty under the law, and no export duty was collected, but a collector might interpret the law, which reads that an export duty shall be levied upon logs, so that masts and spars might be liable to that duty, and it might be collected. I know that in past years duties have been collected. I myself have paid export duties upon masts and spars under the arbitrary ruling of the collector, and it was not worth while to appeal to the Customs authorities to get the mistake rectified. I suggest that that change be made at all events. If the Minister does not see fit to exempt timber of fifty feet and upwards, I suggest that the words "sawlogs" be used in place of "logs," so that masts, spars and timbers not designed for sawing, would be exempt from the operation of the duty. I have very serious doubts about the propriety of the Government reserving to themselves the power by Order in Council to raise this duty. It would be a grave step to take, and I think they had better consult this House before doing so. It is not necessary. I do not think in the next twelve months there will be any increase in this trade. I doubt whether the trade of towing on the lakes ever assume proportions to justify the alarm that exists among many lumbermen. It will be time to deal with this question when we see our timber leaving this country to go to American mills. In the meantime the reservation of this power may be held to be a menace, and I am throughly satisfied that the imposition of an export duty of $3, 50 per cent. greater than the American import duty, would produce bad consequences. Congress at present is in an ugly and vindictive mood, and they would adopt a retaliatory policy on any pretext that might be offered them. We have reason to look with apprehension on the proposition to impose this duty, fearing it may lead to retaliation by the imposition of $3 per thousand upon lumber, and possibly a duty of $4. I think the Government had better drop that proposition to retain power by Order in Council to advance these duties. The necessity for the advance of these duties is not going to arise this year. The amount of business that is going to be done, even if this party does engage in the towing of logs from Michigan, will be insignificant. None can be put in until the following winter, and by that time we will know better the condition of things, the condition of trade, and the Government will understand better whether it is likely to be necessary to impose this additional duty.

Mr. McLELAN. The Customs Department informs me that some time ago the word "sawlogs" was used. They found great difficulty, and asked the House a year or two ago to change it to the word "logs," and, with the advice of the Customs, I adopted that term.

Mr. DAWSON. No doubt the duty on logs may have the effect of protecting Canadian logs and leading to the construction of saw mills on Canadian territory. But there is another subject to which I wish to draw attention. Now, in our section of the country, in the western part of Algoma, people import rough lumber from the United States, rough sawn lumber, and they import the higher grades of that in order to dress it and saw it up, and all the manufacturing is done on our side. This *ad valorem* duty of 20 per cent. on that renders it equivalent to 25 per cent. to them by the time they saw it. These men who are engaged in the lumber trade have written to me on the subject, and they say this:

"On American lumber coming into Canada, the duty is 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, which largely exists as a tax on Canadian lumber."

And they suggest:

"We want a clause inserted in the Canadian Customs tariff to equalise the duty, and it should run as follows: Leaving the balance of the tariff relative to lumber in full force as it is, sawed boards, planks, deals and other lumber of white pine, and not elsewhere specified, $2 per thousand feet, board measure; but when lumber of any sort is planed or finished in any way, then there shall be levied and paid, in addition to the rates levied for rough or unfinished lumber, the sum of 50 cents per thousand feet, board measure, for each side so planed or finished, and if planed on one side and tongued and grooved, $1.50 per thousand feet, and if planed on two sides and tongued and grooved, $3 per thousand feet."

That I think would be a very fair arrangement. It would enable people there to dress rough lumber from the United States and be a great advantage to the mills we have on our side, without, I think, doing any harm.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad the Government have decided not to increase the duty upon spruce logs, but I regret they have not seen their way clear to abolish it altogether. As I pointed out the other evening, this duty bears entirely upon the Province from which I come. The whole of the duty paid last year came from the Province of Quebec, and anybody who is familiar with the border between Quebec and the New England States must be aware that a great many logs have been exported thence without paying duty. People who have bought logs in our country have taken them over into the United States and have not paid the duty, but in consequence of their being obliged to pay a duty, were they found out, they have paid our people to cut these logs on their farms, in the neighborhood of the border, the lower prices which was necessitated by the fact that they have to pay the duty. The consequence is that while our farmers clearing up land in that portion of the country, have obtained the less price which the duty necessitates, the Government of the country have not obtained that duty. We know that the sum of $49,000 obtained from spruce logs which according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, came from exports last year from the Province of Quebec, is absurdly below the mark, as was pointed by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) the other evening. It is evident that there must be some great blunder either in the returns or in the printing of the blue book, and I have no reason to believe it was in the printing, because I know that the logs are not very carefully examined or tested, and I believe that a large number indeed are carried across the border without paying duty. This is a matter which bears entirely upon the people who cut the logs. The men who are clearing up the land and trying to make farms in that new country get just so much less for the logs they have to sell and they are taxed for the benefit, so far as I can see, of nobody at all. The Government of this country does not obtain the revenue; the lumbermen here are not benefited, because it is necessary, from the relative position of the land and the mills, that they shall go across the border and not be sawed up on our side of the line. I think, therefore, this tax is a burdensome one, bearing especially upon a comparatively poor section of the community, and which ought to be abolished.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press the House to support his amendment. It is extremely objectionable to propose that the Executive should be entrusted with the power of increasing the duties. It is so far as I know unprecedented and it is certainly very objectionable. It is not, as the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has said, a reservation of power, it is a proposal to grant this power to the Executive. Then, there is no special reason for it in this case. We are not very far removed from the end of one Session to the beginning of another. If circumstances at any particular time require an increase of this duty or the creation of any other duty it is not very long to wait till Parliament will meet and the representatives of the people be called together to decide whether a duty should be curtailed or increased. I trust, therefore, the hon. gentleman after making certain improvements in the proposition submitted to the House will not accompany those improvements with a proposition which is objectionable from a constitutional point of view and from every other point of view, for I agree with the hon. gentleman, that so far from this being advantageous in a political point of view, it is more likely to be disadvantageous than otherwise.

Mr. HESSON. I hope the Government will not reduce the duty to the old standard of $1. Our forests are now being denuded and destroyed, and our logs are being carried away. I read letters the other evening that went to prove that this was the case and that lumberers are building large barges to take lumber over to Bay City and Saginaw.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is all bosh.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman has no right to say so. The evidence came from responsible gentlemen residing in the country. They are much interested in preventing this state of things continuing, and they have taken the trouble of making it known to me. I know it is not all bosh. It is a very serious matter, and the Government should not permit it to continue. We are entitled to put as much export duty on sawlogs as the Americans put on our lumber. We are doing a gross injustice to those gentlemen who have erected mills here to permit people to come here and buy timber limits and cut the logs and float them down Georgian Bay or Lake Huron and take them to the American market. They only pay $1 per thousand on logs measured in the water, when they are very indifferently measured, and if we export 1,000 feet of boards they charge us $2. It is a gross injustice. I hope the Government will not alter their policy. I should be very sorry if a gentleman, and especially one interested in the lumber trade in the Western States, in Michigan, by favoring the exportation of sawlogs in a rough state and thus destroying our milling interest and damaging the lumbering interests of the country as well, should succeed in its proposition.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to offer a personal explanation as I have been personally alluded to. I may be permitted to say in the first place that I used an expression that is not strictly parliamentary, and I retract it. The hon. gentleman alluded to me as a party engaged in lumbering in Michigan and consequently interested in having an export duty on logs. I am happy to inform my hon. friend that my interests in Michigan have ceased, that I am closing out my business there, and that I have acquired limits in Canada, and that it was from the standpoint of a Canadian lumberman engaged in Canada that I specially advocated freedom from duty. That being my position I felt very apprehensive of the effect on the Canadian lumber trade of the proposition made by the Government when these resolutions were submitted. I think the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) is also under misapprehension with regard to the duty. The Finance Minister does not propose to reduce the duty to $1, but to $2, but on spruce only, which is a very inferior class of timber, it is proposed that the duty should be put back at $1 per thousand.

Resolution, as amended, concurred in.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg to move that "logs" be struck out and "sawlogs" inserted instead. Unless this be done, sawlogs, masts and piling will be liable to the export duty under this law, and those have been classed under the denomination of logs for a number of years past.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Minister of Finance will surely give us some explanation before he asks us to follow an unconstitutional course in regard to giving the Government the power to impose duties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I disagree with the hon. gentleman that there is anything unconstitutional in the House giving certain powers by way of delegation to the Executive. It is to be remembered that the committee of the whole House has already agreed to impose a duty of $3 per thousand. On consideration, the Government have decided to recommend the House to reduce that to $1, but they ask the House to give them power to increase it to $3 should they think it in the public interest to do so. It may be very much in the public interest to have that power before Parliament meets again. It cannot be in any sense by way of menace

to anybody, because the same resolution that gives power to impose $2 gives special power to the Government to take the duty away, should they see fit. Should trade negotiations result in giving us free access to other markets this might be done. That is not unconstitutional. Parliament has given the Government power to take off duty and Parliament is asked to give them power to increase the duty to what has been already voted by Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman is laying down a doctrine which is wholly unconstitutional. The power of taxation is different from any other power sanctioned by Parliament. The hon. gentleman proposes that Parliament shall give the Government that delegated power which is only given to Parliament to raise taxes.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is it the intention of the Government to impose an extra duty on masts, spars and piles?

Mr. McLELAN. The wording is the same as in the old Act, and I do not know that there have been any complaints of hardship.

Mr. CHARLTON. Under the same wording, spars have gone out free of duty in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, while a duty has been charged in Ontario. There has been confusion in the interpretation and application of the law, and it is to remedy that difficulty that I ask that we should define what the law is. Now masts, spars or piles are not sawlogs, and this duty is to prevent the exportation of sawlogs for the use of American mills. Masts are not exported to be used in mills but on vessels; so with spars, while piles are exported for the purpose of constructing docks and wharves. I hold that we should define what lumber is and not leave the law open to the varying construction of inspectors, as has hitherto been the case.

Mr. SPROULE. They even take pine trees the full length, and when they arrive at their destination, they are cut into lumber.

Mr. BLAKE. I move to strike out so much of the amendment as gives power to the Governor in Council to increase the duty.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will ask the Finance Minister what is the reason for increasing the duty on shingle bolts. This is a class of wood that is made up by the poorer settlers from refuse pine, and in my own section the duty is a very great hardship. I think the imposition of the duty is an error, and I cannot see why it should be increased, as the exportation was only 756 cords.

Mr. McLELAN. Many of the shingle mills near the border have been deserted, and the wood for them taken over in boats to the United States and manufactured there.

Mr. SPROULE. Along the Manitoulin Island, they take away both cedar and pine for shingles in boat loads to the other side.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is a case of peculiar hardship to a poor settler, who wants to buy a barrel of flour, that he should not take these refuse pieces of pine log and convert them into shingle wood and get the highest price he can. It seems to me that this is getting protection pretty near the mud sill.

Mr. SPROULE. Some parties have contemplated building shingle mills, and after commencing operations they have stopped, because the shingle bolts were taken to the American side, and they were inclined to believe that they could not get supplies for any length of time.

Resolutions concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

CUSTOMS ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No 148) further to amend the Acts relating to Duties of Customs and the importation or exportation of goods into or from Canada.

Bill read the first and second times, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUBSTITUTES FOR BUTTER.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 149) to prohibit the manufacture and sale of substitutes for butter.

Bill read the first time.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know what is in the Bill, but I hope it does not prohibit the importation of all substitutes for butter. The title is rather wide. There are a good many very wholesome substitutes for butter.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wonder if it would cover molasses. Because in my part of the country the people use a good deal of it as a substitute for butter.

Title changed by adding after "sale of" the word "certain."

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

PUBLIC PRINTING AND STATIONERY.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 132) respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery be concurred in. He said: The amendment is not a substantial one. Section 12 of the Bill provides that every year each Department and each House of Parliament shall make a statement of the printing and stationery it requires. The 13th section provides that the Minister shall report to the Council the quantities required with the estimates of cost; and the Senate has added a provision, to preserve its privileges, that a report shall be made of the quantities as ordered by each House of Parliament.

Mr. TROW. I move that the following words be inserted in place of the words inserted by the Senate:—

In regard to the Stationery Departments of both Houses of Parliament, this Act shall not apply; such Departments shall be controlled by the members of each House respectively.

This amendment is merely to leave the purchase of paper as it was formerly in the hands of the members of Parliament. The selections are made in the old country; they are not made here. Firms here are not required to manufacture the articles required.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They are, and the contract is given to them. I have only to say that this amendment would knock the Bill to pieces. The position which my hon. friend embodies in the amendment has been fought against in England, and the Joint Committee of the House of Lords and the House of Commons, in 1885, were strong in their recommendation that all the stationery should be controlled by the controller of stationery, and that his orders should be followed in regard to the quantity, quality and variety of the stationery required. I have not put that provision into this Bill, leaving both Houses to control their own stationery.

Mr. MITCHELL. While on this subject, I wish to say that I think the quality of the stationery we have been getting during the last few years has been extremely bad, and I have no doubt that, under the improved system, we shall get a better quality for the same money.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If it has been so, it is our own fault. If every year a sub-committee of members, knowing what stationery is, were appointed to make a selection of stationery as to quality and variety, I believe it could be obtained both cheaper and better than it is at present.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I think that the stationery supply to the Senate and House of Commons is quite sufficient without giving us these trunks. I do not know what is done in other countries, but the unlimited supply of stationery given hon. members during the Session does away with the necessity of giving them a trunk full to bring home and distribute in their neighborhood.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I am glad to see I have succeeded in making one convert.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman says he does not know what is done in other countries. If he did, he would make very little objection on the score of economy. In the United States, each representative gets a writing desk, a dozen gold pens, two dozen knives, about $100 worth of paper and several other perquisites.

Amendment negatived, and Senate amendments concurred in.

SUPPLY—ADMINISTRATION OF THE NORTH-WEST.

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

Mr. MILLS. I regret I have not had an opportunity of submitting to the House the motion I proposed to submit at an earlier period, so that there would be ample opportunity to discuss the important question relating to the administration of affairs in the North-West. I cannot hope, at this hour of the evening or this period of the Session, even to give the most scanty outline of the views I entertain of the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite have pursued for some years in the administration of affairs in the North-West. I shall content myself with giving a brief review of a few of the more important features connected with the administration of the Government. These matters are, no doubt, of very great importance, and I propose to ask the House to pronounce a judgment on the motion it put in your hands. I do not expect the judgment will be such as the facts warrant, but notwithstanding that, it is important, with the view of fairly placing before the country the issues that exist between hon. gentlemen on this side and on that, that I should take this course. In my opinion there have been many cases of exhibitions of incapacity, negligence and mismanagement in the conduct of affairs in the North-West Territories, and I think it is important these should be brought fairly before the country at the earliest opportunity, so that the country may be enabled to judge of the incompetency of the present Administration. We know that it is admitted by hon. gentlemen opposite that the North-West Territories are fertile, that the country is well watered, that the climate, although rigorous in the winter season, is, on the whole, healthful, but nevertheless there has not been made, in return for the enormous expenditure in that country during the past eight years, that progress in its settlement which so large an expenditure of public money ought to have brought about. The hon. gentleman who leads the Government told us, in 1880, that if it had not been for the change that took place in 1873 by the formation of the Administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), the North-West country would have been in a very different condition from that in which it then was. I am not going to discuss the merits or the demerits of the policy of the Mackenzie Government. I have not the time, nor is it necessary to do so; but I propose to point out the inadequate results which have followed the administration of this Government. Mr. Wells, the American statistician, has stated that the whole wealth of the United States is not more than the industry of the population produces in four years. The same statement might be made with regard to this country, but the results have not borne out that calculation. The First Minister, in 1880, gave us his views as to what was likely to be accomplished by 1890, through the course he had marked out. The leader of the Opposition said on that occasion that this country had not made the same progress in population as the neighboring Republic, and the First Minister replied that the reason was, we had not adopted a protective tariff and a railway policy, and that by the adoption of both the same satisfactory results which had been obtained in the United States, would be exhibited in this country. He said that instead of this country showing a progress during ten years of 13 per cent. of population, it would show, as did the United States, a progress of 22 per cent. He also told us that at that time, in 1879, there were going into the North-West Territory about 20,000 people, and that the report of the Minister of Agriculture, who estimated the number at 12,000, was inaccurate, that the number estimated was ridiculously small, because the Minister of Agriculture had not taken into consideration the large number which had crossed into the country from various points in other ways than by rail. He told us the population of the North-West Territory was greater than the Minister of Agriculture had shown it to be, and he expressed the confident expectation that there were 25,000 people going in that year, but he would put the figure at the ridiculously small amount of 25,000. He further stated that the number of people going into the North-West Territories would show a yearly average of about 5,000 for the years following. According, therefore, to the statement made by the hon. gentleman at that time, the population in the North-West Territories should, by 1890, amount to 75,000 at least. The hon. gentleman also said there was no danger of the lands of the North-West Territories passing into the hands of speculators, because the power of establishing municipal institutions and imposing taxes would have the effect of transfering the property that might be held by speculators into the hands of *bonâ fide* owners at an early day, and the Government therefore did not think it necessary to take any precautions to prevent a large portion of the territory passing into the lands of private owners for purposes purely speculative. The hon. gentleman also told the House of the results he expected to derive from the policy he was then pursuing. He said that by the year 1890 the amount of cash to be realised by the sale of railway lands would be $16,272,000; by pre-emptions, $16,440,000; and by other sales, $38,533,000; so that, by 1890, the country would derive cash from the sales of land $71,305,000. The hon gentleman assumed that the cost of surveys would be $2,000,000 and the cost of management of the lands $400,000 more during that period. So that the country would have a net sum in cash, to apply in diminution of the obligations that were about to be incurred in the course the Government were pursuing, of $69,000,000, so that by the year 1890 the $75,000,000 which the hon. gentleman estimated the Canadian Pacific Railway would cost would be reduced to the sum of $6,000,000. Then the hon. gentleman, according to the statement he made, showed a hope that by this year the population that would go in from without to that country would number 308,000, and that during the next four years 295,000 would be added to that number, so that by 1890 the hon. gentleman counted upon an addition to the existing population and the natural increase of that existing population of 600,000. In fact, the pictures which the hon. gentleman drew of the future of the North-West Territory were something like those found in the advertisements along the Missouri River in the story of Mark Tapley and Martin Chuzzlewit. What is the actual cost of surveys up to this moment? According to the reports the hon. gentleman has from time to time brought down, they amount to $4,000,000, and the net income from the sale of public lands is something like $500,000. Let us look at the cost that has been incurred in

connection with the acquisition of the North-West Territories in order that we may see precisely what the hon. gentleman had marked out and expected to accomplish. There was in the first place the payment of $1,460,000 to the Hudson's Bay Company; there are the surveys and the management of lands, $4,000,000; the expense annually upon Indians in the North-West in the extinguishment of the Indian title that, under the management of the hon. gentleman, represents a capitalised sum of $25,000,000; the first rebellion, $1,000,000; the second rebellion, $4,750,000, the millions that might be charged to the North-West in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, representing altogether an annual charge something in excess of $4,000,000; and up to this moment the hon. gentleman by his management, by the policy he has pursued in the North-West Territories, has succeeded during eight years in securing a net sum of $500,000. The First Minister told us in 1880 that the lands were a sacred trust, that the Government intended to economise the resources of the North-West Territories, and to apply the funds derived from the sale of those lands to the extinguishment of the Canadian Pacific Railway debt and for the obliteration of those burdens that were incurred in connection with the acquisition of that territory. Well, let us ask how far the expectations of the First Minister have been realised. He, in fact, said to the people four or five years ago: In the North-West you have a great estate; put the management of that estate in our hands, give us a large sum of money to expend upon it, place $100,000,000—for that is what he has practically asked—at our disposal for the improvement of that estate, and we will manage it in such a way that in fifteen years we will wipe out the whole of the burden that has been incurred. In fact, the hon. gentleman assured us that there was to be no permanent burden incurred in connection with the acquisition of the North-West Territory. I wish to call the attention of the House to this fact—and I have briefly stated some of the more prominent points connected with the policy of the hon. gentleman—how large a portion of this expenditure has been altogether unnecessary. In fact, the greater portion of it is due to the mismanagement of the North-West affairs. Take, for instance, the case of surveys. The hon. gentleman has expended at least $3,000,000 more than was necessary for that purpose. If the rebellions are due to the misconduct, the mismanagement, the maladministration of public affairs, then there has been upwards of $5,000,000 upon that; and there has been, through the carelessness and indifference in the conduct of Indian affairs, an addition of $15,000,000 actually to the capitalised sum of that extent when fairly considered. Now, if we look at the surveys and at the sale of public lands, we will see how much out of all proportion the surveys have been to the actual requirements of the public service. Down to 1873, there were surveyed 4,700,000 acres, and there were disposed of as homesteads, by sale and pre emption, 212,000 acres. In 1874, 4,000,000 acres were surveyed, and 334,000 acres disposed of. In 1875, the surveys were 665,000 acres, and the sale 156,000 acres. In 1876, the surveys were 420,000 acres, and the sales 132,000 acres. In 1877, the surveys were 231,000 acres, and the sales 423,000 acres. In 1878, 306,000 acres were surveyed, and the sales were 709,000 acres. In 1879, 1,130,000 acres were surveyed, and the sales were 1,096,000 acres. In 1880, the hon. gentleman surveyed 4,472,000 acres, and sold 682,000 acres. In 1881, he surveyed upwards of 9,000,000 acres, and sold 1,000,000 acres. In 1882, he surveyed 9,460,000 acres, and sold 2,600,000 acres. In 1883, he surveyed 27,000,000 acres, and sold 1,831,000 acres. In 1884, he surveyed 6,400,000 acres and sold 1,000,000 acres. In 1885 he surveyed 39,000 acres and sold 481,000 acres. So that the hon. gentleman, up to the close of last year, surveyed, with what was surveyed during the period of his predecessors, nearly 70,000,000 acres, and he nominally disposed of less than 11,000,000 acres. When I say 11,000,000, that represents a very much larger area than the actual sales, for the hon. gentleman knows that there are a large number of homesteads taken up every year that are cancelled, and in fact the number of cancelled homesteads became so great that the hon. gentleman ceased to give those as portion of the report from the Department of the Interior. I find that, according to the reports from the Department of the Interior, the homesteads taken up cover an area of 5,193,000 acres, and yet it is no exaggeration to say, looking at the reports that have actually come to us in the few years in which reports of the cancellations were given, that 30 per cent. of this area at least has been cancelled. What are the facts? The hon. gentleman has surveyed a larger area of country than at the present rate of settlement would be occupied for the next sixty years. What I wish to call the attention of the House to is that this was altogether unnecessary, that the expense need not have been incurred; that the hon. gentleman, when he came into office, changed the whole plan of surveying the North-West Territories, and not only produced serious dissatisfaction amongst the settlers by the adoption of the policy he entered upon, but incurred a needless expenditure, and surveyed large areas of the country that will be required to be surveyed again before the country is settled. In fact, the interest upon the money spent on surveying will exceed the principal sum itself before those lands are occupied. The policy that was adopted by the hon. gentleman's predecessors in office, which was begun by Mr. Laird, was a system of triangulation and astronomical survey to fix the latitude and longitude, to establish the principle of meridian lines and base lines, and the various scattered settlements over the North-West Territories. If time would permit me, I could point out that in 1878 this work was done, that for the whole of the settlements upon the Saskatchewan River the latitude and longitude were settled in those two years, that traverse surveys were made, that plans of the settlement were sent to the Department as well as plans of survey, and that it was possible to survey, during the year 1879 and the year 1880, every foot of land that was in the possession of any squatter in the North-West Territories. I need only mention the fact that in 1877 this special survey was pressed on to Prince Albert, and the whole of that settlement was surveyed in accordance with that plan. The lots were made as wide as the convenience of the squatters required, and were made two miles in depth. In 1878 the St. Laurent settlement was surveyed, and the survey extended, according to the report of the surveyors, for twenty miles along the South Saskatchewan. It was begun by Mr. Aldous in September, 1878. Nine miles of that settlement was surveyed upon the plan of making the lots ten chains wide and two miles in depth. The remainder of that land was not surveyed that season, as there was not time to complete it, and the hon. gentleman, when he came in, applied the rectangular system to a great portion of the plans which gave rise to serious difficulties between the settlers on the banks of the Saskatchewan. If I had time I could read a report made by the same special surveying party who were engaged in 1877-78, and I could show beyond controversy that in every case the plan of survey was subordinate to the plan of settlement. Where the plan was with a view to river fronts, with lots of considerable depths and narrow frontage, this system was strictly adhered to. Sir, this plan of survey was adopted, and this work that was done enabled these hon. gentlemen, when they came into office, to complete the survey of all the settlements in the North-West Territory, which for years were neglected. In fact, if the hon. gentlemen had carried out the plan of surveying the settlement under the special survey plan, half a million acres of land

of these settlements on the North Saskatchewan could have been surveyed. The House will get a better notion of it if I take a single case of the special survey party No. 4. I will pass over the other three, because I do not wish to trespass upon the indulgence of the House longer than necessary to state the facts connected with the neglect exhibited by the hon. gentlemen in the survey of the various settlements of the North-West Territory. Mr. Aldous, in his report of survey No. 4, says that he made a careful traverse of the river along which a careful survey would extend; and he did this the better to determine along which legal sub-divisions the line in the rear should be run so as to conform as near as possible to a uniform system of lots two miles deep. The report goes on to say:

"In every case where land was occupied and improved and there existed any dispute between the occupants of adjoining claims, I had them to agree together before me on some point which was to be established as their common boundary, in the majority of instances they requested me to decide between them. Their post was then planted where, under the circumstances of the case, I considered it best, divided their claims and they mutually agreed to it as their boundary line.

"When the land was unoccupied and unimproved, merely having been taken up I surveyed it in ten chain lots and entered the claimant's name for it on the plan, stating my opinion to them that such claims could at most merely give them a preferential right to purchase * * * On the 5th of September the survey of Prince Albert settlement was completed, and on the day following we moved to St. Laurent. This settlement extended along both sides of the South Saskatchewan River from its intersection with the 3rd principal meridian south to Gabriel's Crossing, a distance of over twenty miles. I saw that it would be impossible to make a complete survey this season, and therefore determined to work in that portion of the settlement where it was most immediately required.

"A careful instrumental traverse was first made of the river between the points before mentioned. Also a preliminary survey showing all the improvements from which it was evident that the most important part of the settlement lay on the east side of the river below Batoche's Crossing. Here I decided to commence work. I started from the 3rd principal meridian at the north-east corner of section 12, township 44, range 1, west, producing the section line west of the river. From this line the lots are laid out conforming as nearly as possible to 10 chains in width and two miles in depth, one mile north and eight miles south along the east side of the river. Road allowances being left as in the Prince Albert survey.

"Plans of these surveys accompany the report.

"The entire population of St. Laurent consists of French half-breeds, who, with few exceptions, live by buffalo hunting. They simply farm sufficient land to provide themselves with grain and vegetables for winter use. They nevertheless fully understand the advantage of securing land, being well aware that in a few years the buffalo will be exterminated, and that they will be compelled to turn their attention to agricultural pursuits.

Now, the surveyor goes on to state that he has run a base line out to Carrot River, and he recommends the survey of the settlement on Carrot River to the east to Prince Albert, and this same plan was adopted with regard to the settlement on the Saskatchewan. There is a report of the latitude and longitude, of the plan of settlement in the Department, and I ask the Minister to have brought here these plans of every one of these settlements that were sent to the office in the fall of 1878. We find that they also fixed the latitude and longitude of Battleford, that the work of making a special survey of that place was completed on the 8th October, 1878. Yet I find an address some four years later presented to His Excellency Lord Lorne, when he visited that place. Now, I ask the indulgence of the House while I read that address, to show how the people of these settlements regard the course that was pursued by the Government. The address of the people of Battleford is as follows:—

"MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY—

"We, the citizens of Battleford, wish to lay before you the following statement concerning land in this settlement and humbly pray that Your Excellency will cause the matter to be brought before your honorable Ministers at Ottawa, in the hope that more attention may be paid to a petition passing through Your Excellency's hands, than representations sent to the Department have hitherto received.

"Six years have passed away since the first settlement was made here by white men. The spring following such settlement the Government passed an Order in Council declaring a town site reserve of four square miles (or 10,240 acres) at the junction of the Battle and Saskatchewan Rivers. This was followed by a railway reserve of twenty miles on each side of this surveyed route of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which passes through Battleford. The town site reserve included land taken up by settlers above mentioned, and who are promised protection in these holdings by the Dominion Lands Act.

"Petitions have from time to time been sent to the Department requesting a survey and a settlement of the matter, but with no result. Some of these petitions have not even been acknowledged.

"Government buildings have been placed on said land and large portions of the claims enclosed for agricultural and other purposes by the officials, under authority, it is supposed, from the Department To such an extent has this been done on some of the claims that no ground has been left for the settler to farm. Surveyors have at different times wintered here, with full parties under pay, doing nothing, when they might have been blocking out townships and surveying the settlement. This was not done because the surveyors were under pay from the Indian branch, while the lands are another branch of the same Department. With due respect to Your Excellency, we suggest that carelessness or red tape should not be allowed to put the people of Canada to such unnecessary expense, nor the settlers of Battleford to such annoyance. Many good settlers have passed here to go further and fare worse, because the question of land was unsettled, and to-day we are without a mill because no one will risk the necessary expense to put a mill in a settlement where nobody knows how soon he may be ordered off by some of the numerous owners of land in the North-West.

"Your Excellency has doubtless noticed that the houses in Battleford are hardly such as might be expected in the capital of the North-West. The cause is the same, viz., that there is not title to land, and people will not put up expensive houses on land that is in dispute.

"A person would naturally suppose that having made a town site reserve at Battleford, having put up the buildings and located the capital here, having built barracks and filled them with police, the Government would survey the land, settle the disputed claims, and make an attempt to build upon their own town site. But no; having locked up the most advantageous location for a city in the North-West from sale and settlement, they refuse to sell the land themselves or to let any body else sell it and calmly see the settlements on either side of it flourish, but seem to hope that all enterprise here may be choked and Battleford returned to its previous condition as a *rendezvous* for Indians and buffalo.

"Appeals to the Department in person are met with the astonishing answer that if the railroad comes to Battleford, and the land is valuable, the Government will take it, but if it is not worth anything the settler can keep it.

"While surveys are being made all over the country for the Indians, white men cannot get even a civil answer from the Department. Why is this? Because the white men can be depended on to keep the peace, and the red men cannot.

* * * * "In conclusion, we humbly pray that your Excellency will kindly take an interest in our case, and by using the influence which your position gives and your abilities grace, end our trouble and confer a great boon upon a struggling community. We are cut off from many of the commonest pleasures of life and labor under disadvantages enough without having such hindrances thrown in our way."

I might give instances of other settlers and other parties who made similar complaints to those made by the settlers at Battleford. I will refer to another instance, somewhat similar, in dealing with the half breed settlement at Qu'Appelle. Those half-breeds addressed Governor Morris as early as May, 1873, asking the protection of the Government to their holdings. That assurance was given them the following year and the Lieutenant Governor and Minister Laird went there for the purpose of negotiating a treaty with the Indians. A treaty was made with the Indians who claimed the whole country about that region, and this assurance of security in their holding was renewed to the people. In the summer of 1881, 112 of those inhabitants petitioned the Government that surveys of their holdings might be made and that that survey should be made on the same principle that had been recognised in the French settlements of Manitoba and the other settlements of the North-West. They asked for a narrow frontage and great depth, and they also asked that the Government would give them hay privileges at the back of their lots as had been conferred on early settlers in the vicinity of Manitoba. No action seems to have been taken. Somewhat later the whole of the lands occupied by those people seems to have been transferred to a colonisation company, and the company warned off those men, some of whom had been in the country since 1876. On the 29th August, 1882, Lieutenant Governor Dewdney telegraphed from Qu'Appelle to Sir John A. Macdonald as follows:—

"Half-breeds holding old claims in valley waited on me to-day, and complain that Osler Land Company are warning them off and claiming their lands. Would recommend that this company be notified not to interfere with them, have written."

A petition was presented to Mr. Dewdney, and reads as follows:—

"1. That as far back as the year 1860, and up to 1879, we settled or squatted on lands situate on the banks of the Qu'Appelle River; erected comfortable dwellings and outbuildings thereon; ploughed and cultivated the soil, and by continued residence have complied with all the Government conditions.

"2. That we have erected a church and school in a central position; built and opened up roads and bridges, and made numerous improvements which are to-day of great value to the new settler.

"3. That the surveys lately made have discovered some of us to be on railway land, now owned by the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company, whose agent has informed us that we must either buy the land from them or move off. In fact we are informed that they have sold some of the land at present occupied by a *bonâ fide* settler.

"4. That we have refused to comply with the request of the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company, and claim a patent from the Crown for our respective pieces of land, or quarter-sections, fully believing that we are justly and legally entitled to the same. We would, therefore, respectfully ask Your Honor to lay our claims before the right hon. Minister of the Interior (who we know will do us justice in the matter), and request his earliest attention in the matter."

This petition is signed by forty-three half-breeds. The letter of enclosure is dated 29th of August, 1882. In it Governor Dewdney says:

"The declarations set forth in the petition are, to my knowledge, generally correct. I have informed the petitioners that I will duly communicate to them your answer in connection with the said petition.

"With reference to their claims I, yesterday, had the honor to address a telegram to you, and the recommendation therein contained I now beg to reiterate, as I glean that many of the claims are somewhat conflicting, and in some instances run part on even and part on odd numbered sections. I would respectfully suggest that either Mr. Commissioner Walsh or Mr. Inspector Pierce be instructed to examine into and adjust them on an equitable basis; and that, without delay, as the half-breeds interested are very uneasy about their holdings, and may be looked upon as the pioneers of the district."

On the 13th September, Mr. Andrew Russell writes Mr. Dewdney:

"The petition of the half-breeds will be submitted to the Minister on his return to the Department."

No answer was given to the petition. On the 19th March, more than six months after, Mr. Dewdney again wrote:

"Last summer I forwarded a petition from the half-breeds, in reference to their claims in this district, to the Department of Interior, on the occasion of a claim being made by the Qu'Appelle and Ontario Land Company to some of their land.

"There are a number of half-breeds in this district who have been settled in the Qu'Appelle valley for many years. These went on their usual hunt for buffalo, returning to their homes at different times during each year. Others have settled since 1879, and remained pretty constantly on their land.

"The Dominion land surveys have demonstrated that many of them have been living on the same section; and, as land became valuable, a scramble was made by land speculators to obtain the right titles and interests of those settled in the most favored localities."

I wish to call attention to the fact that those people had years before asked for surveys, according to the plan of settlement. They made a like request to the Government subsequently, but the Government paid no heed to their request. When the Government commenced to survey the country, they surveyed it on the rectangular system, and in some instances the people had only a mere gore or a fraction of a lot; and in case there was not a sufficient distance, if the Government had surveyed the lands properly, they could have acquired the amount of land to which they would have been entitled as ordinary settlers. But the Government adopted a plan of survey which was altogether unsuited to the physical circumstances of the country, and was seriously injurious to the settlers themselves. He goes on to say:

"The sooner the claims of these half-breeds are determined the better, as a number of them are *bonâ fide* settlers and deserve consideration. These settlers have not claimed their land as was done in some parts of the North-West by small frontages running back some miles although the bulk of them build their homesteads close to each other and near the water where they could easily catch fish."

In this statement Mr. Dewdney is mistaken because the petitions sent to the Government three or four years ago show that the Government could have made the surveys in conformity with the plan of settlement. But the Government surveyed it differently, and they were willing to accept this after the survey was made if a fair distribution of the land was made, and they were protected from disturbance by the colonisation company, into whose hands the Government had placed those lands. He goes on to say:

"They, however, consider they are entitled to as much land in area as they would have been had they taken up their claims as 'had been the custom with half-breeds.'"

Mr. Dewdney then goes on to suggest a mode of settlement. He urges the appointment of a perfectly independent man, one in no way connected with the speculators in the Qu'Appelle districts. This communication was referred on the 6th July to Mr. Walsh. Mr. J. R Hall, acting Secretary, writes:

"I am directed by the Minister of the Interior to send you herewith the enclosed copies of the correspondence concerning the claims of certain half-breed settlers in the Qu'Appelle Valley and to request that you will at your convenience investigate and report upon these claims."

It will be observed that the petitions of the half-breeds were declared urgent in August, 1882, and they were referred to Mr. Walsh in July, 1883, eleven months after. Now it will be observed that while the Department, eleven months after they were telegraphed to, after they were told that the colonisation company were warning them off their lands, after they were told that those people were uneasy, that they required assurances, that the matter ought to be settled, eleven months after, they referred the matter to the commissioner for his favorable consideration, to be investigated, not at once, but at his convenience. In December, 1883, Mr. J. W. Jackson, member of the North-West Council for this district, writes the Department that he has been waited upon by a large deputation of half-breeds, who say that the Government have been repeatedly petitioned and memorialised to settle the claims of the half-breeds; that there are half breeds in the Territory who have never received anything from the Government but who deserve consideration. So that there was no settlement up to this time. Jackson's letter was not answered till the 13th March, 1884, when Mr. Hall, on behalf of the Minister, writes:

"The Minister has himself been very anxious to have this question settled and on the 18th of September last, Mr. Walsh, the Commissioner of Dominion Lands at Winnipeg, was instructed to visit this locality, and make an investigation into the claims of these half-breeds and other matters. Owing, however, to an unusual pressure of business Mr. Walsh has so far been unable to visit the locality, but he has again been written to and requested to make this investigation at the earliest possible opportunity."

These claims were only settled by the half-breed commission in 1885. Now, I am not going to trouble the House any further with a reference to this question, but I give those instances to show the neglect and the delay which took place in the settlement. I have shown the House that there was every facility for the survey of these settlements in the North-West Territories in the year 1880, and yet we find that in the year 1885 many of these settlements on the Saskatchewan were not surveyed, and these people had not their claims settled or dealt with and that the plan of survey was not at all in conformity with the plan of settlement. I can easily understand how the Government might object to changing their plan of survey if the country was vacant at the time the survey was made, but I confess I do not understand why the Government should have carried out the particular plan of survey which was not best adapted to the physical circumstances of the country, but was altogether at variance with the actual plan of settlement of the country before the survey was made at all. There is but one other matter to which I wish to refer, and that is the question of the issue of patents. There was not only negligence in the survey of the country, there was not only an improper plan of survey, there was not only a total failure to give the people the assurances to which they were entitled, but there has been negligence in the issue of patents, not only to the half-breed population, but to the

white population of that country. I will not read the instances I gave last year, the cases of Mr. Miller and others. They are but instances of hundreds in that country of the extraordinary delay which occurred and of the total absence of capacity on the part of the officers of the Department to comprehend the grievances that the people undertook to bring before them. For the purpose of showing the extent to which the administrative work of the Department has fallen behind the actual settlement of the country, I will first give the number of acres homesteaded since 1878. They were as follows: —

	Acres.
1878	308,640
1879	555,296
1880	280,640
1881	438,707
1882	1,181,652
1883	970,719
1884	533,280

Now, when a homesteader is in occupation for three years he is entitled to his patent, and the following shows the number of acres patented from 1881 to 1884:—

	Acres.
1881	38,514
1882	63,997
1883	292,715
1884	288,365

So that the area patented by the Department, is less than 20 per cent. of the lands for which patents ought to have been issued. I need not detain the House further in the discussion of this question. I stated a very few instances of the neglect, mismanagement and delay which the Government had exhibited in the conduct of the affairs of the North-West, and I beg leave to move the following motion:—

That in the administration of the affairs of the North-West, under the present Ministry, prior to the rebellion, there were grave instances of neglect, delay, mismanagement and misconduct, which were prejudicial to the public welfare, produced serious discontent among the people and retarded the development of the country.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not propose to attempt to follow the hon. gentleman in the speech he has just made. The subject, on which he has spoken briefly and fairly, is one that has been pretty well threshed out during this Session and last Session, and it is not necessary to go over the old ground again. There are one or two clear statements, however, which I think it worth while to make. The hon. gentleman has said that we have gone on with the surveys too rapidly. I do not think that can be regarded as an impediment to the development or settlement of the country. When the hon. gentleman speaks of the number of acres of land which have been granted by the Crown, and which he says have been so small as to render unnecessary the survey of so large an area, he ought to remember that we have granted very large areas to railway corporations. For instance, 25,000,000 acres were granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and it was absolutely necessary, in order that that company might settle its lands, and in order that the alternate sections might be opened to ordinary homesteaders, that they should be surveyed. It was also necessary that the lands of the other railway companies should be surveyed for the same reason. Up to the beginning of the present Session there were granted to railway companies, including the 25,000,000 acres granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, very nearly 40,000,000 acres in the North-West, involving surveys. But, looking at the manner in which the surveys have been carried on by the two Governments, I find one fact, which is of considerable importance, that is, whereas it cost hon. gentlemen opposite to survey the country $12.14 per acre, it has cost the present Government $4.65 per acre; so that if we have made very large surveys, we have at least made them economically, and I believe carefully and well. Then, the hon. gentleman has spoken of the general cost of administration as compared with the revenues of the North-West Territories. All I can say is that while hon. gentlemen opposite were in power their expenditure for administration and the collection of revenue, &c., was $34,226.80 more than they received, whereas, while this Government have been in office, the total expenditures have been but 22 per cent. of the receipts. I think that shows that the administration on the whole has not been an ill-administration. Then, the hon. gentleman says we have been negligent in the issue of patents. All I can say is that while hon. gentlemen opposite were in office they issued 6,577 patents, whereas the present Government have issued 19,217. If there is any one thing more than any other about which there is no complaint in the North-West to-day, it is the issue of patents, which are issued much more promptly than they are in any Province of the Dominion or than they are in the United States. That is one branch of the Department against which no valid objections can possibly be made. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman has referred to the position of the half-breeds at Qu'Appelle. I may say, from information which I have in my hand—and it comes from an exceedingly good source—that the half-breeds at Qu'Appelle claimed no hay lands, for the very good reason that there were none at that place. I may say, with reference to the system of surveys there, that the river system would have been impossible, owing to the conformation of the country and the character of the river. The lands were not handed over to any colonisation company. No half-breed in that section had settled outside the Canadian Pacific Railway belt. The lands in question were sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company; and in every case where a half-breed was settled on a syndicate section, and the fact was established that he had settled prior to the granting of the Canadian Pacific Railway charter, the half-breed got his land. The half-breeds contended that they should have a full homestead. By reason of the broken front on the lake and river, they were not able to get it; but the Government afterwards made up the full quantity to them where they were not able to get the full quantity by the system of survey that was adopted. As I said, I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman in all that he has said, but I take this occasion, which I regret has not offered earlier, to call attention to a statement made in the public press of the country. In addressing the House on a former occasion, I read certain affidavits which were obtained from settlers in the somewhat famous township of St. Louis de Langevin; and the statement has been made by a correspondent of the Toronto *Globe*, who visited the locality, that those affidavits were obtained by force, by threats, by ignorance on the part of those who made them of their contents; and serious attacks have been made against Mr. Pearce—an officer who was in the service of the Department while the hon. gentleman sat on this side of the House as well as since that time, and who, whatever may be said of his manner, is certainly a man of integrity, honesty of purpose and an able administrator—for having, as alleged, forced those unfortunate people to make those affidavits. When I saw that statement in the Toronto *Globe*, I took what I think every hon. member will say was the proper course. I referred it at once to Mr. Pearce for his answer. I felt very keenly the suggestion that any officer of the Department of the Interior would undertake to force people, whether half-breeds or others, to do that which is not only a great impropriety, but a great sin, that is to swear to what is not true. I felt, therefore, that it was due to Mr. Pearce to get from him his explanation Now, I will read Mr. Pearce's answer, which is as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 29th April, 1886.

"SIR,—I notice in the Toronto *Globe* of the 28th instant, a report from its correspondent dated at Regina, the 27th instant, purporting to be the result of an enquiry made by him into the position of settlers in the now

famous township of St. Louis de Langevin, and reflecting upon my conduct in connection with the recent investigation made by me, under instructions from you, having for object the settlement of the land claims of those settlers.

"The statements of this correspondent are entirely untrue, and as the subject is one which affects my personal honor, I desire briefly to refer to them. It is stated:

"'1. That for four years William Bremner could not obtain entry.' The best reply to this will be found in the third clause of Bremner's affidavit, in which he states:

"'3. That at the time of survey we had not made up our minds how we would take up the land. I came up here on account of my family. They desired the land to be taken up as river lots, and we decided to try and obtain it that way. My son Alexander concluded he would be too much cramped, so gave his claim to William Bremner, and moved to section 5. We never applied for entry at Dominion Lands Office, Prince Albert, waiting to see whether entry would be granted in other river frontages or not'

"I represented myself to Mr. Bremner as having been sent to make investigations into the claims of settlers, with a view to instructions being given to the agent to grant entries, which instructions were given by me on leaving Prince Albert, 7th December, 1885. As to his knowledge about the Prince Albert Colonisation Company and its alleged influence in depriving people of their lands, Mr. Bremner, in that paragraph of his affidavit, states:

"'4. That I never was told nor do I believe my son or son-in-law were, or I should have heard of it, that we could not obtain entry for the land as we desired it. Riel once told me possibly we would not obtain it. Had we believed, we would then have abandoned not continuing to make further improvements as we have done.'

"The best comment on the story of their fear that their interest would not be protected in consequence of the allotment to the company is this affidavit of Mr. Bremner, from which it will be seen that so far as his family were concerned they continued making improvements during the whole period of the Riel agitation and subsequent to the outbreak. The same observations apply equally to all the settlers in this township.

"That either Mr. Bremner or his son Joseph subscribed to an affidavit through fear is untrue; in no case were either threats or promises used That they were asked to sign what is not correct is equally untrue. Indeed, the care with which every statement was explained to them, and their carefulness in subscribing to nothing which they did not know to be true, is shown by the closing part of Joseph Bremner's affidavit, as follows:—

"'And declare that the statements contained in the declaration of William Bremner, corroborated by the said Moïse and Alexander Bremner, are true and correct in every particular, except regarding the statement of William Bremner as to the date Alexander commenced residence on his claim, it being stated by Alexander, in April, 1884, not autumn, 1884, as stated by William Bremner.'

"It is said that Moïse Bremner, who witnessed the signature to Pearce's affidavits, declared that Pearce caused only a part of the document to be read. In reply to this, I have to say that Moïse Bremner witnessed no signatures to affidavits, nor was he even present when affidavits were taken from parties other than himself, except possibly that of his father The practice I have always adopted in taking affidavits which, in the performance of my duties for many years, I have been constantly called on to do, is, when parties cannot read, after the affidavit has been prepared on their statement, to read it over carefully to them, and to certify the same in the jurat. Where the party did not understand English, I had it translated, and explained to them in French or Indian, as the case might be. The name of the person so translating it and the fact of such translation being certified to. This, as you will see by reference to the affidavits, was done in the cases in question. The correspondent of the *Globe* states that Norman McKenzie, Jean Baptiste Boucher, Moïse Bremner, George A. McLeod, Peter Carson, Charles Nolin and Thomas Slater, were not asked to sign affidavits, as they could read English. The best answer to this is that Norman McKenzie, Jean Baptiste Boucher and Moïse Bremner, did make affidavits, and these affidavits appear in the report of your speech as printed in the *Hansard*.

"The affidavits of Messrs. McLeod and Carson, it is true, were not obtained for the sufficient reason that McLeod had made his entry on 28th November, 1883, and Carson on the 12th August, 1885. I had only to investigate the case of those who had not obtained entry.

"As to Charles Nolin, his claim was in a township which had never formed a portion of any colonisation company's tracts, and as I was enquiring into the position of those on the land allotted to the Prince Albert Colonisation Company, there was no occasion to obtain an affidavit from him. Thos. Latter is not in the Prince Albert District, his claim being the one now held by Norman McKenzie, who purchased it from him in the autumn of 1883.

"If John Toogood was the only party who obtained entry in October, 1883, it was because he was the only one who applied. All others who were there at that date, or who desired entry, could have obtained the same.

"As to the statement that entries were refused in November, 1883, because the lands had passed into the hands of the Prince Albert Colonisation Company, it is sufficient to say that McLeod obtained entry within the tract as late as 28th November, 1883.

"The statement that a large number of settlers left the tract because they could not obtain entries is not borne out by the facts that some who inspected the land with a view to settling, afterwards settled elsewhere, is no doubt true, but that occurs all over the North-West.

"It is true that as far back as 1882, some settlers who had apparently intended to settle on the South Saskatchewan, or what is now known as St. Louis de Langevin, were persuaded by one Peter Taylor to move to what is now known as the Bresselar Settlement, above Battleford; but it will hardly be contended that their moving was in any way the result of the Prince Albert Colonisation Company. It is not true, as stated, that Mr. Duck and I kept these affidavits secret from Charles Nolin, McLeod and a few others of the most intelligent settlers. There was no reason why they should be shown to either Nolin or McLeod. If the settlers had expressed a wish that they should have been shown to them, they would have been shown—in fact, if Nolin or McLeod had asked to see them, even without being requested to do so by the parties interested, I would gladly have shown them. The correspondent then gives a list of persons who, he says, were in the parish of St. Louis de Langevin when the bonds were sold to the Prince Albert Colonisation Society, and suggests that these persons were deprived of their lands by the Government in favor of the Prince Albert Colonisation Society. In reply, I have to say that the first five named in this list were not in the colonisation company's tract at all. They are as follows: Widow Margaret Ouellette, Charles Nolin, Maxime Lepine, Norbert Finchelt and Michael Canny. The last named, it may be stated, made entry and received his patent long since. As to the others, the following are the facts as to their settlement: Alexander Bremner, commenced residence April, 1884; Alcide Légaré, not yet commenced residence, no buildings, and four acres breaking; George Fiddler, commenced residence August, 1885; Marguerite Boyer (widow), commenced residence June, 1883; Baptiste Boyer, not yet commenced residence, 15 acres breaking, and has improvements to value of $225; W. Bruce, commenced residence June, 1884; Fred. Fiddler, no residence or improvements; Antoine Richard, commenced residence August, 1883; Elzéar Swain, commenced residence July, 1884; Jonas Laviolette, not yet commenced residence; Joseph Bremner, commenced residence September, 1885; Moïse Bremner, commenced residence September, 1884; Jean Baptiste Boucher, jun., commenced residence November, 1882; Jean Baptiste Boucher, sen., commenced residence August, 1882 (the names Baptiste Boucher and Baptiste Boucher, sen., represent one and the same party, the correct name being Jean Baptiste Boucher, sen.); Marie Lavallée has not yet commenced residence (her improvements are worth $60), has been living in Prince Albert for past two years; Solomon Boucher, not commenced residence, has improvements worth $70; Charles Eugène Boucher, not commenced residence, improvements worth $50; Alexander McDougall, commenced residence October, 1884; Norman McKenzie only made his entry in March, 1886. And none of these people were in any way disturbed in their settlement in consequence of the grant to the colonisation company.

"Respectfully submitted.

(Signed) "WM. PEARCE."

That is the statement of Mr. Pearce as to the condition in which he found these people when he made this examination, and in answer to the charge made against him in the *Globe;* but of those affidavits, many, as you will remember, were testified to by Mr. George Duck who is agent for many years in Prince Albert—a gentleman who, I believe, was appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, who is an exceedingly good officer, who understands the French and Cree languages, and who has therefore had a good deal of intercourse with the people of that district. And Mr. Duck makes the following declaration:—

"I, Joseph Duck, formerly local agent of Dominion lands for Prince Albert district, and now employed in the office of the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, Winnipeg, do solemnly declare:

"That I was appointed local agent of Dominion lands in March, 1878, and have been constantly resident in Prince Albert district, from the month of September of that year until January, 1885. That I have read the report of Mr. Superintendent Pearce on the Saskatchewan land claims, addressed to the Minister of the Interior, dated at Prince Albert, N.W.T., 14th December, 1885. That, together with Louis Marion, I accompanied Mr. Pearce on his visit to the settlers named in the list numbered 3, included in said report. That I was personally present at the interviews held by Mr. Pearce with the persons named in the said list. That I know personally the greater part of the persons so named. That, in each and every case in which the persons interrogated were not familiar with the English language, the conversation between Mr. Pearce and the said persons was conducted through the assistance of the said Louis Marion, who acted as interpreter, and who, I know, translated carefully into French or Indian the questions put by Mr. Pearce, and also faithfully translated into English the answers made by the persons interrogated. That the said Louis Marion is a French half-breed, thoroughly familiar with the English and French languages, and also the several Indian languages spoken in the Saskatchewan. That the statements made by Mr. Pearce, as to the result of his investigation herein alluded to, and contained in the report referred to, represent the facts faithfully as they were elicited by him, and truthfully and fully represent the substance of the information obtained by him, which, as above set forth, he had with the persons named in the list No. 3, which forms part of the appendix to the said report. That the chief object of the visit of Mr. Pearce was to complete the investigation commenced by me into the claims of persons resident in the parish of St. Louis de Langevin, which I could not complete owing to the absence, at the time of my enquiry, of many of the settlers having claims to lands in the said parish. That, in each case, and of every person interrogated, he asked the question whether such person had ever been refused entry in accordance with

established survey, whether such person had ever been threatened, or informed, or believed that he would not be allowed to retain the land upon which he had settled, and that without exception the reply to these questions was in the negative. That, the statement having been made that certain of the settlers within the said parish of St. Louis de Langevin had been informed that, owing to the Government having sold the lands upon which they had settled to the Prince Albert Colonisation Company, their claims to these lands would not be recognised either by the Government or the said company, it was deemed advisable to investigate and find out, if possible, the origin of such report. That as many of the settlers as was possible were interrogated on the subject, and pains were taken to trace out the source from which the report had emanated. That without exception the settlers stated clearly and distinctly that no official of the Government or any colonisation company had ever made any statement to that effect. That I have read over the affidavit of Norman McKenzie, one of the settlers referred to, that he is an intelligent Scotchman, a good settler, and a man capable in every way of forming an opinion of his own. That I have also read over the statement of Marguerite Boyer, one of the declarants in the matter, that she is a half-breed widow, whose husband was killed during the recent outbreak, that her affidavit was carefully translated to her by Louis Marion, that she fully understood the same, and that the said affidavit was executed by her in my presence, in her own house, and in the presence of her family, who are conversant with the English, French and Cree languages. That I also heard read over the affidavits of the several Bouchers, Swains, Bremners, Fiddlers, and others relating to the same matter, that I was personally present at the execution of the several affidavits made by them, that I know personally each and everyone of them, that the said affidavits were carefully read over and explained to them in the language with which they were most familiar, that they fully understood the same in every particular, and that they executed such affidavits without inducement of any description whatever, but freely and voluntarily, and without coercion, or fear of coercion, on the part of any person whatever.

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act passed in the thirty-seventh year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled: 'An Act for the suppression of voluntary and extra-judicial oaths.'

(Signed) "GEO. DUCK.

"Declared before me, at Winnipeg, in the county of Selkirk, this 27th day of April, A.D. 1886

(Signed) "H. T. CHAMPION,

"A Commissioner in B. R."

Then I have another affidavit from Mr. Marion, the half-breed who translated these statements and the questions that were asked of these people, and explained the matter to them when asked for information which they gave under oath. This is an affidavit sworn to at Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, in the North-West Territories of Canada:

"I, Louis Marion, farmer, of the settlement of Duck Lake, in the electoral division of Lorne, Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, do solemnly declare:—

"That I am a French half-breed, and have resided continuously at Duck Lake since 1879. That I can speak and understand thoroughly the English, French, Cree and Sauteaux languages. That last December I accompanied Mr. William Pearce on his visit to the French settlements at Batoche and St. Louis de Langevin and their vicinity, and, acting as interpreter, explained thoroughly to the settlers in every case the meaning of all papers they signed for him, and that they understood the meaning of all affidavits they signed for him. That frequently I explained matters to the French half-breeds in both the Cree and French languages, and asked them whether they were sure they thoroughly understood the papers they signed, and that this was done before their signatures were appended, and also that they declared before signing any of the affidavits that they were satisfied and willing to sign the affidavits. That I never heard any of those settlers complain of being disturbed in their holdings either by the Government or by any person authorised by the Government or by any other person whatever.

"And I make this solemn declaration"

This was declared before Mr. D. H. McDowall, justice of the peace of the North-West Territories, on the 27th April, 1886. Now I think that, in the face of the affidavits, after the statement of Mr. Pearce, written on his own behalf and in his own defence, and in the face of the two affidavits I have just read of the two gentlemen who accompanied Mr. Pearce on the occasion, we may fairly consider that the charge, the very serious charge as undoubtedly it would be if it were true, made by the correspondent of the *Globe* that these half-breeds had been induced to swear to what was false under fear or threats that something would happen to them if they did not so sign, is entirely untrue. As I said on rising, I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman in the general argument he has used. We have already had the general question of North-West management sufficiently discussed in several phases during this Session, and I think the House, as well as the country, will realise that, whatever may have been the conduct of this Government, it does not come well from the former Minister of the Interior, the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), to bring up a charge of this kind. I believe that the country will come to the conclusion that, although there may have been, as in the very nature of things there must have been, in the administration of a large department of this kind, with a large territory of that kind so far away from us, some mistakes, some delays, this Government have fairly, honestly and conscientiously endeavored to govern that territory in such a manner as to enure to the prosperity of the country, and that we shall be able in a short time—and we find that a larger immigration is going into that country now than during the last two or three years, at any rate—to realise the great advantages to that country of the policy which the Government has pursued, by opening it up for settlement, by prosecuting surveys in every part of it, and opening it all, we hope, to the reasonable settlement of the people under the law which requires that the settler shall make entry of the land on which he settles within three months of the time when he settles.

Mr. LAURIER. The question involved in the motion of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is so complex that I quite realise that it is impossible to debate it thoroughly at this time of the Session, nor will I attempt to do so. As to what has been said by the Minister of the Interior, I have just this to say. The reproach which was made by my hon. friend to the present Minister was not that the Government had been too rapid in their surveys—

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Oh, yes.

Mr. LAURIER. Oh, no. He altogether misunderstood the objection of my hon. friend. It was not that they had been too rapid in their surveys, but that they had extended their surveys over land unfit for settlement. This was the main charge he made. But the charge I make is that the present Government did not prosecute the system of special surveys upon the larger rivers, which had been inaugurated by my hon. friend when he was in charge of the Department of the Interior. This is the main charge that is brought against the Government, and against which they can offer no excuse. A special system of surveys had been introduced into the country, and it was a necessity of the settlements began by the half-breed population, and not only by these, but by all the Canadian and European settlers upon the large rivers. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that the system of narrow front river lots was not only adopted by the half-breeds but by all other settlers who had settled upon the Saskatchewan River; and he knows also that the system was adopted in Prince Albert, and to some extent in St. Laurent. My hon. friend, while he was in charge of the Department, introduced that system, but the present Government as soon as they came into power in 1878, revoked that system.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No, no.

Mr. LAURIER. I say yes. The Sessional Papears are full of petitions from the half-breeds asking that this special system which had been granted to Prince Albert and St. Laurent, should also be granted to St. Louis de Langevin.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I mean that the policy pursued by the Government when it came in was this: that where there were settlements which desired the system of river survey, it was carried out, but where there were no settlements, as in the case of St. Louis de Langevin, when the surveyors went there, the plan pursued in all other parts of the territory was adopted.

Mr. LAURIER. I take issue altogether with the hon. gentleman, and if I had the Sessional Papers I could show

him resolutions of the North-West Council asking that these special surveys made by Mr. Duck, near St. Laurent, should be confirmed, and asking also a special survey for St. Louis de Langevin, Grandin, and all other places which were inhabited by half-breeds, but that has never been done up to this day, and this is one of the complaints which caused the rebellion. It is no use to attempt to say now the Government has followed the system of special surveys. I deny it. I claim that the prayer of the North-West Council, which was made, if I remember aright, in 1882, asking that these special surveys made by Mr. Aldous in the neighborhood of St. Laurent, should be confirmed, has never been granted by this Government, nor was a similar prayer ever granted in favor of St. Louis de Langevin, and the other half-breed settlements, and this is one of the charges which we make against the Government. The hon. gentleman says to-day that Mr. Wm. Bremner and the other half-breed settlers at St. Louis de Langevin could have obtained their entries if they had chosen to ask for them. Of course they could have obtained their entries upon the regular system of survey, but this is the thing which they would not do; this is the thing that they never would consent to, because they asked for another system of survey.

Mr. BERGIN. They were not disturbed in their holdings.

Mr. LAURIER. Why was it that what was granted to Prince Albert was not given to them? Is there any reason at all that can be given on the floor of this Parliament why the treatment, which was extended to the settlers of Prince Albert, was not also extended to the settlers of St. Louis de Langevin? What was it they asked for in all their petitions? They said: Give us the same treatment which you gave to Prince Albert, give us a special survey, such as was given to Prince Albert. That prayer, which was refused by this Government, was countenanced by the North-West Council and by Mr. Duck, the agent at the time in that locality. Mr. Duck represented, at least on two occasions, that these people had settled upon these lands before the survey, and that therefore they were entitled to a special survey, which he asked for them, but which has never been granted. This is the reason why these people made no entry, and when we are told now that they could have made an entry, it is simply begging the question, because they would not make an entry upon the system of regular survey. They asked a system of special survey, and they asked it because they had settled upon these lands before the regular survey.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). O no, after the survey.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, I again take issue with the hon. gentleman. I can find for him in the Sessional Papers a letter from Mr. Duck of October, 1883, where he says that these people had settled upon the land before the survey, and he asked for them a special re-survey. Mr. Pearce also says that these people had taken up their land before the survey, and that was the reason he asked a special survey for them. Here is the letter of Mr. Duck to which I referred:

"SIR,—As the majority of the settlers on the south branch of the River Saskatchewan in the vicinity of the parish of St. Laurent"——

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is not in St. Louis de Langevin.

Mr. LAURIER. Of course it is not. The population there is not so dense as it is in the Province of Ontario, but so far I understand it, St. Louis de Langevin, Grandin and St. Laurent are all in the same locality, and they were all settled before the insurrection, at all events. The petition goes on:

"had taken up their land previous to the survey, with narrow frontages, similar to those river claims in other parts of this district, and in view of the difficulty likely to be experienced in this office in adjusting the boundary of these claims in accordance with the section survey, I have, at the request of several of the settlers so situated, the honor to request information as to the possibility of re-surveying these sections into river lots on a simpler plan to that adopted in Prince Albert settlement."

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). And that was done in St. Laurent.

Mr. LAURIER. But the petition does not ask for St. Laurent, it asks for the vicinity of St. Laurent, and that is what was not done.

Mr. EDGAR. It was done by my Mr. Mackenzie in St. Laurent.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Then Mr. Duck's letter is absurd.

Mr. LAURIER. Hon. gentlemen are trying to petifog upon this question. The hon. member says this does not apply to St. Louis de Langevin, that the prayer of Mr. Duck did not apply to St. Louis de Langevin, but simply to the vicinity of St. Laurent. Well, Sir, here is the petition of Mr. Bremner who certainly lived in St. Louis de Langevin, and this is what he says:

"ST. LOUIS DE LANGEVIN, 19th November, 1883.

"SIR,—The undersigned farmers, residents of the parish of St. Louis de Langevin, on the south branch of the Saskatchewan, beg to set forth, as follows, their grievance in relation to the lands on which they are located:—

"Many of us are here since the years 1873, 1874 and 1875; others, in still greater numbers, since 1880. Each and all of us took up our lands in accordance with the method formerly prevailing on the lands of the Red River and the Assiniboine—that is to say, in river lots.

"In the autumn of 1880 we petitioned the Minister of the Interior, at Ottawa, for a special survey into river lots, as was granted to the Prince Albert settlement, and to a portion of the St. Laurent settlement. We all signed that petition, not excepting Michael Canny, who has since entered his lot at your office as a sectional lot, and against whose action we hereby strongly protest.

"Since that date, we have sent more petitions, at various times, for the same object, supporting the same with the influence of all persons in authority who took an interest in us, such as Messrs. J. Royal, M.P., D. H. Macdonald, member of North-West Council; L. Clarke, His Lordship Bishop Grandin, and Father Leduc.

"Finally, Father Leduc, who had been sent as delegate to Ottawa by the people of Edmonton and St. Albert, showed us the answer of the Government promising a special survey for all located lands on the Saskatchewan. Since then we have waited in vain for the new survey.

"As we stated at the beginning, many of us have occupied our lots long enough to entitle us to patents, and yet there has been no way, as yet, of getting them entered at your office.

"We beg of you to represent to the Government the grievances herein in part set forth, and urge them to put an end thereto as quickly as possible, for the welfare and peace of loyal subjects of Her Majesty the Queen of England."

The Minister says that the letter of Mr. Duck applied only to the St. Laurent settlement. Here is another letter from Mr. Duck. It is dated 17th December, 1883.

"I have the honor to enclose herewith file No. 924 of this office covering a letter from Mr. Louis Schmidt and others, as also a petition signed by a number of the inhabitants of the parish of St. Louis de Langevin praying for a re-survey of the lands on the River Saskatchewan within the parish into lots of ten chains frontage, on a plan similar to that adopted in the parish of St. Laurent.

"As I have already expressed my opinion as to the desirability of such a re-survey I have the honor to refer you to my previous letter on that subject."

So that recommendation of Mr. Duck did not apply only to the parish of St. Laurent as hinted by the Minister of the Interior, but to the whole of the half-breed settlement; and so far the Government stands convicted of having refused to the half-breeds of St. Louis de Langevin the measure of justice extended to the settlers of Prince Albert. I do not propose to follow this case further. It is a case susceptible of great argument, but it is too far advanced in the day to discuss it now. I propose to refer only to the question which was specially discussed by the Minister of the Interior with reference to the action taken by Mr. Pearce, in procuring evidence from settlers lately at St. Louis de Langevin and elsewhere, with reference to affidavits which had been obtained, and had been placed before the House by the hon. Minister. It

is within the recollection of every one, that a short time after the outbreak it became known that a great many of the insurgents came from that district, which comprises a tract of land granted by the Government to the Prince Albert Colonisation Company; and it was corectly reported at the time that one of the causes of the rebellion, and one of the causes which made the people discontented, was because they found their lands given away to a colonisation company, and they became dissatisfied, feeling as they did they might be evicted from those lands. The Government have been endeavoring ever since to repel the impression which was then created in the public mind. They have been trying to show that whatever might have been the cause of the rebellion by the people who took up arms, that they had not been impelled to do so by the existence of a colonisation company. Mr. Pearce visited the settlement, undoubtedly, with the view of procuring evidence to that effect, and that evidence we have before us now. But when he visited the settlement he did not visit it with the ostensible view of taking evidence in that regard. The pretence he gave to the people when he visited the settlement was that he went there to adjust land claims, and to take such evidence from the people as would place him in a position to give them the patents to which they were entitled. That was the pretence. Mr. Pearce went further than that. He did not content himself with taking such evidence as I have hinted at, but he took evidence in order to exculpate the Government from any blame in having granted those lands to the colonisation company when in possession of actual settlers. He took evidence, and the evidence is now before us. He took several affidavits which have been placed before this House, and upon the strength of which the Government have endeavored to establish that they were altogether blameless in this matter, and that, whatever was the cause of the rebellion, those half-breeds had no grievances under that head because they never knew a colonisation company was in existence. Any man must admit that very little weight can attach to affidavits framed with the exclusive object of exculpating the Government, obtained by agents of the Government and obtained from people who were lately insurgents, whose relatives were lately insurgents, and who, themselves, or their relatives, are still liable to imprisonment, to coercion and punishment. It must strike anyone's mind that these poor people, ignorant and illiterate as they are known to be, must be an easy prey to the longheaded agent of the Government. And we have the evidence of that. I have the evidence in my hands, that, whatever the agents might have meant, the affidavits that have been placed before the House do not convey the real thought which the half-breeds had in their mind when they signed those affidavits. The nature of the affidavits was known in the settlement and neighborhood before they came to Ottawa. It transpired there what the nature of the affidavits was, that the people had never heard of the colonisation company or had any uneasiness on account of that company. A gentleman at Prince Albert heard of that, and knowing that such a statement was contrary to the truth, he took the trouble to investigate the matter. I have the letter which he wrote on the 17th February, 1886, and which is to this effect:

"Some time in last December William Pearce, formerly land commissioner, arrived here ostensibly to arrange for the surveying of the French settlement into river lots. After staying here a few days he left for the French settlement, taking with him Col. Sproat, our registrar and Tory intriguer, and an interpreter. His destination was chiefly or solely the parish of St. Louis de Langevin, the district held by the Prince Albert Colonisation Company. After their return, we heard that they had obtained an affidavit from the half-breeds and other residents on the company's lands, to the effect that they had never heard of the Prince Albert Colonisation Company, that they have never feared or been threatened with ejectment, and that the transfer of the land, on which they had settled, to the company, had had nothing to do with the late trouble. Knowing this to be false, I took the first opportunity to interview one of the Métis residents of that district on that subject. He informed me that the document had been read over to them, and purported to contain only a statement to the effect that they knew nothing of the existence of the colonisation company previous to their settlement on their lands, and that they were given to understand that the signing of the document was a necessary preliminary to the obtaining of their patents. Many of them had settled on their lands before the company existed. Believing that the document, whatever it might be, was intended for political use, and as a document of that nature would be of no political value, I concluded that its real nature was more in accordance with the rumor, and being unable to find anyone who had read it over for themselves, I have the enclosed affidavit drawn up and signed by all the Métis who could be found to have signed the other in that district."

Now, I hold in my hand also the affidavits which were thus signed at the time, but before reading them, I will show the nature of the affidavits which were obtained by Mr. Pearce. I will take one as a sample of all the rest.

"Heard this land was within a colonisation company's tract, but no official of that company ever said anything to me, nor, do I believe, to any of the family, or I should have heard of it. The fact of this land being within a colonisation company's tract never gave my father, brother, sister, or myself any concern whatever, as we always believed we would eventually obtain entry as we desired.

"Sworn before me, at Township 45, Range 24, W. 2nd Meridian, this 9th day of December, 1885, having been first read over and explained to him, and he seemed thoroughly to understand the same.
(Signed) "WM. PEARCE, "Superintendent"

(Signed) "SOLOMOM BOUCHER."

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Does the hon. gentleman say that the other affidavits are the same as that?

Mr. LAURIER. So far as the reference to the colonisation company goes, yes. I believe that to be the case, but if I am astray I may be corrected. It must be manifest that this illiterate population, the moment they were informed that their lands had been granted to a colonisation company, having prayed for their patents for years and not succeeding in obtaining them, must have been very uneasy. Yet these people are made to swear that, although they knew of this statement, they never had any uneasiness about it. Now here is the affidavit to which I have alluded:

"We, the undersigned, residents of the Métis settlement on the south branch of the Saskatchewan River in the North-West Territories do hereby state: That Mr. William Pearce, Commissioner of Dominion Lands, did, on the occasion of his visit to our settlement in the month of December, 1885, present to us for signature a document which was stated to contain only a statement that we knew nothing of the existence of the Prince Albert Colonisation Company when we settled on our land. As we had in most cases been on our lands long previous to the formation of that company, we signed the document, taking his word that the contents were as stated. But we have since learned with great surprise that the paper referred to contained statements that we had heard nothing of the company previous to the uprising last spring, and that we knew nothing of any rumor that our lands were to be taken away, and that the formation of the company and the granting to them of lands in our settlement had nothing to do with occasioning trouble in our settlement. If any such statements are in the document which we signed, we were entirely misled as to its meaning, because we were all well aware for some time before the taking up of arms that there was a company which claimed to own our lands and to have the power to turn us off our homesteads, and even encouraged in the belief of that fact by the failure of the Government to give us any legal title to the lands which we had so long occupied. The only point on which we were entirely ignorant was the extent of our territory which was so granted away from us and it was the fear which we all had of losing our homes that was one of the greatest causes of uneasiness among us."

This is signed by Charles Boucher, Moïse Bremner, Elzéar Swain, Napoléon Boyer, Modiste Laviolette, William Bremner, Alexander Bremner, Joseph Bremner, Baptiste Boyer, William Bruce, Solomon Boucher. To this is attached the following declaration:

"Canada,
"North-West Territories,
"Prince Albert.
"To wit:

"I, Charles E. Boucher, of St. Louis de Langevin, in the North-West Territories, farmer, do solemnly declare that I was personally present and did see the within statement duly signed by Moïse Bremner, Elzéar Swain, Napoléon Boyer, Modiste Laviolette, William Bremner, Alexander Bremner, Joseph Bremner, Baptiste Boyer, William Bruce and Solomon Boucher.

"2. That the above-named parties are resident in the parish of St. Louis de Langevin.

"And I make this solemn declaration, &c.

"Declared before me at Prince Albert, in the North-West Territories, this 16th day of February, A.D. 1886. "ARTHUR S. SIFTON, "Notary Public." } "CHARLES E. BOUCHER.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Is that document an affidavit, or is it only attested?

Mr. LAURIER. This latter is an affidavit.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The document itself is not sworn to.

Mr. LAURIER. No, it is not. The hon. gentleman has also referred to the correspondent of the *Globe*. The correspondent of the *Globe* simply corroborates what is stated in those affidavits, and gives simply the particulars taken by the officer when he procured this declaration. It may be interesting to refer to the interview which took place between the *Globe* correspondent and William Bremner, a Scotch half-breed.

"You are on the lands of this Prince Albert Colonisation Company, I believe?

"'Indeed I hardly know whose land I am on,' was the reply. 'One tells us that we are on the lands of that company, another comes along and says we are not. We are unable to read, and, with the exception two or three, unable to understand English. Of the outside world we know little or nothing. Newspapers and books are no use to us, and few strangers ever visit this place.'

"One of your visitors was a Mr. Pearce?

"Yes. He was here last December, I think. He was accompanied by Duck, land agent, and a few others. He took me a paper to sign.

"Did that paper ask you to say you knew nothing of the Prince Albert Colonisation Society prior to Pearce's visit?

"Yes.

"You are quite sure?

"I am.

"Did you understand what was read to you from that paper?

"Some I did and some I did not.

"Why did you sign what you could not read or understand?

"I was told our signing it would do us good, and I was, to tell you the truth, afraid if I did not sign it, it would be worse for me. What can we do against the Government? Nothing."

Now, this is the true reason why those affidavits were signed. It is manifest that those people had heard of the company. The existence of that company was well known in the North-West Territory, and the moment it was known, these people, having petitioned so long for their patents and not obtaining them, they were uneasy, and so it may have been a cause, as I believe it was a cause, of the late uprising. I shall not say any more on this subject at the present moment. I regret that it did not come up earlier. I know that the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution has waited day after day for the production of the papers which were promised, and which, although we have reached the closing hours of the Session, have not come down.

Mr. AMYOT. I do not intend to make a speech, but I think it is my duty as well as my right to explain the vote which I intend to give. I cannot agree with all that has been said on this side with regard to this question. I do not think the hon. member for Quebec East went far enough when he spoke in favor of the half-breeds, and I think the mover of the resolution has gone too far in proposing the resolution. When in 1867 the question came up about bringing the North-West into the Confederation there was a petition presented by both Houses to Her Majesty the Queen, and in that petition it was said:

"That in the event of Your Majesty's Government agreeing to transfer to Canada the jurisdiction and control over the said region, the Government and Parliament of Canada will be ready to provide that the legal rights of any corporation, company or individual within the same shall be respected, and placed under the protection of courts of competent jurisdiction.

"And furthermore that, upon the transference of the Territories in question to the Canadian Government, the claims of the Indian tribes to compensation for lands required for purposes of settlement will be considered and settled in conformity with the equitable principles which have uniformly governed the British Crown in its dealings with the aborigines."

Then there was a resolution, signed by Sir Stafford Northcote, Sir George E Cartier and the Hon. Wm. Macdougall, in 1869, in which it was said:

"It is understood that any claims of Indians to compensation for lands required for purposes of settlement shall be disposed of by the Canadian Government, in communication with the Imperial Government, and that the company shall be relieved of all responsibility in respect to them."

At a meeting of the delegates it was furthermore resolved:

"That upon the transference of the Territories in question to the Canadian Government, it will be the duty of the Government to make adequate provisions for the protection of the Indian tribes whose interests and well-being are involved in the transfer."

In 1869, this Address to the Queen was signed both by the Speaker of the House of Commons and the Speaker of the Senate:

"That upon the transference of the Territories in question to the Canadian Government, it will be our duty to make adequate provision for the protection of the Indian tribes whose interests and well-being are involved in the transfer, and we authorise and empower the Governor in Council to arrange any details that may be necessary to carry out the terms and conditions of the above agreement."

Now, the Act of Council that was passed, the deed of surrender, contained those very words. So it was well agreed, here and in England, that it would be the duty of the Canadian Government to afford the Indian tribes every possible protection. When the North-West Territories were brought into the Confederation, the Government of the day, and all the Governments since, have seemed to forget the duties they owed to the half-breeds; and I cannot approve of the acts of this Government more than I can of the acts of the preceding Government in that respect. I do not speak of the Indians now, because the case of the Indians has been discussed already; I limit my remarks to the half-breeds. We say the half-breeds are entitled to their homesteads and their pre-emption, and if they are not satisfied with them, they may look for something else. I say that is not only not fair or legal, but the Government knew it; and when they gave them scrip it was a mere farce. It was simply giving away the lands of the North-West for nothing to speculators from other countries under the pretext of giving the half-breeds their rights. I want no other proof of that than what was said in this honorable House last Session. If you take the *Hansard* of the 6th of July, you will find in the mouth of the hon. leader of this House these words:

"The recommendation of Archbishop Taché was that the title should be kept away from the half-breeds for three generations. The recommendation of the council was that it should be kept away for ten years. What was the policy of the Government? Go, take your 160 acres; take your pre-emption for 160 acres more, and you shall stand as well as a white man, and shall get your patent after three years, no matter what the archbishop or the North-West Council have told us. We, the Government of the Dominion of Canada, have more confidence in the half-breeds even than their own archbishop and their own council. We say: We give you the land; occupy it, cultivate it, live on it, be happy on it, and at the end of three years you will get 160 acres, and you will stand free and independent, a freeholder, a yeoman, a free man in the North-West. You shall not be subject to this paternal Government which has been urged upon you by your own friends in the North-West."

Taking away from the half-breeds their paternal Government; taking away from them the right to have large reserves on which they might have lived as a single family; taking away from them the right which we do not refuse to any man, perhaps not even to a Chinaman, of 160 acres of land; exposing them to the aggressions of surveyors who wanted to survey over their property, and to the aggressions of colonisation societies; exposing them to the insults which they have constantly received from white people; taking away from them their very means of living, without the advantages of the civilisation and the education we have, and casting them upon the open prairie—I say this is not the meaning of the agreement which said that we would give them protection and full compensation. I said the Government knew it; and to show that, I have only to quote further, on the next page:

"The nomadic half-breed, who had been brought up to hunt, having had merely his shanty to repair to in the dead season when there was no game—what advantage was it to him to give him 160 or 240 acres more? It was of no use to him whatever, but it would have been of great use to the speculators who were working on him and telling him that he was suffering."

The Government knew what would be the result; they knew of the existence of speculators:

"Oh! how awfully he was suffering, ruined, destroyed, starving, because he did not get 240 acres somewhere else, or the scrip for it, that he might sell it for $50! No, Sir; the whole thing is a farce."

Yes, it is a farce from beginning to end. It is a farce to say that you have fulfilled your obligation by giving scrip to the half-breeds. We know that following the commission which was distributing the scrip, there were land speculators, finely dressed, with money in their pockets, and whiskey, that they might, the moment the half-breed got the scrip, give him liquor and pay him $3 or $4 or $5 and get his scrip. That is the way the Treasury has suffered, and the way the half-breeds have lost their scrip and remain poor without that paternal protection to which they are entitled:

"Now, Mr. Speaker, we, at the last moment, made concessions, and we did it for the sake of peace."

Well, Mr. Speaker, it was too late to make concessions for the sake of peace; we should have done it before, we should have seen to their grievances before. When we saw that there were complaints, that petitions were pouring in constantly, the Government should have sent some friends to them, as it does to-day. If the Government had done then what it is now doing, there would have been no war, and if, instead of the police, we had sent to the half breeds people who spoke their language and were not looked upon as their enemies, we would have been saved the expenditure of $10,000,000 and the loss of 200 or 300 valuable lives:

"The Government knew, my hon. friend, Sir David Macpherson, the Minister of the Interior, knew that we were not acting in the interests of the half-breeds in granting them scrip, in granting him the land. We had tried, after consulting man after man, expert after expert, to find what was best for the country, and we found, without one single exception, they were all opposed to granting unlimited scrip and immediate patents to the half-breeds. But, Sir, an agitation arose, and the hon. gentleman has rung the changes on Riel being brought into that country."

I take it, as admitted by this Government, that no justice has been given to the half-breeds, and I consider it is an obligation on their part that they should see that the half-breeds are better treated, and that a fair compensation be given them for the land from which they have been evicted. This is the meaning I intend giving to my vote. The fault of the Government consists in having chosen too many strangers to deal with the Indians and half-breeds. If they had chosen, instead, some of the employees known to the country, and in whom the country would have had confidence, the atrocities we have witnessed in the North-West would not have occurred. I believe the Government really intend to do justice to the Indians; I believe they understand the white population cannot take possession of the North-West without giving in return some compensation; I believe in the sense of humanity the Government have been most unfortunate in their choice of employees. The consequence was the rebellion occurred and the half-breeds were either killed or ruined. I can prove that, and that is the meaning I intend to give to my vote. I do not intend blaming the Government for all they have done in the North-West. We have taken possession of the country and opened it up as fast as possible. I have often heard the Opposition blame the Government for having opened it too quick; but I think the Government acted wisely in so doing. On the question of the Pacific Railway and the general system of surveying—I except the application of the system to those who are already on their lands and had vested rights—I approve of the general policy of the Government in the North-West, and could not approve any Government which would not follow a similar policy. But, as far as I have stated, and for the reasons I have given, I will vote in favor of the motion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. At this late hour, I will not detain the House more than two or three minutes. If I understood the Minister of the Interior correctly he stated that, as regarded the claim of the half-breeds to these surveys in narrow frontages of ten chains in width along the river, the Government had granted the survey required?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Wherever there were settlers occupying land in that form, the river system was given. Wherever there were no settlements practically, as in the case of St. Louis de Langevin, for a large number of those who petitioned did not live there at all, we made the ordinary surveys.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is exactly as I understood the hon. gentleman. One of the great grievances these half-breeds complained of was that their claims to have their lots surveyed, in the same manner as they were in Manitoba and Prince Albert, were not attended to. Whether they were right or wrong in that system of surveying, it was the one they had always followed, and it ought to have been recognised in their case by the Government, and their titles to the land given accordingly. The hon. Minister says that wherever they had established settlements, their claims were respected and their surveys made in that form. I would direct the attention of the House to a report made to the Department in March, 1882, by Mr. Duck, the agent of Dominion lands. He wrote as follows to the Government:—

"Sir,—As the majority of the settlers on the south branch of the River Saskatchewan, in the vicinity of the parish of St. Laurent, have taken up their lands previous to the survey, with narrow frontages, similar to those river claims in other parts of this district, and in view of the difficulty likely to be experienced in this office in adjusting the boundaries of these claims in accordance with the section survey, I have, at the request of several of the settlers so situated, the honor to request information as to the possibility of re-surveying these sections into river lots on a similar plan to that adopted in Prince Albert settlement, none of these claims having as yet been entered in this office."

On the 4th September of the same year, Gabriel Dumont and forty-six others sent a petition to the Department of the Interior, in which they say:

"In our anxiety we appeal to your sense of justice as Minister of the Interior and head of the Government, and beg you to reassure us speedily, by directing that we shall not be disturbed on our lands, and that the Government grant us the privilege of considering us as occupants of even-numbered sections, since we have occupied these lands in good faith. Having so long held this country as its masters and so often defended it against the Indians at the price of our blood, we consider it not asking too much to request that the Government allow us to occupy our lands in peace, and that exception be made to its regulations, by making to the half-breeds of the North-West free grants of land. We also pray that you would direct that the lots be surveyed along the river ten chains in width by two miles in depth, this mode of division being the long-established usage of the country. This would render it more easy for us to know the limits of our several lots."

Here are the answers from the Department to Mr. Duck's letters. First of all, this letter was written on the 21st September of the same month in which that petition was sent into the Department:

"Sir,—I have the honor, by the direction of the Minister of the Interior, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th March last, stating that you had been requested by several of the settlers in the vicinity of the parish of St. Laurent to obtain information from the Department as to the possibility of there being a re-survey of their river claims by the Government, and to inform you that it is not the intention of the Government to cause any re-surveys to be made. Of course, any sub-division differing from the regular survey they may desire they can procure for themselves when the lands come into their possession. You will please, therefore, communicate this decision to the persons interested.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"A. M. BURGESS,
"*Secretary.*"

Then, on the 13th October, I find the following:—

"SIR,—I have the honor, by direction of the Minister of the Interior, to acknowledge the receipt, through you, of a petition, dated the 4th ult., from 47 French half-breeds, on the subject of certain lands on the Saskatchewan, in the district of Prince Albert, on which they have squatted

"In reply, I am directed to request you to inform the petitioners that when the proper time arrives the case of each *bonâ fide* settler will be dealt with on its own merits; but, as regards the surveying of the land in question, that all lands in the North-West Territories will be surveyed according to the system now in force.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"LINDSAY RUSSELL,
"*Deputy Minister Interior.*"

This reply was given after several applications. And now, on the 23rd December, 1884, just three months before the rebellion broke out, Major Crozier had a gentleman named S. Gagnon employed gathering information with regard to the trouble, and he reported to Major Crozier:

"As far as I can see, the chief grievances of the half-breeds is that they are afraid that the Government will not sanction the way they, amongst themselves, have agreed to take their homesteads—ten chains of frontage on the river by two miles back."

And yet the Minister tells us that these narrow lots were respected. To make the matter still stronger, one month after the rebellion had broken out and after valuable lives had been lost, one of the commissioners sent up writes to the Government:

"Our proposal is to give each occupying lake front half-breed 160 acres homestead free, allowing to retain the few acres fronting lake or river now held in occupation"——

Not free, remember, but—

"on payment of $1 an acre within two years, patent for whole to be retained until payment is made; cases few and acreage small, but concession will do good. Feeling here now very satisfactory."

Here is the answer to that:

"Your proposal as to small water frontages approved. You should declare that area of each shall not exceed forty acres, to prevent inconvenience in other parts of the country."

That is signed by the Minister of the Interior, and yet, in the face of all that, the Minister of the Interior tells us that, where these parties had settled on these narrow frontages, their settlements were respected and the lines run accordingly, and yet, when the rebellion occurred, they had not got further than selling them forty acres for $1 an acre and giving them 160 acres perhaps miles away. In the face of those documents, I will leave the House to judge how much value can be attached to the statements of the Minister.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mills.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Edgar,	Lister,
Amyot,	Fairbank,	Livingston,
Armstrong,	Fisher,	Mills,
Auger,	Forbes,	Mitchell,
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Blake,	Glen,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Guay,	Somerville (Brant)
Cameron (Middlesex),	Gunn,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Harley,	Springer,
Cartwright (Sir Richard)	Holton,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casey,	Innes,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Vail,
Charlton,	Landerkin,	Watson,
Desjardins,	Langelier,	Weldon,
Dupont,	Laurier,	Wilson.—51.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Foster,	McNeill,
Bain (Soulanges),	Grandbois,	Massue,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Hesson,	Montplaisir,
Barker,	Hickey,	O'Brien,
Beaty,	Hilliard,	Orton,
Benoit,	Hurteau,	Paint,
Blondeau,	Jamieson,	Patterson (Essex),
Bourbeau,	Jenkins,	Pruya,
Cameron (Inverness),	Kaulbach,	Reid,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Riopel,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kinney,	Robertson (Hastings),
Carling,	Kranz,	Royal,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Landry (Montmagny),	Shanly,
Chapleau,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Small,
Costigan,	Lesage,	Sproule,
Coughlin,	Macdonald (King's),	Tassé,
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Temple,
Daoust,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Thompson,
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Vanasse,
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McCallum,	Ward,
Dickinson,	McDougald (Pictou),	White (Cardwell),
Dundas,	McDougall (C. Breton),	White (Hastings),
Ferguson (Leeds&Gren)	McGreevy,	Woodworth.—71.
Fortin,	McLelan,	

Amendment negatived.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I might state that it is hoped that His Excellency will prorogue Parliament at five o'clock to-day. When the House adjourns, I will move that it stand adjourned to eleven o'clock this morning.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would say to the Minister of Finance that some of these items I do not feel disposed to discuss at present, but I must reserve the right to discuss them fully on concurrence, if one wishes to do so. That is distinctly understood.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Legislation, Miscellaneous..... .... $3,676.78

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On whose recommendation are these increases of salary to officers in the Library proposed?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Joint Committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because a good many of these increases appear to be running up the rates a good deal above what they were formerly. Formerly we used to buy 300 copies of this Dominion Annual Register, and I think that is quite enough. You seem to be adding 100 here without rhyme or reason, to the amount that was formerly purchased.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I think one copy of this work would be too many. It is written by a man already in the employ of the Government, and I do not think we should pay him so much money for work of this character.

Mr. AUGER. Here is an item to pay for 150 of Mr. Faucher de St. Maurice's work on Parliamentary Procedure. I would like to ask the Minister what he knows about this book?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a book on Parliamentary Procedure and Parliamentary Government. It is a very useful book of reference.

Mr. AUGER. I have a copy of the book here, and it contains only reports of the decisions of the Speaker of the Province of Quebec. It is printed in both languages, one purporting to be a translation of the other. In some places, the English differs altogether from the French, and when in English the decision of the Speaker is against the motion, in French the same decision is translated as in favor of the motion. There are several such instances. In one place,

the decision is given by Mr. Chapleau, of Quebec. I never heard that Mr. Chapleau was Speaker of the Quebec Assembly.

Mr. LANGELIER. He spoke much, but he was not the Speaker.

Mr. AUGER. At page 305, the French edition says: "L'Orateur décide que l'amendement est dans l'ordre." In English it is "The Speaker rules that the amendment is not in order." In some instances, it speaks of the Chairman in French as "l'Orateur," and in English as "Chairman," while in other cases the Chairman is "M. le Président." In one place, it speaks about the Speaker "rising." In French, it says: "l'Orateur se lève," and in English it is the "Speaker raised." I do not know what he "raised." He must have raised something.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He raised $750.

Mr. AUGER. At page 505 again, the decision in French is one way and in English it is just the contrary. It says in French "L'Orateur décide contre l'objection," and in English, "The Speaker sustains the objection." Now, for this very useful work we are asked to pay $5 a volume. Even if it were well translated what use would it be as a reference here? Would our Speaker take it as an authority? I do not think, Mr. Chairman, you would take it as an authority; you would look higher for authority than the Assembly of the Province of Quebec. The book is full of extracts of the proceedings of the House of Assembly at Quebec, translated in some cases from English and in some cases from the French. I have only looked at a few pages of this book, but if an ignorant farmer like myself finds so many faults in it, I think the Minister would find a great many more of the same class.

Mr. BLAKE. What is going to be done with 150 copies of this wonderful book? Had it not better be burned after what we have heard? Because it would be a disgrace to have it in our Library.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is absurd that it should deal with the decisions of only one Provincial Legislature.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The rulings of the Quebec Assembly of course, must be a little in accord with the rulings of this Parliament. I have not seen the book, but the two Parliaments are supposed to follow the same rules of procedure, and in that case the decisions made by the Speaker in Quebec must be as good as those given here, as he is supposed to follow the same authority. Of course, if the translation is something like what we have heard, it ought to be remedied in some way in a second edition.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend will observe that when he, in his own language, or when some hon. gentlemen less familiar with it than he is, quotes to the Speaker, in French, a decision in favor of an objection, I, reading the English copy of the book, find the decision is against the objection, and in such case the book is likely to create more confusion than it will settle.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It will be for the Speaker to decide in the last resort.

Mr. BLAKE. I believe the true inwardness of this thing to be that Mr. Faucher de St. Maurice is a prominent Conservative and supporter of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and this is a little job to pay him $750.

Mr. LISTER. The House never asked for this book and we don't want it.

Mr. BLAKE. Here is another translation on page 430:

"L'Orateur déclare que le sous-amendement est dans l'ordre"

and in English it is "the Speaker ruled that it is not in order." So you find here a decision to suit everybody. If a gentleman on one side of the House wants to find that a particular motion is in order, all he has to do is to look to the left hand page; if on the other hand he wants it find that it is out of order, he looks at the right hand page, and he is provided for. It is an admirable work.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think under these circumstances the Minister would do well to withdraw the item, or let it stand till to morrow.

Mr. McLELAN. Let that item stand.

Mr. BLAKE. I again ask what are we going to do with the copies. If this item is pressed I shall move that we add a provision that the books be burned.

Mr. DESJARDINS. There may be some errors of translation, but it is really a valuable book—and the Ministers who put this item in the Estimates ought to know—it might be useful to the French speaking members of this House.

Item ordered to stand.

Colonial and Indian Exhibition in London..... $50,000 00

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There has been statements made in the press that very unfortunately for this country a large portion of our exhibits did not arrive in time for the opening, and that our exhibit was not completed till a late day. I trust these reports are not correct. The intention of the House last Session was, when it voted money very freely, that the exhibits should be a credit to Canada. It was a great pity that through delay, neglect or mismanagement the Canadian department could not have been complete at the opening. I hope the Minister will be able to dispel doubts that have arisen on this point.

Mr. CARLING. I can assure the hon. gentleman that so far as the Department is concerned there has been no neglect whatever. A very large quantity of goods was sent, some of them were delayed on the railway, which could not be avoided by the Government or the Department. The last shipment left Halifax on 4th May and arrived in London about 16th. It was first announced that the exhibition would be opened on 15th May, and afterwards the date was changed to the 4th; the exhibition was opened sooner than was originally intended. Our information is that the display is very good, that all our exhibits have been shipped and are now in place.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Two weeks late. Does the Minister know what the proportion of the delayed goods was to the total exhibits?

Mr. CARLING. Less than one-third.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Were they in most of the lines?

Mr. CARLING. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then we would be imperfect in all our lines, or at least in a great number of them.

Mr. CARLING. There was a large quantity of goods that could not be taken on board of the vessel. Some heavy machinery had to be put on deck and provided for in another way than was originally intended. The hon. gentleman will find that every part of the goods has been satisfactorily delivered, and is now in its place in the exhibition.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am glad the fault has been remedied, but it is a matter for profound regret to every Canadian that after the expenditure of tens of thousands of dollars and an anxious desire manifested by all the members of the House that this country should appear in a most creditable manner, our display should have been marred in this way. I say this without wishing to cast imputation on the Minister. If there was neglect or delay it should be

censured. But leaving that apart, it must be a matter of profound regret that it should have occurred.

Mr. CARLING. The exhibition opened on 4th May and will continue till 4th November. The tonnage of the goods sent to this exhibition is four times larger than that sent to any exhibition before. Considering that over three thousand tons of goods of all classes from all parts of the country were sent there, it is not a matter blameworthy if the whole of the goods were in place two weeks after the opening of the exhibition.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I differ entirely with the hon. gentleman. The money was voted a year ago. We made a display at the Antwerp Exhibition, and we were told that while it was creditable it was not in any sense such as we should make at the Colonial Exhibition. It was the desire that Canada should take a foremost position at this exhibition. The money required was freely voted, commissioners were appointed throughout the Dominion and they travelled through the country, and the Dominion should have been at the exhibition with a full display at the opening day. It is a matter, I repeat, of the most profound regret that notwithstanding the expenditure made, our exhibit was not complete on the opening day when thousands of people were present from all countries. I am not prepared to censure anyone, and yet I think censure is due somewhere. If it had been a matter sprung upon us, it would have been different; but we had an abundance of time and the only possible excuse given by the Minister was that the date of the formal opening was made eleven or ten days earlier than was first announced. But did not the Government know that change in time to make an extra effort?

Mr. CARLING. Every precaution was taken by the Department. In shipping a large quantity of goods over railways in winter when snow blockades occur, and when perhaps steamers are not able to take on board so large a quantity of goods as expected, delays could not be prevented by the Department. I repeat that every precaution was taken by the Department and the instructions to all shippers were that the goods were to be ready at a particular time and delivered promptly.

Mr. WATSON. I see by the newspapers that Capt. Clark is going to the Colonial Exhibition to represent Manitoba by a joint arrangement between Manitoba and the Dominion. What is the arrangement?

Mr. CARLING. Capt. Clark was strongly recommended by the Government of Manitoba to go over as a representative of the Province, and he has been sent over to England to represent that Province. He has been sent by the Dominion Government.

Mr. WELDON. Were the Local Government consulted?

Mr. CARLING. No, I do not think they were.

Mr. WELDON. I see that Mr. Paine, one of the editors of the St. John *Sun*, has been sent as a commissioner for New Brunswick. What pay does he receive?

Mr. CARLING. Five dollars a day, which covers all the expenses.

Pensions..... $10,500 00

Mr. INNES. I would like to ask what provision has been made with respect to those, for instance, who volunteered into the Mounted Police and were killed at Duck Lake. I know that two or three memorials are in the hands of the Government with regard to these cases. One of these cases I am familiar with, because the family of the young man I refer to resides in my riding—Robert Middleton, a volunteer into the Mounted Police, who was killed at Duck Lake. Though the Orders in Council of last year with respect to pensions do not cover such cases, I notice that they may be specially considered by the Governor in Council. This young man was largely the support of his family. His father and mother are living, but his father is very infirm. It is a case which I think claims the special consideration of the Government, and I think that anything they could grant in the way of a gratuity would be generally approved by the House and the country.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I may say that the Government have decided that, although such cases as the hon. gentleman mentions do not come within the Order in Council, the Government have decided to treat them exactly as militia men were treated. The case to which the hon. gentleman refers, and which he has already brought under my notice, has been referred to another Department. It is one of the cases which will be treated according to the decision arrived at by the Governor in Council under the Order in Council.

Militia..... $22,542 20

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Will the Minister give some explanation of this item with regard to drainage of the citadel, Quebec.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This work was imperatively demanded by the city of Quebec, as the existing drainage was considered dangerous to the city. Several representations were made by the city authorities urging that the work should not be delayed, so an Order in Council was passed empowering me to enter upon those works immediately. They were given out by contract and they are being carried out.

Mr. MULOCK. What portion of the citadel was drained by it? This is a large amount—$16,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. As the hon. gentleman has been in Quebec, he knows how difficult and expensive the drainage of the citadel must be on account of the geography of the place, as a long drain is required to connect with the main drain of the city, and a large amount of rock cutting is necessary. The drainage was begun last winter, at what was supposed to be the most favorable time. Still, I believe there are no two opinions about it. It was commenced immediately after these reports had been made to the Department by the municipal authorities; about December or January.

Mr. LANGELIER. I have no fault to find with the Government for having that work done, for I believe it was a work of absolute necessity. I was a member of the board of health when our attention was drawn to the abominable state in which the citadel was, not only endangering the life of the soldiers, but causing such suffering from diphtheria and other diseases in that portion of the city, which is occupied by well-to-do classes, and is one of the healthiest portions of the city. We found that one of the drains of the citadel percolated through the ground and lost itself there. Instead of asking for tenders for the work by advertisements in the papers, which could have been done in a few days, the Government gave contracts to some of their friends who had no experience in that business; each had a small portion of the work, and the prices paid were just double what the city of Quebec had been paying for work of the very same kind, and even for more difficult work. This work is being done 200 or 300 feet from my house, and not more than half of the excavation is done in rock. The city of Quebec has been paying $1 per lineal foot for work much more difficult than that for which the Government have been paying $1.75 and $2 per lineal foot. The pretext of beginning the work was to give the laboring classes employment, but it gave employment only

to Tory laborers, and many other laborers were refused employment. The first part of the work was given to a stevedore named Power; I know him very well. Some time afterwards he disturbed a meeting held by the Liberals of Quebec. There is not one man in charge of any part of that job who understands the business. I know all those contractors, and they never would have taken the contracts if they had not obtained them at extravagant prices.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. With regard to not advertising for tenders, the architect of the city of Quebec wrote to say that the work should be commenced immediately, and it could not be delayed. I sent my clerk down to hurry matters as much as possible, and tenders were asked from a number of contractors. The hon. gentleman says that merely Tory laborers were employed. If that had been the case, I would have been following the example set by hon. gentlemen opposite when in power. We all remember that on the work of the fortifications, it was necessary that every man should carry a certificate in order to get employment from the Liberal contractors engaged in that work. But I deny that that system was followed in this case. The hon. gentleman, who must know the population of Quebec, must have forgotten that some of the men employed there were active supporters of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). The hon. gentleman cannot say that any discrimination was made between the men who came to ask for employment. Of course, everybody could not be employed, as only a certain number were required. The hon. gentleman says the prices paid were very much more than the prices paid by the corporation. The hon. gentleman knows that it is impossible to decide from other contracts what is a fair price for work of that kind. I speak from reports which have been made to me when I say that that excavation was one of the most difficult that could have been undertaken in Quebec. Knowing Quebec as I do, I cannot understand how the excavation could be other than rock excavation, from the point at which it starts in the Grande Allée to the citadel, and when it gets into the citadel the hon. gentleman knows that there is nothing but rock there. I have heard men, competent to express an opinion, say that the contracts were let at lower rates than it was possible to make any money from. Tenders were obtained, and the lowest tender was in every case accepted. It is impossible for us to advertise in the newspapers, but we sent around and got several contractors to tender. As to Mr. Power, he may be a stevedore, but he has already carried out several contracts in Quebec, and the fact of his being a stevedore need not prevent a man being useful in other walks in life. In so far as Mr. Power is concerned, he carried out his contract very successfully.

Mr. LANGELIER. It could not have taken more time to advertise in the newspapers than to send letters to those who got the contracts, and the Government, in writing, should have written to contractors who are in the habit of doing that work, and not to people who are not. Three jobbers were engaged. One is a stevedore, who had never, to my knowledge, done work of that kind before. No one would think of entrusting the excavation of rock to a man who is in the habit of loading ships. The other is a carter. Who would apply to a carter, when he has no time to advertise, instead of to a contractor? I am not surprised at all that the work should cost so much. The hon. gentleman said that laborers from Quebec East had been employed on the work, but I can tell him that there was nearly a riot over this. About 100 laborers had collected near the works, and complained that it was an outrage on them that men should have been taken from the hon. gentleman's county, outside the city, to do the work, while people within the city were left without employment. I asked them why they were not employed, and they said they had to get certificates from Mr. Bossé or Mr. McGreevy or somebody else, but not one of them was told to get a certificate from me, although I was the mayor.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend is rather unreasonable. He has not taken into question the circumstance that two operations were engaged in by the Government, two drainage operations, one in the citadel and one in the Treasury.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad this explanation has been made by the hon. Minister. I understood this work was given in order to allay, in some degree, the Riel agitation in Quebec, and I am glad that it was nothing of the kind.

Militia Contingencies..... $6,292 20

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The deputy Adjutant General is Colonel Denison, of Toronto, and the Brigade Major Colonel Milsom. Both officers have been for a long period in the service, and fulfilled their duty with great credit to the country and themselves. They had been engaged for a period of five years, and were not to expect any gratuity on retiring, but they had rendered such good service that we decided to allow them these sums: $2,400 for the Deputy Adjutant General and $2,400 for the Brigade Major.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not object to this item; on the contrary, in my opinion, it is not large enough. Colonel Milsom was an officer in the regulars, who was induced to leave the service and enter ours. I speak now from information I have received from a friend of mine who got it from Mrs. Milsom. I am not acquainted personally with either Colonel or Mrs. Milsom. From enquiries, I find it is correct that Colonel Milsom was in the regular service, and was induced to leave it, I think, by the Province of Nova Scotia; that he entered the Canadian service, and is now sixty-five years of age; that he has not a penny in the world beyond what is proposed to be given him here; that he has a family depending on him, and this proposed gratuity will realise exactly one shilling a day. It would not be to the honor of this country to turn this man out a pauper on the charity of the people. In two years he must starve or go to the poor house. He has no calling or capacity for doing anything. What is to become of him? I presume it is too late to improve this matter now, but I hope that next Session it will be again considered.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry I cannot agree with my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock). This officer was appointed on certain conditions, and those conditions he understood and accepted. At the end of the five years he was to have no claim of any kind. Having no claim, the Minister now offers to give him $2,400. I must say I think that is very liberal treatment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is, if the gentleman was appointed for the term of five years, as my hon. friend says; is that the case?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I thought I could make a distinction in this case, because Colonel Milsom entered the service before the Order in Council was passed appointing these men for five years only, and probably looked upon his appointment as permanent when he joined the service, and I also considered the services he has rendered and the long period of time he had served the country.

Mr. MULOCK. How many years has he been in the service?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think some thirty years.

Mr. BLAKE. Was he paid all the time?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. VAIL. He was employed by the Nova Scotia Government for a considerable time, and was a valuable officer, and it was unfortunate for him that he had to be moved to Toronto. Everyone knows it is impossible to support a family of any size upon a small pittance like this. I am sorry his case is a hard one, and would have liked to see the Minister do a little better for him. Perhaps at a future time he will reconsider the case.

Mr. MITCHELL. I object altogether to granting gratuities of this kind to these officers. If there is any law which provides for granting pensions or gratuities to them, they should have them, but if not, these sums of money should not be placed in the estimates in this way, but a law should be brought into Parliament and discussed. There are thousands of people employed by the Government and by private individuals who have served years and years and have only what they have saved out of their earnings to live upon, and the same thing should be applied in the Militia Department.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Does the Minister propose to place the military districts in charge of the commandants of the Military schools where such are located?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do, as much as possible, thus saving the salaries of the adjutant-general and brigade major.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). A difficulty arose recently between the commandant at Toronto and one of the volunteer corps. Those officers who are permanently employed and those who are more of a volunteer character do not generally assimilate together, and I fear other difficulties will arise if this policy is carried out. The saving is not very great when the additional pay and perquisites received by the commandant are taken into consideration.

Canadian Pacific Railway—British Columbia... $200,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that on the Onderdonk contract?

Mr. McLELAN. The rolling stock that was under contract reverted back to the Government. The Government was to take the rolling stock back that might be on the contractors' hands at the completion of the contract. The contract has not been adjusted, I think, as yet.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the amount of Mr. Onderdonk's demand?

Mr. McLELAN. I am told he has not presented an account, and there is no final settlement. This is a statement of the rolling stock, engines, &c. I am told he has not put in any claims.

Mr. MITCHELL. Are the accounts settled yet?

Mr. McLELAN. No, the accounts are not settled. I asked if he had put in a claim, and they told me no. There are twenty-nine locomotives and a number of cars. These have been valued by the mechanical superintendent of two railways and the engineer of construction. The engines are valued at from $3,000 to $9,450. The one at $3,000 is struck out as being unfit, as by the terms of the contract it was only the rolling stock that was considered fit for use.

Mr. MULOCK. They have been used in the construction of the road?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. What was done with these locomotives?

Mr. McLELAN. The Government has them on hand yet.

Mr. BLAKE. $9,450, at the present prices seem to be very high for a second-class locomotive that has been used some years. I think we can get a new locomotive for $7,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It takes a lot of money to get them over there.

Mr. BLAKE. Then we are to pay for transporting them there also, although the contractor took them there to make his contract. Are they in the possession of the Government now?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the Government running the road now?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. If we had the engines here running on a road they would be of more value.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the road is not being run?

Mr. McLELAN. There is an arrangement with Mr. Onderdonk to carry the mails, and I believe that he also carries such passengers and freight as may be presented. A certain portion of the road is being run.

Mr. BLAKE. With this rolling stock?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot say that.

Mr. BLAKE. It is being run now, on account of the Government, by arrangement with Mr. Onderdonk.

Mr. McLELAN. The arrangement with him is to carry the mails, and he also carries freight and passengers.

Mr. BLAKE. The question of whether the road was built according to contract would be one question, and the question how much should be paid to him would be another. Are either of these points settled?

Mr. McLELAN. The report of the chief engineer is that the work is up to the contract.

Mr. BLAKE. Then has the Government accepted that report of the chief engineer and decided to accept the work?

Mr. McLELAN. No, it has not been officially carried through yet.

Mr. BLAKE. Unless the report of the chief engineer is overruled, it may be taken that the work is up to the contract. The story is that Mr. Onderdonk has presented a large claim for extras.

Mr. McLELAN. The work has not yet been passed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not know there is any difference between the Department of Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have not heard of any. I suppose Mr. Onderdonk was here in connection with this matter of rolling stock. The report of the valuator is dated March.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the Canadian Pacific Railway been asked to accept the road?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot say.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made any statement or communication to the Government as to the position of the road relative to what they are entitled to demand under the contract?

Mr. McLELAN. It has not come before the Government; it may have come before the Department of Railways.

Mr. BLAKE. What is delaying the settlement with Mr. Onderdonk?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot say that anything is delaying it.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the Government engineer made a final estimate of what is due to Mr. Onderdonk?

Mr. McLELAN. I know of no final estimate.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the price of the cars?

Mr. McLELAN. From $600 at $700.

Mr. MULOCK. What sort?

Mr. McLELAN. Flat cars, first and second class. There are 64 first class, 38 second class, 55 third class, 240 fourth class. The prices are $730, $725, $720, $700, $690, $695.

Mr. BLAKE. They are second-hand flat cars?

Mr. McLELAN. That is what is on the memorandum.

Mr. MITCHELL. We can get hundreds and thousands from contractors at from $400 at $500 new.

Mr. MULOCK. A new flat can be purchased for under $300.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that the chief engineer's estimate?

Mr. McLELAN. That is the valuator's. The chief engineer has struck out $3,325.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems a most extraordinary estimate for second hand flat cars.

Mr. McLELAN. There is a statement signed by M. J. Haney, W. T. Reid and P. Clark as valuators.

Carillon Canal..... $24,000 00

Mr. CASEY. This item is an instance of the folly of trying to discuss estimates at this hour of the morning. In connection with the Carillon Canal there were undoubted scandals, undoubted improprieties of management and conduct on the part of the Government, which really ought to be discussed. I shall not of course attempt to discuss them at this hour of the morning, but I shall simply enter my protest and reserve my right to say something on this item on concurrence.

Kingston Penitentiary..... $11,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is $3,000 of this for furniture of the warden's house, and the balance is for plumbing, fitting in gas works and a number of small expenses.

Mr. BLAKE. Do we supply the warden with furniture?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. We do in all the penitentiaries.

Mr. BLAKE. This is the warden recently appointed. I do not remember that we furnished the late warden with furniture.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The late warden owned the furniture and took it away with him.

Mr. BLAKE. Exactly. Then this is a new expense. What will be the cost of putting gas into the main structure?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say.

Mr. BLAKE. This is contrary to the usual care with which the hon. gentleman's estimates are prepared.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are a number of small items which I might read to the hon. gentleman, but he cannot expect me now to be able to collect the different amounts relating to gas together and give him the total.

Public Works, chargeable to income—Public buildings, Ontario..... $39,961 17

Mr. CASEY. I see an amount of $2,225 for the St. Thomas post office, Custom house, &c. I thought that was finished last year.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a small balance of the work done last year which we had no money for. In the Supplementary Estimates for 1886-87 there is another small sum of $2,400 to complete that.

Public Buildings, Manitoba..... $30,975 50

Mr. CASEY. What will be the total cost of the Winnipeg post office?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. $205,300.

Public Buildings, North-West Territories..... $43,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The total cost of the Regina gaol and lunatic asylum, for which $11,500 is asked, will be $52,000. The additional barrack and stabling accommodation for the Mounted Police force will cost altogether $125,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this all at Regina?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. All at Regina.

Repairs, Furniture, Heating..... $40,575 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount of $6,500 is to make good the damages caused by the fire of 22nd February last. It is the intention of the Government to give $200 of this money to the Firemen's Benevolent Society as a reward for the services they rendered on that occasion.

Roads and Bridges—Ottawa City..... $19,174 50

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to cover the expenses of keeping these bridges in order, as well as the approaches and Major's Hill Park. The street in front of the buildings is now under our charge, and the sidewalks also, and will have to be repaired. Then $2,000 is required for the park to keep up the walks, the flower beds and trees, and to water the park.

Department of Indian Affairs—Manitoba and North-West Territories..... $399,617 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood the First Minister wanted to make special explanations about this item.

Mr. McLELAN. He will on concurrence, perhaps.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hum! It would be a pity that he should not, because we were informed in the Senate that he was most anxious to make them.

Mr. McLELAN. So he is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hum!

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Unfortunately his health will not permit him to be here this time of night.

Mr. CASEY. We should not be here at this time of night, either.

North-West Mounted Police..... $154,541 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is Lieutenant Colonel Irvine leaving the force?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, and Colonel Lawrence Herchmer has been appointed his successor.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That when the House adjourns, it stands adjourned till 11 o'clock to-day.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 4:48 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 2nd June, 1886.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RAISING OF DAMS ON MUD CREEK.

Mr. BLAKE (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, Whether the raising of the dams upon Mud Creek, at the outlet of Mud Lake, in the township of Bedford, was done by the authority or with the privity of the Government, or of any official of the Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am told that it was not.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to say a few words in reference to the state of public business. The House will recollect that, at an early hour yesterday, the First Minister, in answer to a question from the other side of the House, stated his expectation that the business of this House might close to-day and that prorogation might take place on Friday. At a later hour in the afternoon or evening, I was informed that His Excellency had been kind enough to say he would attend at any hour this evening, however late, for the purpose of prorogation, if the business of the House could be got through in time. I believed it would conduce to the convenience of hon. members of this House, after their attendance during this long and laborious Session, if that result could be achieved. I felt, however, that it would be impossible to achieve that result unless we had a late sitting of the House yesterday, and at least the usual sitting to-day, and therefore I suggested, through you, Mr. Speaker, that, if we sat late yesterday, and then met at eleven to-day, we would, in that way, get four hours and a half more than if we met at the usual hour, and we might get a full day's work in order to accomplish the result which was desired. No communication was made to me as to the hour at which it was proposed to ask His Excellency to prorogue, and I was taken by surprise when I was told that the hour was as early as half-past five. Still I thought it was right to endeavor to accomplish the result, so far as that could be done consistently with a reasonable discussion of the Estimates, and I am still ready to do my part towards the accomplishment of that result by using, as I have done privately and as I now do publicly, any influence I may have with hon. members to curtail the discussion within the narrowest limits consistent with public duty. But I desire to state that I had no idea, until the public statement was made here, that it was contemplated that prorogation would take place as early as half past five. I shall still do all that is possible to accomplish that result, but it was not the result I contemplated when the arrangement was concurred in. My belief was that we could, by meeting here at eleven, get a usual long day's work done by a reasonable hour of the evening, and that by that means we could get to the same result as far as the business of the House was concerned as was contemplated by the First Minister when he made the announcement in the afternoon. If we can do so earlier, I shall be only too glad. What can be done to accomplish that result shall be done, but, as I am always anxious to observe the most rigorous and absolute good faith in any arrangements to which I am a party, I think it due to myself to make the statement that this was not what I contemplated, though I am not desiring to impute any breach of faith to hon. gentlemen opposite in announcing half-past five. It was done, I suppose, because it was thought that was the meaning of the arrangement, but it was entirely opposed to the view I had entertained. In the course of the communications, the hour of ten o'clock was named to me as an hour up to which prorogation might take place.

THE FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. DAWSON. I desire to suggest to the Government that the Franchise Amendment Bill should be printed, as amended, immediately, and sent to the revising officers. It very seriously affects the revising officers in my district.

RAILWAY BETWEEN ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY.

Mr. VAIL. Yesterday I asked the Government whether an application had been made for the extension of the grant of $3,200 a mile made to the road between Annapolis and Digby. The time would expire on the 1st July of this year. I was told that an answer would be given when the Minister of Railways was in his place.

Mr. POPE. I have no knowledge of any application having been made. If it has been made, I have not seen it. Does the hon. gentleman say there has been an application?

Mr. VAIL. Yes.

Mr. POPE. I have no knowledge of it. This has not been considered by the Government, but I will consider it at the first opportunity. When the hon. gentleman spoke to me yesterday, that was the first I heard of it.

Mr. VAIL. The paper has been before the Government for a fortnight. I understood some time ago that an Act was to be introduced to extend the time, and that is why I asked the question.

BOUNTY ON PIG IRON.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the resolution reported from Committee of the Whole yesterday, respecting bounty on pig iron manufactured in Canada from Canadian ore, be concurred in.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. McLELAN introduced Bill (No. 150) respecting the bounty on pig iron manufactured in Canada from Canadian ore.

Bill read the first and second times, considered in Committee, read the third time, on a division, and passed.

AN OBSCENE PUBLICATION.

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

Mr. MULOCK. Before the adoption of this motion, I desire to say that I have received a communication from the mayor of the city of Toronto asking me to call the

attention of the Government to the following matter: He informs me that the New York *Police Gazette* had been prohibited from entering Canada, and that this prohibition is being evaded by the title of the paper being changed to the *Sporting Times;* that the same obscene paper under this title is now for sale in the usual places where such papers are sold, and he desired me to bring the matter in this way before the Minister of Customs—I presume it would be —in the hope that the matter would be dealt with.

NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would ask the Premier whether the requirement of the Government in relation to the Beaty Bill has been fulfilled: whether the deposit has been made by Mr. Beaty or not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A deposit has been made in New York, but whether satisfactory or not we cannot yet say.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Maintenance of Gaol and Lunatic Asylum at Regina..... $10,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. This would seem to be the organisation of a lunatic asylum at Regina, and it proposes a lump sum without any scale or arrangement as to the number of officers or the salaries.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is for the establishment of a lunatic asylum and hospital at Regina. The expenses of the lunatics in the North-West are very great, and they have to be sent to the penitentiary in Manitoba, where their board and lodging have to be paid for. It is proposed to put up an ordinary building to be used as a lunatic asylum and hospital for the lunatics who are found on the plains, and the serious cases of illness which have now to be sent to the hospital at Winnipeg at an enormous expense. There is no scale fixed for the number of officers or salaries, but that will be done on the most moderate scale.

Mr. BLAKE. The objection is to this bulk vote for salaries, when we have no statement of what the expenses are estimated to be. I trust that, under such circumstances, the salaries to be given will be of the most moderate and unexceptional character, and made in such a manner that Parliament may freely deal with them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By all means.

Legislation..... $100,520 00

Mr. MULOCK. Why is this $100,000 to meet expenses of the Franchise Act different from the item already given?

Mr. McLELAN. It is expected that the expenses will be very much less under the amendments that are made.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman will please give some particulars with respect to the $100,000.

Mr. McLELAN. The money will be expended over all the items, especially the printing.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the first item was passed, further information was promised. The country understands that the Franchise Act will cost a considerable sum. We require information as to payment to be made to the clerks, and with respect to the travelling expenses of the different officials. Our constituents will expect to obtain full particulars, and I am afraid we shall return to them blindfolded in regard to the expenses attending this Act.

Mr. McLELAN. The accounts have not come in, so as to enable the Government to make anything like a correct estimate of the expenditure. I took the accounts for printing of four of the large counties of Nova Scotia, and found they averaged $500, and upon that an estimate for the whole Dominion was based. We have no data on which to make an estimate. It is stated by those competent to judge in regard to printing matters that the expense of printing the lists will be largely reduced.

Mr. VAIL. How is it proposed to pay the revising officers? In some Nova Scotia counties there are 10,000 or 12,000 votes, and in other cases one revising officer has two counties with 20,000 or 22,000 each. Is the same sum to be paid to each officer, or will payment be made in proportion to work done?

Mr. McLELAN. Regard will be had to the quantity of work done.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The Finance Minister has stated that there is no data on which to form a reliable estimate. The Department of the Secretary of State, however, issued a circular to the different revising officers asking them for a statement of the probable cost of working the Franchise Act, omitting the cost of printing and the revising officers' salary. The cost given was between $600 and $700 per constituency. At $600, the total would reach $126,600, omitting the payment to revising officers and the printing of the lists. Consequently the estimate of the Government is entirely too small. There is a manifest determination on the part of the Government that the country shall not obtain full particulars as to the working of the Act. The only justification for a reduction in the amount is that a saving is expected in printing the lists. There is ample ground for a reduction. In one of the western constituencies the printing of the voters' list at the cost of the municipality, containing 4,792 names, was $179.65; the new list, printed under this Act and under the tariff of the Secretary of State, containing 5,126 names, will cost $621.12. One municipality that had its lists printed at the cost of $28 will pay $130 under this Act, and there is a difference of only one in the number of names.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). No doubt the Government have made a mistake in endeavoring to keep the printing under their own control. From a return brought down to the House on 21st May, which contains 1,570 pages, with respect to the Franchise Act, I have been able to cull a few interesting statements, which go to show that the Government are determined that the printing of the voters' lists shall be worked for the benefit of their own newspapers. The Government must have determined that the printing of the voters' lists shall be kept entirely in the hands of their own friends, for I find various telegrams in this correspondence instructing the revising officers that they are to have the work done at certain offices. I will read a few of them to show the House in what way the Government are seeking to control the matter. I entirely agree with the statement of the hon. member for Middlesex that if this printing had been left entirely in the hands of the revising officers, and had been done in the usual way in which it has heretofore been done in the Province of Ontario, one-half the expense would have been saved to this country. There is no doubt the Government intended that their newspapers should make a fat thing of the printing of the voters' lists, and the prices they were allowed, running from 12½ to 16 cents per name, is certainly an extravagant price, as any printer will decide for himself on looking at the list. Here is the first letter I will read:

(*Telegram.*)

"DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
"OTTAWA, 2nd January, 1885.

"To His Honor Judge SINCLAIR,
"Hamilton, Ont.

"Arrangements have been made for printing under Franchise Act for your district being done at office of Hamilton *Spectator*.

(Signed) "G. POWELL, *U.S.S.*"

Now, the Government were not altogether fortunate in their correspondence with Judge Sinclair, the revising officer for Wentworth, as will be seen by the correspondence which follows. Before proceeding with that, however, I will read a letter to the *Spectator* Printing Company from the Secretary of State:

"OTTAWA, 2nd January, 1886.

"The Proprietor of the Hamilton *Spectator*.

"SIR,—I am directed to inform you that the revising officer appointed under the Electoral Franchise Act for the electoral district of Wentworth, has been instructed to have such printing as may require to be done under the said Act, for his district, performed at the office of your paper.

"I have, &c.,

(Signed) "G. POWELL, *U.S.S.*"

In reply to the telegram sent to Judge Sinclair, I find the following answer:—

"HAMILTON, 4th January, 1886.

"G. POWELL, Esq.,
"Under Secretary of State, Ottawa.

"SIR,—I have your telegram of the 2nd instant, in these words: 'Arrangements have been made for printing under Franchise Act for your district being done at office of Hamilton *Spectator*.' In so telegraphing me I think you must have overlooked the provisions of the Franchise Act. The 16th section says in regard to the preliminary list that 'the revising officer shall then forthwith *cause* to be printed, &c,' and as to the final lists the 24th section says that the revising officer shall *cause* a sufficient number of copies of each of such lists * * *to be printed*, &c. You will therefore see that the revising officer is the person delegated by Parliament to have the lists printed He cannot do so without employing some printer; and how I had determined upon in regard to that was this: I proposed to invite tenders for the work, and the lowest tenderer would get the job provided he could do the work properly and with despatch. The money to be paid for it is not yours, mine, or any other officer of Government, but public money, and I had determined to contract for its expenditure according to well-known business rules, so that all parties able to do it should have an equal opportunity to compete for the work. This I considered to be the best course in the public interests to pursue before receiving your telegram, and I am still of that opinion. Until the Statutes declare that I must get the printing done at a particular office, or in some other way prescribes that some other person shall perform the duty of seeing the printing done, I must assume that responsibility myself. It is part of my duty under my commission, and I decline to allow any interference with it. When I fail in such duty in that respect, the Statute affords a remedy. Until then I propose to follow the Act of Parliament in regard to the printing, the same as in other respects, trying so far as my ability and an earnest desire will allow to administer the provisions of this Statute fairly and with equal justice to all.

"Yours truly,

(Signed) "J. S SINCLAIR.
"Revising Officer for the Electoral Districts of North and South Wentworth."

I will just say that it is a pity that more of the revising officers throughout the length of the Dominion have not the backbone which Judge Sinclair displayed in this matter. In answer to that letter of Judge Sinclair, I find the following from the Under Secretary of State:—

"DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
"OTTAWA, 9th January, 1886.

"SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th instant, relative to telegraphic instructions to you from this Department regarding printing required by you as a revising officer under the Electoral Franchise Act, and to state that the matter will receive consideration.

"I have, &c.,

(Signed) "G. POWELL, *U.S.S.*

"His Honor JUDGE SINCLAIR,
"Hamilton, Ont."

Then the *Spectator* Company write this letter;

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant).

"*RE* FRANCHISE ACT.

"'THE SPECTATOR,'
"HAMILTON, CANADA, 25th January, 1886.

"The Hon. SECRETARY OF STATE, Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—The enclosed advertisement, inserted by the revising officer of Wentworth, we cut from the Hamilton *Times*.

"On referring to yours of the 2nd instant, we find you say that Judge Sinclair has been instructed to give us the printing.

"We will be glad to hear from you on this matter.

"In same letter you speak about tariff, &c. We will be glad to have copies of same at your earliest convenience.

"Yours respectfully,

(Signed) "'*SPECTATOR*' COMPANY,
"W. CAREY."

Another letter to the *Spectator* people on the 26th of January by the Under Secretary of State:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
"OTTAWA, 26th January, 1886.

"W. CAREY, Esq., Managing Director *The Spectator*,
"Hamilton, Ont.

"SIR,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th instant, enclosing, for the information of the Secretary of State, a notice of the revising officer of Wentworth, under the Electoral Franchise Act, in reference to the printing of the voters' lists under that Act, and to state that my letter to Judge Sinclair was merely in the form of a suggestion, as it would not be proper on the part of the Government to dictate to the revising officer as to the discharge of his duties. Two copies of the tariff at which the lists are to be printed are herewith enclosed.

"I have, &c.,

(Signed) "G. POWELL, *U.S.S.*"

I wish to put this on record, so that the revising officers will understand that the Government have no right to dictate to them as to the manner in which they shall discharge their duties under the Franchise Act. Here is a letter from the revising officer of Hamilton addressed to the Secretary of State:

"HAMILTON, CANADA, 6th January, 1886.

"SIR,—I beg to acknowledge receipt to-day of sheets referred to in your favor of 30th ultimo, received by me yesterday.

"Judge Sinclair, Revising Officer for divisions, county Wentworth, informs me that he has been instructed to have printing done at *Spectator* office. As I have received no instructions, I shall be glad to know whether I am to advertise for tenders or have printing done at *Specator* Company office without advertising."

"I am, your obedient servant,

(Signed) "WM. BELL,
"Revising Officer for Hamilton."

'Hon. J. A. CHAPLEAU,
"Secretary of State, Ottawa."

Here is another from the *Spectator* Office:

"*RE* VOTERS' LISTS.

"'THE SPECTATOR,'
"HAMILTON, CANADA, 21st January, 1886.

"Hon. J. A. CHAPLEAU,
"Secretary of State, Ottawa.''

"DEAR SIR,—We have seen Mr. Bell, the Revising Officer for Hamilton, about printing the voters' lists. He tells us that he has not yet received instructions.

"Please issue your instructions to him to give the *Spectator* the printing of said lists, &c.

"We would suggest that the work ought to be commenced at an early date as the time is getting short in which it must be done.

"Yours very respectfully,

(Signed) "SPECTATOR COMPANY,
"W. CAREY."

Here is another from the *Spectator*:

"'THE SPECTATOR,'
"HAMILTON, CANADA, 25th January, 1886.

"The Hon SECRETARY OF STATE, Ottawa."

"DEAR SIR,—We have been informed by Mr. Bell, the Revising Officer for Hamilton, that we are to have the printing for the city.

"Kindly send us a scale of rates by return to be allowed by Government and oblige,

"Yours very truly,
(Signed) "SPECTATOR COMPANY,
"W. CAREY."

This is the same company which in 1883 and 1884 were paid $17,897 for doing work which they should have done for $4,610 for the Agricultural Department. But they were not satisfied with trying to get the printing for Hamilton for the *Spectator* office, but they also control the *Mail* job office at Toronto, and here is a letter to the Secretary of State with regard to the printing for that city:

"'MAIL' JOB DEPARTMENT,
"TORONTO, January 9, 1886.

"Secretary, Department Secretary of State, Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—I understand that instructions are being issued to the revising barristers respecting the printing required by them. I hope you can use your influence towards securing for the *Mail* job department a share of the printing for the city of Toronto and the ridings of York. We have every facility, and think we have a claim on the Government for this printing. Please advise us what course we shall adopt in order to secure a portion of this printing, and oblige

"Yours truly,
(Signed) "'MAIL' JOB DEPARTMENT,
"Per W. A. SHEPARD, *Manager*."

Just to show that this system has been adopted by the Government, I will read another telegram from the Department of the Secretary of State:

(*Telegram.*)

"DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
"OTTAWA, 2nd January, 1886.

"To His Honor JUDGE DAVIS, London, Ont.

"Arrangements have been made for printing under Franchise Act, for your district, being done at office of London *Free Press*.
(Signed) "G. POWELL, *U.S.S.*"

That is a paper which gets from $10,000 to $12,000 worth of pap every year. Here also are the instructions to the proprietor of that paper:

"OTTAWA, January 2nd, 1886.

"The Proprietor of the London *Free Press*.

"SIR,—I am directed to inform you that the Revising Officer appointed under the 'Electoral Franchise Act' for the Electoral District of Middlesex, has been instructed to have such printing as may require to be done under the said Act, for his district, performed at the office of your paper.

"A tariff regulating the charges to be allowed for printing is now being framed, and upon its adoption a copy of the same will be forwarded to you, for your information. I am also to state that the form of the voters' lists to be printed is under consideration.

"I have, &c.,
(Signed) "G. POWELL, *U.S.S.*"

But here is the most interesting correspondence of all, namely, that between the Department of the Secretary of State and the proprietor of the Chatham *Planet* newspaper:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
"OTTAWA, 2nd January, 1886.

"To the Proprietor of the *Planet* newspaper,
"Chatham, Ont.

"SIR,—I am directed to inform you that the revising officer appointed under the Electoral Franchise Act for the Electoral District of Bothwell has been instructed to have such printing as may require to be done under the said Act, for his district, performed at the office of your paper.

"A tariff regulating the charges to be allowed for printing is now being framed, and upon its adoption a copy of the same will be forwarded to you, for your information.

"I am also to state that the form of the voters' list to be printed is under consideration.

"I have, &c.,
(Signed) "G. POWELL, *U.S.S.*"

(*Telegram.*)

"DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
"OTTAWA, 2nd January, 1886.

"To His Honour Judge BELL, Chatham, Ont.

"Arrangements have been made for printing under Franchise Act, for your district, being done at office of Chatham *Planet*
(Signed) "G. POWELL, *U. S. S.*"

"CHATHAM, ONT., 9th January, 1886.

"G. POWELL, Esq, Under Secretary of State, Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR,—I have to acknowledge yours dated 2nd instant and posted Ottawa 7th re the printing required to be done under 'The Electoral Franchise Act' for the Bothwell District. I shall be pleased to learn if the appointment for this division (West Kent) has been made. Compliments of the season.

"Yours very truly,
(Signed) "S. STEPHENSON."

"CHATHAM, ONT., 27th January, 1886.

"G. POWELL, Under Secretary of State, Ottawa.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have just had a consultation with Judge Bell, Revising Officer for East Kent, about the time I might expect the copy for the lists, and was met with the salutation, 'I do not propose giving you the printing, nor do I propose to be dictated to by the Government where it shall be performed.'

"I am in a position to get out both lists and perform it within the time required by the Government, and will furnish bonds for its due performance. My staff consists of nearly forty hands and I have plenty of material on hand. Will you please instruct me at once if the spirit of your letter of the 2nd and the telegram sent to the revising officer about the same time, is to be carried out, that I may lose no time in completing arrangements. I am very sorry to trouble you with a matter I thought was, and yet consider, an absolute certainty, that I am to do the work for this county.

"I have the honor to be,
"Your obedient servant,
(Signed) "SYDNEY STEPHENSON."

(*Telegram.*)

"CHATHAM, January 28th, 1886.

"To J. A. CHAPLEAU, Secretary of State, Ottawa.

"Judge Bell, Revising Barrister, East Kent, says: 'I do not propose giving you the printing, nor do I propose being dictated to by the Government where it shall be performed, in your letter of second instant. He is a stockholder and I think director in the *Banner* Printing Company, to whom he says he is going to give the work. See my letter to Under Secretary; please send further instructions.

(Signed) "SYDNEY STEPHENSON."

"DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
"OTTAWA, 29th January, 1886.

"SYDNEY STEPHENSON, Esq,
"Proprietor *Planet* newspaper, Chatham, Ont.

"SIR,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th and of your telegram of the 28th instant with reference to the printing of the voters lists, under the Electoral Franchise Act, for the Electoral District of Bothwell and to state that whatever course his Honor Judge Bell may choose to pursue cannot be helped

"The telegram addressed to Judge Bell was suggestive only, as it would not be proper on the part of the Government to dictate to the revising officer as to the discharge of his duties.

"I have, &c.,
(Signed) "G. POWELL, *U.S.S.*"

Then comes a very interesting letter from Mr. Stephenson:

"CHATHAM, ONT., 1st February, 1886.

"G. POWELL, Esq.,
"Under Secretary of State, Ottawa, Ont.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have yours of yesterday's date, and regret you cannot see your way clear to insist upon the printing being done at this office. Judge Bell is a most violent partisan, and will not hesitate to thwart the Government if it will be of any advantage to his own party. His connection with the *Banner*, one of the most rabid papers in the country, a copy of which I send you, should, I think, be a good reason why he should not say where the work should be done; besides, not a word would be heard from him or the *Banner*, as he would not care to have his connection ventilated through the papers. The Ontario Government, some years ago, threatened the present sheriff with dismissal unless he took the printing, which was being done by Mr. Rufus Stephenson, at this office, to the *Banner*, where ever since every dollars worth has been done. I have fifteen hundred dollars worth of material on hand, that has been perfectly useless since the Postal Guide was given the Government printers, but which will come in now, thereby placing me in a splendid position to do the work rapidly. Mr. Carling and Mr. Pope promised to give me printing to recoup me for my loss, as Mr. Carling said it was a mistake to have taken the work just at the time the Department did. The present Minister——"

I think this must be a mistake in copying, and should be member.—

"—owes me $1,000 for election printing, which will be a total loss, so that if you can put it in such a light to give me the work I wish you would do so,

"Trusting you will see your way to telegraph or write the returning officer by first mail, and send me a favorable reply,

"I remain, your obedient servant,
(Signed) "S. STEPHENSON."

In reply to this, a letter was sent to Mr. Stephenson, as follows:—

"DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
"OTTAWA, 10th February, 1886.

"To S. STEPHENSON, Esq.,
"Chatham *Planet*, Chatham, Ont

"SIR,—Adverting to previous correspondence upon this subject, and especially to your letter of the 1st instant, I have the honor to inform you that it is not in the power of the Government to dictate to the revising officer as to whom he shall select to print his lists.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
(Signed) "G. POWELL, *U. S. S.*

Now, the object I have in reading this correspondence is to let the revising officers all over the Dominion see that the Government has no right to dictate to them in this matter; and if they have a desire to guard the interests of the public they will not consent to be dictated to by the Government. The course pursued by the Government in favoring their friends in the printing of these lists has resulted in doubling the cost of the lists without any doubt whatever; and it is just as well that the revising officers, newspaper men, and the public generally should understand that when an Act of Parliament is placed on the Statute-book of this country, the Government have no right to dictate to the officers appointed to administer that law, either as to the course they should pursue in dispensing the patronage or in any other way. They have the Act of Parliament to guide them, and have no necessity for instructions from the Government. I do not wonder that these newspaper men are so anxious in this matter. They smell boodle on every occasion; and they can see that by manipulating the Department of State they are able to obtain patronage at exorbitant prices, which are much greater than the prices charged under the Ontario Election Act. Under these circumstances, it is time this matter should be brought under the notice of the House. I may say that this Mr. Stephenson is the man who received a gratuity of $2,000 or $3,000 from the Government, three or four years ago, for handling the printing of the Pacific Railway Commission report, never having done any work upon it, but just pocketing the money and giving the work to the Government contractors here. Before I sit down I would propose, not exactly in connection with this, but in connection with the manner in which returns are brought down, that they should be collected in a more connected shape. The return contains 1,670 pages of letters and telegrams, all on the same subject, between the Department and individuals, and they are so mixed up, no system at all being adopted, that it is difficult to find what one wants. When there are so many officials employed, who have but little to do, surely returns ought to be brought down in better shape and in some sort of consecutive order.

Mr. MoMULLEN. I simply rise to say that I cannot allow this item to pass without putting on record my humble protest against the increase of salary of $400 to the Assistant Clerk of the House. We are not in the financial position to warrant these increases.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. What the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) has said is but a rehearsal of what has already appeared in the public press. The hon. gentleman, to make a point, was obliged to make a statement of supposed fact, which he does not know and which is not supported by proof. There is only one point, if any, that could be made, and that is that the demand of the Government that the printing should be done in certain newspaper offices had the effect of costing the country more than the printing otherwise would. The hon. gentleman being weak in his argument, was strong in his assertion. He stated, in substance, that the printing cost twice as much as it would if left to the revising officers to give to whom they chose. That statement is completely inexact. The circular which was sent to the revising officers was sent frankly and openly, and it was to the effect that the Government could have the printing done; and I think the Government should have taken the printing of all the lists into their hands, under the one condition that moderate rates should be fixed. The rates fixed in the circular were considered by Mr. Romaine and the Queen's Printer to be very reasonable, and the proof that they are so lies in the fact that the printers, not only Conservative but Grit printers, who have printed these lists, have tried to induce the Government to give higher prices than those fixed. The Grit papers have been just as eager as the others to get higher prices. Therefore, the point the hon. gentleman tried to make he did not succeed in making. It will be seen, practically, by recriminations of different printers, that the prices, as fixed by the Department, were very reasonable—not too low, but certainly not too high. No complaint has been or will be made in that respect. I do not see why the Government should not have the lists printed. If we had left it to the revising officers, the charges would have been a great deal in excess of the prices we have fixed in the circulars. As to the manner of bringing down the report, the report is well brought down. It is as much connected as possible Of course the correspondence had to be given into several hands, for had we engaged only one officer there would have been great loss of time, and it may happen that there may be some slight want of connection on that account, but, generally speaking, the correspondence has been taken and combined as sent. We have received 161 letters at a time, and they are put in the report by order of date.

Mr. BLAKE. I entirely dissent from the position taken by the Secretary of State. The statement made by my hon. friend as to the cost of printing is one which the Secretary has not in the least answered. It would be a new thing to find that the reasonableness of prices is to be fixed by the persons who get the job; it is not generally so. My hon. friend gave the example of Ontario, and stated that the rates the Government prescribed would entail double the cost which similar work cost the Ontario Government.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I deny that statement, and have authority for the denial.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend stated the Government ought to have the right to say where the printing should be done. That may be a question for argument, but it is not the view adopted by the Government last Session. The Government then, by the Franchise Act, gave the power to the revising officer who, they declared, were independent of the Government, to determine where the printing should be done. If the hon. gentleman held the view he now takes, last Session, he failed then to convince his colleagues, and, as a member of the Government which carried the Bill, he participated in and is responsible for the policy which the Government then adopted, and which he now says is not the right one. The Act having declared that the printing should be left altogether in the hands of the revising officer, it was an impudent act on the part of the Government to send them instructions as to the way in which they should discharge their duty, and if but a few of the revising officers were possessed of sufficient firmness and regard for their position, to repudiate the impudent assumption of the Government, so much the worse for the country. A circular was sent the revising officers, saying that the printing had been arranged by the Government to

be given to so and so, and when a few repudiated this instruction, the hon. gentleman is obliged to say it was only a suggestion.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. So it was.

Mr. BLAKE. It was an instruction.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It was not.

Mr. BLAKE. The language of the letters in which he communicated with the newspaper officers is, that "the revising officer has been instructed to send you the papers." Now the hon. gentleman says they were not instructed, and that the statement is about as accurate as many others the hon. gentleman has made. Most of the revising officers obeyed his instructions, and few repudiated them. When an Act of Parliament is passed, that Act ought to be obeyed by the Government, and the hon. gentleman has no right to take a power or to assume an authority in carrying out an Act which Parliament has not given him, and which he assumes because he thinks that the Act should have provided differently. He has no right to assume to himself an authority which Parliament did not clothe him with. He has no right to arrogate to the Government an authority which Parliament did not clothe them with. He ought to have left this entirely to the control of the revising officers. What he might have done was this: He might have issued a circular to the revising officer saying that he had enquired and had found that such and such rates ought to be maximum rates; he might have issued a circular for their information, suggesting that the principle of tender ought to be applied, but merely as suggestions. Even these would be acts of interference which would be entirely questionable, but of that character that they could be acts of interference in respect of which nobody could say that the Government was animated by anything else than a consideration for the public service. But, when you find that their act of interference is one directed to the support of their own party papers, declaring that the printing is to be given to persons whom they nominate and appoint on considerations of party favoritism, then you find interference which, of any description whatever, would be questionable, but in this case is more than questionable, is grossly improper.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I maintain that the Government had a right to make a suggestion. If the argument of my hon. friend was correct, the revising officers might have told the Government that they had no right whatever to fix a rate for the cost of printing and might have said that the Statute gave them a right to print at a dollar, when we said they should print at fifty cents, and we would have been called impudent for endeavoring to save the public money. This question of patronage which is put as a condemnation against the Government is not an act of patronage or favoritism, inasmuch as the rate was fixed and was to be followed, and what was to be given was not to be given more to one than to another, but was a regular price; and I state again, without fear of being contradicted by the fact, that, in regard to what my hon. friend has stated to be a proof that we have paid more for the printing than should have been paid, that the Ontario lists did not cost so much, if it is with such an argument that he wants to ask the country to go with them and condemn the Government, he is asking the condemnation under a false pretence, because in making the comparison with the lists of Ontario, he is insinuating that these lists are the same, should be printed in the same manner, and could not cost more, list for list, than the others; whereas there is a wide difference, if not of a half certainly of more than a quarter. The comparison is calculated to deceive the public, and I state again, in the face of my hon. friend and of any of the printers on that side of the House, or outside of the House, the Grit printers, that the rates for printing which were given as absolute rates, are low rates for printing such lists.

Mr DUNDAS. I am not going to argue the constitutional principle as to whether the Government is right or not in dispensing the patronage to those papers which support them and approve of their policy. I would only say that they have the precedent of the hon. gentlemen opposite to follow in this matter, if that precedent is of any value. But I beg to take issue at once with the position that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) has taken, that is, that the Government and the members representing the constituencies have all through dictated to the revising barristers as to how they should have the printing done. I know in the constituency which I represent there was no interference of any kind with the revising officer, and the result is that the printing was done by the Reform paper of that town, notwithstanding that there was a paper in the town representing the principles of this Government. There was no interference in any way either by the Government or by the representatives to prevent the revising officer from giving the printing to whom he chose, and he gave it to that paper which is noted for its consistent opposition to the Government.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Because the other could not do it, perhaps.

Mr. DUNDAS. The other paper could do it, and is as respectable a paper as will be found in any town of its size in Ontario. The assertions made by those gentlemen are too sweeping, and I regret taking up the time of the House at this period of the Session in order to give this contradiction, which I am sure could also be done by members representing other constituencies.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). It was stated by the Secretary of State that it was merely a suggestion, and no dictation was intended to the revising officers. I will read a telegram which will throw some light on that point:

"Arrangements have been made for printing, under Franchise Act, in your district, being done at the office of the Hamilton *Spectator*."

That is not a suggestation; that is a dictation. The same was sent in reference to the London *Free Press*, the Chatham *Planet* and other newspapers. In regard to the cost of the printing, I say most emphatically, and I know of what I speak, that the price paid for the printing of these lists was an outrageously high price, and, if the Government had not fixed the rates to be paid, and the revising officers had been allowed the opportunity of asking for tenders for printing these lists, it would have saved the country a great deal of money. It is fair to compare these lists with the Ontario lists, and, if they are compared, it will be found that the Ontario lists do not cost one-half what the Dominion lists cost, as ordered to be done by the Government.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The statements received from the clerks of the municipalities in the west riding of Middlesex show that the total cost to the municipality of the voters' list for 1885 foots up to $179.65. I had these in my possession and have added the figures myself. There were 4,972 names on these lists. I have counted the new voters' list and it contains 5,126 names, which, at 12 cents a name, half a cent less than the amount allowed by the Government, would amount to $621.12. If there is a comparison instituted between the two lists as to the amount and character of the work, the quantity of paper required, and their relative value in other respects, the municipal lists will be said by printers to have been most expensive, because every one of them except one has a four page cover, stating what is contained in the document, and there are other conditions which would make the list much more costly than the one prepared under the Dominion Franchise Act.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). A few figures in opposition to a statement are very valuable. The Secretary of State has taken very high ground and denied positively without furnishing any figures whatever. I have had left with me a statement by an hon. member which he had gathered with reference to the operation in his county. Whereas the municipal lists in one municipality were printed for $30, under the Franchise Act they will cost $60; in another municipality they cost $30, under the Franchise Act, $90.12; in another $20, under the Franchise Act, $72; in another $25, under the Franchise Act, $103; in another $35, under the Franchise Act, $120; in another $20, under the Franchise Act, $72.

Intercolonial Railway $20,000 00

Mr. MITCHELL. With regard to this vote, I moved at an early stage of this Session for a return of papers connected with several claims, those of the Rev. Mr. Bannon, the late Senator Muirhead, the present Judge Wilkinson and a number of others, who had claims arising out of the contractors' claim on section 16. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that these claims have been referred to the Dominion Arbitrators for arbitration, and they have made a very favorable report, which I will not trouble the House with reading. I would ask the Minister when he will take up these claims with a view to having them arranged? I presume this vote is placed here for the purpose of meeting cases such as I have referred to.

Mr. POPE. I will take up the claims very soon, but as to whether this vote is for the purpose of meeting such claims as the hon. gentleman refers to, I do not know. It is put here for the purpose of paying persons who may be proved to have anything due to them. With respect to the claims the hon. gentleman mentions, I will enquire into them, and if they come under this vote, of course they will be dealt with.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wanted to know if this vote is applicable to these claims. A favorable report has already been made, and I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to meet those claims, which are just.

Mr. WELDON. I would mention to the Minister of Militia that there has been some difficulty about giving passes over the Intercolonial Railway to the riflemen who went to the rifle competition in the Maritime Provinces. I hope that such arrangements may be made as that these passes may be continued, otherwise the volunteers of the Maritime Provinces will certainly be deprived of meeting in competition.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can tell the hon. gentleman that this matter is now under consideration.

Trent River Navigation, &c $160,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. What does this "&c." mean? In this connection the Minister promised to give us what information there was as to the estimated cost of the canal.

Mr. POPE. The "&c." means the unfinished work, and this is considered sufficient to complete. As to the rest, I shall have to apologise to the House, as the chief engineer has given me nothing that I can bring before the House, and I have no other information at present except what would be misleading, and could be of no advantage to the House. As soon as I can get the information I will bring it down.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very sorry that the information the hon. gentleman has in his archives on the subject of this canal, up to this time, would be misleading.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex).

Canals $60,000 00

Mr. KIRK. I would ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if he took into consideration the petition and application made to him for a sum of money to repair the White haven Canal in Guysboro' county. The people have been pressing it upon him for the last two years, and I am sorry the Minister has proposed no vote for that purpose. What is the reason he has not given some attention to that canal?

Mr. POPE. I really cannot, at this moment, give the hon. gentleman any information, but I will enquire into it, and on concurrence will be able to say whether there is anything.

Esquimalt Graving Dock $250,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This sum is to complete that work, to pay the contractors for the work finished, and the Imperial Government will repay the sum by the 1st of January.

Military Works in British Columbia $25,000 00

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This sum has been placed in the Estimates for the purpose of carrying out an understanding between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Government. Under this arrangement the Imperial Government undertake to provide all the armament, the guns, a system of marine torpedoes, &c., for the purpose of protecting the harbors of Victoria and Esquimalt, Canada undertaking to build the fortifications, which will be armed with guns sent out from England.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry this arrangement has not been laid on the Table of the House. What are the plans for the military works which the hon. gentleman proposes—I do not know whether this is to complete or whether it is a payment on account. If it is not to complete, what is the general character of the work, and what is the value of the contribution by the Imperal Government by way of armament, as compared with the proposed contribution by Canada?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The plans for the fortifications are not yet completed, and have not yet been received. The intention is to build earth works of as inexpensive a character as possible. The Imperial Government's contribution will be from £25,000 to £30,000 sterling, and the contribution of Canada, without being over positive as to the amount, which can only be ascertained exactly when the plans are ready, will reach between £15,000 and £20,000 sterling.

Mr. BLAKE. Will this scheme involve a permanently increased expenditure for a military fort to defend the works?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Last year and this year a sum has appeared in the Estimates for C School of Gunnery. That school will be on the same principle as A and B Batteries, and will take charge, to a very great extent, of these works. The intention is not to increase the expense by adding to the force, but to organise the militia in British Columbia as in other portions of the Dominion.

Mr. VAIL. I understand that an Imperial engineer is going to British Columbia. Is he being sent there by the Imperial Government or by the Canadian Government?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am under the impression that he is being sent out by the Imperial Government for the purpose of inspecting the Esquimalt graving docks, but I am not able to give any definite information.

Montreal Post Office, Electric lighting..... $2,250 00

Mr. BLAKE. Is this an independent service?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, the next building is the Montreal *Gazette* office, where there is an engine and we obtain the electricity from that building.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have 150 lamps for $2,750 The contract runs for four or five years, and additional lamps are to be furnished at $7.30 per lamp, per annum.

Mr. BLAKE. What candle power are the lamps?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say.

Mr. BLAKE. How does the cost compare with the cost of gas.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In 1885 the gas cost $4,000, so we save about $700 or $800 per annum.

Public Buildings, Ontario.. ..... $134,477 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is to be the cost of the Napanee post office and custom house?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Between $15,000 and $16,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is it to be put?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is not decided.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is in redemption of a pledge made four years ago and it is time it should be redeemed. This, I suppose, is for the land only.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, we do not wish to fix the price of the land. We do not want it to be understood that the land will cost that much.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps there may be a gift of the land.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, perhaps—if you put it where I want it. But would it not be better to take a vote for the whole amount and proceed with the work. There can be no difficulty in settling about the site.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The object of that is this: After the Session, in June or July, we must procure a piece of land and some one is sent to examine. When we have fixed on a proper site it is purchased and the Order in Council is passed. Then the title must be examined so that it takes some time to get the final title. The plans and specifications will be prepared, and by that time Parliament will be meeting again and we will ask for an additional amount.

Mr. MULOCK. What is this $8,000 for Toronto post office.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Part of it, apparently about $6,500, is to purchase a lot on the west side of the post office on Lombard street. We were afraid it might get into other hands and that we would be prevented from getting light on that side of the property. The balance is to remodel the plumbing and outbuildings.

Mr. MULOCK. How much land has been purchased?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is forty-one feet by ninety-one feet.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the price per foot?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is evidently an error in the figures supplied me, but deducting the amount for repairs from the whole vote the price paid must be about $6,500. The property has not been finally purchased—only provisionally—till Parliament votes the money.

Mr. MULOCK. If $6,500 is the price, it is a most exorbitant price. The place is in the slums of the city. The Post Office bounds extend in the rear to Lombard street, a street that has been abandoned; and I am aware of transactions in property in that street, far better situated than this, in which $50 a foot was considered as the value of the land. If the Government have paid $6,500 for it, they have paid three times its value.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The memorandum I have states that if this lot passed into private hands and was built upon, the light on that side of the post office building would be, to a large extent, shut off. The price is considered by the chief architect to be fair and reasonable.

Mr. MULOCK. Who is the chief architect?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Fuller.

Mr. BLAKE. It is absurd to take Mr. Fuller's estimate of the value of property in Toronto.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He takes evidence.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know whether he took evidence in this case or not; it is not stated. The proper way to ascertain the value of the property is to take the opinion of those who know the value of property in the city, and my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock), who cannot be far astray, states that we are paying three prices for it.

London Infantry School $30,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain the vote of $30,000 for the London Infantry School?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is to enable the chief architect to carry on the work of the proposed new barracks. The cost of the barrack building, including furnishing, heating, &c., is estimated at $75,000; then there is $3,600 for the architect and $2,000 for the clerk of works, the total estimated cost being $81,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman received any information as to difficulties in connection with the drainage of the site of the school?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not.

Mr. BLAKE. It has been stated in the papers that there are serious difficulties, and that pile driving will have to be resorted to in order to overcome them.

Mr. CARLING. The architect was in the city yesterday, and he says that the difficulty can be overcome by the construction of a drain

Mr BLAKE. I suppose this is the property as to which the tripartite agreement was made some time ago, under which the city bought some property from the Minister of Agriculture, and the hon. gentleman took that property and gave the city some other property?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state the nature of the arrangement?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In 1884, on the recommendation of General Middleton, it was determined to establish an Infantry School at London. The citizens of London were very adverse to the school being established on the Government property, for reasons which they set forth. Upon that recommendation, three sites were offered, the Geary site, the Kent site, and the Carling farm. The matter was submitted to the brigade major of the district, and he recommended the Carling farm as the most suitable. The offer made to the city was $10,000 in cash and a deed of 16 acres of land of Government property and the right to use some 90 acres adjoining for camping purposes for 20 years, for 8 acres of land now used as our military property. This proposition was approved by Order in Council; but it had to be submitted to a vote of the ratepayers of London, who rejected it. Subsequently, however, the city made a new proposition, that they would give a free deed of fifty-five acres of

the Carling farm within the city limits, which has been used as a military camp-ground for many years, for eight acres of the Government property referred to in the former proposition. This proposition was again referred to the brigade major, and was referred by him to Mr. George Durand, a well-known architect of London, on the 26th of April, 1885. A valuation of the two properties was sent in by him. The Government property was estimated at $41,355 and the fifty-five acres of the Carling farm were estimated at $46,000. I was not satisfied to take this valuation; I wanted to get more than one, and the proposition was again submitted to the valuation of Mr. McElheran, an auctioneer and valuator, and Mr. William M. Ward, a real estate agent; and these gentlemen reported the value of the Government property at $39,030, and the fifty-five acres of the Carling farm at $44,000. This subsequent offer of exchange was referred to the council and approved, and the exchange has been made, and the contract for the building let, and the work is now going on. I will bring down and lay on the Table all the papers.

Mr. BLAKE. Is Mr. Durand the architect of the building now?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. It has been represented outside, from time to time, that this institution, which is to be erected in or near London, is to be analogous to the Kingston College. Of course, that is not the case.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No; it is to be analogous to the School of Infantry, Toronto.

Manitoba Penitentiary..... $25,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to go on with certain works. The works when completed will require a very large sum, but we are only doing what is absolutely necessary just now. The total cost will be about $354,000. The amount that we would have required this year might have been $125,000, but we have placed $50,000 in the Estimates, and with these $25,000 we think there will be enough for this year, the labor of the convicts being largely employed.

North-West Mounted Police Barracks..... $75,000 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is to be applied towards the erection of new barracks at different points, and the total cost will be about $1.0,000.

Mr. BLAKE. Where are the main centres to be?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The headquarters of the force will be at Regina, from which point the police will be sent where required. We are to have a regular patrol along the whole frontier as a great deal of trouble arises in connection with horse thieves, raiders crossing to and fro and coming into collision with the inhabitants. We will have a movable force employed from the foot of the Rockies to Emerson. The force has been increased from 300 to 1,000, so that present accommodation is quite inadequate.

Harbors and Rivers in Nova Scotia..... $93,400 00

Mr. VAIL. I see an item here: "Breakwater, Economy, $1,500." Where is the economy?

Mr. MITCHELL. I notice there are quite a number of votes for harbors and rivers in Nova Scotia, but when you come to Nova Scotia there is very little. I moved, at an early stage of the Session, for papers connected with an application for a pier at Nigquac, as my French friends call it, or Nigger Whack, as it is called by my Irish friends. Last year, when I did not express my opinions so freely as to the conduct of the Government, I got some encouragement, but I was disappointed, and I am still more disappointed this Session, because an election will be coming on shortly and I would like to do something there to strengthen my hands. I put the matter before the Minister of Public Works and represented that this was really a vote that would materially assist a certain portion of my constituency that wanted my assistance. They have not yet had any public money expended in their locality there, and they are badly in need of a public landing. I have tried every possible means. I tried coaxing, I tried putting the real merits and justice of the case before the Minister. I then tried a little pressure. Then I tried something a little stronger. Then I gave them an editorial or something of that kind, but the whole thing would not do. He says, my dear Mitchell, while I would be very glad to do anything I could for you, you know how it is yourself; you have been attacking us, and when it comes before the Council I need not tell you how it is, you know all about it. I appealed then to my hon. friend's vanity, and I flattered him a bit. I said, you know, Sir Hector, you can do anything you like with Sir John if you go the right way about it. He said he would try again, but it is a case of try, try again, and nothing has come of it. I find I am excluded from the list. Now, I appeal to the First Minister, and I want to know now if he is going to do anything about it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would make a suggestion. Would the hon. gentleman take a senatorship instead?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would make a suggestion also. I know that I had to pay for widow Murphy's cow in order to get through the estimates a few years ago. Give him his pier, for Heaven's sake.

Mr. MITCHELL. I reject the offer of a senatorship with disdain. I would rather have this little pier given to the suffering people of Neguac than a senatorship. I would not take a senatorship. I will tell you what I would take. Sometimes the hon. gentleman's promises are not kept, but, if he will promise that it shall be put in next year, if we are here, I will keep quiet.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend from Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has made an utterly impossible suggestion to the Government. He has actually suggested to the Government to give to my hon. friend from Northumberland his pier. Where shall we find his peer? The hon. gentleman really ought to adopt, with modifications, his former plan. He offered and succeeded in exchanging a senatorship for another public work. The only thing he has now left to exchange is his seat in the House of Commons. The senatorship is gone. I have something to complain of about the hon. gentleman again to-day. Really, there ought to be a certain amount of decency observed in regard to the method on which we are to vote money and the purposes for which we are to vote it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not belong to your party yet. Don't lecture me.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman did, perhaps I should not make these observations. But I would suggest to him, ought we not, for decency's sake, to avoid saying that the object of an appropriation is to strengthen ourselves with our people, and that that is the object for which these appropriations are scattered through these Estimates?

Mr. MITCHELL. We know it is. I am honest in the matter. I suppose I have the right hon. gentleman's promise for next year?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, if the hon. gentleman is content with that——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have no peers on this side of the water, but I offered my hon. friend the next thing, a Canadian senatorship.

Mr. VAIL. I do not object to this vote; it may be justifiable; but I am interested in a matter in my county. Previous to Confederation, four-fifths of the amount granted

for this purpose were expended in the counties of King's, Annapolis and Digby. Of late, very little money has been expended in those counties. Four years ago, I asked the Minister of Public Works if he would vote some money for a couple of wharves in that county, but nothing has been done except that he sent an engineer there, who has corroborated my statement as to the dangerous condition of the Church Point wharf. Last year the Minister told me he would do something, and this year I expected from what he said that, at all events, a small amount to keep the work from being destroyed would be placed in the Estimates, but there is no mention made of it. Does the Minister intend to make that appropriation, or cannot he take it out of the amount voted for the repairs generally in the Maritime Provinces?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to say to-day, but I will consider it.

Mr. VAIL. I would like information with reference to this grant for Great Village River. I find here is a grant of $3,900.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a revote.

Mr. VAIL. Part of it, I am aware is a revote. Expenditure has been going on for three or four years on that work. In 1884 the first grant was made of $4,250, and in 1885 another grant was made of $850.

Mr. McLELAN. All that has been expended of the public money on that work has been $5,100, and by private subscription, from $14,000 to $17,000.

Mr. VAIL. I think the Minister of Finance ought to expend all his private means on it.

Mr. McLELAN. The Minister of Finance is not expending any of his private means on it.

Mr. VAIL. This is merely to straighten a brook by which his firm is to get an advantage by bringing in a large amount of marsh that will be made valuable. It is spent in the interest of the Minister of Finance and his partner there, and the money is paid to the firm to which the Minister of Finance belongs—or if he is not now he has been up to a recent date a member of that firm. I do not think the hon. gentleman, in his capacity as Minister of Finance, should appropriate the public funds in that way and leave other districts that are much more in want of help, out in the cold.

Mr. McLELAN. There is no district on the whole coast of the Bay of Fundy that more requires this money than Great Village River, for the general navigation of the place. If the hon. gentleman had ever seen it or known anything about the trade of that place, he would not stand up here in Parliament and make such an assertion. I have no special interest in it other than general benefit to the place.

Mr. VAIL. The money has been paid to the partner of the Minister of Finance?

Mr. McLELAN. No, it has not; he is not my partner in any business except in owning ships outside.

Mr. VAIL. I have letters from there explaining fully the position of affairs, which I do not propose to read to-day to show all I know in regard to it.

Harbors and Rivers, Quebec..... $98,325 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is very much to be regretted that a number of items involving this large sum, the most of which the Minister must have known would be required, were not put in the original estimates instead of being brought down now. I cannot pretend to go through these at present, but I desire to know what number of these items are a commencement of works which may involve much larger sums.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Montmagny, $2,000; I do not think anything else will be required. Rimouski River, $1,000 will complete. River Saguenay, $5,000; this will not complete, but it is a work that has been going on for some time. The next item of $5,000 for the River Saguenay will not complete, and we will require $2,000 or $3,000 more. Chicoutimi, $3,425 are for repairs. Rivière Verte, $1,000; this is to take out the boulders. St. Laurent, St. Jean and Ste. Famille, $3,000; this is for repairs. Rivière Ste. Anne de Beaupré, $2,000 is to complete a wing dam. Doucet's Landing, $2,000 is for dredging; nothing else will be required. Longueuil, $10,000; this is a new work, and will require more money later on, but this amount will make a complete work by itself. Longueuil is a harbor having two railways and having a large trade with Montreal, but having no accommodation for vessels. Cascades, $3,000; we will require $2,500 to complete. Rivière du Lièvre, $1,000; that is for a look at the lower portion of the river. Bay St. Paul, $5,000; that completes the work. Kamouraska, $3,000; I think that amount will complete. Rivière St. Nicholas, $1,200; that is to clear the river of boulders. St. Placide, $5,000; I think that will complete.

Harbors and Rivers, Ontario..... $59,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the arrangement with Belleville? Does the $20,000 that were to be expended, complete the work?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A great deal of damage was caused there by the flood, and the people of the town have sent deputations asking the Government to come to their relief. An arrangement was made that if we would give $10,000 they would pay the same amount, or if we gave $20,000 they would give $20,000 on their side, because the work was partly of a local nature. This work will be in my Department.

Roads and Bridges..... $18,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the policy of the Government going to be with respect to roads and bridges in the North-West. We seem to be entering on a policy which may involve very heavy outlays. I am aware that when the Dominion own the land we may be called upon to contribute larger sums than we could otherwise be called upon to grant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are doing as little as possible. The Bow River is a very fine and rapid river, and is in the centre of the ranching country, and the structures will be more expensive than the few inhabitants there could undertake to build.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot venture to make any suggestions at this moment, but I hope that next Session the Government will announce some policy with respect to constructing bridges in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right.

Telegraphs..... $20,400 00.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would give some information?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have been building telegraph lines in the North-West for a number of years. We have been extending the line from the Canadian Pacific Railway to the north, as far as Prince Albert on one side and St. Albert on the other, by way of Edmonton. This line is absolutely necessary if we want to have communication with the upper country. When the troubles of last year occurred, I do not know what would have happened but for having this telegraph line. Of course, it might be handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but it is a

question whether we should allow all our telegraph lines to pass into the hands of that company.

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions..... $33,500 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought we had dropped the item of $24,000 for steam communication between Canada and Germany.

Mr. McLELAN. A company had an agreement for this service for three or five years, and was very unfortunate in losing a number of ships. It was supposed that the company had abandoned the route, but they have asked to be allowed to complete their contract. With respect to the $7,500 for subsidy for steamers from a port in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island to Great Britain or continental ports, I may say that this item was dropped from the ordinary Estimates. There was some objection raised on the part of New Brunswick that the grant merely aided the shipment of the lumber of a particular firm. Information was obtained from Prince Edward Island that a large number of farmers had been making preparations to export cattle, and it was decided to continue the grant so that they should not be disappointed.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think I can add a little to the information furnished. The hon. gentleman will perhaps tell us why the amount was dropped as regards the port of Miramichi. He can continue the service for the Bay of Fundy, all round the Halifax coast and in connection with Prince Edward Island; but I can inform him that taking away the subsidy for the Miramichi route is practically rendering useless the island subsidy, as a vessel cannot run on that route on one subsidy. The vessel was of great use to the Port of Miramichi, and although it filled up with deals, it carried fish, cattle or tanning extract of which a large quantity is manufactured. Why the subsidy is dropped, is because I am not a subservient follower of the Administration. I should like to know by what right the hon. Finance Minister struck out the subsidy.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not think it is right for the hon. gentleman to charge me with having struck it out. If he supposed that it was done at my dictation, he should have sent me some communication calling attention to it, but I have not heard from him on the question. I have heard from a great many people on the north shore that the only result of granting the subsidy was that a certain firm was able to ship deals at less cost than their neighbors. And for that reason it was dropped—knowing the differences of opinion among the various shippers and manufacturers of lumber along the coast, as well as the feelings of some of the parties in Prince Edward Island in respect to the class of boats used last year—a class that cost a very high insurance—it was dropped from the main Estimates. Representations were made from the island that it was desirable to have encouragement to some boat to call there. If the steamers that run to Miramichi are of the proper class, arrangements may be made with them as far as this $1,500 will go, and we think it will be sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman says that if I had desired this I should have communicated with him Well, my experience in communicating with him has not been of a very satisfactory character. I have frequently addressed him with but little result; so much so that I have ceased to address him. But what I did do was to get several of the representatives, both of our Province and the island, who are interested in the matter, to speak to the hon. gentleman on the subject. I know that a representative was sent from the firm who owned these steamers to have an interview with the hon. gentleman on this subject, and he called on me to see what I would advise, and he asked me to go with him. I said there is no use; I will only do you harm with the Finance Minister, and I had better stay away. The hon. gentleman speaks about the island being served, and about the island calling on him for a subsidy. Why, Sir, the ground on which the double subsidy was given last year was that it required both subsidies to get the firm to put on vessels that were suitable, and I think he has treated that section of the country very unfairly. The hon. gentleman knows very well that if I had thought that my requesting it would be of any service I would have written him a ream of paper on the subject, but I had written him so much and so little attention was paid to it that I thought it was of no use to communicate with him.

Mr. McLELAN. I have only known two instances in which the hon. gentleman has addressed me on public matters, on which his representations have not been met, and in those instances I did not think that it was in the public interest that his views should be met.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will refer to the records of his department.

Mr. McLELAN. One was on the question of an increase of salary to his brother, and the other was the superannuation of a lighthouse keeper and the appointment of an older man than the one he wished to have superannuated.

Mr. MITCHELL Since the hon. gentleman has referred to it, I will state the kind of justice I have received from him. It is true that I did ask that my brother should be restored, as a number of other officers had been restored to the same positions, in point of salary, which they had occupied before the Mackenzie Government came in, that Government having reduced their salaries. I found that out of some twelve officers whose salaries had been reduced by Mr. Mackenzie, every one of them but my brother was restored to their old positions. I had correspondence with the hon. gentleman, and had frequent interviews with him, and he repeatedly admitted that it was a great hardship that he should be treated differently from the others. I pointed out numerous instances in his own Province and in mine, and I said that I did not care for the amount of money but that it was a slur on a good officer that he should not be restored to his old position, as the others had been. Those are the facts of the case, and the hon. gentleman knows them to be the facts of the case, and he knows it to be an act of injustice, and that he repeatedly promised to have the matter rectified and never kept his promise.

Mr. McLELAN. No, I never promised.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then he says that I wanted one man superannuated and another put in his place who was older than the man whom I wished superannuated. I say that is not true.

Mr. McLELAN. Then you put what is untrue on the records yourself.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has the records there in the Department and I challenge him to bring them here. I will tell the House the facts. There are three lighthouses in the Bay of Miramichi, at the angles of a triangle so to speak—one of them being occupied by this Mr. Savoy. I wanted Mr. Savoy, who is 63 years of age, superannuated and another person, a younger man put in, and I wanted the others shifted so that the arrangement would be more convenient to the people there. I wanted old Mr. Savoy superannuated and his nephew, a young man, put in his place. The hon. gentleman does not remember the incidents as well as I do. But he would not do it, and a little feeling arose and the injustice which the hon. gentleman perpetrated in connection with my brother's case induced me to feel that it was not worth my while to send communications to him.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman says that injustice was done him in the case of his brother, that I promised

to remedy that injustice. When the hon. gentleman went out of office he increased the salary of his brother, who was an inspector of lights, from $1,200 to $1,600. I said that I could not restore him to his old salary because if I did I should have to do so in the case of the other inspectors. With respect to the superannuation of the light-house keeper, the hon. gentleman said here is a point where a vessel has been wrecked, and the man is too old; you should have a younger and more active man; I want that man superannuated; I want his nephew appointed; I want another man brought to that place where it is dangerous. But when he gave me the name of the man, and when I looked at the record which he himself placed on the records of the Department, I found that the man that he wished to put in the place was older than the man he wanted to superannuate by a year. Further, I found that his own brother, the inspector, had made a report on the case of this man who was located at the dangerous point, and that his report stated that the man did all that possibly could be done, in the case of the shipwreck, that he kept his lights well, and I said to the hon. gentleman how can I superannuate that man in the face of your brother's report.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman now refers to another feature of the matter. The charge was brought against Savoy by his political opponents that he was unfit for his position, that a shipwreck had occurred there, that he was unable to help the people and that four persons were drowned in sight of the lighthouse. I asked that the officer should be changed and one brought from the Portage Island lighthouse to that point. This man, though he was a year older was a vigorous and able man—very much the superior of the other in physical ability. It is true, he sent my brother down to investigate and report on the matter as to whether Mr. Savoy had neglected his duty to save those people. It was proved that he was an old man and that he could not go out, and four persons were drowned within sight of the lighthouse.

Mr. McLELAN. It was not that he had neglected to do anything, but the circumstances were such that no man could do anything.

Mr. MITCHELL. It was that he had neglected his duty, and you sent your inspector to go and enquire into the matter, and he reported that a young man had better be appointed there.

To provide for the cost of the Police Vessels to be employed in the Protection of the Fisheries. $50,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the First Minister any information to give to the House with respect to negotiations with the British or American Government in relation to the protection of the fisheries?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An active correspondence is going both with Washington and England every day. We are not in a position to lay before the House just now this correspondence, which I hope will terminate satisfactorily.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe a statement in the papers that the Bill which has passed both Houses at Washington has been reserved. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to give any information on that subject?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is stated.

For the encouragement of the production of Cod Liver Oil and Fish Guano..... $4,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT, What is this for?

Mr. FOSTER. This is to encourage the production in our own country of cod liver oil for medicinal purposes. There is plenty of material for it, it commands a very remunerative price, and it is thought that by this encouragement some method may be adopted so that it may become a paying and profitable industry.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended to subsidise one or more manufacturers?

Mr. FOSTER. The Department has not matured any distinct plan by which it shall be done. This is simply a trial vote, and after the House has passed the vote, some plan will be adopted by which the object sought may be gained.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a perfectly absurd way of asking Parliament to vote money. The hon. gentleman says the Government have not decided on any plan whatever of accomplishing this object. It seems to me this vote is proposed without the slightest regard to what the relative duties and rights of the Executive and Parliament are.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think in all conscience the Government before asking for $4,000, ought to have some sort of idea of what is to be done with it. The Minister does not state whether he is going to subsidise a manufactory or what on earth he is going to do with this money, and for aught we can tell, it may be handed over without the public interest being served. I would rather give him $4,000 for secret service at once, because then we would know where we stood.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not to be so used. Some attention has been given to this subject, and information has been received from the Maritime Provinces. It is proposed to divide this sum among the four Maritime Provinces, giving them $1,000 each. It will probably be given in the way of a bounty. The maximum production will be fixed, and the medicinal oil will be subject to inspection.

Mr. BLAKE. Have any applications been made by any individuals?

Mr. FOSTER. Applications have been made, and a very large and influential deputation waited on me, composed of members of this House from the Maritime Provinces. They brought to the attention of the Department what was being done in Norway in this industry, and pressed very strongly that something ought to be done to encourage it here. I have no doubt some efficient plan will be adopted by which that will be done.

Mr. GILLMOR. I represent a large fishing population, and I know nothing about that deputation. I know that the demand for guano is greater than the supply. It has been manufactured in my county for many years, and the industry is a profitable one. It brings from $6 to $12 a ton, and there is always a demand for all that is made. With regard to cod liver oil, I do not know that there has been any made there for medicinal purposes.

Mr. MILLS. The Government ought to abandon this vote. They might as well ask a vote for the raising of wheat. Where is the difference? These men are engaged in the manufacture of a particular product, which has been manufactured in parts of this country for years back, and for which there is always a demand. Why, therefore, should persons engaged in other branches of industry be taxed for the purpose of inducing people in particular localities to engage in this branch?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If this were merely a vote for the encouragement of the manufacture of guano, I could see why it should not be voted, but its object is the encouragement of the manufacture of cod liver oil for medicinal purposes. What we produce is merely the crude oil which is exported and comes back refined into medicinal oil at an enormously enhanced price. Whether from the want of enterprise or other circumstances, noboby has gone into that enterprise. The difference between the value of the crude oil and the oil for medicinal purposes is enormous,

and the object of this vote is to encourage the manufacture of this medicinal product. It is to try and start that industry. Guano is merely the refuse after the production of the oil.

Mr. MULOCK. It is satisfactory to hear the explanation of the First Minister, which has made more impression on my mind than that of the Minister in charge of that Department. I would like to ask whether any persons have offered to undertake that industry?

Mr. McLELAN. A deputation, with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, waited upon us in respect of this matter, the deputation being composed of members of this House representing fishing districts. They stated there was a large waste of offal in districts in Quebec, Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, and that the crude did not sell for more than 40 or 50 cents a gallon, while the imported article for medicinal purposes sold for $2 a gallon. They stated further there was a waste in the want of conversion of the crude oil into medicinal oil of hundreds of thousands of dollars. There were no instances in which guano had been manufactured in their districts. No individual outside made representation that he wanted to go into it, but they said there was a waste and there ought to be some steps taken to remedy it.

Mr. WILSON. This proposition is very unreasonable, when we consider that in the country there is as good oil manufactured as can be got abroad. Does the hon. gentleman expect by this vote, that he is going to foster the industry so far as to make it self-sustaining? If there is a market for oil, the demand would cause the supply to be produced, and the waste would not take place. To say that cod liver oil manufactured in Canada is not good for medicinal purposes is an absurdity. I find it superior to much of the stuff we get from abroad. Canadian manufactured cod liver oil is as beneficial, from a medicinal point of view, as any we can get. There must be something behind this vote we cannot divine.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman acknowledged that the vote should not be taken if it was for the encouragement of guano only; but he said the guano was taken from the product which is the result of converting the crude oil into refined. We know that the liver of the cod is the most valuable part of the fish; it is that which is always saved, and from which the oil is taken, so that in taking out the raw oil you will get the guano at any rate. There is therefore no necessity to refine it to get the guano; besides the work of manufacturing medicinal oil has been going on for at least twenty years in Quebec, as my hon. friend (Mr. Langelier) has said. The hon. gentleman said there was a great waste of the fish offal because we did not make the guano.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know of any part in which we do.

Mr. BLAKE. It is made in Charlottetown.

Mr. McLELAN. Except Charlottetown.

Mr. KIRK. It is made in the Gut of Canso.

Mr. BLAKE. It is made in various parts; and it is proposed that in those parts in which it is not yet made, the public money should be used in order to induce the people to enter into this business. One of the uses to which the fish is put is the conversion of the offal into guano. That is done in some parts and not in others, and in those in which it is not done it is proposed public money should be given to people who will undertake to do it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon gentleman knows that the market for refined cod liver oil is limited in this country, that oil being used mainly for pulmonary diseases. Does the hon. gentleman propose to encourage consumption? Is he endeavoring to create a market for the oil in this way? I do not understand why he should wish to encourage the production of an article which we are already supplied with. If a larger proportion of unrefined oil is used than refined oil, that is simply because there is a larger market for it than for the refined. If he thinks there should be a larger number of victims to pulmonary disease, I can understand why the Government should take the course. They must first create the market before they can derive much advantage from the supply. The common sense course for the Government is to strike this item out, which has been put into the estimates without sufficient consideration, and ought not to be retained.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not the way to deal with a matter of this kind. The hon. gentleman jokes about the encouragement of pulmonary consumption. What we want is to encourage the consumption of refined cod liver oil. We have no market for it now. The Norwegians supply England to a great extent, and there is no reason why we should not. We believe, that by-and-bye it will be an important article of export to England. There is no reason why we cannot supply England for medicinal purposes as well as Norway.

Mr. MILLS. And pay part of the price to induce them to buy?

Mr. PAINT. Newfoundland has manufactured cod liver oil for fifty years, and supplies England with a great deal of it. Every 100 quintals of fish produces about 100 gallons of oil.

Mr. GILLMOR. Nonsense.

Mr. PAINT. By encouraging this industry, it will raise the price from 50 cents to $2 and $3 per gallon, and, if it should not increase it to that value, still it will be worth $1 and $1.50 a gallon, in proportion to the condition to which it is refined. This vote, small as it is, will enable the Government to place these refineries at four different points in the four different Provinces, Quebec, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. That is what was recommended by the delegation.

Mr. LANGELIER. The manufacture of cod liver oil has been in existence in Quebec for many years. The nuns of the Hôtel Dieu have been supplying the physicians of Quebec with the best kind of cod liver oil for medicinal purposes. I have heard it stated by physicians that there is no better oil than that made in that establishment, and I am sure those ladies never asked for any encouragement from the Government to go into that industry.

Mr. VAIL. We have plenty of refined cod oil made in Halifax. With regard to guano, if this is to be extended to those factories that have been in operation for some time, I shall not object, because I have one in my own county. I do not think it is worth while to encourage the commencement of any more to interfere with those that are already at work.

Indians, Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces.....	$10,537 50

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It will be remembered that a motion was made, when the First Minister was not here owing to illness, by my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron), and certain facts were brought out at that time which seemed to point to a great deal of carelessness and mismanagement on the part of officials in the North-West. On that occasion, I brought before the House certain information which was contained in a return brought down by the Department, in which it was shown clearly that flour that was unfit for human food had in some cases been supplied, and the medical attendant has testified that that had led to the sickness and death of some of the Indians. The

report which I now wish to bring before you had not then been submitted, and it is confirmatory of this, showing that there must be negligence and incapacity on the part of the officials in the North-West. I desire, in as brief a manner as possible, to show how the Indians were dealt with. The first thing that I will refer to is a report of Lieutenant Colonel Irvine, dated Fort Walsh, 23rd September, 1882:

"Sir,—I have the honor to enclose herewith copy of a telegram this day sent to the Department. The messages from the Indians, as regards their annuity and reservations, I promised to send to you and the Department's reply thereto the Indians now await. I have also to inform you that on my return from Qu'Appelle, I found some 2,000 Indians here. They are all in a starving and wretched condition for want of clothing. These Indians say that this is their country and they intend to remain here. They ask that they receive aid by the issue of provisions. Will you be good enough to impart to me in the form of instructions what your wishes are? In the present starving condition of the Indians, I fear, if no food is given them, that they may hereafter commit depredations, which will bring them in collision with the force. Of course, in case of any depredations the offenders must and will be arrested and punished. It is always possible that such punishment might be accompanied with bloodshed. The actual power of the Indians now here, in view of future hostility, is certainly not great, but, as it is superfluous to point out to you, an outbreak of any kind would be disastrous and create universal alarm throughout the country. As you will observe from my telegram, the supplies of your Department will not last more than three weeks, even for that time the issues will have to be made sparingly. I trust you will be good enough to reply to this by return of mail."

Then we find another letter from the same place, Fort Walsh, of the 2nd October, from another party:

"Sir,—I have the honor to enclose herewith a statement showing the amount of provisions in store here on the 30th September, just past. These issues have not been made on my own responsibility, but by orders I have received from the officers commanding the post and of Lieutenant Colonel A. G. Irvine, Commissioner of Police. No regular issue of rations has been made, the amount of provisions issued being very barely sufficient to sustain life. There are at present 300 lodges of Indians camped here, these lodges average eight souls, making a total of about 2,000 souls. They are in an utter state of destitution, and are merely existing in a semi-starving state. You will perceive that were regular issues to be made to those Indians, the supply on hand of flour would last about to the end of the present month, and that of meat about twenty days.

"I have, &c., &c,
(Signed) "FRANK NORMAN."

That is from a second person discussing the same. Then on 9th October the following telegram is sent from Fort Walsh to the Hon. E. Dewdney by Mr. Fred. White:—

"Over 200 Indians here almost naked and verged on starvation. Weather cold and snow now on ground. Have been among them for two days. Am satisfied many will perish unless early assistance rendered. Please instruct agent McDonnell to come here at once to make payments. I will arrange to have money here in readiness.

"(Signed)
"FRED. WHITE."

Now, here are reports with reference to the starving condition of these Indians from three different Government officers, one dated 23rd September, one 2nd October, a more pressing one 19th October. That letter of 23rd September, of Lieutenant Colonel Irvine, asks particularly that there should be answer at once, pointing out the dangers of hostility from the Indians on account of insufficiency of food. That was not answered by Mr. Dewdney until the 27th October. Over a month elapsed before any attention was paid to that. I do not find after he had answered it that anything was done to furnish supplies to these Indians. On the 1st February we find a despatch from Fort Walsh as follows:—

"I have the honor to enclose a memorandum I am in receipt of from Surgeon Robert Miller at this place, with reference to the condition of the Indians

"I have informed Surgeon Miller that it is not in my power to increase quantity of food to the Indians, as my instructions from the Indian commissioner are to keep the Indians at Fort Walsh on starvation allowances.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,
"Your obedient servant,
(Signed) "FRANK NORMAN."

Now, we have not got that letter of Surgeon Robert Miller, but it must have stated that that which was imminent to the Indians five months before was upon them now, and it was undoubtedly a strong letter, so strong that Frank Norman thinks it necessary to report to the commissioner that he had not power to listen to the request of the surgeon. Now, on 25th February, as near as I can make out, the first action was taken by the commissionner in reference to the relief of the Indians. His telegram is dated from Ottawa, 26th February—the commissioner is at Ottawa. There is a pressing telegram to the commissioner from Robert Miller, dated 1st February, and it is twenty-five days after that before the commissioner gives any instructions at all, and the reason is apparent—instead of being there at the post of duty, he is here in Ottawa, what does he say?

"Yours 1st February received; increase ration supply slightly; purchase 200 pounds tea, fifty pounds tobacco and distribute judiciously and where most needed."

That was to be distributed amongst 2,000 Indians. Now, Sir, I think that reveals clearly a state of carelessness and of negligence on the part of the commissioner that deserves some explanation. Lieutenant Colonel Irvine says they are starving, that the peace of the country is in danger; Frank Norman reports the same thing a few days after, and still a stronger telegram comes from Fred. White two weeks after that; and although all these despatches were received in September and October, we find no action is taken until February. Mr. Dewdney seems to give as his reason that these Indians ought not to be at Fort Walsh, and the policy was adopted of driving them away and throwing the responsibility upon Colonel Irvine if hostilities did break out. Now, I come to the year 1884, and I am dealing with the Indians on their reserves. On 7th February we have a report by the Government medical officer, with reference to Piapot's and the Assiniboine reserves, on which the Indians are living. This medical officer reports a great deal of disease among them. I have not time to read it all, but among other things he enumerates:

"And starvation, if the last can be recorded as a disease. I find that in the last three months, thirteen deaths have taken place in each reserve, in all twenty-six, a very heavy death rate, and from all I can gather, death has been accelerated, if not immediately caused by the scant supply of food served out to these Indians. At the present time, this condition of starvation is more evident among the Assiniboines, as the Crees have lately obtained supplies by cutting wood. I saw several children in the Assiniboine camp worn and wasted, and unless properly fed, must die in a few days. The old medicine man asked me if I could give him some medicine to have by him, that would be helpful when the Indians fainted, as from their scanty and insufficient rations, a number of them suffer in that way. It may not come within my province to report this condition of starvation, but I am well satisfied that if they were sufficiently fed, there would be less tendency to illness among them. I may also add, that from the way they have been allowed to starve, a firm determination was expressed by both Piapot and Jack, that as soon as they could travel they would forsake the reserve and go west again."

Now, I say if there be any justification for keeping the Indians on starvation allowance at Fort Walsh, because the Government did not want them there, it cannot be applied to this band located on their reserve; but they are in such a state that they threaten, as soon as they can travel, to go where they can find some food. Sir, there must be feelings in the breast of the red man when he gazes upon these children, as described by the medical officer, worn and wasted with starvation, and then compelled to remain on their reserves; and I can readily understand that there would be a feeling of great uneasiness among them when the poor old medicine man has to ask: Have you anything by you that will strengthen men who faint for the simple necessaries of life? The medical officer of the Government says that it may not be in his line, perhaps, to report this, but he considers that it is essential for the keeping of the Indians on their reserve, and in the public interest that he should report it. Then, some few days after that, a letter to the superintendent follows; and it must be said, with reference to the deputy of the hon. gentleman, that when

these cases are brought before him, there is, at any rate, evinced by him strong feelings of humanity. I need not read his letter. One clause says:

"If the condition of matters on the reserve be such as stated by the doctor, prompt and remedial measures should be called for."

It appears an agent was sent to examine and report upon the condition of affairs which I will not read, but I will read a short letter from page 35, which says:

"OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
"NORTH-WEST TERRITORY, REGINA, 27th February, 1884.

"SIR,—Again referring to my letter of the 7th inst., No. 6,930, and your reply of the 15th, No. 11,175, I have the honor to state, that Mr. Agent McDonald was forwarding a report of his tour of inspection of the Indian Head reserves made subsequently to the visit of the doctor, a copy of which is herewith enclosed. By it will be seen that the destitution mentioned as existing by Dr. Edwards, was, to a certain extent, exaggerated."

By reading the report hon. members will see that there was only too much force in what the doctor reported. The committee will agree with me that there are evidences that the Department has a humane desire to have grievances attended to, but blame lies at the door of the Government so long as they maintain officials in office whose duty is to attend to grievances and fail to do so, though reported upon by their own officials in the public interest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I regret very much I was not able to be here when the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), made a long and elaborate attack on the Indian Department in regard to its North-West management. I do not know that I would have gained much information by it, because the speech was an elaborately prepared one, in which the hon. member went into a number of details which could not be answered on the spot. So soon as I was aware of the speech made by the hon. gentleman I obtained a copy of it and transmitted it to the North-West. I asked for a report not only as regards the Indians but in regard to all the matters referred to, and I gave instructions that every charge should be brought up, every statement should be examined into and verified or refuted. In order to do that a great extent of country had to be traversed. Each charge consisted of a distinct allegation of wrong-doing, a sin of omission or commission. The evidence to meet each charge had to be collected and thoroughly investigated. Only within the last two or three days I have received additional evidence. I had intended, if my strength had allowed me, to have gone into the whole question, but it would have taken a much longer time to have read the evidence in rebuttal than it occupied to make the charges, and the House would not have listened to me. The speech of the hon. member has been published under the auspices of hon. gentlemen opposite and widely distributed. I shall take care that the answer will be distributed equally widely. I will let the country see from the evidence that, from the beginning to the end, the speech of the hon. gentleman is characterised by the same want of accuracy as has characterised all the speeches and attacks on everybody and everything made by the hon. gentleman in the House this Session. I shall be able to show that to the satisfaction of the country. As regards the charges against Governor Dewdney, I would not be worthy of my place if I did not rise in support of my officers when I know they do their duty. That gentlemen has a very severe and unpopular duty to perform, and there have been a set of influences brought against him which at one time brought undeserved unpopularity upon him. That he has surmounted, and the country and the North-West are rising to express views as to his merits just as strongly as originally they were prejudiced against him. I believe he is a good officer, a faithful officer. When the hon. gentleman states he was in Ottawa instead of being at his post, I may say that he was here because I summoned him myself for the purpose of going into the whole matter connected with arrangements in the North-West. It would be very easy for Governor Dewdney to throw away the money of the country upon Indians hanging round the various posts begging for food. It would be very easy to give them flour, beef and bacon, that would cause him no trouble and might give popularity. But he was told to husband the funds and the food placed at his disposal. With respect to the Indians that were camping in and about Fort Walsh, he was specially instructed by me to act as he did. Those Indians had left their reserves. They were told to go back to their reserves and to cultivate the land, and that they should have food if they did so. We had agricultural implements, cattle, seed grain and food for them there, but they would not go. They were near Fort Walsh, and almost immediately adjoining the boundary between the United States and Canada. There was then great danger of improper communications being had between the Indians of the two countries. They were, therefore, told that if they remained there they would not get any food. They were also told that if they would go to their reserves they would be fully supplied in every way, but they would not go. They were reduced from full rations to half rations, and then to quarter rations, but with the obstinacy of Indians they would not go, and they were told that if they refused they must take the consequences. It is only by using those means that you can get the Indians to work. There are police stations, scattered settlements, land agencies, all those are nuclei for white settlers, and their food is stored. The Indians hang round all those posts. So long as they can get the white men to feed them they will stay there. The mass of the white population in the North-West is composed of young men, and the Indians hang round the posts because they want to stay there, and their women want to stay there, and because the Indians sell their women, and the greatest amount of demoralisation goes on in consequence of the degraded habits of the Indians, the barbarous and savage habits of the Indians. It is the policy, and it will be the policy of the Government so long as I have anything to do with this Department, to see that the Indians go on their reserves and work there, and the Government will then fulfil the treaty obligations and even more. By strictly carrying out that policy it has been in a degree successful. The Indians are going on their reserves, and this year the accounts are much more favorable as to the number of Indians on the reserves, the quantity of land broken and the quantity of roots and grain put in. The Indian will allow himself to run almost to death's door rather than move from the place where he is. It was only because with Christian feelings we could not see them starve that they were given quarter rations. That is the policy of the Government, and it is the correct policy. The committee must remember that the Government are under no obligations to furnish food to the Indians. He has got his hand and his head; he has the capacity for work if he chooses. The white immigrant goes there and he must "root hog or die"; he must work or starve.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We shut him up on a certain reserve?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reserves are enormous.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We shut them up on reserves, and the reports of the hon. gentleman's own agents show that they have lost their crops through frost.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Indians, by the strict, stern rule, are settling on their reserves. Why, Sir, before the buffalo disappeared we gave no food to the Indians. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power, did not give food to the Indians. There were treaty obligations; a certain number of cattle and implements; a certain amount of seed grain and so on, were all given under treaty obligations, and that was all required to be given and all that was given until the sudden disappearance of the buffalo.

Canada, or the Canadian Government, or the Canadian people, was under no obligation to feed these Indians, but as Christian men they could not allow them to starve; they supplied them with food, and every vote we asked for the purpose of feeding these Indians was opposed by hon. gentlemen on the other side, and especially by the hon. member for Bothwell, who said we were pauperising the Indians, and that they should work as well as the white men. Votes were taken year after year to feed the poor Indians while they were changing their habits of life, and changing their modes of acquiring their food. The buffalo was gone, and we fed them—sparingly, but sufficiently—until, by degrees, they could be got to go upon their reserves. I state distinctly that there has been a great amount of benevolence with prodigality or profusion; there has been great tenderness to the Indians. Although the Indian will keep himself in a starving condition, there has been the greatest tenderness on the part of Parliament to put money at the disposal of the Government, and there has been a careful and judicious disposition of the vote to the Indian, without letting him feel that he had enough for himself and his family without working. The great trouble is to get the Indians to work, for they can work and they are now working. But if they are told by pseudo-philanthropists, by men who are led more by their hearts than by their heads, that they are suffering, that it is the duty of the Government not to allow them to starve, then they never will work. It would be impossible for me to go into an answer to all the charges made against the Department. I shall see, Sir, that the vindication of the Department shall be widely disseminated in all parts of the Dominion, because it will not do that the Government or any Government should lie under the charges which were brought against them—altogether unfounded as most of them are—sometimes from drawing improper inferences, and sometimes from the utter want of accuracy upon which the hon. gentleman relied. More than that, I accept the challenge thrown out from the other side, and it is the intention of the Government to issue a commission—and I pledge myself it will be an impartial commission—to look into the whole question of the management of the Indians in the North-West, as well as the charges which have been brought, or may be brought, against the Department, and I am quite satisfied, on the part of the Department, to abide by the result.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is certainly a great misfortune that the hon. gentleman has not been able, from whatever cause, to have stated publicly in the House what he has to say in reply to the attacks from the hon. member for West Huron and the hon. member for Brant. Any statement of that kind, coming from the Government, ought I think to be made in the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am aware the hon. gentleman's state of health may have afforded a reasonable ground for not doing it. However, my object was not on the present occasion to enter into this discussion, which cannot be possibly carried on to-day, but I want to call attention to this point with regard to Mr. Edgar Dewdney, whom the hon. gentleman has repeatedly declared to be a very excellent officer, and who may be so in some respects, for anything I can say to the contrary. It is a fact that Mr. Dewdney—it has I believe been repeatedly admitted by the hon. gentleman himself—has been largely engaged in various speculative transactions in the North West. The hon. gentleman said yesterday, and I was glad to hear it, that he himself, in the whole term of his office, had never bought an acre of land in the North-West or elsewhere, and he claimed credit for it.

JHON A. MACDONALD. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I think he can, because I think that the position of a Minister or a Lieutenant Governor is such that he ought not to speculate, and ought to keep himself clear from speculation. With regard to members of the House it is different, and unless they avail themselves of their position to claim undue advantages it is another affair. But there are strong reasons why a Minister of the Crown, and more particularly the Minister of the Interior, or a Minister specially concerned in North-West affairs, or the Lieutenant Governors of the distant Provinces, should keep themselves perfectly clear from being mixed up with a number of persons in real estate transactions of that kind. No doubt there is a great temptation, but they are officers of this estate; they occupy a semi-judicial position in which their private interests might warp their minds unintentionally. Now the statement made and repeated in the papers, and, as I understand, admitted on the part of Mr. Dewdney and the hon. gentleman himself, is to the effect that Mr. Dewdney has been largely engaged in speculative transactions. Now, as a matter of public policy—and the hon. gentleman knows that I am only laying down the rule which has been laid down again and again by the English Government as to their officers—no man in his position should engage in such transactions. I shall not wait to point out the innumerable evils which arise from that state of things, but I say if he has done so he has seriously erred and has laid himself open to an immense amount of misconstruction. Any gentleman holding his position I maintain should keep himself aloof from all sorts of speculation or speculative proceedings. That is my doctrine, and I should be sorry to hear the Minister disavow it. I ask him to state what he thinks on this subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says I admitted that Mr. Dewdney had been engaged in large speculative transactions. Well, I am not aware that I made such an admission. What I stated was that he told me that when the Hudson Bay Company put up some seven or eight sections at sale, some years ago, he had bought them with some others. I have not been informed of any other speculations; he may have engaged in them or he may not have done so; he did not inform me. Mr. Dewdney has written to me again and again, both during last summer and the year before, that he would like very much to have an enquiry made into the charges made against him, and I shall make it now. Whether he has bought any property or not I do not know. We know that Mr. Cauchon, the late Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, bought largely, and altogether hon. gentlemen opposite knew he was engaged seriously in speculation, although like everbody else up there he unfortunately ruined himself; yet I do not think hon. gentlemen objected to his speculations. Mr. Aikins is the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, and I am not aware whether he has bought a lot or not; but it is a question whether he could not buy if he liked, not land under the control of the Government; but I take it that the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, or Quebec, or Manitoba or British Columbia or the North-West, is not to be prevented from buying from private individuals. I think Mr. Dewdney would be exercising a wise discretion in not buying any land directly or indirectly from the Government; I agree with the hon. gentleman so far. But the hon. gentleman says that in consequence of these speculations Mr. Dewdney's unpopularity arose. His unpopularity arose from this one cause—his refusal to give permits to bring intoxicating liquors into the North-West. The law imposed on him the duty of issuing those permits; it was an unpleasant duty, from which he has asked to be relieved; but some one must do it, and so long as the present system of excluding intoxicating liquors from the North-West continues, I think the responsibility of issuing permits is thrown very properly upon the representative of

the Dominion Government there. No doubt he has occasionally issued permits to the wrong men, and he has received great abuse for the permits he did grant. But I remember perfectly well when the first attacks against him were made. They came from Prince Albert, and one of the persons who attacked him told him he would drive him out of the North-West because he refused a permit to a club at Prince Albert, where there might be unlimited drinking of intoxicating liquors. That is how his unpopularity arose.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there is a difference between what may be permitted to an officer in new territories and responsible to us as Mr. Dewdney is, and what may be permitted to officers in a settled province. These officers, except on rare occasion, ought to be more wholly independent of us, and their relation to us bears no sort of analogy to the relation of an officer like Mr. Dewdney.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think there is any comparison between the two kinds of officers. My own views may be rigid, but I think a person in the exalted position of a Lieutenant Governor, would be much better, even in a Province, to keep out of land speculations. I entirely agree that the position of Lieutenant Governor of a Province is entirely different from that of the Lieutenant Governor of Territories which are directly under our control, the lands of which are Crown lands, and in which questions affecting those lands are disposed of largely on his advice. I only repeat what has been currently stated for a long time, that Mr. Dewdney was charged with the selection of the town site of Regina, and that he had personal interest in lands which were very materially affected by the selection of that site. That shows the inconvenience of placing himself in a position of a landholder. Even though he may not have bought an acre of land from the Government, but from the Hudson Bay Company or private persons, he had the opportunity of influencing the decision of questions which would make those lands very valuable. Therefore, I think his position is entirely different from that of Lieutenant Governors in settled Provinces.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is very much in what the hon. gentleman says. On a previous occasion I stated that Regina was selected by the joint judgment of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government. The company had laid out a plan for building a railway northward from this point to Prince Albert, and southward to the Turtle Hills to the south-western branch; they published a map with that purpose indicated, and we agreed that that would be the proper place to have a town. But Mr. Dewdney had certainly nothing to do with the selection of the place. After the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had selected this place as the crossing of the two roads Mr. Dewdney said he thought also that it would be a good place for a town; but at the same time I know, because he told me, that two miles off there was a Hudson Bay lot which he and his friends had bought.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With reference to the main question, it is to be regretted that the First Minister was not in his place when this subject was brought before the House. It is also to be regretted that he finds it necessary to announce, without making a speech openly before the House and the people, where his statements can be scrutinised and criticised, that he will issue something like a manifesto with reference to the management of his Department. He says that is necessary because the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) was inaccurate in his statements. I suppose he applies the same remark to those I made. All I can say is that they were based on records brought down from the hon. gentleman's own Department, and I made them in the presence of the Government in order to be set right, if on any point I was wrong. But if the hon. gentleman is to go through the papers of the Department and select such as he sees fit without giving us any opportunity of scrutinising them, we should like to know it. Whatever may be said of the statements made by the hon. member for West Huron or by myself, they were made in Parliament. In the presence of the Government, surrounded by their supporters, and here is the place where the answer should have been given. The First Minister has based his statements on the fact of the Indians about Fort Walsh being on their reserve; but he has not touched on the report of the medical officer with reference to the Piapot Indians who were just where he wanted them to be, and who were reported to be starving on their reserve.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman issue this document over his own signature, or does he propose to make use of the officers of his Department? Because I can see that rather serious inconveniences will arise if gentlemen at the head of Departments call upon their officers to issue what is to all intents and purposes a political pamphlet. I do not object to the hon. gentleman making any speech or using any declarations when he sees fit, but I do not think his officers should do it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will take my own course about that; and it will be under my responsibility it will be issued. The hon. gentleman says the answer ought to be made here. It could not be given here, because we had to trace up the facts and the evidence of the statements of sundry agents which the hon. member for West Huron quoted. We had to see those agents and ask them what they meant. For instance, there was a statement respecting Mr. Lawrence Clarke, whom everybody knows. He says that the whole statement in the speech of the hon. member for West Huron is false; he used very strong language in that regard. Sundry clergymen have also stated that they have been quite misled. One of the charges brought was that a certain person had made a certain statement respecting frauds in the Department. On being asked why he made that statement, he said the only fraud he knew of was a fraud committed by Mr. Pope Nixon, an officer of the late Government, and that was what he referred to, and not to any recent irregularities. The evidence will show there never was a greater tissue of false statements. I would have been very glad to have laid the evidence before the House, but it was only the day before yesterday that I received it from the far North-West. It will, however, be published and distributed.

Mr. BLAKE. We will all be anxious to receive the exculpatory or explanatory statement of the hon. gentleman, but why should he not lay the material now on the Table before publishing it, since he has the material? The hon. gentleman had the right to make, from the evidence that reached him, what charges he chose, but on examining it we find the evidence altogether fallacious.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must analyse it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Let us analyse it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must classify it under the different charges. You shall get the whole of the evidence I can assure you of that. I shall have it carefully prepared in narrative form and distribute copies to every member, besides furnishing copies to the constituencies.

British Columbia—Indians $600 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why is the salary of the agent, Meason, increased $200? The amount of money in British Columbia which goes to salaries is perfectly unprecedented. Out of the sum we vote for the Indians, about $4,000 reaches them and the balance goes in salaries.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Indians in British Columbia are not the same people at all as the Indians east of the Rocky Mountains. They are self-sustaining, but

they require agents to look after them. The salaries are large, especially on the mainland, where food is exceedingly scarce, and the cost of transport enormous. You cannot get agents for smaller salaries than those we now give. The Indians are in large bands, the agents are not numerous, and you must pay them well if you are to have them at all.

Miscellaneous Printing..... $8,000 00

Mr. McLELAN. This is in consequence of a report of the joint committee. This should come under the head of legislation.

L. S. Crow, for services in connection with the seizure of the premises and plant of the Acadian Steel Works..... $100 00

Mr. McLELAN. This is for the services of the sheriff of the county who had the whole plant and stock of that company under seizure for three or four months. They were subjected to a good deal of annoyance, trouble and expense, in consequence of the railway people, the parties who had brought the suit, insisting upon taking part of the stock away at times, and the sheriff had to follow it. The sheriff rendered his accounts and charged for this extra service. The Department said they had no legal authority to allow him the amount, although he was entitled to it, and therefore this vote is brought.

Mr. BLAKE. What was this bountied and favored institution under seizure for—at the instance of the Government?

Mr. McLELAN. The Railway Department claim they were in arrears for the freight, and when the company went into liquidation they seized the whole property, and, in adjusting certain accounts, it turned out that the balance was in favor of the company for material supplied otherwise.

Customs—Outside Detective Service.....$5,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. I see there is a provision for the pay of officers. Is it proposed to appoint permanent officers, and at how much pay?

Mr. McLELAN. It will be necessary to have officers to test the sugars, and the question arises whether it would not be necessary to have parties in Montreal and Halifax, as well as here, for this work. It is hoped that the whole thing can be run satisfactorily with one office here.

Legislation, Miscellaneous..... $3,676 78

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In reference to the item of $750 for 150 copies of Mr. Faucher de St. Maurice's work on Parliamentary Procedure, which was allowed to stand, I have been looking over the errors which are found in that volume very carefully, according to the list supplied to me by my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Auger). These are matters of errors in the proof-reading and translation. I dare say that the book as originally written in French is correct. In the titles of six or seven decisions, the English translation is exactly a contradiction of the French text. This occurred in three or four cases. In others, an explanation is given in English whereas in the French title it is simply stated what the decision is. Out of eighteen or twenty errors that have been mentioned, six or seven are certainly of a character which must absolutely be corrected, the others being only due to a faulty translation. This of course does not alter the quoting of the decisions themselves, because those are generally rendered without error. I had seen the book, I had seen it recommended by men whose authority I could take as to its value as a piece of interest more than a piece of instruction. It is a collection of decisions which might not be very instructive as a whole for the points that have been raised and decided, but it is interesting as a matter of study and history of the Parliament of Quebec. I shall make it my duty to write to the author of the book and ask him to publish in such a manner as may be useful to those who may have bought the book another page of errata, to correct as much as possible—because I admit it is not a sufficient correction—those faults.

Mr. BLAKE. Many of the errors that were pointed out to us were obviously mistranslations, and they occur in the head notes which give the clue of the decision itself. I have not had the opportunity of studying the volume, I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has studied the text, and found it more accurately translated than the head notes. The errors may not be so plain or so outrageous in the text as they are in the head notes, in which black is made white and white made black.——

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In three or four cases, it is exactly that.

Mr. BLAKE. But, when you find such errors in the head notes, what are you to expect in the text, and of what value can the work be? What is proposed to be done with the 150 volumes? They are not for distribution amongst members of this House. There are not enough to go around the Senate and ourselves. Are they to be sent abroad, because if they are I doubt if they will be very creditable to us in anyway.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. About fifty copies were required for exchanges. The Departments have taken each four copies, which is the limit, and a few copies were left to be distributed amongst the chief officers of both Houses. I have read the text of all the decisions in the headings of which errors were pointed out, and the translation of the text appears to be correct.

Mr. BLAKE. What in the world do thirteen Departments want with four copies each of this book of precedents? It is a mere machinery for subsidising the book. I can understand the exchanges, though, as I have said, I do not think it will be very creditable to us if we are to disseminate this work in fifty different libraries, but the four copies for each Department are quite useless. That would be fifty, and there are fifty for the exchanges, and there are fifty more for which there appears to be no particular use at all.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I stated that they were for the officers of both Houses.

Mr. BLAKE. It will be very dangerous to distribute the book among the officers. It will mislead them so.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is a valuable collection and it is unfortunate that these errors occur. I think the book has a real value.

Mr. MULOCK. The Secretary of State mentioned that he had not examined this book critically himself, but that he had based his recommendation upon advice given him by others. Would he tell us who the parties are on whose opinion he acted?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said the book was recommended to me by persons who were acquainted with it. I read nearly the whole of the French, and it appears that the French is correct. It is the translation and proof-reading that are defective.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we ought to take special care that this book is not used by any person engaged in parliamentary practice as legislators, as the reading of it might do them a great deal of harm.

To repay amount of forged bond $4,988 32

Mr. McLELAN. It was found that a forged coupon was sent to London some years ago, and this is to repay the amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know that in ordinary cases the Dominion can undertake to pay clever forgeries upon it, but in this case, there are certain circumstances that make it exceptional, though I should regret it as a precedent to be followed hereafter. It is the business, I think, of the parties who may happen to take them, unless we ourselves in some way were responsible by carelessness on the part of the officials of the Government for the forgery having been committed.

Mr. McLELAN. It appears there was some carelessness on the part of our officer, and it was represented on the other side that it would be better for us to pay it rather than have suspicion thrown upon our bonds. At present our agents are responsible for the bonds issued on the other side.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who applies for this?

Mr. McLELAN. It was transferred to brokers in Toronto by F. Lewis, formerly a clerk in the Finance Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are the parties to whom this is to be paid?

Mr. McLELAN. They have not given me the names.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the Government ought to take a distinct attitude on this question. Were the coupons, or a number of them, paid before the forgery was detected?

Mr. McLELAN. It passed into some person's hands and went to London for payment, and it was there discovered to be a forgery. There had been, I think, an extra number of bonds which got into the hands of this person, and he made use of one of them. Our agents in London informed us that the same thing had occurred in one of the other colonies, and that the colony had paid it to preserve its credit above suspicion.

Mr. MULOCK. Had some of the forged coupons been paid?

Mr. McLELAN. I have no recollection of that.

Mr. MULOCK. What practice has been adopted so that the thing may not occur again?

Mr. McLELAN. The usual practice of checks, and counting in and out.

Sundry expenditure in connection with the rebellion in the North-West Territories $1,014,309 67

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the total amount of claims likely to be preferred with respect to losses arising out of the rebellion? The losses have been stated at an enormous sum, and if we are to make them good, I fancy that the sum of $67,000 will prove utterly below the requirements of the case.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). This amount is simply to pay the settlers in the neighborhood of Battleford, on the first report of those who went out in the spring to investigate the losses. I have telegraphed Mr. Ouimet in the hope of getting an approximate estimate of what will be required, but I have not been able to get an answer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have not the Hudson Bay Company, for instance, preferred a claim ranging up to $1,000,000 and odd?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, but the Government do not at all recognise that claim.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But it has been preferred?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). They have preferred a very large claim. Mr. Ouimet is instructed to take evidence without prejudice to any person.

Mr. McLELAN.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I wish to draw attention to some facts which have come into my possession on the question of the losses resulting from the rebellion. I will preface the reading of a letter which I received by the statement that, to my knowledge, it is from a gentleman whose word can in every sense be accepted; and I think the internal evidence of the letter itself will corroborate my statement. He writes as follows:—

"I have witnessed in connection with the Mounted Police a state of things hardly credible. Usually swindling is made difficult to detect; here since the rebellion it has been practiced all around, openly and in broad daylight. Nobody ignores what is going on; many have a hand in it, all directly or indirectly benefit by it. The moral sense of the public has become so blunted that no expression of wonder or condemnation is to be heard; all this is accepted as a matter of course. A man is considered lucky and holding a good berth in proportion to the chances he has to swindle the Government. This state of affairs, bad enough before, has been aggravated by the rebellion or more properly the management of the commissariat. Teamsters had no check put upon them. They were loaded at the railway station without any record of how their loads were being made up; they could deliver half their loads or less without any possibility of detecting their frauds. Instead of having special teamsters loaded with oats and provisions to supply the other teamsters along the road each teamster was his own master and could supply himself and horses with the contents of his own load. The inevitable consequence has been that the teamsters being able to steal without detection out of their loads as much as they pleased being interested besides to carry as light a load as they could, to spare their horses, did not deliver one-fourth of their loads. They either made 'caches' or wantonly threw away or spoiled part of it. Boxes, sacks of oats could be seen everywhere along the road. Soft places were often bridged with sacks of oats and left there A great many instances were freely reported by men relating their own doings or experience when but 100 or 200 lbs. only were delivered out of a load of 2,000 lbs.

"Now, as no quantities were recorded at the place of delivery the consequence has been that officers and men of the North-West Mounted Police have been selling these goods by the waggon load at very low figures all along since the rebellion, pocketing the proceeds. It was done so openly that to my knowledge any man, known or not, by going to the barracks at a specific hour, 7 a.m. in winter, was sure to come back with a load of oats, sometimes a bag of flour or bacon at a conventional price, usually one half the real value. Many officers and men pay all their bills with provisions from the barracks. In one instance 18,000 lbs of beef were paid as delivered when no delivery was ever made, the sale being a sham one to divide proceeds.

"If I was to relate all the facts within my knowlege my story would be a long one. The story has been the same all along the North-West, you may take it as a certainty that far from exaggerating the facts, I remain with the feeling that this letter will fail to convey to you an adequate idea of their real extent.

"I know of facts of a similar nature in connection with the Indian Department here, but they are of minor importance in comparison and only implicate subordinates. Mr. Rae, a former agent of Battleford, is generally reported as having taken advantage of his position in the same way. What I do know is that he always fed the Indians as little as he could; that he never inspected the cattle or farming of the Indians, never visited them in their houses, treated them brutally, putting them out of his office forcibly, always speaking of them with contempt, &c. The Indians do not make a secret that it was their intention to kill him at the time of the outbreak. When he was agent at Duck Lake his Indians were dissatisfied. *En resumé*, he is the worst agent I have known, mostly because I consider it to be the worst feature of an agent to be harsh and inhuman as he is. He was removed to Prince Albert last fall. Orde, a former agent at Battleford, was also a poor one, but mostly on one point, namely: his unsettled mind and want of firmness.

"Reed, who is now Indian commissioner, succeeded Orde, and was considered a very superior agent. Mr. Wright, the present agent, is the most painstaking and best liked by the Indians. Lately, however, he has been arrested for embezzlement, supposed to have been committed while at the Winnipeg office. It appears that he was short of $1,700 in his bank account, but as he had for many years the handling of very large sums it is not supposed here that he is guilty of more than irregularity or neglect. He had so won the confidence of the Indians that his presence here was considered a safeguard against troubles and his departure was regretted accordingly.

"Payne and Quinn, the instructors who were killed, were both inhuman characters. Payne was killed by an Indian whom he had just violently put out of his house.

"Moosomin and all his band refused to join Poundmaker; half of Red Pheasant's band did the same. In both cases the instructors Applegarth and Clink had won the sympathy of the Indians under their charge by their considerate and humane treatment. Kind dealing is the most essential thing; Indians are just as much influenced by it as white men are. As a proof of this the present agent, Mr. Wright, had been visiting them from house to house enquiring kindly of the sick and their wants, &c. In less than two months he had won their affection and confidence to such an extent that when arrested they were highly indignant, and expressed the idea that this was done only because he was too kind-hearted for them. Of course if guilty he must be punished, but the whole population have expressed their appreciation of his services by their petitions. Their interference in favor of a man accused of such an

offence may seem out of place, but when you consider that the peace, tranquility and prosperity of a settlement are all in the hands of one man, their interference cannot be said to be quite misplaced. Good agents mean good instructors, so that to a great extent the Indian problem would be solved with half a dozen good agents through the North-West Mr. Clink, the instructor who by his kind dealing towards the Indians under his care succeeded in keeping them loyal, wanted to go back to his reserve when the troubles were over, but as he thought himself entitled to an increase of salary and asked for it he was discharged."

Now, I propose to show by the documents submitted to the House——

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman has read a letter; will he state the name of the writer?

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Does the hon. gentleman demand the name of the writer, with his Commission sitting in the North-West to enquire into these things, and the First Minister stating——

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. I do not propose anything; I merely ask if he is going to give the name.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The gentleman making that statement is a responsible individual; he speaks from knowledge of the facts; and I take the responsibility of saying here that every statement he makes is entitled to credence. Let us see how far his statements are borne out. Much of the suspicion that has existed in reference to the affairs of the North-West has arisen from documentary evidence submitted to this House; and much that has been stated outside must have been concealed, and purposely concealed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that these Estimates are being put through with a rapidity never before attempted in Parliament, and it is utterly impossible, if disorder prevails, that progress can be made. We desire to help hon. gentlemen opposite on this occasion; but you cannot pass 200 items of estimates through without discussion at all. There is but one way we can get on, and that is by hon. gentlemen listening quietly, and the quieter hon. gentlemen opposite are the shorter my hon. friend will be.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I desire to confine myself largely to statements of fact, and I desire to be brief. Now, I desire to place before the committee in a condensed form the statements, financial and otherwise, that have been submitted to the House very recently. An individual who is known to the Department of Militia as Major Bell appears before the public in a variety of characters in connection with North-West tranactions. I find, for instance, that W. R. Bell, the manager of the Qu'Appelle Farming Company, as he himself states in his evidence before the Commission, presents himself to Major Bell of the force and suggests that he be given a contract for the supply of hay. W. R. Bell says to Major Bell: "I have so many thousand tons to sell; how much will you give for it?" And the reply is: "I will give $22 a ton," and Major Bell as the officer of the Department of Militia closes the contract with W. R. Bell. I find in addition that Major Bell makes a purchase from the Hudson Bay Company of a number of carts and horses, and with these makes a contract with himself for the transport of a quantity of supplies, hires out his own horses to himself, and draws the sums I mentioned. Up to the 30th of June, 1885, Major Bell, as the senior partner of the firm of Bell & Lewis, drew $52,774 for teaming, and up to the 15th of March, 1886 drew in addition $53,911. As manager of the Qu'Appelle Farming Company, he drew up to the 30th of June, 1885, $44,547, and $12,174 in addition up to the 15th of March, 1886. As W. R. Bell, on a special contract made between himself as representing the Department and himself as a purchaser from the farmers of the North-West Territories, of hay and other supplies, he drew $6,152 at the same time that he draws, as Major Bell, an officer of the North-West field forces, something like $1,000 in salary. Up to the 15th of March last, he drew a total of $171,059. There is this, however, to be said, that the Commission that subsequently met overhauled Major Bell's account and in a communication that was sent to the firm of Bell & Lewis he is asked to refund to the Department of Militia the over amount of $1,890. I am sure the committee and the country will appreciate the great care of that Commission in demanding from Major Bell, who has had these very discreditable transactions with the Department, a refund of $1,890 which he had been overpaid in these immense transactions, representing the enormous sum of $171,000. Now, I proceed still further to examine the peculiar characteristics of the contract which this man made. The following is from the evidence of Stewart before the Commission, page 209:—

"Q. Have you anything about a memorandum of agreement between you and Major Bell, and also give your reasons for signing that?—A. On the 20th I went to Qu'Appelle to take possession of the Qu'Appelle route. I found Mr. Jones there, Mr. Bell's clerk, and I could not very well take possession that night of the route, and I waited until night. Major Bell arrived from Winnipeg on the night of the 20th of May. The following day I went to his office and told him that I had the contract, and wished to take charge of the work. He told me that he had a contract himself covering Qu'Appelle, Moose Jaw, Swift Current and Calgary, and that he had made arrangements in Winnipeg with J. L. Lewis and Mr. Whitehead as partners to handle all the freight, and wished me to go further west. I did not wish to do so, and he told me that Laurie had no right to give a contract, that he was a 'damn fool,' and that he would have him dismissed before a week. * * * He told me that J. L. Lewis and he and Whitehead were going to work together and that he would give me an interest in the contract at $212 a ton."

Let us see for how much Stewart, the contractor, agreed to perform that service. Colonel Forrest asks Stewart at page 217:—

"Q. With regard to these negotiations between you and Bell, in the result your prices were effected by these propositions, now where there has been collusion to make up two prices, have they profited by your collusion?—A. That is easily answered. I worked on the price of $110 per ton, I didn't go in collusion, I didn't acquiesce one hour with Major Bell, it sounded too much like a penitentiary job for me. My contract was for $110 per ton, but that contract Major Bell wished me to acquiesce in was for $212 per ton. Had I acquiesced in this arrangement, the Government would have been wronged to the extent of over $100,000—$102 per ton at Moose Jaw and something in the neighborhood of $60 per ton at Qu'Appelle, and a like amount at Saskatchewan Landing—the aggregate I know would amount to over $100,000. Further, they followed my advice in changing the plan of transportation, making each teamster responsible for his load and charging him with any loss the Government sustained."

There this contractor bears evidence to the statement made in the letter I have read, that every teamster dumped his load where he pleased, and made a makeshift for a load, and drew his pay at the end of the journey. He further says:

"My contract was about one-fifth of the amount that I understand it was costing the Government to carry supplies from Qu'Appelle to Clarke's Crossing. I received the knowledge from Mr. Rigby who was handling the pay rolls and making out the cheques for the Hudson Bay Company, in the same office with the paymaster, Mr. Crawford. He advised me that it was costing from $500 to $700 a ton from Qu'Appelle to Clarke's Crossing."

Now, it may be said that Mr. Stewart was making this statement on his own responsibility entirely, but he produces a letter from Mr. Bell, dated Moose Jaw, 27th May, to this effect:

"MY DEAR STEWART,—I have made a very satisfactory arrangement to me. I have quite cleared myself with the General and satisfied Ross entirely. Now I have laid a foundation for a good thing for you, and I want you to fall in with my arrangements, and I trust all will come out to our mutual satisfaction.

"Yours in haste,
"BELL."

Stewart was suspicious of Bell, doubted his honesty, feared his intent was really to deprive him of the contract instead of sharing it with him, and asked him for a written engagement, and on page 217 of the report will be found this engagement:

"Copy of agreement signed by W. R. Bell and John Stewart, dated May 21st, 1885.

"This memo. of agreement between W. R Bell and John Stewart is made in good faith and on the honor of each, that out of the contract now existing in the name of John Stewart for transport, W. R. Bell to have one-half profits or losses; that out of the contract now existing in the name of Bell & Lewis for same work, but at an increased price, J. Stewart to have one-quarter interest in profits.

"W. R. BELL.
"JOHN STEWART."

"May 21st, 1885.

"I, Thomas Henry Gilmour, of the city of Winnipeg, notary public do hereby certify that the above written copy of agreement is a true, and exact copy of the original memorandum of agreement of which it purports to be a copy, and that the above was copied by me from the original memo. of agreement on the 24th day of August, A.D. 1885.

"T. H. GILMOUR,
[SEAL.] "Notary Public for Manitoba."

That is the connection of this W. R. Bell with the transport service of the North-West; but there is this peculiarity in this case, that the undertaking of the Government with the Hudson Bay Company was of that loose kind, that until the 21st May, any certificate of whatever character which represented that company, from any men of the force whatever, was accepted and the account paid; and the result is, that while the Commission state in their report that they have examined something like $3,000,000 worth of accounts, the larger portion of that amount appears already, in the statement submitted to the House, as paid, and other sums, equal to that demanded from Bell, are demanded from other parties by the Commission on the re-examination of the accounts. What use is there in making those demands, when the money is paid? The arrangement made with the Hudson Bay Company shows the entire incapacity of the Militia Department for undertaking a service which the whole country was led to believe had been undertaken with the greatest exactitude, precision and satisfaction to all concerned, and was going to cover the Militia Department in particular with a halo of glory. In reference to the waste of supplies, Mr. James Anderson, who appears himself to be drawing pay as a commissariat officer makes this statement that "he went up to the front and on return reported to Captain Swinford at the base that everything was going to rack and ruin; hay wasted; in fact in some of the stations you could walk over your boots in oats." I stated the other day that the amount of supplies which had been furnished to the forces in the North-West during the rebellion was out of proportion to what the men could reasonably consume. I stated that the quantity of tea supplies equalled the allowance for between 41,000 and 42,000 men for ninety days, and I base my statement on the accounts submitted for payment which amounted to 59,728 lbs. This is at the usual allowance, as appeared in "General Orders", namely one quarter of one ounce of tea per man per diem. Yet there were only 4,756 men under arms in the North-West. The same result is apparent with regard to the sugar supply, the meat supply and the bread supply. I have a statement of these supplies, which I extracted from the Public Accounts and have gone over them with a good deal of care, in order to satisfy myself thoroughly in reference to them. Not only was the supply excessive but the prices in many instances were ridiculously large for the kind of supplies furnished. The arrangements with the Hudson Bay Company, under the blanket agreement with the Government, was that they the company, should supply the provisions at ordinary wholesale prices, but even in Winnipeg they charge the exorbitant price of 2 cents a lb. for salt. For rice at Edmonton 20 cents per lb. were paid, and for bacon 25 cents per lb. Other supplies are charged in proportion. I find besides the most surprising fact that there was supplied to the force something like 800 lbs. of baking powder at a cost of $750. I find the entire amount drawn in these ways, to the 30th June, 1885, by the Hudson Bay Company for all supplies, was $291,238, and to the 15th March, 1886, in addition, $114,823, or a total expenditure on supplies furnished by the Hudson Bay Company alone of $406,000. The Government also paid to the Hudson Bay Company, on accounts contracted by the force while on service, $1,311,303, and a commission on those last named of $65,654, a total to Hudson Bay Company of $1,788,525. These were paid, in the way I stated, on the blanket agreement between the Hudson Bay Company and the Government. This resulted in all sorts of accounts appearing as having been passed by that company, accounts that are entirely against the rules and regulations that govern the Militia Department. We have no justification whatever for paying those accounts further than that certain individuals went to the company and purchased supplies. What right had the major general commanding the forces, for instance, any more than anyone under him, to purchase supplies on his own account and charge them to the Government? If special supplies were wanted by a private in the force he had to pay for them himself. He was furnished with a kit, and had to be satisfied with that, but the major general and the staff officers could procure, at the expense of the Government, whatever they could find in the neighborhood in which they happened to be which they thought it would suit them to purchase. I find that Major T. Charles Watson, who, I believe, is a temporary clerk in one of the Departments, was sent to Yorktown in the North-West Territories, and given a commission to form a company there; and, in addition to drawing a very handsome allowance as pay, has had paid for him an allowance nearly equal to one-half the entire amount that every other subordinate in the Yorktown volunteer company received for his services. He received a forage cap $2, a pair of trowsers $6, a pair of boots $6, and an overcoat $5. This is a man who at the same period, as a temporary clerk, has drawn $2.50 a day. I find that the Minister himself has added to the immense charge for cab-hire in his Department $271 in connection with the North-West rebellion, and $470 for travelling expenses. I hope that was not the least efficient means resorted to in order to suppress the rebellion. There was a report current in regard to looting in the North-West. I only give such information as I have, but there was a rumor that a good many supplies that were seized were, under the instruction of the major general and some of the officers serving under him, taken to the eastern Provinces, and I question very much if some of the losses embraced in this vote are not losses that were sustained in that way. The Ten Commandments will not budge in a case like this, and stealing will continue stealing whether by a major general or by any of his forces or any one else; and this country ought not to be called upon to pay losses until it is ascertained how they occurred. It is a matter of current rumor that horses came back from that country in a most mysterious way, and, if the First Minister is going to make enquiry into the condition of the Indians, it is only due to the people that enquiries of an equally drastic character should be made in this matter. There are some of the details which I have given that admit of no question. There is no doubt that there was waste and extravagance and carelessness there, and I submit that I am justified in having brought this matter to the attention of the committee, even at this late hour of the Session.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I propose for a few moments to say a few words with reference to the transactions to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and I do so on my personal responsibility and a personal witness, and not on a statement made by an anonymous writer. For nearly three months I was on the principal route of transport between the railway and the Saskatchewan, a route on which 1,300 teams were passing continually up and down. It was my official duty, and I made it my business as a member of this House, to make note of everything that went on; and, so

far as the conduct of the teamsters, the loading of the teams, the management of the transport service between Troy and the Saskatchewan are concerned, I say on my personal responsibility that the statements made by the hon. gentleman in reference to that are absolutely without foundation. For four weeks at Fort Qu'Appelle, and for some little time at Troy, I had personal knowledge of the way in which Major Bell conducted the transport. Whether Major Bell was guilty of jobbery or not, I am not going to say, I know nothing about it. So far as he had control of that transport, he managed it most thoroughly and efficiently. No team left Troy that was not fairly and properly loaded. I saw the way in which the service was conducted between Troy and Clarke's Crossing, and the statement that these teamsters acted in the way alleged in that letter is absolutely without foundation, and I say that from my personal knowledge of the facts. The transport service was well and efficiently conducted in every possible respect. Of course, the teamsters would sometimes be careless. That could not be prevented by anybody, but to say that there was the waste described by the hon. gentleman is a pure fabrication. The statement which has been made by the hon. gentleman, in reference to General Middleton, was made a long time ago, shortly after the transactions occurred, and I say the charges made against General Middleton and his staff are the most cruel, the most unjust and the most unjustifiable fabrication. I have it on the best authority—I do not know why I should not state it—I have it from the lips of General Middleton himself, that, so far from his having received those so-called luxuries that he is reported to have had, he and his staff never even drew their rations, but paid for every mouthful they had. They never drew a single ration from the time they left Winnipeg till they came back again. They paid for everything they got, even for the bread and meat, the ordinary rations which they were entitled to draw as well as the rest of us. Those items which were put in the account as charged to General Middleton were things which were got *bonâ fide* for the hospital, and which were used for the hospital. He never got any of them, and, if the thing was investigated, I think the charges in reference to the looting would be found as devoid of foundation as these with reference to the rations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think we can possibly go into this discussion at length, but I would call the attention of the Minister of Militia to this, that the hon. gentleman behind me has stated that 60,000 pounds of tea had been issued for 4,000 or 5,000 men for three or four months. A good ration of tea is generally supposed to be a quarter of an ounce, and that total amount ought to have sufficed to supply 40,000 men for that period. That is a fact which, for the Minister's own sake, ought to be explained, if it be a fact. I have not verified it, but I assume it from the hon. gentleman's statement. The other statement which my hon. friend made, and which he is responsible for and not I, is that our horses that were employed in that outbreak required 250 pounds of forage per day, according to the returns of what was paid, and, of course, that shows a very culpable waste, if it be so. I mention this, because I think it is fair that the Minister of Militia should be able to give an explanation, if there is one. My own opinion is that we must allow for very considerable waste under such circumstances. I am not going to quarrel with the hon. gentleman because waste is shown; but there is a difference between waste and downright flinging away, which would be the case if 60,000 lbs. of tea were paid for our forces. I would call attention to the last item in this vote, "pay for extra services as secretary to the surgeon general," whom I take to be the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin). That gentleman may have rendered very valuable services to the country; I am not in a position to say whether he did or not, but I think, when an hon. gentleman is here serving in Parliament and drawing his indemnity, it is an exceedingly vicious practice, unless no other person can be got to do the duty, to assign to him a large extra salary. He drew his $1,500 like the rest of us last year, and he got $1,840 besides for services rendered simultaneously with those he rendered as member of Parliament, and he was promoted to full colonel besides. Here is a gentleman who stays at home, incurs no sort of inconvenience, and is paid three times as much as my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), and the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Orton), who went out and did good service in the field. I think he only got $400. I would rather have reversed it, and given the surgeon-general $400, and the hon. member for Wellington $1,800. I must say that I think it is not creditable to us, that a gentleman who stayed here and who was drawing his indemnity, should receive four or five times as much as those gentlemen who saw service in the field. I say nothing about the value of the advice the hon. gentleman gave the Minister, but I do not think he had had any experience as to what was wanted for troops in the field. From what little I know of the service, from the books I have read, I think the advice and the report which he made are largely extracted from the usual regulations in Her Majesty's service.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman has very properly called my attention to the extraordinary statement made by the hon. member for Middlesex about the quantity of tea which was purchased for the use of the troops in the North West. If that hon. member had taken the trouble to read up about some of the campaigns that have taken place in the world, he would have known, instead of giving his time to counting the ounces of tea, butter and sugar, of which he has made a list, that in an ordinary campaign it is impossible to purchase the exact quantity of provisions that may be required, the same as a family is able to do from week to week. After the troubles are all over the hon. gentleman is very wise, and criticises the manner of the campaign very freely; but I say it was impossible for anyone to know how long that campaign was going to last, nor did we know whether it would be necessary to provide for 5,000 troops, or a much larger or lesser number. But the hon. gentleman does not seem to have taken the trouble to ascertain whether these provisions had been given away or consumed. Sir, I have here a return showing that most of these stores, the tea, sugar, coffee, hay, horses, oats, and everything else, were disposed of, some at auction, and others were transferred to the Indian Department or to the Mounted Police, and we got rid of all these stores without the country losing anything. The hon. gentleman says there was extravagance. Well, I remember that when the $4,000,000 were voted by Parliament, an hon. gentleman on the left of the Speaker stated that it was merely a preliminary vote, that it was well understood it would not cover the necessary expenditure. To-day we know that $4,700,000 covers all the claims, including that of the Hudson Bay Company, all the expenditure, and yet the *Globe* and other organs of hon. gentlemen opposite stated that the rebellion was going to cost some $10,000,000. Now, disappointed at the smallness of the expenditure, the hon. member for Middlesex stands up and attempts to cast slurs at the administration of the Department, and even finding fault with the rations which were given to our volunteers who went up there to fight the battles of their country. Sir, as Minister of Militia, I am ready to stand by that report. I am ready to submit to an investigation, because I am certain that if all the facts could be known, it would be found that the Department did its duty, and that the men who were employed by the Department in various functions, did their

duty. Now, one word about the surgeon general. All I can say is that that gentleman rendered invaluable services to the country. I do not know whether he prepared himself for the important duties which he performed, but I can inform the House that Dr. Boyd, who was sent out by the Princess Louise, to look after the hospital stores which she sent out to the North-West, stated that during his vast experience during the several campaigns he had passed through, he had never seen any hospital or medical service more perfectly organised than the one which was organised by the surgeon general. I certainly consider that for these services which he rendered, sitting up night after night, and working from early morning until night, he was entitled to the pay which we gave him.

Mr. BLAKE. The point is this: That Lieutenant Colonel Bergin occupied a relation to this House and the country of such a character as did not justify the Department in selecting him for this appointment, when scores of men all through the country, quite as competent to discharge those duties, did not occupy such a relation. I consider it is a direct interference with, and an evasion, if it be not a breach, of the Independence of Parliament Act. I do not depreciate nor discount his services in any way, yet I consider that the Government were not justified, under all the circumstances, in conferring this appointment upon him.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I wish to deny the charge of the hon. gentleman that I objected to the rations that were issued to the force. My objection was altogether to the effect that the country had paid a great sum for rations that the force did not get. I wish the committee to recollect that I am dealing largely with the report of the Commission appointed by hon. gentlemen to examine into the accounts in connection with the rebellion, and in dealing with the claim of Major Bell the report says:

"It is admitted W. E. Jones, chief clerk of transport under Bell, went to Saskatchewan Landing, and shipped about ninety tons for Battleford. Bell swears this was to protect the Government, and to prevent a stoppage in the forwarding of supplies, pending the acceptance of tenders for freighting, by the tonnage system. Jones swears he went there and engaged the teams at $70 per ton, expecting he was to have the contract, which Bell had promised to get for him if possible in recognition of his services as clerk, and there is no reason to doubt Bell knew the stores could be hauled for $70 per ton as arranged by Jones, when he offered the contract to Thomas Howard at $125 per ton, less $10 for feed for teams."

The Commission, after making that statement, submits the following as its finding:—

"The telegrams and correspondence (Exhibits A to R, John Stewart's evidence), particularly a note written by Bell at Moose Jaw, 27th May, addressed to 'My Dear Stewart,' in which he says he 'has quite cleared himself with the general, and laid a foundation for a good thing,' shows Bell was trying to manipulate the various contracts for his own benefit."

Such is the evidence on which I base the charge that this man employed by the Department was using his position to benefit himself under the name of W. R. Bell, Bell & Lewis, and the Qu'Appelle Farming Company. As to the major general's accounts, I have taken the published statements submitted by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Militia. At page 465 of the Auditor General's report there is charged for mess supplies for General Middleton, $396. I am bound to take those published statements. As to the defence of the transaction made by the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) that the general never received any supplies, I ask then where they have gone? If General Middleton did not receive them he owes it to the House and to the country to demand an investigation.

Mr. O'BRIEN. If I send a requisition for certain stores for the use of my regiment, that requisition will appear in my name. No doubt the General sent requisitions for stores for the hospital, and they appear in his name and were charged against him.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). There is a separate account for hospital supplies on which there was a very large expenditure, which is likewise open to criticism.

St. Catharines Milling Company—Law costs..... $11,500 00

Mr. LISTER. This is a somewhat peculiar item. It seems strange that this Government should undertake to pay the costs of the St. Catharines Milling Company in defending a suit brought by the Ontario Government against the company for trespassing on the Government's lands. Many years ago an award was made between Ontario and the Dominion by which the territory known as the disputed territory was awarded to Ontario. The First Minister of this Government refused to confirm that award. He treated that award as a nullity and the land as if it belonged to the Dominion. It has been stated over and over again and never contradicted, because it cannot be contradicted, that the land in the disputed territory has been portioned out by this Government to its followers—thousands and thousands of miles of Ontario land have been given to the political followers of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Among those gentlemen are the St. Catharines Milling Company, comprising a relative of the Minister of the Interior and other gentlemen who support this Government. When Ontario attempted to enforce its rights, to prevent those trespassers committing further trespasses and keep them from taking away the timber, the Dominion Government stepped in and assumed the reponsibility of the costs incurred by these parties in defending that suit. The Dominion Government not only refused to give the Province what belonged to her, but when she began to assert her rights, the Dominion Government undertook to pay the costs in defending trespassers. The return brought down is a somewhat peculiar one. The member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is a member of the firm that is defending this suit, and the return shows that that gentlemen, through his firm, has had correspondence with the Government, and what influence has been brought to bear on the Government to lead them to undertake the liability of defending the suit is more than I can understand. All the letters which have passed between the Government and this legal firm and the St. Catharines Milling Company have not been brought down, and it is evident there are other letters which are of importance. The Department of Indian Affairs requested this legal firm of which the hon. member for North Simcoe is a member, and that hon. gentleman is the counsel who has argued this case in the courts of Ontario and proposes to argue it in the courts of England, to send in an estimate of the amount required to carry on this litigation. We find by the return that they have submitted an estimate of costs amounting to $20,000. They ask the Parliament of Canada to vote them $20,000 of the people's money for the purpose of defending the St. Catharines Milling Company for the trespasses which they have committed on the lands of the Province of Ontario, and the House and country will be struck by the liberality with which those gentlemen propose to pay themselves out of the public Treasury. This Bill is headed, "The Queen against St. Catharines Milling Company—Estimated costs." Costs already incurred, $3,500. Those were the costs up to the Court of Appeal of Ontario. In the court of first resort, judgment was given against hon. gentlemen here. The Privy Council of England has decided that the land belongs to the Province of Ontario. The First Minister has carried out the threat he made in 1879, the threat that although the land might belong to Ontario yet not a stick of timber or a pound of lead should she have. It is now proposed to take the case to the Supreme Court of Canada. It has been in the Court of Chancery, in the Court of Appeal, and their judgment has been given in favor of the Province; and these lawyers, who propose to pay themselves with such prodigality and liberality, propose now to

take it to the Supreme Court. The bill reads: Deposit as security for respondent's costs, $500; estimated cost of appellants, solicitors, agents, &c., $300; preparing factum, 250 pages, $500. That, in fact, was prepared from that used in the Court of Appeal, and the work could be performed by any clerk. Printing, say 300 pages, $450; senior counsel, $1,000. The hon. member for North Simcoe charges $1,000 to argue the case in the Supreme Court, and the junior counsel charges $500, making $2,950 more. Then they expect to be defeated in the Supreme Court of Canada, and they are making provision to carry it on to the Privy Council, and let us see what that will cost. Deposit on the respondent's case $1,500; solicitors' and English agents' fees, $1,500; printing, $1,000; senior counsel from Canada and expenses, $5,000. It is needless to say that the senior counsel for Canada will be the hon. member for North Simcoe, and there is to be a junior counsel who charges an additional $1,000. That makes $6,000 in all for fees. Then, in case the bill is not large enough, they put in an item for contingencies, $2,850, making a total cost of $20,000. Now, this bill was so enormous that the Minister of Justice in his correspondence stated that $11,500 ought to be sufficient and according to his recommendation, the estimate this Session is for that amount. But next Session, if hon. gentlemen opposite are present, no doubt this estimate will be supplemented by another item, in which further sums will be asked to pay the hon. member for North Simcoe and his friends the amount of money which they claim. Well it is a nice thing to farm out these things, and to go to England in the month of July, and to go before the Privy Council for the sum of $5,000. Many people would like the chance of doing that merely on a little advice to the First Minister as appears to have been the case in this instance. I state that the Government have not brought down the correspondence in this case, I state that there has been correspondence between Mr. McCarthy and the Government, which is material, and which has not been brought down, and I prove that by the memorandum prepared by Mr. Burgess, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, in which he says:

"Directions as to the action to be taken in this case were conveyed to me by the right hon. the First Minister during your absence in the North-West. Sir John Macdonald has also noted on the back of the letter from Mr. Dalton McCarthy, Q.C., dated 28th September last, that the Department will indemnify the company for the costs of the appeal."

Now, Sir, it was not only that company alone who were applying to the Government to pay their costs, as would appear by these papers brought down, because these papers appear—with the exception of one in which an estimate of the costs is made—to have been written by the president of the milling company. But somebody is behind all that, and that somebody is the firm of McCarthy, Osler & Creelman. Mr. McCarthy appears to have written the First Minister, not as a member of the firm, but as Mr. McCarthy, according to the memorandum I have read. Now, I say it is a disgrace and a shame, after what we know has taken place with regard to this territory, that the Province of Ontario should be forced to contend for its rights in the courts of Ontario, and that this Parliament, with representatives of that Province, should undertake this litigation against the Province of Ontario, and that the costs should be paid by the people of Canada. I can well understand from this item and others in the Supplementary Estimates why the Government delays to the last moment in bringing down the Estimates. The reason is perfectly clear. The object of the Government is to stifle the shady transactions. I do not believe that the people of this country would submit to allow this Government to take out of the public Treasury money for the purpose of defeating, delaying and embarrassing any single Province of the Dominion. The conduct of the Government has been an outrage on the Province from which I come, and I believe that, when the time comes, the people of the country will show unmistakably that they consider it to be so.

Mr. MULOCK. Is there any other liability against the Government in respect to this lease?

Mr. McLELAN. I know of none.

Mr. DAWSON. I understand that the full papers in this case are not yet printed so as to enable the hon. gentleman to judge of the merits of the case.

Mr. LISTER. Here are the papers. The case has been before the country for the last ten years.

Mr. DAWSON. Those are not all. However confident the hon. gentleman may be in his own opinion, the fact is that the papers which would throw light upon this matter are now being printed. This is a mere item in the Estimates, upon which the hon. gentleman takes occasion to bring up, in a great measure, the whole question. But this is no time to discuss it. It is a pity that the motion, of which the hon. member for Bothwell has given notice, was not proceeded with, but I think when the hon. gentleman mentions in his resolution the extreme west and north, he might also have taken in the extreme east, which has also been decided upon by that judgment of the Privy Council. The lines as determined by that decision clash, and it put the eastern boundary at a line drawn due north from the confluence of the Mississippi and the Ohio. The Government of Ontario suggested that an Act should be passed to amend the decision of the highest court of the realm, but I have always maintained that it was better to send the report back for amendment. The case is not at all in the position in which the hon. member for Lambton represents it to be.

Mr. MULOCK. I think there is a principle involved in this matter. We find the Government entering into an agreement to indemnify this milling company in respect of certain costs, and the money the Government pays in this case, goes into the pocket of a member of this House. Here is a letter from the firm McCarthy & Co., to Mr. Vankoughnet, the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, dated the 9th of October, 1885:

"THE QUEEN *vs.* THE ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBERING COMPANY.

"DEAR SIR,—Captain Murray, president of the defendant company informs us that he has to day sent to you a request to forward to us as solicitors for the company, a cheque for $1,500 to cover deposit with court as security for costs and other disbursements in connection with the appeal herein. We hope to have the pleasure of receiving this cheque early next week, as the required expenditure must be made without delay."

One cannot read these papers without coming to but one conclusion, that is, that this is a suit carried on in the name of the St. Catharines' Milling Company, but really by this Government, and the Government are in an indirect way placing the money in the hands of one of their own supporters who is a member of this House. Of course the Government have a right to defend those who have claims upon them for protection, and to employ such counsel as may be necessary to do so. But this is another illustration of the charge made against the Government, that directly or indirectly their supporters in this House are using the public Exchequer to put money into their own pockets, and in that respect I attack this transaction, if in no other. I asked the Minister a little while ago if there was no other liability attaching to the Crown in connection with this transaction. One shook his head, and another stated that he knew nothing; but if we assume that we are liable to defend this company in its litigation, and if that litigation fails, we shall have to go further, we shall have to meet a bill of damages for breach of contract. If this company have any legal or moral right to compel the people of Canada to pay the costs of prosecuting their claim, they

will have an equal right to call on the people of Canada to indemnify them. It has been stated that compensation has been given in various indirect ways to persons interested in this company, by reason of their not getting what they claim—that they have received advantages in the way of leases or other advantages. I object to this item *in toto*. In the first place, no legal liability can be established. In the next place, it cannot be said that there is any moral liability, because these lessees knew that they were buying a doubtful title. This question had been fought out at the polls for years. Everyone in Canada knows that there was a grave doubt whether this Government had any interest in that disputed territory or not. The award of 1878 was against them, and that award has been confirmed by the highest tribunal to which Canadians can appeal. Yet these defendants, in the face of that, chose to enter into this speculative transaction, and to take from this Government the right to cut timber in that territory when they knew perfectly well that that right would be contested in the courts. On what principle, then, are we asked to indemify them? It is a monstrous thing that the Government should retain one of their own supporters in this House to defend this company, and thus violate substantially the Independence of Parliament Act. This is a transaction which is a disgrace to everyone concerned in it.

Mr. MILLS. I understand that the First Minister is contesting the right of Ontario to this territory, not because he is disputing the boundary of Ontario, but because he claims that the Indians have a paramount title, which the Crown here alone could acquire. I put a question to him the other day as to whether he maintained the same view with regard to the waste territories of the Province of Quebec. If he is right in his contention as to Ontario, I do not see why it should not apply to every other territory in British North America where the Indians have not surrendered their right. I would like to know on what theory the hon. gentleman proposes still further to test this question, and to say that the rights of the Indians on the western side of the boundary between Ontario and Quebec are paramount, while on the eastern side of that boundary they are not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know as it would be of any use for us to discuss an abstract question; but as the hon. gentleman asks me the question, I have no objection to giving him my opinion, that the original title of the Indians is the same in one part of British North America as in another. With respect to this case, I would merely say that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has done the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) a great injustice. He has not been employed by the Government, and has nothing to do with the Government.

Mr. MULOCK. He has got the money.

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. The case stands thus, a suit was brought against this capital stock company on behalf of the Government of Ontario. The company employed Mr. McCarthy's firm; neither Mr. McCarthy nor his firm had anything to do with the Government. He simply acted as counsel and as partner of his firm and solicitor for this company. There is nothing wrong in that. The question arose in the courts whether the title of the company was valid or not. They had their title from the Dominion Government, and that question arose over the Indian title. It was very important that question should be settled at once, and as this suit was going on, the Government consider that the most convenient and economical way of settling the question was by making this suit a test case. The Crown supported the Indian title, and helped the company to carry on the suit until the final decision was arrived at as to the validity of that title. Mr. McCarthy, being the counsel of the St. Catharines company, continued to be so. The arrangement was not made with Mr. McCarthy, but with the company, that their case should be made a test case. This would save the bringing of many actions, as the whole thing would be settled finally in this one case. The Government, therefore, on my advice, said we would make it our own case, and have the question setted for once and forever.

Mr. MILLS. Supposing the Supreme Court or the Privy Council sustain the view taken by the First Minister on this question, are we to understand he will act on that principle in all the Provinces?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the Privy Council decide in favor of the view which the Dominion Government take, that of course will be the law, and it will be the law with respect to the Indian title in all parts of British North America.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I understood the Government intended to make this their own case, and would consequently have something to do with the lawyers conducting it.

Mr. DAWSON. I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will admit that the title of the Indians is not the same in all the Provinces. The title of the Indians which was affirmed by the Imperial proclamation of 1763, is a little different from the claim of the Indians of the Province of Quebec.

Committee rose and reported.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Pensions payable on account of Rebellion of 1885.. $20,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Militia was good enough to hand me a statement showing the way in which these pensions are distributed. Looking over this statement—and I think it ought to have been printed—I see that apparently—though there may be reasons for it—there is an enormous discrepancy in the awards made under what seem to be similar circumstances, and I will give two or three instances which will enable the hon. gentleman to state what sort of principle has been laid down about awarding these. I see a sum assigned to a Mr. Swinford, father of Lieutenant Charles Swinford, of the 90th Battalion, wounded at Fish Creek and died afterwards, of $730 a year. That is a very liberal allowance in itself, and an allowance which, with every desire to deal liberally with the families of volunteers, seems to me to require explanation; but it requires explanation more, I think, on this ground, that, I believe in precisely similar cases, a much smaller pension has been allowed. Here I find Mrs. Elizabeth Lydia Brown, mother of Captain Brown, an officer of higher rank, in Boulton's mounted infantry, killed at Batoche, receives a pension of $259.15. Now, *primâ facie*, there is no reason why $730 should be assigned to the father of a lieutenant and only $259 to the mother of a captain, unless there are some reasons which call for very remarkable discrimination. Then, I see an allowance to Mr. Moore, father of Private Thomas Moore, killed at Batoche, of $500. This is in the nature of a gratuity, and not a pension. John A. Hughes, father of Private Isaac Hughes, who seems to have died after an injury received at Batoche, gets $1,825. Those two instances will answer my purpose as well as all the rest. There is an apparent enormous discrepancy. There are others in this which require attention, but probably the hon. gentleman, by explaining those two, will give the House and myself a better idea of the principle upon which

this has been arranged than if I went into the smaller items which require explanation.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The first step to be taken in all these cases of gratuities and pensions, is to have the report of the medical examiners upon them. In the case of death we consider the circumstances of the parents, or those who are to receive the money. As in the case of Swinford, the father and mother may be altogether dependent upon their son for their livelihood, and this explains the difference in the awards. Of course the regulations concerning gratuities and pensions apply to all cases alike but we always take into consideration the special circumstances of each case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must observe that $730 a year to the father of a deceased officer is a very large allowance, although it may be justified, and it is doubly large when you only allow one-third of that sum to the mother of a deceased officer of a superior rank.

Mr. WATSON. I had the pleasure of knowing both these young men. The families are similarly situated, but I believe that the father of Swinford has a position from which he draws a fair living. I think the discrimination that has been made between them is not justifiable. So far as bravery is concerned Captain Brown was one of Boulton's best scouts, and it is strange that his mother should only receive $250 pension while the other should receive $730.

Militia—Military Properties, Contingencies, &c...$32,142 20

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In order to remove any doubt I desire to ask the Minister of Militia if I understood his statement correctly on the position of the officers. There are two classes of officers in the service: One appointed after a certain five years rule, said to have been established a few years ago; the other class was appointed before, I believe. The House on both sides recognised that when a certain age, to be determined by the Government, and which I believe is sixty-three years, is reached then the propriety of retirement is recognised. What I want distinctly understood is this: Do hon. gentlemen intend, at the expiration of these term of five years, to dispense with the services of the officers who were appointed prior to the introduction of the five years' rule, and who are not yet sixty-three years.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have already explained to the hon. gentleman that the policy followed by the Department is, that those appointments are made for five years only. As to the cases of Colonel Denison and Colonel Milsom: Although this change of policy applied to them, it was considered from the fact that when they were appointed no such rule was in existence, there should be a difference made in their favor. The officers who occupy a similar position will have a precedent in that case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I understand the position is this: that with respect to officers who were appointed prior to the five years' rule spoken of, that until they have attained sixty-three years, the Government do not intend to apply this rule of removing them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Ocean and River Service.....$18,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister was to state whether the contract with the Allan Line Steamship Company had been completed.

Mr. McLELAN. The old contract required one year's notice to terminate it, and that has been given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know what the Government propose to do. Do they propose to invite public tenders or renew the contract on certain conditions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have given notice of termination of contract with the Allan Steamship Company, in order to be able to obtain an improved service on the St. Lawrence.

Canals—Maintenance and Repairs.....$497,024 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I beg leave now to ask the question of which I gave notice, but which was not reached, that is, Whether the raising of the dams upon Mud Creek, at the outlet of Mud Lake, in the township of Bedford, was done by the authority or with the privity of the Government, or of any official of the Government?

Mr. POPE. No, it was not.

Militia—Permanent Corps, &c.....$135,700 00

Mr. MULOCK. I had the honor to present a petition to this House a short time ago from a gentleman named Browning, and I desire briefly to state what it set forth. It alleges that Mr. Browning was appointed provisionally as lieutenant, and served in the North-West. It was intended that he should obtain a certificate from the military school at Quebec, but whilst the rebellion was in progress he could not attend there. Of course I am now only speaking of what appears in the petition. It appears that he discharged his duties in the North-West satisfactorily, and when the rebellion was over he accompanied the troop to Quebec, and there entered upon the course of study to which the law entitled him. At that time the school was in an unsettled state, in consequence of the rebellion, and it is stated that no squad was formed whereby he could receive such instructions as the law entitled him to, until the 15th of October, although he had been in attendance for a long time. The petition goes on to state that in the month of November he was making enquiry at the school with a view of taking advantage of the privileges to which he was entitled of having a horse kept in the school. He says that he then learned for the first time that the commandant of the school had been drawing rations for his horse, charging them against Browning without his knowledge or consent. The petition states that the commandant thereupon conceived the advisability of getting rid of the petitioner, and that day he received an order from the commandant to present himself for examination on the 6th of November. He thereupon replied by letter, stating that it was not reasonable to ask him to present himself for examination on the 6th of November, inasmuch as he had not had the instruction to which the law entitled him. The law entitled him to a course of twelve weeks' instruction at the school, and during that time to thirty-six lectures in all, distributed over the period, or an average of three a week. It also entitles him to certain practical work in command of the troop. It appears that on the day he was notified to present himself for examination, he had not had up to that moment any opportunity of command of a troop, although according to the course of instruction he was required to pass an examination in that branch of the service. The reply he received from the commandant was to the effect that he must either obey the order and present himself for examination on the 6th of November, or accept his transport, which meant, of course, to leave the school. He replied that to force an examination under such an alternative was simply to summon him up to be rejected, and accordingly he intimated that if that were the final decision of the commandant, he might accept the latter alternative at once, and he at once took his transport. Thereupon the commandant, instead of adhering to his first decision, informed him that the examination would not take place, but that he must await further orders. He accordingly remained at the school, and after getting the

command of a troop, to which he was entitled, on the 12th of November, he was called up for examination, and the examination being only in a small portion of the work, he was rejected. He was forced to the examination after having been only five or six weeks out of school. It is urged that he was there for months; but the petition alleges that the school was not organised until the 15th of October. The petition alleges further that when called up for examination, he was not given the opportunity of being examined in all the subjects, but he was so unfairly tested that, even had he obtained full marks in the subjects in which he was examined, he would not have obtained sufficient to entitle him to pass. Further, from the facts set forth in that petition, it does not appear that he failed in respect of one subject by which he could be rejected. It is therefore evident that he did not receive that fair examination that the law entitled him to. It appears that he was forced to his examination, when he should not in justice have been forced to it. A motive for the conduct of the commandant was supplied by the alleged fact of his having committed the offence charged. The gravity of that offence is sufficient to make me hesitate to assert anything more than the petition states. Thereafter, the commandant reported to the proper authorities, where Mr. Browning is stationed—and I may say he is a resident of Toronto and an officer in the Governor General's Body Guard; and the communication from the commandant passed through the various channels, and ultimately reached Mr. Browning. That communication asserted that Mr. Browning had failed in his examination, had been guilty of insubordination, and had given the commandant an infinitude of trouble during the time he was at the school. Mr. Browning felt that that was a charge which demanded investigation, and he asked for particulars in respectful and proper language, but they were never furnished to him. The conclusion I have arrived at from a perusal of the Queen's regulations and the English law applicable to the case, is that when an officer complains against his superior officer, it is not competent for the commander of Her Majesty's forces in Canada to deliver final judgment. But that is what was done in this case. Mr. Browning presented his letter for an investigation of the charge against him by Commandant Turnbull. The application of Lieutenant Browning for an investigation was submitted to the Minister of Militia. The Minister felt that he had not the power to interfere, and he did not interfere, although I submit that his duty, under the circumstances, was to have obtained the report of the officer commanding, and to have submitted that report to the Government, as nothing short of the Government can adjudicate upon such a case. I am sure there are members of this House who can testify to the capacity of Lieutenant Browning as an officer. There are those who met him on the field; and he was desirous of further serving his country in the way I have indicated. He writes that he has been unjustly deprived of his position in the service, and that an attempt is now being made to drive him therefrom in disgrace. That is a state of affairs that the honor of this country cannot permit. If he is deserving of dismissal, he at least has the right of a soldier to a fair enquiry, and I think the papers will show that he has not received that consideration in this respect which every officer and every private is entitled to. To illustrate the mistake that has been made. I may say that when Lieutenant Browning's letter asking for an investigation, setting forth the facts and casting reflections upon the honor of Colonel Turnbull was sent through the various channels to Major General Middleton, that gentleman forwarded that communication to Colonel Turnbull for his report in regard to the grave charge made therein against him; and Colonel Turnbull neither confessed nor denied it, but simply made a marginal note that he had nothing to say in regard to it. That is stated in the city of Toronto by the officers. Now, it is due to Colonel Turnbull that his conduct should be investigated, and it is due to Lieutenant Browning, if there has been any denial of justice to him, that the pending order against him should be cancelled and he should be reinstated in his position, and allowed to take that full course of instruction to which the law entitles him. It is also due to him that he should have a fair enquiry into the alleged case of insubordination. Had time permitted, I would have gone fully into this matter, but, under the circumstances, I leave it as it is, expecting that the Department will, in view of the matter set forth in this petition, deal with this case as justice demands. I may further say that a perusal of the petition laid upon the Table shows that, as a last resort, before appealing to this House, Lieutenant Browning personally attended before the Minister of Militia and argued his own case. I do not know, of course, what occurred, but the petition alleges that the Minister of Militia, in giving final judgment, said he had investigated the case with a great deal of care, and that if he could give Lieutenant Browning relief, more especially as he had been informed by Lieutenant Browning's friends, who had written him on the subject, that Lieutenant Browning was a good Conservative, he would do so I do not deny to a Conservative the justice he is entitled to, but it will be a fatal day to the Militia of Canada when the politics of any officer should have the slightest weight with the authorities.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman has shown that the course which I have invariably followed has been not to allow politics to interfere in the management of the Militia Department. The hon. gentleman has just stated that Lieutenant Browning told him that, in investigating the matter, I had told Lieutenant Browning that however much he was reported to me as being a strong Conservative I did not consider that I could interfere. My reason is obvious. This is a matter of military discipline which came under the major general commanding. He made a report, and my excuse for not going into the case is really what the hon. gentleman gives himself, that time does not permit. I looked into every report that was made, the report of the major general and the report of Colonel Turnbull. The latter gentleman is an officer well known who has made of the Cavalry School of Quebec a great success. We have never had any charge against him, and in his report he contradicts every statement made by Lieutenant Browning. However I told Mr. Browning's friends that if he chose to make charges against the Cavalry School, I was willing to have a court of investigation appointed. With reference to the charge made against Colonel Turnbull, in so far as drawing rations in the name of Mr. Browning is concerned, this is the practice followed in the school. In many cases, the cadet comes in bringing his own horse, and is allowed $1 per day for his time, and his rations are served out. In other cases, where a cadet does not bring in his horse, one is told off to him and rations drawn in his name, so that his time at school counts from the time he comes in until the time he goes out. The horse is essential to him, and rations are drawn in his name. There is, therefore, nothing at all in the charge made against Colonel Turnbull. The hon. gentleman must know that in the General Orders, under paragraph 106, if an officer after a short course in any school of instruction fails to pass the examination he may be retired; and the major general, if he has sinned at all, has sinned in this case on the side of leniency. Lieutenant Browning was reported as being insubordinate. The major general did not choose to courtmartial him, but fell back on the General Orders and retired him. However, I am ready to grant a court of enquiry and into the statements made, which are supported by the two officers, Lieutenant Hewitt, well known in Toronto, and Lieutenant Lessard, who formed the staff of the Cavalry School of Quebec.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the officer demands it, of course, he is entitled to a courtmartial when charges are made against him, otherwise serious oppression might be perpetrated on gentlemen entering our service. They have their rights; and in the case, especially of a man who has served in the North-West, it would be proper, if he chose to demand a court martial it should be accorded him.

Indians—Grant to supplement Indian Fund..... $34,638 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take this opportunity of calling again the attention of the First Minister who is specially charged with it, to the fact that the salarirs of Indian agents are altogether out of proportion to the relief afforded the Indians. Out of about $5,000 in New Brunswick $2,000 are for salaries, so that only $3,000 may be said to reach the Indians. It did not appear, on the explanations given, that there was just ground for this great discrepancy that exists in the salaries, between Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The Indians are just as much scattered and there are just as many agents in the one Province as the other. Forty per cent. of salary on the pittance paid these people is an enormous commission.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The agents have other duties to do besides the disbursement of money. The salaries are not paid out of the moneys distributed to the Indians, but out of the Indian Management Fund.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am speaking of the salaries in this identical vote. You have charged New Brunswick $1,876 for salaries and the total distributed is $3,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not able to explain the real reason why the salaries in one Province are greater than in another. The salaries are small, from $25 to $200, I suppose the bands are more scattered, but I cannot at this moment explain the details.

Commercial Agencies..... $10,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here also I wanted some sort of general idea of what you are going to do under this rather comprehensive title of commercial agencies. The sum asked from one aspect is rather small, but it is altogether too large to throw away.

Mr. McLELAN. It is proposed to select certain points at which we may appoint agents or pay parties residing there or familiar with the trade of that country, and employ them in endeavoring to work up a trade with the Dominion of Canada. Two or three points have been spoken of and commend themselves rather favorably to myself and to my colleagues. For instance, Australia has been named. There is a gentleman with whom I have had several interviews, Mr. Woods, who has a firm in Australia, and who is familiar with the manufactures of this country, and his brother has been resident in Australia for a long period and is thoroughly familiar with the trade in that country. Mr. Woods has persuaded me that a considerable amount of benefit can be done to the Dominion by the appointment of himself or some other person to work up a trade with the Dominion of Canada. It has been also proposed to employ a man during the Colonial Exhibition in London, to see the representatives of the various colonies there, and endeavor to effect sales or open trade with the various colonies. It has also been spoken of that we should send to some of the points in South America where there is a probability of trade being opened with the Dominion. I propose, as soon as Parliament is prorogued and I have got a little rest, to take this matter up and make a selection from the different points and the parties who have been represented as good for this business. Of course a great deal depends on the character of the man.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose no figure was named?

Mr. McLELAN. No. Mr. Woods talked as if it was not so much salary as some small compensation which would enable them to devote some of their time to it. I did not commit myself to taking him, but I was favorably impressed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We must judge by results. There is a good deal to be said *pro*, and there is a good deal to be said *con*. If it is merely in order to allow a few gentlemen to draw salaries my opinion is that our sister colonies are a good deal in the same position as ourselves. They are producers of raw materials. Possibly in regard to Australia exchanges may be effected with profit, but it is a long way off. I had occasion, when I was Finance Minister, just before leaving office, to make some enquiry into this subject, and I make this suggestion to the hon. gentleman. I am inclined to think that, particularly from the Maritime Provinces, there is a profitable trade awaiting us in connection with the Mediterranean, which has never been exploited as the French say, and I suggest that some attention might be paid to the Mediterranean trade.

Charges of Management..... $184,224 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon gentleman agreed to give some definite information as to the very important question, what the Government are going to do about the very large amounts that are now being received. All the information I have received tends to show that this question has to be looked into, and, in the Maritime Provinces to which the hon. gentleman belongs, that it is a very important question, that the deposits in the banks which form, to a great extent, the trading material, the wage fund of the people employing labor, have been seriously depleted by the high rate paid by Government largely in excess of the current value of money. On two occasions the hon. gentleman promised to announce what the Government were going to do in that respect.

Mr. McLELAN. I am not sure that I said I would be able to announce what we were going to do, but I said it was under the consideration of the Government. There seemed to be perhaps well-founded complaints that the savings banks were being used by some parties, in the Lower Provinces more particularly, for the purposes of banking transactions. The amount is now limited to $1,000 to be received from any one person. When these banks were instituted in 1871, depositors were allowed to deposit any amount, up to 1877. They were then limited by Order in Council to $10,000. This continued up to the 25th November, 1880, when another Order in Council was passed limiting the amount to $3,000. The large amounts which have been received and are held from individuals, in the Lower Provinces more particularly, of $10,000, $ 2,000 and $15,000, were received as to the largest amounts previous to the first Order in Council, passed in 1877, restricting it to $10,000. Up to 1880, various sums had been deposited up to $10,000. Since 25th November of that year, they have been restricted to $3,000. The question is under the consideration of the Government whether we shall further restrict them and place them on the same footing as the post office saving banks. What most requires attention, I think, is what the banks complain of, that the savings banks in the Lower Provinces are used for the purposes of exchange, to the detriment of the banking institutions. That is a question that will receive immediate attention, and it is perhaps desirable that that practice should be first dealt with, and then comes the question whether we should put them on the same footing as the post office savings banks as to restricting the amounts to be received from one individual in one year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman knows that, in England, the amount received is small. I think the total is £60. That is not used by Government, but invested, and under such circumstances but little risk can arise. We are receiving enormous sums, and paying certainly 33, probably 50, per cent. more than would be given for money at all anywhere else. I do not object to the Government continuing an allowance, even more than the money is worth, perhaps, to that particular class of depositors who may fairly come under the head of comparatively poor depositors—call them poor men if you like—I mean workingmen. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman restricts to a moderate sum the amounts that can be received hereafter, and he will go far to ward off a considerable danger, but he will run a danger, I think, if he persists in receiving moneys at rates much in excess of those which the banks can afford to pay. Now, in the post office savings bank department, although most of these deposits were made some time ago, sums as high as $16,000 and even $19,000 have been received, largely, no doubt, from some public or private institutions. In the case of private persons we know how easy it is for a man to make a deposit in the name of some friend of a sum equal to the maximum amount that may be received. Therefore, I suggest that the hon. gentleman would do well for future deposits to affix a strict rule, and in those cases where the sums exceed the limit, not allow more than the current bank rates.

Canadian Pacific Railway—British Columbia.. $200,000 00

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister of Finance promised to give us a copy of the reports of the arbitrators with reference to this rolling stock.

Mr. BLAKE. We want a copy of that document concerning the rolling stock which was in use.

Mr. POPE. I have a copy of the rolling stock as it was appraised by Messrs. Heney, Reed & Clark, all of them mechanical engineers. The amount was $199,535.

Mr. MULOCK. When was that matter referred to the arbitrators?

Mr. POPE. They appraised this when the work was completed, on the 1st July last. They went to British Columbia and inspected the stock. I cannot state exactly when the award was sent in.

Mr. MULOCK. The award values the property at about three times its value.

Mr. POPE. No, not as high as that, but I think they did put it pretty high. My impression is that it is more than we can get for it, but still, you must remember that it cost a great deal to get that stock into that country.

Mr. BLAKE. As well as I can judge from the enquiries I have made since this paper was laid upon the Table, and from what little knowledge I obtained before, I should say that this was a high valuation for these articles when they were new, and it is worth somewhere about three times their present value. I would like to know when these three gentlemen went to that country, and when they made this award.

Mr. POPE. It was during last season that they went to that country, in the autumn, if I remember rightly.

Mr. BLAKE. Was it this year that the award was made?

Mr. POPE. Yes, during the present year.

Mr. BLAKE. Did any Order in Council for payment of the award pass?

Mr. POPE. The amount has not been paid.

Mr. McLELAN.

Mr. BLAKE. Did any Order in Council pass for the payment?

Mr. POPE. I think so.

Mr. BLAKE. About what time?

Mr. POPE. I could not say.

Mr. BLAKE. Were there any negotiations with Mr. Onderdonk for the purpose of arriving at an amicable settlement without obtaining an award?

Mr. POPE. I had some talk with Mr. Onderdonk, and I found he thought the rolling stock so much more valuable than I did that I considered we could not go any further.

Mr. BLAKE. Surely Mr. Onderdonk presented a claim of what he thought the rolling stock worth before you went on to appraise the value.

Mr. POPE. I do not think he presented any figures.

Mr. BLAKE. But you thought from his conversation that his figures were too high. Were they much more than this sum?

Mr. POPE. A good deal more.

Mr. BLAKE. Probably a quarter of a million.

Mr. POPE. About $300,000.

Mr. BLAKE. And the Minister thought that he would do well in getting off for $200,000?

Mr. POPE. I think the figure is a high one; but the matter was left to those gentlemen who made the award, and I had no alternative in the matter.

Mr. MULOCK. Did they distinguish the value of the rolling stock and the cost of placing it where it then was?

Mr. POPE. They gave the award.

Payment to Father Lacombe $1,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman place the documents on the Table of the House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This payment is for the special services which Father Lacombe rendered with the Blackfeet and Piegan Indians. He has great influence with those Indians, and he was specially asked by the Government to devote himself to this service, a service then of considerable danger even to himself. We were only too glad to obtain his services. His services were very valuable, as will be understood from the orderly character of those warlike tribes during the rebellion.

Railways and Canals $31,850 49

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With reference to this refund to Mr. John Heney of canal tolls and wharfage, I understand that this was a rebate for goods which were delivered under contract which he obtained by tender.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that it is indefensible, after a number of parties tender for a contract on which they all suppose that the tolls and wharfage would have to be paid, for one man to get a sum of nearly $4,000 after a considerable lapse of time. On what ground was it paid?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The ground upon which this claim was preferred against the present as well as the late Government was, that in 1873 an Order in Council was passed to refund the amounts paid in tolls or wharfage. Some $8,000 or $9,000 was paid under that Order in Council.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What date?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It was in 1873, but I could not say what month.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Could you say whether it was in October?

Mr. COSTIGAN. My impression is that it was after the change of Government. The objections which may be raised against Mr. Heney in this, on the ground of his being a tenderer for the work, applies just as well in the former cases dealt with under the Order in Council. Parties tendered for these works on the canal when their materials and vessels were chargeable for certain amounts. It was held that inasmuch as the work was being done for the Government, they should not be called on to pay these tolls, and in every case from 1873 to this time they were repaid. Mr. Heney in transporting his barges had to pay tolls, but when transporting material he had not to do so at all. His contract called for a certain quantity of wood for the Parliament buildings. The officer in charge compelled Mr. Heney, for convenience sake, I presume, so as not to crowd up the ground, to land the wood on the wharves, so that he might draw it here as it should be required. Therefore, it seems pretty hard to charge him wharfage on wood which really belonged to the Government.

THE SUPPLY BILL.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McLELAN moved:

1. Resolved That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1886, the sum of $3,501,921.23 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

2. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1887, the sum of $21,562,021,41 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Committee rose and reported resolutions, which were read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. McLELAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 145) for granting to Her Majesty certain moneys required for defraying certain expenses of the public service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1886, and the 30th June, 1887, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the first, the second, and the third times, and passed.

PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a letter from the Secretary of His Excellency the Governor, as follows:—

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY,
OTTAWA, 31st May, 1886.

SIR,—I have the honor to inform you that His Excellency the Governor-General will proceed to the Senate Chamber to prorogue the Session of the Dominion Parliament on Wednesday, the 2nd June, at 8.15 o'clock p.m.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,

HENRY STRATFIELD, Captain,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honorable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is just possible that we may not all have an opportunity of returning to this House next year, if an election takes place; and I want to say that if that event does take place, I hope that men will come here, not with the party chains tied around their legs, but that, whether Liberals or Conservatives, they will come with freedom of conscience and independence of judgment, prepared to decide questions of public policy on their merits. I do not know what course the gentlemen leading the two great political parties may adopt, but many of the members of this House sympathise with me in the views I express, although they vote the other way. I may say that a large majority of the gentlemen on this side of the House express the views I express; but they are like a gentleman whom I have in my eye, who says in his own eloquent way, while my opinions are mine, and they are in sympathy with yours, my votes are my party's. On the other side of the House, there are men who come here pledged to support the leader of the Opposition; they vote with him, although they often feel that the views I express are right; but they cannot afford to depart from party lines. When I have stated on one or two occasions that this House has ceased to be a deliberative body——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. If I am out of order, I apologise, but these are my opinions at all events; and I hope when we have a general election—I do not hope for much until we do—that gentlemen, when they go on the hustings, will go there, whether Liberals or Conservatives, I do not care which—I am neither—I am an independent man—will go there prepared, if elected to this House, to come here, free and unfettered, ready to vote, not as the party dictates, but as their conscience tells them is right and in the interest of the country. These sentiments I feel it my duty to take this opportunity to express at the close of this Legislature. If I have said anything to any hon. members during this Parliament that might be thought offensive or out of place, I hope they will forgive me. I have adopted the course I have pursued in this House from an intense conviction that if we a want to elevate this country, we have to break away from those absolute party ties which control men on both sides of this House, and assume a more independent attitude prepared to exercise the right of private judgment, and vote as our consciences and hearts direct us.

Mr. TASSÉ. I do not rise to discuss the merits of the greater party, which is so well and ably represented by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, but I am sure that all the Conservative members of this House will be only too glad to accept the apology which has been made to us by that hon. gentleman. My intention in rising is to draw the attention of the Government and the House to a great event which is about to take place; I refer to the completion and inauguration of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That work is assuredly one of the great works of this century, a greater work than the Suez Canal, a greater work than the Union and Central Pacific Railway, and a greater work than the Northern Pacific Railway, and I think that such an event in Canadian history should not pass unnoticed. As all the supplies are voted, I do not rise with the object of asking the Government to propose to vote any money for the proper celebration of that great event, but it seems to me that the Government should call the people of this country to celebrate that event in a proper and dignified manner. I think the inauguration of that railway should be the occasion of a general holiday for the people of Canada, for that great work is certainly the work of the people of Canada, directed as they have been so well by the Government which has so ably conducted the destinies of this country for so many years. I have noticed with pleasure that the great city of Montreal has already taken steps to celebrate the departure of the first train which will leave Montreal for the Pacific coast, and I think the whole people should be called upon to follow the example of the commercial metropolis of Canada and celebrate that in a proper manner. I was informed from good sources that the authorities of the Canadian Pacific Railway were disposed

to offer to members of Parliament a grand excursion over the road on that occasion and to invite all the members, even those who have voted against the Pacific Railway, and I believe the greater party, which is so well represented by the hon. gentleman who spoke before me, and I may say that those who cannot take part in that grand excursion will be afforded an opportunity to visit the Pacific coast during the year at no cost to themselves.

Mr. MITCHELL. I forgot to thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I do so now, for the amount of forbearance you have always shown me, and the manner in which you have presided over the deliberations of this House.

Mr. TROW. I rise with considerable diffidence to say a few words. I had no intention of doing so, because I thought my respected leader would close this sitting. I presume he is busy, so it devolves upon some one to say a few words, of mutual congratulation I suppose, as is usual on these occasions. I congratulate the Government, as did the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), as to the great success of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have travelled along that line, and, having been a close observer of things by the way, I was highly delighted with my trip. It is almost a world wonder, the magnitude of that work, the difficulties they had to encounter, and the rapid progress they have made. We have had rather an interesting Session, rather unusually so. The debates have been exceedingly lively, and unusual subjects have been undertaken by members of the House. For instance, at the outset we undertook the Riel discussion. That was certainly a real discussion. There was nothing assumed about that. I had intended on one occasion to say a few words myself, but my extreme modesty prevented me. My reason for intending to do so was that I knew something about the circumstances of the case, I was well acquainted with the principal parties who took an interest in that war, I was acquainted with Gabriel Dumont, and I must say that I presume I am the only gentleman in this House who had a private interview with Mr. Riel, four days before his execution. I had the honor, through Colonel Richardson and the Lieutenant Governor, of having an interview of over half an hour or three quarters of an hour with Riel, four days before his execution, and therefore I felt an interest in explaining my views in that discussion. Other lively discussions have taken place. We have had Home Rule, and we have had also a few scandals. I am sorry sometimes that we have to listen to old exploded notions, that should be exploded at all events and buried in oblivion. I wish that hon. members were confined to a certain political portion of our history, and only referred back to subjects for a few years. We are in the habit of going back too far, even prior to Confederation. I think there is ample for discussion and intelligible debate that has taken place in the country politically during the last few years, and I think it would be advisable that our members on both sides of the House would curtail their speeches and make them not only more brief but more to the point. However, I presume that any deliberative body sometimes exaggerates and gets a little astray on both sides. I regret very much the illness of the Premier, that he was confined to his house for so long a time and was unable to take part in the discussions of this House. We found the loss of his presence for various reasons. One was that he seems to have the command and control of men probably better than any other individual in the Dominion. I noticed one evening here that the majority was reduced to about twenty, and I was very much elated, but the next morning the Premier made his appearance quite early. If we had brought it down to ten, probably he would have been here before breakfast. Other members of the Cabinet have been afflicted. It is something remarkable, whether it is the onerous duties these gentlemen have to perform or the great responsibilities they have to undertake, or the confinement, or the excessive labor, at all events some unaccountable thing seems to injure their health. My advice to these gentlemen, in the event of a general election or otherwise, would be to take their positions over here. As a rule we are all healthy.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And hungry.

Mr. TROW. We are not by any means fond of opposition, and I believe it would be a relief to hon. gentlemen, judging from their state of health, that it would be better for them, better for the country and for all around if we changed positions, and I have no doubt, if a general election takes place, that will be the result. There seems to be a rumor afloat that an election will take place. I have a little inclination to go to the old country, and I hope it will take place before I start. My hope is that the members of the Executive may improve in health. We would like to see them here again, but on this side of the House. Before I take my seat I wish to give credit to the hon. Minister of Public Works, who is the most indefatigable worker I know of, and who both day and night has shown a wonderful amount of vitality, push, pluck and determination. In fact, we have all done our duty. No man has worked harder than the leader of the Opposition, and no man in this Dominion is better prepared to analyse and perfect the measures of the Government. The country is under a deep debt of gratitude to the Hon. Edward Blake for his determination to see that everything is done in a proper and legitimate manner.

PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

Mr. SPEAKER,

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate.

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to incorporate the Continental Bank of Canada.
An Act respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.
An Act to incorporate a Community of Religious Ladies under the name of the Sisters, Faithful Companions of Jesus.
An Act respecting the Railway from Esquimalt to Nanaimo, in British Columbia.
An Act respecting the Union Suspension Bridge.
An Act relating to the Canada Southern Bridge Company.
An Act to reduce the Capital Stock of the Bank of New Brunswick.
An Act respecting the Pictou Bank.
An Act respecting th Burlington Bay Canal.
An Act to incorporate the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.
An Act to incorporate the Calvin Company (Limited).
An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.
An Act to naturalise Girolamo Consentini, commonly called Baron Girolamo Consentini.
An Act to amend the several Acts relating to the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto.
An Act futher to amend "The Post Office Act, 1875."
An Act further to amend "The Interpretation Act."
An Act to incorporate the Anglo-Canadian Bank.
An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.
An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Nova Scotia Steamship Company (Limited).
An Act to incorporate the Tecumseh Insurance Company of Canada.
An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.
An Act to grant certain powers to The Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Company of Algoma (Limited).
An Act to incorporate the E. B. Eddy Manufacturing Company.
An Act to reduce the Capital Stock of the Union Bank of Lower Canada, and to change the corporate name thereof to the "Union Bank of Canada."
An Act to reduce the Capital Stock of the Union Bank of Halifax.

An Act to expedite the issue of Letters Patent for Indian Lands.
An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Pictou Coal and Iron Company.
An Act respecting the Application of certain Fines and Forfeitures.
An Act respecting the transfer of the Lighthouse at Cape Race, Newfoundland, and its appurtenances, to the Dominion of Canada.
An Act to incorporate the Forbes' Trochilic Steam Engine Central Company of Canada.
An Act to incorporate "The First Synod in the Dominion of Canada of the Reformed Episcopal Church," and for other purposes connected therewith.
An Act respecting the Saskatchewan Land and Homestead Company (Limited).
An Act respecting the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from a point at or near Stellarton to the Town of Pictou.
An Act to amend The Animal Contagious Diseases Act.
An Act to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Freehold Loan and Savings Company, and to authorise the said Company to issue Debenture Stock.
An Act to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Western Canada Loan and Savings Company, and to authorise the said Company to issue Debenture Stock.
An Act to consolidate the borrowing powers of the Canada Permanent Loan and Savings Company, and to authorise the said Company to issue Debenture Stock.
An Act respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.
An Act to make further provision respecting Summary Proceedings before Justices and other Magistrates.
An Act respecting the Central Ontario Railway.
An Act to amend the Criminal Law and to declare it a misdemeanor to leave ungarded and exposed certain holes, openings and excavations.
An Act to incorporate the Bow River Coal Mine Railway and Transportation Company.
An Act to incorporate the Lake Superior Mineral Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Kingston and Pembroke Mutual Aid and Insurance Company (Limited).
An Act to amend "The Adulteration Act."
An Act in further amendment of the Weights and Measures Act of 1879.
An Act respecting Commissions to Public Officers of Canada.
An Act respecting the Canadian Copper Company.
An Act respecting the Ango-American Iron Company.
An Act to amend the Act respecting the North-West Central Railway Company.
An Act to amend an Act to authorise the granting of Subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies.
An Act respecting the Protection of Navigable Waters.
An Act respecting the Bank of Yarmouth.
An Act to amend the Act respecting the British Canadian Bank.
An Act to incorporate the Victoria and Ste. Sault Marie Junction Railway Company.
An Act to explain the Act intituled: "An Act for the final settlement of the claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion."
An Act to amend the Act incorporating the Ottawa Board of Trade.
An Act to incorporate the Brockville and New York Bridge Company.
An Act to incorporate the Maskinongé and Nipissing Railway Company.
An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Guelph Junction Railway Company.
An Act to further amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882.
An Act for the relief of the Corporation of the Town of Cobourg.
An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Niagara Frontier Bridge Company.
An Act to incorporate the Yarmouth Steamship Company (Limited).
An Act to punish Seduction and like offences, and to make further provision for the Protection of Women and Girls.
An Act respecting the Dominion Lands Colonisation Company (Limited).
An Act for the relief of Flora Birrell.
An Act in amendment of the Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883, and the Act amending the same.
An Act to amend the law relating to the salaries of certain Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature for Ontario.
An Act to amend the law respecting Crown Cases reserved.
An Act to make further provision respecting the administration of the Public Lands of Canada in British Columbia.
An Act to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Junction Railway Company.
An Act to amend the Act to provide for the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company (Limited).
An Act respecting the Montreal Board of Trade.
An Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and North Pacific Railway Company.
An Act to amend an Act respecting a Reformatory for certain Juvenile Offenders in the County of Halifax, in the Province of Nova Scotia.
An Act respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada.
An Act respecting the London and Ontario Investment Company (Limited).
An Act to amend an Act respecting Offences against the Person.
An Act to incorporate the School Savings Bank.
An Act respecting Experimental Farm Stations.
An Act respecting Interest in the Province of British Columbia.
An Act further to amend the Law of Evidence in certain cases.
An Act to incorporate the Northumberland Straits Tunnel Railway Company.
An Act respecting the representation of the North-West Territories in the Parliament of Canada.
An Act to further amend the Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.
An Act to incorporate the Saint Gabriel Levee and Railway Company.
An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway and Steamship Company.
An Act respecting the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.
An Act to further amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1883.
An Act respecting certain Works constructed in or over Navigable Waters.
An Act respecting the Carleton, City of Saint John, Branch Railway.
An Act respecting the improvement of the Harbor of Quebec
An Act respecting Tolls over the Dunnville Dam and Bridge connecting works constructed over the Grand River.
An Act respecting Insurance.
An Act further to amend the law respecting the North-West Territories.
An Act further to amend "An Act respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Companies, Building Societies and Trading Corporations."
An Act to incorporate "The North American Telegraph Company."
An Act to incorporate the Kootenay and Athabaska Railway Company.
An Act to make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-West.
An Act to authorise the construction of a Railway from the Straits of Canso to Louisburg or Sydney, as a Public Work.
An Act respecting certain subsidies for a Railway from Metaredjac on the Intercolonial Railway to Paspebiac.
An Act respecting the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company.
An Act respecting Real Property in the Territories.
An Act to amend the Act respecting the Electoral Franchise and the Dominion Elections Act, 1874.
An Act respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.
An Act to authorise the granting of the Subsidies therein mentioned for, and in aid of the construction of certain railways.
An Act to authorise the grant of certain Subsidies in Land for the construction of the Railways therein mentioned.
An Act further to amend the Acts relating to Duties of Customs and the importation or exportation of goods into or from Canada.
An Act to prohibit the manufacture and sale of certain substitutes for Butter.
An Act respecting the bounty on Pig Iron manufactured in Canada from Canadian Ore.

His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to reserve the following Bill for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon:—

An Act further to amend the Act respecting Fishing by Foreign Vessels.

Then the Honorable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:

The Commons of Canada have voted the Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill:—

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1886, and the 30th June, 1887, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service,

to which Bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words:—

In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks Her Loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the Fourth Session of the Fifth Parliament of the Dominion with the following Speech:—

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I desire to convey to you my best thanks for the earnestness and assiduity with which you have performed your important duties.

The legislation of the Session has been of an eminently practical character, and cannot fail to aid in the promotion of the material progress of the country.

The grant of representation in the House of Commons to the North-West Territories will, if sanctioned by the Imperial Parliament (of which there is no reason to doubt), give the people of that vast region an interest and voice in the affairs of the Dominion, and enable them to lay the wants and requirements of their young country, with authority, before the great council of the nation.

You have at the same time conferred upon them the boons of an efficient judicial system and a speedy and inexpensive mode for the transfer of property in land.

The measure for the establishment of a central experimental farm, with auxiliary stations for the Provinces, will be greatly appreciated by our agricultural population.

I congratulate you heartily on the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway and on the repayment in money and land of the advances made in its aid from the public Treasury.

The future prosperity of this great enterprise and the consequent advantage to the best interests of the Dominion I now consider as fully assured.

The appropriations in aid of various railways will tend largely to increase the trade and develop the resources of the districts traversed by them, and I am especially pleased to know that by the provision made for the construction of a railway through Cape Breton, that historical Island will at last be brought into connection with the railway system of Canada.

Among the many useful measures you have passed may especially be noticed the amendments of the Franchise Act, rendering its working more simple and less expensive; the consolidation of the Statutes; the arrangement for the organisation of a better and more economical system of parliamentary and departmental printing; and the amendment of the Dominion Lands Act.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I thank you in Her Majesty's name for the supplies you have granted for the public service.

Honorable Gentlemen and Gentlemen:

In bidding you farewell until next year, I rejoice to be able to congratulate you on the general prosperity of the country and the good promise of a plentiful harvest.

The Parliament of the Dominion of Canada was then prorogued until Monday, the twelfth day of July next.

Printed by MacLean, Roger & Co., Parliamentary Printers, Wellington Street, Ottawa.

INDEX.

FOURTH SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT, 1886.

Abbreviations of well-known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; H., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; Ms., Motions; m, moved; Neg., Negatived; N. B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Priv. and Elec., Privileges and Elections; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp. Special; Stmt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Y, N., Yeas and Nays; Names in italic and parentheses are those of the movers.

Abbott, Hon. J. J. C., *Argenteuil.*

Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 948 (ii).

Allen, Mr. B., *North Grey.*

Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1093 (ii).

Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 539 (i).

Fishing Rights of Indians on Lakes Huron and Nipissing, Pets, &c., on M. for copies, 695 (i).

Glenannan to Wingham Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1615 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) to Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1117 (ii).

Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 660 (i).

Maritime Court of Ont., extension of Jurisdiction (B. 5, 1°*) 37; 2° m., 149; in Com., 560, 569 (i).

Oleomargarine, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) respecting legislation, 552 (i).

Settlers in Saugeen Peninsula, on M. for Com. of Sup, 1538 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1615 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts Agriculture, &c. (Dominion Exhibition) 1093 (ii).

Civil Govt. (Interior Dept. of) 539 (i).

Allison, Mr. W. H., *Hants.*

Roche, M. of N. S., transfer of, on M. for Sel. Com. to enquire into conduct of certain members, 1337 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1617 (ii).

Truro to Newport Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1617 (ii).

Amyot, Mr. G., *Bellechase.*

Administration in the N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1738 (ii).

Criminal Law Amt. (law of evidence) B 3 (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*) in Com., 911 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*). in Com., 1669 (ii).

Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1265 (ii).

Medals for Volunteers who served in N.W. (M. for copies of Cor.) 438 (i).

Mutual Reserve Fund Life Association certificates (Ques.) 1173 (ii).

Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 955 (ii).

Plante, Jean Baptiste, claim (M. for copy) 696 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of (personal explanation) paragraph in Toronto *Mail*, 331 (i).

Quarantine Regulations and SS. *Parisian* (Ques.) 1659 (ii).

Amyot, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Riel, Louis, case of, authority to exercise mercy (Ques.) 59 (i).
——— Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt. 77-92; on Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 193 (i).
——— Execution of (M. for Rets. &c.) commuting sentence, 186. (i).
——— Execution of, Reps., &c., in favor of mercy (Ques.) 266 (i).
——— Medical Commission Reps. (Ques.) 68 (i).
——— O. C. ordering Execution (Ques.) 59 (i).
——— Pets. for hanging (Ques.) 266 (i).
——— Reps. of Doctors Valade and Lavell (Ques.) 120 (i).
——— Respites granted. (M. for copies of O. C.) 43; motives for (Ques.) 59 (i).
——— Respites granted, O. C. *re* execution, and letters, &c. of Med. Commission (M. for copies) 59 (i).
——— Trial, documents respecting (M. for copies) 43; instructions sent to Mr. Justice Richardson (M. for copies, &c.) 59 (i).
Senate, constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1291 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1265 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J., *South Middlesex.*
Administration of the N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup, 1739 (ii).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 862 (ii).
Auditor and Receiver Genl., Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 521 (i).
Cape Breton Island Ry. B. 143 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 1488 (ii).
Court of Ry. Commissioners B 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 595 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1470, 1505, 1671 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 763 (i).
Senate, constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1292 (ii).
Speeches in Parlt., on prop. Res (Mr. *Charlton*) limiting, 791 (i).
SUPPLY:
Charges of Management (Aud. and Rec. Genl., Winnipeg) 521 (ii)
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 763 (i).

Auger, Mr. M., *Shefford.*
Cab-hire, in Com. of Sup., 871 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1476, 1507 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1266 (ii).
Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1094 (ii).
Lanoraie, construction of Wharf at (Ques.) 1173 (ii).
Printing Pamphlets in Quebec Offices (Ques.) 865 (ii).

Auger, Mr. M.—*Continued.*
Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 871 (ii).
St. Maurice, Faucher de, on Parliamentary Procedure, in Com. of Sup., 1740 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Health Statistics) 1094 (ii)
Civil Govt. (Privy Council Office, contingencies) 871 (ii).
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Faucher de St. Maurice on Parliamentary Procedure) 1740 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1266 (ii).

Bain, Mr. T., *North Wentworth.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 863 (ii).
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 944; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 1366 (ii).
Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1092 (ii).
Experimental Farm Stations, establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 971 (ii).
Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1095 (ii).
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1391 (ii).
New Edinburgh and Gatineau Ferry (Ques.) 1172 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 765 (i); on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1192 (ii).
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1417 (ii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Subsidy (Ques.) 331 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1087 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dominion Exhibition) 1092; (Health Statistics) 1095 (ii).
Immigration (general vote) 1391 (ii).
Quarantine (general vote) 1417 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 765, 767 (i).

Baker, Mr. E. C., *Victoria, B.C.*
Auditor and Receiver Genl., Vic., in Com. of Sup., 522 (i).
Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s. (B. 40, 1°*) 93 (i).
Dom. Lands in B.C., settlement of, on M. for Cor. 497 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. B. 47 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for 2°, 517 (i).
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1388 (ii).
Interest in B. C. (B. 22, 1°) 61 (i); on M. for 2°, 1243; in Com., 1244 (ii).
Niagara and Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 38, 1°*) 93 (i).
SUPPLY:
Charges of Management (Auditor and Rec. Genl., Vic.) 522 (i).
Immigration (general vote) 1388 (ii).
Vancouver Island, re-adjustment in representation Act Amt. (B. 107, 1°) 746 (i).

Barker, Mr. F. E., *St. John (N.B.) City.*
Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 43 (Mr. *Mackintosh*) in Com., 556 (i).
Carleton City of St. John Branch Ry. B. 137 (Mr. *Hackett*) on M. for 2°, 1424, and in Com., 1424 (ii).
Supreme Court Judgments (M. for Stmnt.*) 802 (i).

Barnard, Mr. F. J., *Yale.*
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (*Mr. Chupleau*) in Com., 1234 (ii).

Beaty, Mr. J., jun., *West Toronto.*
Dom. Lands and Colonisation Co.'s (B. 45, 1°*) 119 (i).
Freehold Loan and Savings Co.'s (B. 113, 1°*) 805 (ii).
Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 643 (i).
Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, &c., B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) in Com., 908 (ii).
Intoxicating Liquors Act Amt. B. (prop. Res.) 903; 1°* of B, 904 (ii).
London and Ont. Investment Co.'s incorp. (B. 97, 1°*) 694 (i).
N.W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 17, 1°*) 58 (i); M. for Com., 974; on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 981 (ii).
Private Bills Pets., extension of time (M.) 47 (i).
Reformed Episcopal Church (First Synod in Dom. of Can.) incorp. (B. 59, 1°*) 226 (i).
Western Can. Loan and Savings Co.'s (B. 112, 1°*) 805 (ii).

Béchard, Mr. F., *Iberville.*
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1506, 1669 (ii).
Hamond, Eugéne, employment of by Govt. (Ques.) 1379 (ii).
Nataskowan River, Estuary of, rent paid (Ques.) 1379 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Kirk*) Official Reps. and headings to extra copies, 631 (i).
Richelieu River, obstructions in (M. for copies of Pets. &c.) 33 (i).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 169-174 (i).
St. John's, Q., Ry. Wharf (Ques.) 897 (ii).
Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Ry. Co.'s Wharf (Ques.) 1096 (ii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
Farm or Real Estate Banks, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Orton*) 581 (i).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1265 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 358-364 (i).
Stoney Mountain Penitentiary, Prisoners' health (Ques.) 1172 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1265 (ii)

Benoit, Mr. P. B., *Chambly.*
Boucherville Islands, obstructions in channel (Ques.) 495 (i).

Bernier, Mr. M. E., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Joint Stock Co.'s, printing Blue-book (Ques.) 186 (i).
Lanoraie, construction of Wharf at (Ques.) 1173 (ii).
Queen *vs.* Riel, printing Blue-book (Ques.) 186 (i).

Bergin, Mr. D., *Cornwall and Stormont.*
Consolid. Inland Rev. Acts Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res. (oleomargarine) 685 (i).
Factories, regulation (B. 121, 1°*) 946 (ii).
Oleomargarine, in Com. on B. 101, 685; (Amt.) to M. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com. *re* M. Roche, 1337 (ii).
Printing of Parlt. (Ms.) to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1195, 1239, 1309; Sixth Rep., 1421 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* paragraph in *Globe* and vote on Home Rule, 1311 (ii).
Roche, M., of N. S., transfer of, on M. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com. (Amt.) to consdr. Res. respecting oleomargarine, &c., 1337 (ii).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (correction of misstatement) 1061 (ii).

Blake, Hon. E., *West Durham.*
Address, on the, 8 (i).
Albert Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1627 (ii).
Almonds, conc. in Ways and Means, 748 (i).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 862; on Amt. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) to M. for 3°, 910 (ii).
Baie de Chaleurs Ry. Co's. Subsidy, B. 144 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1628; in Com. on Res., 1497; on M. to conc. in Res., 1515 (ii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1626 (ii)
Bounty on Pig iron B. 150 (Mr. *McLelan*) on prop. Res., 1661; in Com., 1715 (ii).
Burlington Bay Canal B. 76 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 518 (i).
Business of House, on M. to take Thursdays, 512 (i); Wednesdays, 1014; (remarks) 1746 (ii).
Butter, Substitutes for, B. 149 (Mr. *McLeLan*) on M. for 2°, 1728 (ii).
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Orton*) on Amt. to place on Govt. Orders, 1218; Bs. 92, 99, and 118 on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) to place on Govt. Orders, 1220 (ii).
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com., 1200 (ii).
——— agreement, confirmation of, on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. *McLelan*) 932; in Com., 941-945 (ii).
——— bonds, release of, on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. *McLelan*) 1017; in Com., 1018, 1020; on M. to conc, in Res., 1078 (ii).
——— expenditure in B. C., in Com. of Sup, 1744 (ii).
——— homesteads in Ry. Belt (Ques.) 120, 185 (i).
——— lands, sale of by Co. (Ques.) 543 (i).
——— Port Arthur to Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1696 (ii).
——— tariffs (Ques.) 1076 (ii).
Caraquet Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1604 (ii).
Carleton City of St. John Branch Ry. B. 137 (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com., 1424 (ii).
Carriage hardware, conc. in Ways and Means, 1720 (ii).

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. *White, Hastings*) in Com., 783 (i).
Chinese, legislation respecting (Ques.) 62 (i).
Citadel, draining of, in Com. of Sup., 1743 (ii).
Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries, in Com. of Sup., 1757 (ii).
Colonial Exhibition, delay in transmitting exhibits (remarks) 1077 (ii).
Consolid. Inland Rev. Acts Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res. (fusil oil and distillery refuse) 683; (malt) 684; (spirits) 685 (i).
Crow, L. S., for services, in Com. of Sup., 1763 (ii).
Disallowance of Man. Ry. Co.'s charters (M. dropped) 383 (i).
Disturbance in the N. W., Amnesty to parties who took part in Rebellion (Ques.) 61 (i).
——— Amnesty, general, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1259 (ii).
——— duty of Govt. to bring down further papers, (Res.) 497 (i).
——— Half-breeds, Indians, &c., committals and convictions (Ques.) 61 (i).
——— Indians who took part in Rebellion (Ques.) 1075 (ii).
——— Reps. from Govt. Counsel on Trials, &c. (Ques.) 185 (i).
——— Rets. respecting (enquiry) 34 (i).
——— Trial of Half-breeds, Indians, &c. (Ques.) 58 (i).
Dom. Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 913, 920, 923-930, 1078-1081, 1083, (ii).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
Earthenware, conc. in Ways and Means, 1719 (ii).
Easter, Adjmnt. for (remarks) 747 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. B. 47 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. to introd., 119; on M. for 2°, 5 5 (i).
Farm or Real Estate Banks, on M. (Mr. *Orton*) for Com. on Res., 432; in Com., 436 (i).
Felt, conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).
Fines and Forfeitures application B. 82 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 713; (Amts.) to recom., 714 (i).
Fire-arms in the N. W. (Ques.) 1076 (ii).
Fishing by Foreign Vessels in Can. Waters B. 136 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 1423; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1704 (ii).
Franchise Act Amts. (Ques.) 543 (i).
——— expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1750 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1498, 1502, 1505; on M. to ref. back to Com., 1604; in Com., 1665 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 754 (i).
Fusil oil and distillery refuse, in Com. on Res., 683 (i).
Gaol and Lunatic Asylum at Regina, in Com. of Sup., 1747 (ii).
Glenannan to Wingham Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1615 (ii).

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*
Government measures (remarks) 913, 1198 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Travelling Expenses, on M. for Ret., 793 (i).
Hair cloth, conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).
Handkerchiefs, conc. in Ways and Means, 1722 (ii).
Hereford to International Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1614 (ii).
High Court of Justice, Ont., Judge's Salary (Ques.) 898 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1023; Res. wthdn., 1030; (prop. Res.) 1096; on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) to Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 1119-1125; (Amt.) 1136; on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1139; on Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) 1140; on Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) 1142 (ii).
Homestead Entries, cancelled or abandoned in the N.W. on M. for Ret., 802 (ii).
Imperial Federation (remarks on M. for adjnmt.) 34 (i).
Indemnity to Members Act Amt., on prop. B. (Mr. *Farrow*) 38 (i).
Indemnity to Members, on Res. (Mr. *Farrow*) Ques. of Order, 121 (i).
Indian Lands Letters Patent B. 102 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 808 (ii).
Ingersoll, London and Chatham Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1598 (ii).
Inland Revenue. *See* "Consolidated."
I. C. R. McCann Station to Joggins Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1615 (ii).
——— Oil Contracts (Ques.) 897 (ii).
Interest in B.C., B. 22 (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) to place on Govt. Orders; (Amt.) to place B. 92, Can. Temp. Act, 1878 (Mr. *Jamieson*) on Govt. Orders, neg. (Y. 68, N. 88) 1218; on M. for 2°, 1244; in Com., 1244 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 80 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 2° objected to, 519; in Com., 712 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1745 (ii).
Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1611 (ii).
Land Grants to Militia Force B. 142 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. to introd. B. (objection) 1421; on M. for 2°, 1563. (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 1°, 876; on M. for 3°, 1015 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and the N.W.T. B. 147 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res., 1631; on M. to conc. in Res., 1639 (ii).
Loans, Temporary, by Govt., on M. for Ret., 57 (i).
Logs, conc. in Ways and Means, 1727 (ii).
London Infantry School, in Com. of Sup., 1753 (ii).
Macdonald, Hugh, and Pilotage Commission (Ques.) 68 (i).
Malt and methylated spirits, in Com. on Res., 684 (i).
Man. and North-Western Ry. Co.'s Land Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1631 (ii).

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*

Metapediac to Paspebiac Ry. Subsidy. *See* "Baie de Chaleurs Ry. Co."

Miall's Pamphlet on Scott Act, in Com. of Sup., 881 (ii).

Military Works in B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).

Militia, contingencies in Com. of Sup. 1743 (ii).

Moncton and Buctouche Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1596 (ii).

Montreal and Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1616 (ii).

Mud Creek Dams, raising of (Ques.) 1746 (ii).

Nail plate, iron or steel, conc. in Ways and Means, 1722 (ii).

Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1627 (ii).

Newcastle to Douglastown Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1625 (ii).

Nictaux and Atlantic Ry., in Com. on B. 145, 1620, 1636 (ii).

Northern and Western Ry., N.B, Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1604 (ii).

Northern Light and winter communication with P E.I., on M. for Cor., 854 (ii).

Northern Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Sen. Amts., 1605 (ii).

N.W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 979; (remarks) 1002, 1004 (ii).

——— Land Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1631 (ii).

O'Donohoe, Hon. Senator, Cabinet arrangements (Ques.) 58, 61 (ii).

Oil cloth, conc. in Ways and Means, 1719 (ii).

Oleomargarine, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 759 (i); on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1191 (ii).

Paper hangings, conc. in Ways and Means, 1720 (ii).

Parry Sound colonisation Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com on Res., 1614 (ii).

Perth Centre to Plaster Rock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1624 (ii).

Pig Iron. *See* "Bounty."

Pipes, gas and water, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 755 (i).

Plante, Jean Baptiste, claim, on M. for copy, 697 (i).

Police vessels for protection of Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1757 (ii).

Post Office Act, 1875, Amt. B. 77 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) in Com., 711 (i).

Prince Albert Colonisation Co., on M. (Mr. *Edgar*) for Sel. Com., 491; on M. to add to Com., 492 (i).

Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. to introd., 1217; in Com., 1552, 1559, 1563-1565 (ii).

Printing of Parlt., on M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1196, 1239 (ii).

Prorogation (Ques.) further Govt. measures, 1703 (ii).

Blake, Hon, E.—*Continued.*

Privilege, Ques. of, handling returns (remarks) 842; on paragraph in *Globe re* Mr. *Ives*, 1078 (ii).

Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1745 (ii).

Public Lands in B.C., B. 120 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 1202 (ii).

Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1621 (ii).

Real Property in the N.W.T. B. 10 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1516; in Com. on Res., 1532 (ii).

Rebellion. *See* "Disturbance."

Renfrew to Eganville Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1626 (ii).

Returns, enquiries for, *re* North-West Troubles, 65, 66; Indians of Ft. William Reserve, 119 (i).

——— expense in producing, on M. for Ret., 390 (i).

Revised Statutes of Can. B. 9 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. to introd., 39; in Com., 513 (i); 1224 (ii).

Rideau Hall, additions, alterations, repairs, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 801 (i).

Riel, Louis, Execution of, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to make Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) first Order of the day, 119 (i).

——— Execution of, on Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to M. for Rets, 187 (i).

——— Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 237-265 (i).

——— Medical Commission, on M. for Cor., 844 (ii).

——— Rep. of Trials (remarks) 35 (i).

——— Trial of, on M. for copies of documents, &c., 43 (i).

Roche, M., of Lingan, N.S., transfer of, charge against certain members, prop. Res. for Sel. Com., 1173; reply, 1176; neg. (Y. 51, N. 89) 1341 (ii).

Rules of the House, on prop. Amt., 842 (ii).

Rubber belting, conc. in Ways and Means, 1719 (ii).

St. Eustache to St. Placide Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1624 (ii).

St. Maurice, Faucher de, on Parliamentary Procedure, in Com. of Sup., 1741 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1692 (ii).

Spirits, in Com. on Res., 685 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital (Trent River Nav.) 1752 (ii).
Charges of Management (remarks on order of business) 519 (i)
Civil Govt. (Int., Dept. of) 525 (i); (Inland Revenue, contingencies) 881 Militia, (contingencies) 1743 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Customs, Polariscopic test) 1763 (ii).
Fisheries (Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries) 1757; (Police Vessels) 1757 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 1762 (ii).
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Faucher de St. Maurice on Parliamentary Procedure, 1741, 1763; (Franchise Act, expenses under) 1750 (i).
Militia (draining Citadel) 1743 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Gaol and Lunatic Asylum at Regina) 1747; (L. S. Crow, for services) 1768; (Rebellion losses, &c.) 1768 (ii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 1692 (ii).

Blake, Hon. E.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Kingston Penitentiary) 1745; (N. W. T.) 1745; (Military works, B. C.) 1752. *Income:* Buildings (Que.) 1752; Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1754 (ii).

Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (expenditure in B.C.) 1744; (Port Arthur to Red River) 1696 (ii).

Select Standing Coms., on M. to add names, 37 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act. Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1085 (ii).

Stereotypes and electrotypes, conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).

Stewiacke Valley and Musquodoboit Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1624 (ii).

Stove bolts and nuts, conc. in Ways and Means, 1721(ii).

Straw board, conc. in Ways and Means, 1719 (ii).

Subsidies to Rys. (remarks) 1514 (ii).

Subsidies to Rys. (land), B. 147 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 1710; on M. for 3°, 1714 (ii).

Subsidies to Rys. (money), B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1596, 1611; on M. to introd. B., 1636; in Com. on B., 1704 (ii).

Substitutes for Butter. *See* "Oleomargarine," "Butter Substitutes."

Supreme Court of Judicature of Ont. B. 125 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1201 (ii).

Supreme Court of Judicature for the N.W.T., in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Thompson*) 1203 (ii).

Tariff, The. *See* "Ways and Means."

Thompson, Mr., M.P., decease of (remarks) 802 (i).

Trent Valley Canal, on M. for Ret., 903; in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).

Truro to Newport Ry. Sub., in Com. on Res., 1620 (ii)

Union cloth paper, conc. in Ways and Means, 1720 (ii).

Union Suspension Bridge B. 72 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. for ½°, 518 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 748 (i), 1719 (ii).

TARIFF CHANGES: (almonds) 748 (i); (carriage hardware) 1720; (earthenware) 1719; (felt) 1721 (ii); (gas pipes, iron) 755; (gimps, &c.) 755; (gloves, mitts, &c.) 756; (hair cloth) 756 (i); (handkerchiefs) 1722; (logs) 1727; (nail plate, iron or steel) 1722; (oil cloth) 1719 (ii); (oleomargarine) 759 (i); (paper hangings, &c.) 1720; (rubber belting) 1719; (stereotypes and electrotypes) 1721; (stove bolts and nuts 1721; (straw board) 1719; (union cloth paper) 1720 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 109 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 747 (i).

Western Counties Ry. (remarks) on intrdn. of B. 146, 1636 (ii).

Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s Land Subsidy, in Com., on Res., 1632 (ii).

Bowell, Hon. M. *North Hastings.*

Almonds, conc. in Ways, and Means, 748 (i).

Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1090 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1090 (ii).

Baking powder, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1584 (ii).

Barbed wire-fencing, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1626 (ii).

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*

British American Bank Note Printing Co., charges against (Ans.) 62 (i).

B. C. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).

Buoys and Beacons, in Com. of Sup., 1377 (ii).

Cab hire, &c., in Com. of Sup., 871, 874 (ii).

Can. and Antwerp Steamship Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1371 (ii).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amts. Bs. 92, 99, and 118, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*), to place on Govt. Orders (Speaker's ruling asked) 1220 (ii).

Canals, Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1659 (ii).

Canso and Port Hood Steamship Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1371 (ii).

Carriage hardware, conc. in Ways and Means, 1720 (ii).

Cement, Portland and Roman, conc. in Ways and Means, 773 (i).

Chinese Immigrants, on M. for Ret., 383 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1233; on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for 3°, 1241 (ii).

Civil Service Superannuation, on M. for Ret., 1183 (ii).

Clergyman in Inverness Co. (remarks) on personal explanation, 1541 (ii).

Cologne water, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).

Cordage, manilla and sisal, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1586 (ii).

Customs appointment at Woodstock (Ans.) 1075 (ii).

——— office at Yukon (Ans.) 266 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 1454 (ii).

——— seizure in Montreal (remarks) 1594; (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1370, 1687 (ii).

Debates, Official Rep. (M. for Sel. Com) 30 (i).

Exports and Imports, Value of (Ans.) 1240 (ii).

Fairfield, N.B., postmastership (Ans.) 1661 (ii).

Felt, conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).

Fish Importations on M. for Ret. 371 (i).

France and Quebec Steamship Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1370 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1468 (ii).

Fruit, dried and green, conc. in Ways and Means, 750 (i.)

Govt. Steamers, maintainance and repairs, in Com. of Sup., 1372 (ii).

Grape Vines imported under valuation (Ans.) 370 (i).

Grease, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 780 (i).

Harness and saddlery, conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).

Inch Arran Hotel, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1536 (ii).

Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1655 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1205 (ii).

Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, &c. B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) in Com., 908 (ii).

Iron sand or globules, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 780 (i).

Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*

Laces, braid, fringes, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 757 (i).

Laundry blueing, conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i).

Loans, temporary, by Govt., on M. for Ret., 57 (i).

Lylian, schooner, seizure of (Ans.) 912 (ii).

Manitoba Claims Settlement B. 123 (Mr. *McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1145 (ii).

Montreal Board of Trade Acts Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 857 (ii).

Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1627 (ii).

N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com. (remarks) 999 (ii).

N. W. T. Law Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1462 (ii).

Oleomargarine, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. for conc. in Ways and Means, 758; (Amt.) 761 (i); on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1192; in Com. on B. 101, 1205 (ii).

Paper Hangings, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1587 (ii).

Philosophical instruments, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 781 (i).

Prince Albert Colonisation Co. (personal explanation) 488 (i).

Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1562 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of (personal explanation) Prince Albert Colonisation Co., 488 (i).

——— Ques. of (Mr. *Kirk*) Official Reps. and headings to extra copies, 632 (i).

Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1419 (ii).

Revenue Frauds by Montreal Firms (Ans.) 709 (i).

Rideau Hall, additions, alterations, repairs, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 798 (i).

——— gardening and grounds, amounts paid, on M. for Stmnt., 796 (i).

Scythes, conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).

Senate, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1089 (ii).

Spirits and strong waters, conc. in Ways and Means, 769 (i).

Stereotypes and electrotypes, conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).

Sugars, conc. in Ways and Means, 774, 779 (i).

Sugar duties paid at Montreal and Halifax (Ans.) 898 (ii).

Sugar in bond in Montreal (Ans.) 783 (i), 843 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1626 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives, care of) 1090 (ii).

Canals—Capital (Murray) 1453 (ii).

Charges of Management (Auditor and Rec. Genl., Winnipeg) 521; (Victoria) 522 (i).

Civil Government (Customs, Dept. of) 690 (i); (contingencies) 874; (Depts. generally, contingencies) 886; (Gov. Gen's. Sec's. Office, contingencies) 868 (ii); (Militia, Dept. of) 523 (i);

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

(Privy Council Office, contingencies) 871 (ii); (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 524 (i).

Collection of Revenues (Canals) 1659; (Customs) 1454 (ii).

Indians (Man. and N. W.T.) 1655 (ii).

Legislation: Miscellaneous (printing, paper, &c.) 1090; Senate (salaries, &c.) 1089 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Buoys and Beacons) 1377 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Canada and Antwerp) 1371; (Canso and Port Hood) 1371; (France and Quebec) 1370 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 1372 (ii).

Penitentiaries (B. C.) 897 (ii).

Pensions (Veterans of 1812) 1154 (ii).

Quarantine (general vote) 1419 (ii).

Syrups, &c., conc., in Ways and Means, 779 (i).

Trade and Navigation Returns (presented) 31 (i).

Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1154 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 748 (i), 1584, 1720 (ii)

TARIFF CHANGES:-(almonds) 748 (i); (baking powder) 1584 (ii); (blueing) 749 (i); (carriage hardware) 1720 (ii); (cement) 773; (cologne) 770 (i); (felt) 1721 (fruit, dried) 1756, (ii); (fruit, green) 751, (Geneva gin) 769; (gloves, mitts) 756; (grease) 780; (harness) 756; (iron sand, putty) 780; (laces, braids, &c.) 757 (i); (manilla cordage, sisal, &c.) 1586 (ii); (oleomargarine) 758 (i); (paper hangings) 1587 (ii); (philosophical instruments, globes) 781 (i); (scythes) 1721; (stereotypes and electrotypes) 1721 (ii); (sugar) 774, (syrups) 779 (i); (union cloth paper) 1720 (ii); (wire fencing) 773; (yeast) 772 (i).

Union cloth paper, conc. in Ways and Means, 1720 (ii).

Yeast cakes, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).

Bossé, Mr. J. G., *Centre Quebec.*

Union Bank of Lower Canada, Capital Stock reduction, &c. (B. 41, 1°*) 93 (i).

Bryson, Mr. J., *Pontiac.*

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* quotation from "Parliamentary Companion," 1077 (ii).

Burns, Mr. K. F., *Gloucester.*

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) to Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1108; on Amt. (Mr. *Coughlin*) 1137 (ii).

Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 341 (i).

Burpee, Mr. C., *Sunbury.*

Butternut Ridge, N.B., Postmaster (Ques.) 1075 (ii).

Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1269 (ii).

Experimental Farm Stations B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1148 (ii).

Flour and Coal Duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1428 (ii).

Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1264 (ii).

Mount Middleton, N.B., Postmaster (Ques.) 1075 (ii).

Navigable Waters, works in, B. 130 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1248; in Com., 1271 (ii).

Nerepis Station, N.B., Postmaster (Ques.) 1075 (ii).

Stipendiary Magistrate at Calgary (Ques.) 427 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works, Income: Dredging, 1269; Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1264 (ii).

Burnham, Mr. J., *Peterborough.*
Trent Valley Canal, on M. for Ret., 900 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. D. M., *West Middlesex.*
A, B, and C Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 1308 (ii).
Ammunition, Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1306 (ii).
Assistant Financial Inspector, in Com. of Sup., 521 (i).
Batteries, Cavalry Schools, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1547 (ii).
Books purchased for Depts., in Com of Sup., 882 (ii).
Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1301 (ii).
Brokovski, E., complaints against (M. for copy*) 438 (i).
Canals, Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1659 (ii).
Cement, conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).
Citadel, draining of, in Com. of Sup., 1742 (ii).
Customs, Dept. of, contingencies in Com. of Sup., 875 (ii).
Disturbance in the N.W., Military Operations in the N. W., Rep. (Ques.) 1075 (ii).
Non-combatants, recognition of Services (Ques.) 633 (i).
Rebellion losses, claims, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1764 (ii).
Reps. on Rebellion presented to House (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1643, 1646 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 922, 1082 (ii).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1550 (ii).
Fishing License Fees (Ques.) 1076 (ii).
Franchise Act, expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1747 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act, Amt. Bill 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1471 (ii).
Home Rule Resolution, dispatch of (Ques.) 1380 (ii).
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1387 (ii).
Indians, Administration in the N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 742-745 (i).
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1654 (ii).
Ingersoll, London and Chatham Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1602 (ii).
Land Grants to Militia Force B. 142 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 2°, 1569; in Com., 1572 (ii).
Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 893 (ii).
Military properties, in Com. of Sup., 1309 (ii).
Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1299; contingencies, 1308, 1744 (ii).
Morgan's "Annual Register," in Com. of Sup., 1740 (ii).
Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).
Philosophical Instruments, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 781 (i).
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1548 (ii).
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1417 (ii).
Rebellion. *See* "Disturbance."
Reports on Rebellion (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1643 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 367 (i).
Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 147 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 2°, 1709 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. D. M.—*Continued.*
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1602 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Charges of Management (Assistant Financial Inspector) 521 (i).
Civil Govt.: Contingencies (Customs) 875; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 869; (Militia, Dept of) 1308, 1744; (Public Works) 882 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: (Canals, repairs, &c.) 1659; (Dom. Lands) 1550; (Post Office, Mail Service, salaries, &c.) 1548; (Weights and Measures and Gas, salaries, &c) 1546 (ii).
Immigration (general vote) 1387 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 1654 (ii).
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Franchise Act, expenses under) 1747; (Morgan's "Annual Register") 1740 (ii).
Militia (A, B, and C Batteries, &c.) 1308; (Ammunition, clothing, &c.) 1306; (Batteries, Cavalry Schools, pay, &c.) 1547; (Brigade Major's salaries, &c.) 1301; (draining Citadel) 1742; (Military properties) 1309; (Military, Branch and District Staff, salaries) 1299 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Rebellion losses, &c) 1764 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1656 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 893 (ii).
Quarantine (general vote) 1417 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 772, 781 (i).
Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1546 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. Hector, *North Victoria.*
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for 3°, 1354; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1365 (ii).
——— Port Arthur to Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1695 (ii)
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Orton*) on Amt. (Mr. *Kranz*) to place B. on Govt. Orders, (Amt) to add Bs. 92, 99 and 118, 1219; neg. (Y. 22, N. 149) 1222 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) 1136; on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1139 (ii).
Independence of Parlt. Act, breach of, on M. to ref. to Com., 1594; refutation of charges, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1580 (ii).
Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 947; in Com., 950 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (Port Arthur to Red River) 1695 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. Hugh, *Inverness.*
Canso and Port Hood Steamship Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1371 (ii).
Cape Breton Island Ry. B. 143 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 1487 (ii).
Flour and Coal Duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1438 (ii).
I. C. R Strait of Canso to Sydney, &c. (Ques.) 843 (ii).
——— Stellarton and Pictou Branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 613, 618, 625 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* paragraph in *Globe*, 460; Official Reps. and headings to extra copies, 632; paragraph in *Free Press* on headings to Official Reps., 692 (i); (personal explanation) *re* clergyman in Inverness Co., 1541 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. Hugh—*Continued.*
Port Hastings Wharf, repairs, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 60 (i).
Port Hood Harbor, protection to (M. for Cor.*) 60; closing of (M. for Cor.) 787 (i).
Short Line Ry., on M. for copies of Cor., 446 (i).
Strathlorne, N.S., Postmaster, dismissal of (M. for Cor., &c.) 59 (i).
Subsidy to N.S., readjustment, on M. for Ret., 451; (Amt.) 455; neg. (Y. 16, N. 82) 456 (i).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Canso and Port Hood, &c.) 1371 (ii).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1057 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. M. C., *West Huron.*
Baie de Chaleurs Ry. Co. (Ques.) 1481; on M. for Com. on Res., 1482 (ii).
Baker, I. G. & Co., contracts for Indian Supplies (M. for Ret.*) 438 (i).
Boundaries of Ont., West and North, expenses incurred by Dom. since 1870 (M. for Stmnt.*) 438 (i).
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1357 (ii).
Census of Man., N.W.T., and Keewatin (Ques.) 43 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. (law of evidence) (B. 23, 1°) 66; 2° m., 707; 2° neg. (Y. 57, N. 80) 709 (i).
——— (offences against the person) B. 135 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1382 (ii).
——— (seduction, &c.) B 20 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com., 570; in Com., 704 (i).
Disturbance in N.W., duty of Govt. to bring down papers (Amt.) to Amt. (Mr. *Hall*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 508; neg. (Y. 62, N. 111) 510 (i).
——— settlers on service and homesteads (Ques.) 426.
Dom. Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 913, 917 (ii).
Franchise Act, instructions to Revising Officers, on M. for copies, 46, 48 (i).
——— O. C., &c., respecting putting in force of Act, &c., and instructions to Revising Officers, &c. (M. for copies*) 58 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com. 1471, 1499, 1500, 1506, 1508, 1511 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup, 1267 (ii).
Homestead Entries, cancelled or abandoned in the N. W. (M. for Ret.) 801 (i).
Indian Administration of the N.W. (Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 718, 730; neg. (Y. 65, N. 114) 746 (i).
Liquor License Acts, costs incurred by Dom. (M. for Ret.*) 438 (i).
Maritime Court of Ont. Jurisdiction B. 5 (Mr. *Allen*) in Com., 561 (i).
Metapediac and Paspebiac Ry. *See* "Baie de Chaleurs."
Military Branch and District Staff salaries, in Com. of Sup., 1299 (ii).
Mounted Police Supplies, contracts by I. G. Baker & Co. (M. for Ret.*) 438(i).
N.W.T. Law Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1383, 1459 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. M. C.—*Continued.*
N.W. Central Ry Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com. (M. to adjn. deb.) 1003 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Haggart*) application for coal mining location, 1144 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Kirk*) Official Reps. and headings to extra copies, 632 (i).
Representation of the N.W.T. in Parlt. B. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1206; on M. for Com., 1213; in Com., 1250 (ii).
Rideau Hall, additions, alterations, repairs, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 797 (i).
——— gardening and grounds, amounts paid, on M. for Stmnt., 796 (i).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 104–118 (i).
——— Execution of, on Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to M. for Rets., 191 (i).
——— Rep. of Trial (Ques.) 34 (i).
——— Trial of, shorthand notes, &c. (M. for copies) 57 (i).
Stather, R., Papers, *re* application for discharge, on M. for copies, 374 (i).
Summary Proceedings before Magistrates B. 84 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 715, 805 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1267 (ii).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1047-1055; applications for, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1574-1579 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. C. J., *Victoria, N.S.*
Survey of Ry. Routes in Cape Breton (Ques.) 246 (i).

Carling, Hon. J., *London.*
Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1090 (ii).
Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 691 (i), 1698 (ii).
Census of Man. (Ans.) 1240 (ii).
——— N.W.T. and Keewatin (Ans.) 43 (i).
Central Board of Agriculture (Ans.) 634 (i).
Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1095, 1741 (ii).
——— delay in transmitting exhibits (remarks) 1077; in Com. of Sup., 1741 (ii).
Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1091 (ii).
Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1091 (ii).
Experimental Farm Stations, establishment (B. 124) prop. Res., 866; M. for Com. on Res., 960; (remarks) 964; (reply) 972; in Com. and 1°* of B., 973; 2° and in Com., 1146 (ii).
Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1094 (ii).
Immigration and Emigration (Ans.) 370 (i).
——— assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 640 (i).
——— from Dakota and Texas (Ans.) 1217 (ii).
——— from France, and work of M. Labelle (Ans.) 1661 (ii).

Carling, Hon. J.—*Continued.*
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1385, 1392 (ii).
——— settlers in Man. and N.W. T. (Ans.) 42 (i).
Immigrants settled in Canada, number (Ans.) 61 (i).
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1652 (ii).
Ingersoll, London and Chatham Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1599, 1603 (ii).
Keewatin, Man. and N.W.T., population (Ans.) 370 (i).
Labelle, Rev. M., Immigration Rep. (Ans.) 1633, 1661, (ii).
London Infantry School, in Com. of Sup., 1753 (ii).
Metapediac and Pasbebiac Ry. *See* "Baie de Chaleurs."
Model Farm, in Com. of Sup., 1659 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) respecting legislation, 553 (i).
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1548 (ii).
Printing Pamphlets in Quebec offices (Ans.) 865 (ii).
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1417 (ii).
Quarantine Regulations and SS. *Parisian* (Ans.) 1659 (ii).
Roper, S. C. D., employment of by Govt. (Ans.) 570 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1599, 1602 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives, care of) 1090; (Colonial and Indian Exhibition) 1095, 1741; (Dom. Exhibition) 1091; (Health Statistics) 1094 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Agriculture, Dept. of) 1698; (Post Office, contingencies) 883 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office, Mail Service, salaries, &c.) 1548 (ii).
Immigration (general vote) 1385; (contingencies) 1392; (publishing pamphlets) 1393 (ii).
Indians (N.B.) 1652 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Model Farm) 1659 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (London Infantry School) 1753 (ii).
Quarantine (general vote) 1417 (ii).
Wood, M. C., explanation, in Com. of Sup., 885 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir Adolphe, *Quebec County.*
A, B, and C Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 1309, 1547 (ii).
Ammunition, clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1302 (ii).
——— manufactured at Quebec, on M. for Cor., 554 (i).
Batteries, Cavalry Schools, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1309, 1547 (ii).
Brigade Majors, salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1300 (ii).
Cartridge Factory at Quebec (Ans.) 543 (i).
Citadel, drainage and water supply (Ans.) 843 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1742 (ii).
Disturbance in the N.W., Anderson, James, Cor. *re* purchase of supplies, &c., on M. for copies, 427 (i).
——— Batoche, battle of, Rep. of officer second in command (Ans.) 369 (i).
——— claims Commission (Ans.) 42 (i).
——— claims paid (Ans.) 42 (i).
——— distribution of Medals (Ans.) 1661 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir Adolphe—*Continued.*
Disturbance in the N.W., instructions to non-combatants, on M. for copies, 427 (i).
——— Laurie and Strange, Maj. Generals, status in active Militia (Ans.) 119 (i).
——— losses, claims, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1767 (ii).
——— non-combatants, recognition of services (Ans.) 633 (i).
——— reports on Rebellion presented to House (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1642 (ii).
——— transportation contractors, on M. for Ret., 427 (i).
——— transport service, &c. (Ans.) 61 (i).
Drill Instruction and Drill Pay, in Com. of Sup., 1306 (ii).
Flying Column for N.W., on M. for Cor., 634 (i).
Imperial Titles, on M. for Ret., 698 (i).
I. C. R., Claims arising out of construction, in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).
Land Grants to Militia B. 142 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res., 1456; on M. for 2°, 1570; in Com., 1572 (i).
Laurie, Maj. Genl. and Genl. Strange, position in Militia force during Rebellion (Ans.) 68 (i).
London Infantry School, in Com. of Sup., 1753 (ii).
Manitoba Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 893 (ii).
Medals, distribution of (Ans.) 1661 (ii).
Military Branch and District Staff, salaries, in Com. of Sup., 1295 (ii).
——— operations in N. W. Rep. (Ans.) 1075 (ii).
——— properties, in Com. of Sup., 1309 (ii).
——— works in B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).
Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 57 (i).
——— Rebellion Rep. (presented) 1455 (ii).
——— contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 877, 880 1307, 1743 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1295 (ii).
——— organisation in N.W.T. (Ans.) 843 (ii).
——— regiments visit to Great Britain (Ans.) 709 (i).
Pensions to Volunteers wounded at Duck Lake (Ans.) 633 (i).
——— N.W. Rebellion, in Com. of Sup., 1742; conc., 1771 (ii).
Powder imported for Cartridges (Ans.) 898 (ii).
Prince Albert Volunteers, Scrip for (Ans.) 633 (i).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1622 (ii).
Rebellion. *See* "Disturbance."
Reports on the N.W. Rebellion (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1642 (ii).
Return, imperfect, *re* Seizures by Expeditionary Force in N.W. (remarks) 1380 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 195-206 (i).
Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1308 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir Adolphe—*Continued.*
Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Ry. Co.'s Wharf (Ans.) 1096 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1622 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Militia, Dept. of) 523 (i); (contingencies) 877, 1307, suppl., 1743 (ii).
Militia—(A, B, and C, Batteries) 1309, 1547; (Ammunition, clothing, &c.) 1302; (Batteries, Cavalry Schools, &c., pay, &c.) 1309, 1547; (Brigade Major's salaries, &c.) 1300; (draining Citadel) 1742; (Drill instruction and drill pay) 1306; (Military properties) 1309, conc., 1771; (Royal Military College) 1308; (salaries, Branch and District Staff) 1295 (ii).
Miscellaneous—(Rebellion losses, &c.) 1767 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 893 (ii).
Pensions (N.W. Rebellion) 1742 conc., 1771.
Public Works—Capital (Military Works, B. C.) 1752; Buildings (London Infantry School) 1753 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Claims) 1752 (ii).
Tête du Pointe Barracks (Ans.) 1240 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J., *Huron, South Riding.*
Address, on the, 23 (i).
Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 1547 (ii).
Advertising, &c., in Com. of Sup., 875 (ii).
Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1698 (ii).
Almonds, conc. in Ways and Means, 748 (i).
Ammunition, clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1302 (ii).
Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1090 (ii).
Baking powder, conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i); in Com., 1584 (ii).
Barbed wire-fencing, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).
Batteries, Cavalry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1547 (ii).
Bayfield Harbor, repairs (M. for Cor.) 383 (i).
Bolts and nuts, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1584 (ii).
Bounty on Pig Iron B. 150 (Mr. *McLelan*) on prop. Res., 1661; in Com. 1715 (ii).
Brigade Major's salaries &c., in Com. of Sup., 1301 (ii).
BUDGET, The (Ques.) 330; Reply, 426 (i). *See* "Ways and Means."
Buoys and Beacons, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1377 (ii).
Can. and Antwerp Steamship Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1371 (ii).
Can. and Germany Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1756 (ii).
C.P.R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for 3°, 1346 (ii).
——— bonds, release of, in Com. on Res., 1017, 1021 (ii).
——— confirmation of Agreement, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *McLelan*) 941 (ii).
——— expenditure in B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1448 1744 (ii).
——— lands, sale of, by Company (Ques.) 542 (i).
——— Port Arthur to Red River, in Com of Sup., 1449, 1693 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—*Continued.*
C.P.R., salaries, &c., of Staff, in Com. of Sup., 1450 (ii).
——— subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1448 (ii).
Canso and Port Hood Steamship Subvention, in Com. of Sup., 1372 (ii).
Cape Breton Island Ry., on prop. Res., 1455 (ii).
Cape Race Lighthouse transfer B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 672 (i)
Caraquet Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1605 (ii).
Carriage hardware, conc. in Ways and Means, 1720 (ii).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. B. 105 (Mr. *Pope*) on prop. Res., 681 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1233 (ii).
Cobourg, relief of town, *re* construction of Harbor, on pro. Res. (Mr. *McLelan*) 866 (ii).
Cocoanut, dessicated, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1584 (ii).
Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries, in Com. of Sup., 1757 (ii).
Cologne water, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).
Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1095 (ii).
Consolid. Fund, Receipts and Expenditures. (M. for Ret.*) 35 (i); (Ques.) 1076 (ii).
Consolid. Inland Rev. Acts Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) on prop. Res., 601; in Com. on Res. (fusil oil and distillery refuse) 682; (malt) 684; (methylated spirits) 685 (i).
Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1659 (ii).
Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 881 (i).
Cook, Mr. H., Timber Dues, on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 1420 (ii).
Cordage, manilla and sisal, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1584 (ii).
Cornwall Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
Cotton fabrics, printed or dyed, conc. in Res. rep. from Com. on Ways and Means, 769 (i).
Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 585 (i).
Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1544 (ii).
Currants, dates, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 750 (i).
Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).
Debates, publishing of, in Com. of Sup., 1089 (ii).
Debt of the Dom. (Ques.) 31 (i).
Debts of Ont. and Que. (Ques.) 974 (ii).
Deposits. *See* "Post Office"
Disturbance in the N.W., claims paid (Ques.) 42 (i).
——— operations and war claims (Ques.) 1343 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act, 1883-84, Amt B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. to introd., 600 (i).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 530, 532 (i), 1550 (ii).
Dorchester Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 892 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—*Continued.*
Earthenware, conc. in Ways and Means, 1719 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. B. 47 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for 3°, 603 (i).
Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1156 (ii).
Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1543 (ii).
Experimental Farm Stations B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on prop. Res., 866; on M. for Com., 960; in Com., 973 (ii).
Exports and Imports, Stmnt. of (M. for Ret.*) 35 (i); Value of (Ques.) 1240 (ii).
Extra Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 883 (ii).
Fancy goods, conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i).
Farm or Real Estate Banks on M. (Mr. *Orton*) for Com. on Res., 432, 572 (i).
Feathers, Ostrich and Vulture, conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i).
Fines and Forfeitures B. 80 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 671 (i).
Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1698 (ii).
——— salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup, 1541 (ii).
Fishing rights of Indians on Lakes Huron and Nipissing, Pets., &c. (on M. for copies) 696 (i).
Franchise Act Amts. (Ques.) 543 (i).
——— expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1698 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*), in Com., 1481 (ii).
Fruit, dried, conc. in Ways and Means, 750; green, 750, 753 (ii).
Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1437 (ii).
Fog-whistles, &c., maintenance, in Com. of Sup., 1375.
France and Quebec Steamship Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1370 (ii).
Fusil oil and distillery refuse, in Com. on B. 101, 601 (i).
Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 542 (i); 1543 (ii).
Gloves, mitts, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).
Govt. Steamers, maintenance, in Com. of Sup., 1372 (ii).
Hair cloth, conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1266, 1269 (ii).
Harness and saddlery, conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).
Heney, John, refund to, on conc. of Sup., 1774 (ii).
High Court of Justice, Ont., Judge's salary, in Com. on Res., 973 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland on Amt. (Mr. *Coughlin*) 1136 (ii).
Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 658 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1386 (ii).
Imperial Federation (remarks on M. for adjnmt.) 33 (i).
——— titles, on M. for Ret., 699 (i).
Independence of Parlt. Act, breach of, on Amt. to M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1595 (ii).
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1650, 1745 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act. *See* "Consolidated."
I. C. R. miscellaneous works, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—*Continued.*
I. C. R., repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1659 (ii).
——— St. Charles branch, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
——— Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 604, 614, 618, 624; on M. for 3°, 665 (i).
Interest in B. C., B. 22 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1244 (ii).
Iron sand or globules, &c., conc. Ways and Means, 780 (i).
Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup., 886, 890, 1698 (ii).
Kaministiquia River, in Com. of Sup., 1157 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 891, 1164 (ii).
Laces, braid, fringes, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 757 (i).
Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
Lacombe, Father, payment to, on conc., 1774 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N.W.T. B. 147 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on. Res., 1630; on M. to conc. in Res., 1639 (ii).
Laundry blueing, conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i).
Lead pipe and lead shot, conc. in Ways and Means, 757 (i).
Legal services in connection with Fishery Award and revision of Statutes, in Com. of Sup., 1159 (ii).
Legislation, *Debates*, publishing of, 1089 (ii).
Life-boat service and rewards, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1372 (ii).
Lighthouse keepers, salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1375, (ii).
Logs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1587; conc., 1725 (ii)
Mail Subsidies and Steamship subventions, in Com. of Sup., 1370 (ii).
Malt, in Com. on B. 101, 684 (i).
Man. and North-Western Ry. Co.'s Land Subsidy, in Com. on Res. 1630 (ii).
Man. Claims Settlement B. 123 (Mr. *McLelan*) on prop. Res., 866; on M. for Com. on Res, 959; on M. for 2°, 1145; on M. for 3°, 1199 (ii).
Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 894 (ii).
Maritime Court of Ont. Jurisdiction B. 5 (Mr. *Allen*) in Com., 569 (i).
Methylated spirits, in Com. on B. 101, 685 (i).
Miall's pamphlet on Scott Act, in Com. of Sup., 881 (ii).
Military Branch and District Staff, salaries, in Com. of Sup., 1295 (ii).
——— properties, in Com. of Sup., 1309 (ii).
Militia, contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 1307, 1743 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1295 (ii).
Model Farm, in Com. of Sup., 1659 (ii).
——— *See* "Experimental."
Moncton and Buctouche Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1597 (ii).
Montreal Armories, in Com. of Sup., 1162 (ii).
Morgan's "Annual Register," in Com. of Sup., 1740 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—*Continued.*
Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1656, 1745 (ii).
Mud Creek Dams, raising of (Ques.) 1746 (ii).
Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to trans. Sen. Amts. to Govt. Orders, 1664; on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1678 (ii).
N.W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act. Amt B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 988; in Com. on Res., 1631 (ii).
Obstructions in nav. rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1374 (ii).
Paper hangings, conc. in Ways and Means, 1720 (ii).
Pensions to Volunteers who served in the N.W. (Ques.) 1198 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1154 (ii).
Philosophical instruments, globes, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 781 (i).
Pig Iron, *see* "Bounty."
Pipes, gas and water, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 755 (i).
Police Vessels for protection of Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1757 (ii).
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1547 (ii)
Post Office Savings Banks, and Govt. Savings Bank deposits (M. for Stmnt. *) 392 (i).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 2°, 1528; in Com., 1555 (ii).
Printing Immigration pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 1395 (ii).
——— M. to refer item to Public Accts. Com., 460 (i).
Printing of Parlt., on M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1195 (ii).
Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup , 1697 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., meeting of (remarks) 1514 (ii)
Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1154, 1158, 1160, 1162, 1163, 1166, 1261 (ii).
Public Expenditure, Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1646; neg. (Y. 36, N. 70) 1648 (ii).
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1417 (ii).
Quebec Harbor Improvements further Loan B. 140 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1385 (ii).
Rebellion, losses, claims, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1764 (ii).
Repairs, Furniture, &c., Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1261 (ii).
Representation of N.W.T. in Parlt. on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) for Address to Her Majesty, 866; in Com., 1213 (ii).
Returns *re* expenses in N.W.T. (remarks) 66 (i).
Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1270, 1755 (ii).
Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1303 (ii).
Rubber belting, conc. in Ways and Means, 1719 (ii).
St. Maurice, Faucher de, on Parliamentary Procedure, in Com. of Sup., 1741 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1162, 1693 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—*Continued.*
Scientific Treatise in Deptl. Rep., in Com. of Sup., 883.
Scythes, conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).
Sec. of State, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1697 (ii).
Senate, salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1089 (ii).
Settlers in Saugeen Peninsula, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1539 (ii).
Stellarton and Pictou Ry. *See* "I. C. R."
Straw board, conc. in Ways and Means, 1719 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1597, 1704 (ii).
——— *See* "Land Grants."
Sugars, conc. in Ways and Means, 773, 779 (i); in Com., 1587 (ii).
Superannuation, on M. for Ret., 1184 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice, 886 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives, care of) 1090; (Colonial and Indian Exhibition) 1095 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 1452; (Lachine) 1452; (Murray) 1453; (Tay Canal) 1453; (Welland) 1453; (Williamsburg) 1452. *Income* (maintenance, &c.) conc., 1771; (refund to John Heney) conc., 1774; (Rideau) 1453; (Welland) 1453 (ii).
Charges of Management (Asst. Financial Inspector) 520; (Auditor and Rec. Genl., Halifax, Victoria and Winnipeg) 521 (i), conc., 1773 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Agriculture) 1698 (ii); (Auditor Genl.'s Office) 689; (Customs, Dept. of) 690 (i), (contingencies) 875; (C. S. Examiners, contingencies) 841 (ii); (Finance, Dept. of, and Treasury Board) 689 (i); (Fisheries) 1698 (ii); (Gov. Genl.'s Sec.'s Office) 522 (i), (contingencies) 868 (ii); (Indian Affairs, Dept. of) 688; (Interior, Dept. of) 524; (Inland Revenue, Dept. of) 689 (i), (contingencies) 881 (ii); (Justice, Dept. of) 523 (i), (contingencies) 877 (ii); (Marine, Dept. of) 691 (i), (contingencies) 886 (ii); (Militia, Dept. of) 523 (i), (contingencies) &c, 1307, 1743 (ii); (Post Office, Dept. of) 690 (i), (contingencies) 883 (ii); (Privy Council Office) 1697 (ii), (contingencies) 521 (i), 870 (ii); (Public Works, Dept. of) 691 (i), (contingencies) 883 (ii); (Rys and Canals, Dept. of) 691; (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 524 (i), suppl., 1697 (contingencies) 880 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Adulteration of Food) 1547; (Outlers' salaries, &c) 1544; (Customs) 1451; (Dominion Lands) 1550; (Excise, salaries and stamps) 1543; (I. C. R, repairs, &c.) 1659; (Post Office, Mail Service, salaries, &c.) 1547 (ii)
Fisheries (Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries) 1757; (Police vessels) 1757; (salaries, &c.) 1541 (ii).
Geological Survey, 1543 (ii).
Immigration (general vote) 1386; (printing pamphlets) 1392, 1395 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 1652, 1762; (Man. and the N.W.) 1652, 1745, 1761; (N.B.) 1651; (N.S.) 1651; (Ont., Que. and Mar. Provinces) 1650, conc. 1773 (ii).
Justice, Administration of, 1698 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (contingencies) 1089. Miscellaneous (Faucher de St. Maurice, on Parliamentary Procedure) 1741; (Franchise Act, expenses under) 1698; (Morgan's "Annual Register,") 1740; (printing, paper, &c.) 1090. Senate (salaries, &c.) 1089 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Buoys and Beacons, &c.) 1377; (Fog-whistles, &c., maintenance) 1375; (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms) 1376; (salaries, &c.) 1375 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Can. and Antwerp, &c.) 1371; (Canada and Germany) 1756; (Canso and Port Hood) 1372 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition, clothing, &c.) 1302; (Batteries, Cavalry Schools, &c., pay, &c.) 1547; (Brigade Major's salaries, &c) 1301; (Military properties, permanent batteries, &c.) 1309; conc., 1771, 1773; (Royal Military College) 1308; (salaries, Branch and District Staff) 1295 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Miscellaneous (Rebellion, losses, &c.) 1764; (Commercial Agencies) 1659, conc, 1773; (Forged Bond, payment for) 1764; (Lacombe, Father, payment to) conc., 1774; (Model Farm) 1659 (ii).

Mounted Police, 1656, 1745 (ii).

Ocean and River Service, conc. 1771; (Govt. Steamers) 1372; (obstructions in nav. rivers) 1374; (Rewards, &c., and Life-boat service) 1372; (Winter Mail service, P.E.I.) 1375 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 892; (Kingston) 891; (Man.) 894; (St. Vincent de Paul) 1693 (ii.)

Pensions (Rebellion of 1885) 1154; conc., 1770; (Veterans of 1812) 1153 (ii).

Public Works—Capital (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1156; (Port Arthur and Kaministiquia River) 1157; (Public Buildings, Ottawa) 1154. *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 1166; (Man.) 1166; (N.S.) 1158; (N.W.T.) 1166; (Ont.) 1163, 1753; (P.E.I.) 1160; (Que.) 1162. Harbors and Rivers (B.C.) 1269; (N.B.) 1263; (N.S.) 1754; (N.W.T.) 1269; (Ont.) 1266, 1755, (Port Arthur Harbor) 1157; (Que.) 1755. Repairs, Furniture, &c. (Public Buildings) 1261. Roads and Bridges, 1270, 1755 (ii).

Quarantine (general vote) 1417 (ii).

Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (expenditure in B.C.) 1448, 1744; (Port Arthur to Red River) 1449, 1693; (salaries, &c., of staff) 1450; (Subsidy) 1448. I.C.R. (Miscellaneous works) 1451; (St. Charles Branch) 1452 (ii).

Supreme Crt., extra Reporter, in Com. of Sup., 890 (ii).

Syrups, cane-juice, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 779 (i).

Tay Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

Temporary Loans by Govt. (M. for Ret.) 56 (i).

Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1073 (ii).

Travis, Judge, in Com. of Sup., 886 (ii).

Tubing, wrought-iron, conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).

Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 1153 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 748, (i); 1583, 1719 (ii).

TARIFF CHANGES: (almonds) 748; (baking powder) 749 (i), 1584; (bolts, nuts, &c.) 1584 (ii); (blueing) 749 (i); (carriage hardware) 1720; (cocoanut, dessicated) 1584 (ii); (cologne) 770; (cotton) 769 (i); (earthenware) 1725 (ii); (fancy goods) 749; (feathers) 749; (fruit, dried) 750; (fruit, green) 750; (gas pipes, iron) 755; (Geneva gin) 769; (gloves, mitts, &c.) 756; (hair cloth) 756; (harness) 756, laces, braids, &c.) 757; (lead) 757 (i); (logs), 1587, 1725; (Manila cordage, sisal, &c.) 1584, (paper hangings) 1719 (ii); (peaches) 755; (philosophical instruments, globes) 781 (i); (scythes) 1721; (straw-board) 1719 (ii); (sugar) 773; (syrups) 779; (tubing) 770; (whips) 770; (wire) 770; (wire fencing) 772; (yeast) 772 (i).

Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

Williamsburg Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).

Whips, conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).

Winter Mail service, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 1375 (ii).

Wire, iron or steel, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).

Yeast cakes, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin.*

Agents, purchasing, names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 437 (i).

Ammunition, clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1303 (ii).

——— manufactured at Quebec (M. for Cor.) 554 (i).

Bell & Lewis, Howard Wright, J. Stewart and Mr. Sinclair, moneys paid to for transport, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 437 (i).

Bounty on Pig Iron B. 150 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1717 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*

Can. Temp. Act. Amt., 1878, B. 104 (Mr. *Orton*) on Amt. (Mr. *Kranz*) to place on Govt. Orders, 1219 (ii).

C. P. R., B. C. contracts (Ques.) 709 (i).

——— Port Arthur to Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1450, 1694 (ii).

Carillon Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1745 (ii).

Claims recognised by Govt. and amounts paid (M. for Ret.*) 438 (i).

Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 592 (i).

Disturbance in the N. W., Anderson, James, Cor. *re* purchase of supplies, &c. (M. for copies) 427 (i).

——— Batoche, battle of, Rep. of officer second in command (Ques.) 369 (i).

——— claims Commission (Ques.) 42 (i).

——— food, material, medical supplies and comforts, forage, &c., purchase of (M. for Ret.*) 438 (i).

——— instructions to non-combatants (M. for copies) 427 (i).

——— Laurie and Strange, Maj. Generals, status in Active Militia (Ques.) 119 (i).

——— Middleton, Maj. Genl., names, &c., of Staff (M. for Ret.*) 437 (i).

——— reports on Rebellion presented to House (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1640 (ii).

——— transportation contractors (M. for Ret.) 427 (i).

——— transport and supply officers, names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 437 (i).

——— transport service, &c. (Ques.) 61 (i).

Farm or Real Estate Banks, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Orton*) 578 (i).

Flour and Coal Duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1432 (ii).

Franchise Act, expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1700 (ii).

——— instructions to Revising Officers (M. for copies) 43; (remarks) 56 (i).

Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1649 (ii).

Grenville Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1097-1101; on Amt. (Mr. *Coughlin*) 1138; on Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) 1142; on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1027 (ii).

Horses purchased and from whom, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 438 (i).

Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 656 (i).

Indemnity to Members, on Res. (Mr. *Farrow*) and Mr. Blake's Ques. of Order, 123 (i).

Indians, Man. and N. W. T., in Com. of Sup., 1745 (ii).

Indian voters, applications for registration (M. for copies) 449 (i).

Ingersoll, London and Chatham Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1600 (ii).

Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1610 (ii).

Laurie, Maj. Genl. and Genl. Strange, position in Militia force during Rebellion (Ques.) 68 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*
Medical and hospital staff, names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 438 (i).
Military Branch and District Staff, salaries, in Com. of Sup., 1296 (ii).
——— claims Commission, names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 438 (i).
Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1296 (ii).
N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) Speaker's attention called to member not voting, 1011 (ii).
Officers, &c., who volunteered for service, names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 438 (i).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) respecting legislation, 550 (i).
Order, Ques. of, and Parliamentary language, 1580, 1635 (ii).
Pig Iron. *See* "Bounty."
Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1745 (ii).
Reports on the N. W. Rebellion (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1640 (ii).
Representation of the N. W. T. in Parlt. B. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1213; in Com., 1214-1216 (ii).
Return, imperfect, *re* Seizures by Expeditionary Force in N. W. (remarks) 1380 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 315-323 (i).
Seizures by Mounted Police or Expeditionary Force (M. for Ret.*) 438 (i).
Senate, constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1286 (ii).
Staff Paymasters, names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 438 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1600, 1610 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Carillon Canal) 1745; (Grenville) 1453 (ii).
Geological Survey, 1649 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 1745 (ii).
Legislation (Franchise Act, expenses under) 1750 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition, clothing, &c.) 1303; (salaries, District Branch and Staff) 1296 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 1745; (Ont.) 1745 (ii).
Railways—Capital (Port Arthur to Red River) 1450, 1694 (ii).
Voters' Lists, printing of, contracts, &c. (M. for Stmnts.) 448 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. P. B., *L'Islet.*
Elgin Station, L'Islet (Ques.) 544 (i).
Fines and Forfeitures B. 80 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 671 (i).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 307-309 (i):
——— Execution, communications from Quebec Govt. (Ques.) 426 (i).
Slides and Booms, amounts owing on account of (Ms. for Rets.*) 1195 (i).
Valin, Mr., M.P., Grants of land to, in N. W. (M. for Ret.) 31 (i).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A., *Terrebonne.*
Can. Temp. Act, in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 106, 1°) 746 (i); 2° and in Com., 1229; 3° m., 1240 (ii).
——— legislation respecting (Ans.) 62 (i).
Commissions to Public Officers (B. 110, 1°*) 781 (i); 2° m., 958; in Com., 958 (ii).
Fabre, salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1474-1506 (ii).
Franchise Act, expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1693, 1750 (ii).
——— instructions to Revising Officers, on M. for copies, 46 (i).
——— working of, Cor. (presented), 1482 (ii).
Govt. measures (remarks) 913 (ii).
Joint Stock Co.'s printing Blue-book (Ans.) 186 (i).
Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup., 1698 (ii).
Montreal and Western Railway Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1616 (ii).
New Glasgow to Montcalm Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1614 (ii).
Newspaper Subscriptions and Cab-hire, in Com. of Sup., 880 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* paragraph in *Advertiser*, 393 (i).
Printing and Stationery Bureau (B. 132) M. to introd., 1217; 2° m., 1517-1524, 1530; in Com., 1552-1567; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1728 (ii).
Queen *vs.* Riel, printing Blue-book (Ans.) 186 (i).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 342-358 (i).
——— Execution, communications from Quebec Govt. (Ans.) 427 (i).
——— Pets. from Orange Lodges respecting (Ans.) 196 (i).
——— Pets. praying for clemency, &c. (Ans.) 120 (i).
——— Rep. of Trial (Ans.) 34 (i).
——— Sir Alex. Campbell's Memo., cost of publishing (Ans.) 66; amounts paid newspapers (Ans.) 67 (i).
St. Eustache to St. Placide Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1624 (ii).
Sec. of State, Dept. of, in Com of Sup., 1697 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1614; in Com. on B, 1704 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (C. S. Board of Examiners) 841 (ii); (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 534 (i), 1697; contingencies, 880 (ii).
Justice, Administration of, 1698 (ii).
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Faucher de St. Maurice) 1763 (ii); (Franchise Act, expenses under) 1698, 1750 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Can. Temp. Act) 1658; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1658 (ii).
Terms of Union with P.E.I. (Ans.) 692; (suppl. Ans.) 710 (i).
Woodruff, J. A., amounts paid to (Ans.) 68 (i).
Wurtele, Hon. J. S. C., appointment as Judge (Ans.) 912, 1343 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*
Bounty on Pig Iron. B. 150 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1716 (ii).
Business of House, on M. to take Thursdays, 513 (i).
C. P. R., operation of main line, cost of (Ques.) 121 (i).
Cape Breton Island Ry. B. 143 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 1486 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt., (seduction, &c.) (B.20, 1°*) 60; 2° m., 441; 2° carried (Y. 114, N. 47) 444; M. for Com., 570; in Com.,704; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1326 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals Prevention (B. 11, 1°) 41; 2° m., 438 (i).
Copyright, Laws relating to, on M. (Mr. *Edgar*) for Sel. Com., 380 (i).
Debt, Public, net and gross, increase, &c., (Ques.) 42, 59, 495 (i), 1076 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 913, 1079 (ii).
Dominion Lands, in Com. of Sup., 530 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. B. 47 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for 2°, 516; on M. for 3°, 603 (i).
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 963 (ii).
Farm or Real Estate Banks, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Orton*) 574 (i).
Foresters' Deposits in Govt. Banks (Quse). 1095 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1501, 1513, 1666, 1671 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 751 (i).
Grazing land and grazing land leases (M. for Ret.*) 392 (i).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1266 (ii).
Immigration and Emigration (Ques.) 370 (i).
——— assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 651 (i).
Indian Administration of the N.W., on Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 745 (i).
Keewatin, Man. and N.W.T., population (Ques.) 370 (i).
Licenses to cut Timber in Dom. (M. for Ret.) 65 (i).
Logs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1588; conc., 1725 (ii).
N.W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 991 (ii).
Pig Iron. *See* "Bounty."
Printing Accts. and Public Accts. Com. (M. to refer items) 383 (i).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*); on Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) to M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1729 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (personal explanation) *re* coal lands and application of Mr. Haggart, 1096 (ii).
——— application for Timber Limits, 1514 (ii).
——— Timber Limits and Mr. Gault's disclaimer, 1199 (ii).
——— veracity questioned by member, 1421 (ii).
——— remarks *re* Rev. Mr. Robertson, 1594 (ii).
Returns, expenses in producing, on M. for Ret., 386 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Co.'s B. 36 (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) order for Com. objected to, 494; in Com., 782 (i).
Settlers in Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 42 (i))
Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1270 (ii).
Speeches in Parlt. (Res.) limiting, 789 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. (Ques.) 68; (M. for Ret.) 391 (i).
SUPPLY:
Charges of Management (remarks on order of business) 519 (i.)
Civil Govt. (Int. Dept. of) 530 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1266. Slides and Booms, 1270 (ii).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in the N. W. T., Res. in Amt. to Com of Sup., 1030-1041; neg. (Y. 43, N. 99) 1074 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 751 (i), 1583, 1725 (ii).

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland.*
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 966 (ii).
Life-boat Service and Rewards, in Com. of Sup., 1374 (ii).
Oleomargarine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1194 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (Rewards and Life-boat service) 1374 (ii).
Immigration (general vote) 1417 (ii).

Cockburn, Mr. A. P., *North Ontario.*
I. C. R., Buctouche and Moncton branch (Ques.) 330 (i).
Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 948; in Com., 951, 954 (ii).
Northern Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to trans. to Govt. Orders, 1663 (ii).
Rivière du Loup and Edmonston Ry. (Ques.) 331 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Foster*) on prop. Res., 710 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. for Ret., 901 (ii).

Colby, Mr. C. C., *Stanstead.*
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) B. in Com., 1670 (ii).
Prorogation (Ques.) 1703 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Atlantic Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 58, 1°*) 226 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 771 (i).
Wire, iron or steel, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 771 (i).

Cook, Mr. H. H. *East Simcoe.*
Business of House, on M. to take Thursdays, 512 (i).
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. Bs. 92, 99, 118, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Vic*) to place on Govt. Orders, 1221 (ii).
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 1364 (ii).
Chippewa Indians, Pets. from (Ques.) 1659 (ii).
Farm or Real Estate Banks, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Orton*) 583 (i).
Fishing in Muskoka District (Ques.) 1076 (ii).

Cook, Mr. H. H.—*Continued.*
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1665 (ii).
Franchise Act, instructions to Revising Officers, on M. for copies, 51 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) 1142 (ii).
Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 946; in Com., 950, 955 (ii).
Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for Com., 1315; in Com., 1325 (ii).
Penetanguishene Lighthouse (Ques.) 1515 (ii).
Post Offices in Muskoka, &c., established (M. for Ret.) 43 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Dickinson*) on personal explanation, 1171 (ii).
——— *re* Timber limits (personal explanation) 1167 (ii).
Roper, S. C. D., employment of by Govt. (Ques). 570 (i).
Squaw Island, Fishing Privileges, &c. (Ques.) 784 (i).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1067–1070 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal (M. for Ret.) 898; enquiry for Ret., 1343 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*
Adulteration Act Amt. (B. 108, 1°*) 747 (i).
Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 1547 (ii).
Canal Tolls, amount collected (Ans.) 784 (i).
Consolid. Inland Rev. Acts Amt. (B. 101) prop. Res., 601; in Com., 681; 1°* of B., 688 (i); in Com., 1204 (ii).
Cullers, Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1544 (ii).
Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1543 (ii.)
Heney, John, refund to, on conc., 1774 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1024; (Amt.) 1096; agreed to (Y. 117, N. 61) 1135; on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1132; on Amt. (Mr. *Coughlin*) 1137; on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1139; on Amt. (Mr. *Mills*), 1141 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. *See* "Consolidated."
——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 31 (i).
Inspection Act Amt. (Ans.) 784.
Liquor License Act, 1883, Commissioners' and Inspectors' emoluments (Ans.) 266 (i).
——— refund of fees (Ans.) 266 (i).
Miall's pamphlet against Can. Temp. Act (Ans.) 121 (i).
New Edinburgh and Gatineau Ferry (Ans.) 1172 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) respecting legislation, 553; on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 759 (i); in Com. on B. 101, 1204 (ii).
Preventive service, in Com. of Sup., 1544 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, Timber Limits, refutation of charges, 1634 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 309-315 (i).

Costigan, Hon. J.—*Continued.*
Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1547 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Charges of Management (Aud. and Rec. Genl. Winnipeg) 521 (i).
Civil Govt. (Inland Rev. Dept.) 689 (i), contingencies, 881 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Adulteration of Food) 1547; (Canals, refund to John Heney) conc., 1774; (Cullers) 1544 (Excise, preventive service) 1544; (salaries and stamps) 1543; (Slides and Booms) 1547; (Weights and Measures and Gas, salaries) 1544 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 759 (i).
Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. (B. 109) prop. Res. and 1°* of B., 747 (i); 2° m., 957 (ii).
Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1544 (ii).

Coughlin, Mr. T., *North Middlesex.*
Home Rule for Ireland, (Amt.) to Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) 1136 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* report of vote in Ottawa *Free Press* 1168 (ii).

Coursol, Mr. C. J., *East Montreal.*
Fabre, Hector, Rep. from (Ques.) 1661 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) to Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1127 (ii).
Immigration from France and work of M. Labelle (Ques.) 1661 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 134 (i).
——— Medical Commission (Ques. and M. for Ret.) 31 (i).
Select Standing Committees (Amt.) to add names, 36 (i).
West Indies, Trade relations with (Ques.) 785 (i).

Curran, Mr. J. J., *Centre Montreal.*
Burlington Bay Canal B. 76 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 518 (i).
Canal Tolls reduction (Ques.) 494 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. (seduction, &c.) B. 20 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 705 (i).
Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 588 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1511 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*), 1101–1104; on Amt. (Mr. *Coughlin*) 1137; on Amt. (Sir *John A Macdonald*) 1139; on Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) 1141 (ii).
Lachine Canal crossing in Montreal (Ques.) 426 (i).
Land Grants to Militia B. 142 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res., 1456 (ii).
Life-saving apparatus, &c. (Ques.) 783 (i).
Montreal Board of Trade incorp. Acts Amt. (B. 90, 1°*) 599 (i); 2° m., 856 (ii).
Privilege, Ques of, paragraph in *Evening Journal, re* Execution of Riel, 301 (i).
Quebec Harbor Improvements further Loan B. 140 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1384 (ii).

Curran, Mr. J. J.—*Continued.*
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry. Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 125-134 (i).
St. Gabriel and Levee Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 116, 1° and 2°*) 876 (ii).
St. Lawrence River overflow (Ques.) 865 (ii).

Daly, Mr. M. B., *Halifax.*
Sugar duties paid at Halifax and Montreal (Ques.) 898 (ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Adams, David J., schooner, seizure of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1256 (ii).
Address, on the, 27 (i).
Advances to P.E.I. (Ques.) 1378 (ii).
B. C. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).
Books of Reference for depts., in Com, of Sup., 882 (ii).
Business of House, on M. to take Thursdays, 512 (i).
Cab-hire, in Com. of Sup., 870; telegraphing, 881 (ii).
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for 3°, 1353 (ii).
——— expenditure in B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1449 (ii).
——— Port Arthur to Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1449 (ii).
——— salaries, &c., of Staff, in Com. of Sup., 1450 (ii).
Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 43 (Mr. *Mackintosh*) in Com., 559 (i).
Cape Breton Island Ry. B. 143 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 1487 (ii).
Cape Race Lighthouse transfer B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 673 (i).
Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1158 (ii).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. B. 105 (Mr. *Pope*) on prop. Res., 674 (i); on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1381 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1229, on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for 3°, 1241 (ii).
Claims of P.E.I., settlement of, in Com. of Sup., 1263 (ii).
Cleaning offices, in Com. of Sup., 885 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. (law of evidence) B. 141 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1464 (ii).
——— (seduction, &c.) B. 20 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 706 (i).
Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1454 (ii).
Disturbance in the N. W., duty of Govt. to bring down further papers, on Amt. (Mr. *Hall*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 506 (i).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 1550 (ii).
Dorchester Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 893 (ii).
Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1157 (ii).
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1149, 1153 (ii).
Extra Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 880 (ii).
Farm or Real Estate Banks, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Orton*) 584 (i).
Fines and Forfeitures B. 82 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 671 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*
Fishing by Foreign Vessels in Can. Waters B. 136 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 1422; in Com., 1423 (ii).
Fisheries Protection (Ques.) 494 (i).
Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for Cor., 702 (i).
Franchise, Electoral Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1468, 1499, 1507 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1262 (ii).
Hensley, Mr. Justice, Rep. of, *re* Trial of Gillis for murder (M. for copy*) 802 (i).
I. C. R., Dalhousie branch, expenditure, M to ref. to Pub. Accounts Com., 227 (i).
——— Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 604, 610; on M. for 3°, 665 (i).
Inch Arran Hotel, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1533 (ii).
Indian Title, extinguishment of, in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 829-836 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1204 (ii).
Interest in B. C., B. 22 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1245 (ii).
Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup., 891 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 892 (ii).
Legal Services in connection with Pub. Works, in Com. of Sup., 1159 (ii).
Manitoba Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 893 (ii).
Militia, Dept. of, contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 878 (ii).
Morgan's "Annual Register," in Com. of Sup., 881 (ii).
Navigable Waters protection B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 630 (i); in Com., 953; on M. for 3°, 1015 (ii).
Navigable Waters, works in, B. 130 (Sir *Hector Langevin*), on M. for 2°, 1246; in Com., 1270 (ii).
Newspaper subscriptions, in Com. of Sup., 884 (ii).
Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 1321 (ii).
Northern Light and winter communication with P. E.I., on M. for Cor., 846 (ii).
Northumberland Straits Tunnel Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com., 1466 (ii).
N. W. T. Law Amt. B. 133 (Mr *Thompson*) in Com., 1383, 1461 (ii).
Oleomargarine, in Com. on B. 101, 1204 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Kirk*) Official Reps. and headings to extra copies, 632 (i).
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1549 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., explanation of non-attendance, 1144 (ii).
Public Works and Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1155, 1158, 1160, 1162 (ii).
Quebec Harbor Improvements further Loan B. 140 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1385 (ii).
Queen's Birthday, on M. for adjnmt., 1455 (ii).
Real property in the N.W.T. B. 10 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1517 (ii).
Representation of the N.W.T. in Parlt. B. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1216, 1253 (ii).
Returns, enquiry for (remarks) 65 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—*Continued.*

Revised Statutes of Can. B. 9 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 514 (i), 1227 (ii).

Rideau Hall, additions, alterations, repairs, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 798 (i).

Roche, M., of N.S., transfer of, on M. for Sel. Com., to investigate charges against certain members, 1327 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1162 (ii).

Senate, constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1281 (ii).

Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1547 (ii).

Summary proceedings before Magistrates B. 84 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 715 (i).

Supreme Court, extra Reporter, in Com. of Sup., 891 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice, 891 (ii).

Civil Govt. (Interior Dept. of) 525 (i). Contingencies (Customs) 874; (Depts. generally) 886; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 868; (Finance, Dept. of) 881; (Inland Revenue) 881; (Interior, Dept. of) 881; (Militia, Dept. of) 878; (Post Office) 883: (Privy Council Office) 870; (Public Works) 881; (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 880 (ii).

Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1454; (Dominion Lands) 1550; (Post Office) 1549; (Slides and Booms) 1547 (ii).

Penitentiaries (B. C.) 896; (Dorchester) 893; (Kingston) 892; (Man.) 893 (ii).

Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1158; (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1157; (Public Buildings, Ottawa) 1155. *Income:* Buildings (N. S.) 1158; (P. E. I.) 1160; (Que.) 1162. Harbors and Rivers (P. E. I.) 1262 (ii).

Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (expenditure in B. C.) 1449; (Port Arthur to Red River) 1449; (salaries, &c. of staff) 1450 (ii).

Terms of Union with P.E.I. (remarks) 692 (i).

Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T. on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Ques. of Order) unparliamentary language, 1071 (ii).

Travelling expenses, in Com. of Sup., 882 (ii).

Treaty of 1818, co-operation of Newfoundland (Ques.) 494 (i).

Dawson, Mr. S. J., *Algoma.*

British Canadian Bank incorp. Act Amt. (B. 114, 1°*) 865 (ii).

C. P. R., confirmation of Agreement, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *McLelan*) 942, 945 (ii).

——— Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com., 1199 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 930 (ii).

Fishing rights of Indians on Lakes Huron and Nipissing, Pets., &c., on M. for copies, 694 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1473, 1507 (ii).

——— printing for distribution (remarks) 1746 (ii).

Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1649 (ii).

Hudson's Bay Exploration (Ques.) 865 (ii).

Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 659 (i).

Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1650 (ii).

Dawson, Mr. S. J.—*Continued.*

Indian Title, extinguishment of, on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 839 (ii).

Kaministiquia River, in Com. of Sup., 1158 (ii).

Lake Superior Mineral Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 34, 1°*) 92 (i).

Logs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1591; conc., 1726 (ii).

Life-boat service, rewards, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1373 (ii).

Lighthouse keepers, salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1375 (ii).

Port Arthur Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1158 (ii).

Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1555 (ii).

Private Bills, extension of time (M.) 393 (i).

Robinson Treaty, Indians under (M. for Cor.) 62 (i).

Rules of the House (prop. Amt.) 842 (ii).

St. Catharines Milling Co. law costs, in Com. of Sup., 1769 (ii).

Ste. Ursule, Mattawin and Lake Temiscamingue Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 74 (Mr. *Hurteau*) on M. for 3°, 957 (ii).

Settlers in Saugeen Peninsula, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1541 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1613 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Geological Survey, 1649 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries, &c.) 1375 (ii).

Miscellaneous (St. Catharines Milling Co., law costs) 1769 (ii).

Indians (grant to suppl. fund) 1650; (N.B.) 1651 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Rewards, &c., and Life-boat service) 1373 (ii).

Public Works, Capital: (Port Arthur Harbor and Kaministiquia River) 1158 (ii).

Thunder Bay colonisation Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1613 (ii).

Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T. on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1072.

Victoria and Sault Ste. Marie Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 95, 1°*) 630 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1591-1726 (ii).

Desjardins, Mr. A., *Hochelaga.*

Criminal Law Amt. (law of evidence) B. 3 (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 6 m h., 911, neg. (Y. 59, N. 68) 912 (ii).

Debates, Official Rep. (M.) to conc. in 1st Rep., 66 (i).

Dom. Elections Act, 1874, Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 1186 (ii).

Fabre, Hector, Rep. from (Ques.) 1661 (ii).

French Canadian representation for Ont. in Senate (Ques.) 1633 (ii).

Immigration from France and work of M. Labelle (Ques.) 1661 (ii).

Labelle, Rev. M., Immigration Rep. (Ques.) 1633 (ii).

Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 949 (ii).

Desjardins, Mr. A.—*Continued.*
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to M. (Mr. *Amyot*) for Rets. respecting commutation of sentence, &c., 193 (i).
——— Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 206–213 (i).
St. Maurice, Faucher de, on Parliamentary Procedure, in Com. of Sup., 1741 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1693 (ii).
Stoney Mountain Penitentiary, prisoners' health (Ques.) 1172 (i)
SUPPLY:
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Faucher de St. Maurice, on Parliament Procedure) 1741 (ii).
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 1693 (ii).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1066 (ii).

Desaulniers, Mr. A. L., *Maskinongé.*
Half-breed prisoners in the N.W. (M. for copies of O.C.*) 60 (i).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 338–341 (i).
——— recommendation to mercy by jury (Ques.), 62 (i).

Dickinson, Mr. M. K., *Russell.*
Privilege, Ques. of, Timber limits (personal explanation) 1168 (ii).

Dodd, Mr. M., *Cape Breton.*
Nova Scotia and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 56, 1°*) 185 (i).
Roche, M., N.S., transfer of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com., 1174 (ii).

Dundas, Mr. J. R., *South Victoria, Ont.*
Franchise Act, instructions to Revising Officers, on M. for copies, 52 (i).
——— expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1751 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Franchise Act, expenses under) suppl., 1751 (ii).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*
Senate, constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1294 (ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., *West Ontario.*
Bankruptcy and Insolvency, legislation (Ques.) 59 (i).
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 1362, 1366 (ii).
——— B. C. section (Ques.) 121 (i).
——— Gravenhurst to Callander, lease of line (M. for copies of agreements, &c.,) 391 (i).
——— Northern Pacific Ry. agreement (Ques.) 633 (i).
Colonisation Co.'s letters patent incorp. (M. for copies) 65 (i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—*Continued.*
Commercial Treaties, negotiations (Ques.) 844 (ii).
Copyright, laws relating to (M. for Sel. Com.) 377, 382 (i).
Duck, Geo., Dom. Land Agent at Prince Albert, Rep. of (M. for copy*) 58 (i).
Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1446 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com. 1498, 1505, 1510, 1512, (ii).
I. C. R., Paspebiac branch (Ques.) 186 (i).
Imperial Titles (M. for Ret., 698 (i).
Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co's, &c., Act Amt. (B. 15, 1°) 48; 2° m., 437 (i); in Com., 908, 1179 (ii).
Insolvent Debtor's discharge (B. 71, 1°*) 393 (i).
Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Ques of Order, 1316; in Com., 1320 (ii).
Pickering Post Office irregularities (M. for copies of Reps.) 60 (i).
Prince Albert Colonisation Co., exchange of land (M. for O.C.*) 58 (i).
——— (M. for Sel. Com.) 489; agreed to (Y. 150, N. 1) 481; on M. to add names to Com., 493 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* supposed Telegrams read in House, 781 (i).
——— (personal explanation) *re* Revising Officer, East Toronto, 1701 (ii).
Representation of N.W.T. in Parlt., on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) for Address to Her Majesty, 867; English legislation (Ques.) 1514 (ii).
Revised Statutes of Can. B. 9 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1225 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to M. for Rets. (Amt.) 186 (i).
——— deputation to (Ques.) 785 (i).
Stephenson, Rufus, Inspector of Colonisation Co.'s, Rep. of (M. for copy*) 58 (i).
Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 147 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 1709 (ii).
Supreme and Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 21, 1°) 60 (i).

Everett, Mr. C. A., *St. John (N.B.) City and County.*
Address, The, moved, 2 (i).
Cordage, manila and sisal, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1585 (ii).
Iron sand or globules, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 780 (i).
Registered Letters, compensation for (Ques.) 1378 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 780 (i), 1585 (ii).

Fairbank, Mr. J. H., *East Lambton.*
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for 3°, 1351; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1367 (ii).
——— Port Arthur to Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1696 (ii).

Fairbank, Mr. J. H.—*Continued.*
Contingencies, &c., Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1307 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. (burglars) B. 28 (Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*) on M. for 2°, 1185 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 922, 926 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1476, 1501, 1506, 1666, 1668 (ii).
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1415 (ii).
Indian Administration of the N. W., on Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 742 (i).
Mining Law Amt (Ques.) 844 (ii).
Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1657 (ii).
N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 994 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 762 (i); on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1194 (ii).
Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1308 (ii).
St. Catharines Milling Co., law costs, in Com. of Sup., 1770 (ii).
Senate, constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1292 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Militia, Dept. of, contingencies) 1307 (ii).
Immigration (general vote) 1415 (ii).
Militia (Royal Military College) 1308 (ii).
Miscellaneous (St. Catharines Milling Co., law costs) 1770 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1657 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (Port Arthur to Red River) 1696 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 762 (i).

Farrow, Mr. T., *East Huron.*
Colonisation Co.'s and settlers (Ques.) 330 (i).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 530 (i).
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 968 (ii).
Indemnity to Members Act Amt. (prop. B.) 38; prop. Res., 121 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Interior, Dept. of) 540 (i).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., *North Leeds and Grenville.*
Cordage, manilla and sisal, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1585 (ii).
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 964 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1481, 1670 (ii).
Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 644 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1400 (ii).
Indian Administration of N.W., on Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 739-741 (i).
Oleomargarine, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1190 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (personal explanation) *re* Rev. Mr. Robertson, 1592 (ii).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F.—*Continued.*
Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 147 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 1712 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues (Weights and Measures and Gas, salaries, &c.) 1546 (ii).
Immigration (general vote) 1400 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1586 (ii).
Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1546 (ii).

Ferguson, Mr. J., *Welland.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 865 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 753 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 753 (i).

Fisher, Mr. S. A., *Brome.*
Consolid. Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res. (oleomargarine) 688 (i).
Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1091 (ii).
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1151 (ii).
Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1430 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 752 (i).
Logs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1590; conc., 1727 (ii).
Montreal Armories, in Com. of Sup., 1163 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) respecting legislation, 549; on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 764, 769 (i).
Pipes, gas and water, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).
Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1163 (ii).
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1417 (ii).
Senate, constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1289 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dom. Exhibition) 1091 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Weights and Measures and Gas, salaries, &c.) 1545 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Public Buildings (Que.) 1163 (ii).
Quarantine (general vote) 1417 (ii).
Timber Island, Lake Ont., sale of (Ques.) 784 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 752, 764, 768, 772 (i); 1590 (ii).
Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1545.
Whips, conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).
Wire, iron or steel, conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).

Forbes, Mr. J. F., *Queen's, N.S.*
Brooklyn Breakwater, N.S., repairs (Ques.) 265 (i).
Hardware and Ry. Supplies purchased in Halifax (M. for Ret.*) 58 (i).

Foster, Mr. G. E., *King's, N.B.*

Adams, David J., schooner, seizure of (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1254 (ii).
American Fishermen, depredations by (Ans.) 783 (i).
Aspy Bay fishery dispute (Ans.) 1076 (ii).
Buoys and Beacons, in Com. of Sup., 1377 (ii).
C.P.R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for 3°, 1350 (ii).
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Orton*) on Amt. to place on Govt. Orders, 1218 (ii).
Cape Race Lightship and steam Fog-whistle, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 226 (i).
——— Lighthouse, transfer (B. 100) prop. Res., 513, in Com., 672; 1°* of B., 673 (i).
Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries, in Com. of Sup., 1757 (ii).
Disturbance in the N.W., duty of Govt. to bring down further papers, on Amt. (Mr. *Hall*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 508 (i).
Fisheries Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1698 (ii).
——— &c., in Com. of Sup., 1542 (ii).
——— deep-water in B. C., on M. for Cor., 496 (i).
——— joint Commission, respecting, on M. for Ret., 392 (i).
——— protection and Marine Police, regulations issued, on M. for copies, 458; (Ans.) 494 (i).
——— protection in Manitoba (Ans.) 692 (i).
Fishery negotiations (Ans.) 120 (i).
Fishing by Foreign Vessels Act Amt. (B. 136, 1°) 1310; 2° m., 1421; in Com., 1423; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1703 (ii).
——— Bounties, claims for, on M. for copies, 698 (i).
——— in Muskoka District (Ans.) 1076 (ii).
——— License Fees (Ans.) 1076 (ii).
Fog-whistles, maintenance, in Com. of Sup, 1375 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, maintenance and repairs, in Com. of Sup., 1372 (ii).
Hamond, E., employment of by Govt. (Ans.) 1379 (ii).
Harbor Master of Sarnia (Ans.) 692 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) 1141 (ii).
Hudson's Bay Exploration (Ans.) 266 (i), 865, 1378; in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
I. C. R. Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 619 (i).
Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 649 (i).
La Canadienne and *Alliance*, collision (Ans.) 1660 (ii).
Life-boat service and rewards, &c., in Com. of Sup. 1372 (ii).
Life-saving apparatus, &c. (Ans.) 783 (i).
Lighthouse and Fog alarms, in Com. of Sup., 1376 (ii).
Lighthouse-keepers, salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1375 (ii).
Lobster Fishing in P. E. I. (Ans.) 31 (i).
Macdonald, Hugh, and Pilotage Commission (Ans.) 68 (i).
Mails, carriage of, in P. E. I. (Ans.) 495 (i).
Marine, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 31 (i).

Foster, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*

Marine and Fisheries, Rep. of Min., 1869, on M. for copy, 391 (i).
——— Police Force in Can., on M. for Ret., 384, 386 (i).
Meteorological Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 1377 (ii).
Moody, John, employment of by Govt. (Ans.) 1379 (ii).
Nataskowan River, estuary of, rent paid (Ans.) 1379 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection (B. 96, 1°) 630 (i); 2° m., 946; in Com., 950; 3° m., 1015 (ii).
Northern Light and winter communication with P.E.I., on M. for Cor., 846, 852 (ii).
Obstructions in nav. rivers, in Com of Sup., 1374 (ii)
Penetanguishene Lighthouse (remarks) 1515 (ii).
Port Rowan Life-saving service, on M. for Cor., 786 (ii).
Printing Immigration pamphlets, in Com. of Sup, 1398 (ii).
Scatterie Fog-whistle superintendent, on M. for Cor., 787 (i).
Senate, constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt to Com. of Sup., 1280 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. (B. 103) prop. Res. and 1°* of B., 710; 2°, and in Com., 1086 (ii).
Stellarton and Pictou Ry. *See* "I. C. R."
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Fisheries, Dept. of) 691 (i), suppl., 1698 (ii); (Marine Dept. of) 691 (i), contingencies, 886 (ii).
Fisheries (Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries) 1757; (salaries, &c.) 1542 (ii).
Immigration (printing pamphlets) 1398 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Buoys and Beacons) 1377; (Fog-whistles, &c., maintenance) 1375; (salaries, &c.) 1375 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Hudson Bay Expedition) 1658 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1372; (Obstructions in nav. rivers) 1374; (Rewards, &c., and Life-boat service) 1372; (Winter Mail service, P. E. I.) 1375; (Wrecks and Casualties) 1374 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Observatories) 1377 (ii).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1062 (ii).
Treaty of 1818, co-operation of Newfoundland (Ans.) 494 (i).
Windsor, Ont., Harbor Master at (Ans.) 785 (i).
Winter Mail Service, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 1375 (ii).
Wrecks and Casualties, in Com. of Sup., 1374 (ii).

Gaudet, Mr. A., *Nicolet.*

Wire fencing, from Lévis to Rivière du Loup (Ques.) 544 (i).

Gault, Mr. M. H., *West Montreal.*

Buoys and Beacons, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1377 (ii).
Burlington Bay Canal B. 76 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 518 (i).
Can. and Antwerp Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1371 (ii).

Gault, Mr. M. H.—*Continued.*
Consolid. Inland Rev. Acts Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res. (oleomargarine) 688 (i).
C. P. R. bonds, application for (remarks) 704 (i).
Cordage, manilla and sisal, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1585 (ii).
Customs Seizure at Montreal, settlement (Ques.) 1343; (remarks) 1369, 1594 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt., 1874, B. 29 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 1186 (ii).
Father Point deep-water pier (Ques.) 633 (i).
Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1441 (ii).
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1388 (ii).
Imperial Titles, on M. for Ret., 699 (i).
Lachine Canal, lots on basins (Ques.) 633 (i).
Land Grants to Militia B. 142 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. to introd., 1421; in Com. on Res., 1457; on M. for 2°, 1572 (ii).
Militia Regiments visit to Great Britain (Ques.) 709 (i).
Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 1377 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, application for colonisation lands, 1198; (explanation) 1421 (ii).
Quebec Harbor Improvements further Loan B. 140 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1384 (ii).
Revenue frauds by Montreal firms (Ques.) 709 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (general vote) 1388 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Buoys and Beacons) 1377 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Canada and Antwerp) 1371 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (Observatories) 1377 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1585 (ii).
West Indies, Trade relations with (Ques.) 785 (i).

Gigault, Mr. G. A., *Rouville.*
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1147 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 96-99 (i).

Gillmor, Mr. A. H., *Charlotte.*
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. B (105) (Mr. *Pope*) on prop. Res., 679 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1237 (ii).
Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries, in Com. of Sup. 1757 (ii).
Consolid. Inland Rev. Acts Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res. (oleomargarine) 687 (i).
Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1544 (ii).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 537 (i).
Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1440 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 754 (i).
Harbors and Rivers, N.B., in Com. of Sup., 1264 (ii).
Iron sand or globules, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 780 (i).

Gillmor, Mr. A. H.—*Continued.*
Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup., 888 (ii).
Logs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1590 (ii).
Marine Police Force in Can., on M. for Ret., 385 (i).
Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 946 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) respecting legislation 552 (i).
Rideau Hall, additions, alterations, repairs, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 800 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice, 888 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Interior, Dept. of) 537 (i); (Post Office, contingencies) 884 (ii).
Collection of Revenues, (Outlers, salaries, &c.,) 1544 (ii).
Fisheries (Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries) 1757 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1264 (ii).
Travis, Judge, in Com. of Sup., 888 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 754, 780 (i), 1590 (ii).

Girouard, Mr. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 952 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 332-338 (i).

Glen, Mr. F. W., *South Ontario.*
C. P. R., leased lines, amounts paid by Co. as rent, &c. (Ques.) 368 (i).
Dom. Lands, pre-emption entries, &c., amounts owing and unpaid (M. for Ret.*) 393 (i).

Gordon, Mr. D. W., *Vancouver Island.*
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 542 (i).
Chinese immigrants (M. for Ret.) 382 (i).
——— Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1229; on Amt. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) to M. for 3°, 1243 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry., inspection, &c. (Ques.) 369 (i).
——— B. 47 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for 3°, 602 (i).
Fog-whistles, maintenance, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1375 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Fog-whistles, &c., maintenance) 1375 (ii).
Vancouver Ry. reserves, Squatters, pre-emption records (Ques.) 369 (i).
White Fish fry at fish hatcheries M. for Ret., 788 (i).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis.*
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 783 (i).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 223-226 (i).

Guillet, Mr. G., *Northumberland, West Riding.*
Fishing rights of Indians on Lakes Huron and Nipissing, Pets, &c., on M. for copies, 696 (i).
Life-boat service and rewards, in Com. of Sup., 1374 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1191 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Interior Dept. of) 542 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Rewards and Life-boat service) 1374 (ii).

Gunn, Mr. A., *Kingston.*
Land Grants to Militia B. 142 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res., 1457 (ii).
Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1657 (ii).
Sugars, conc. in Ways and Means, 774 (i), 1724 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Mounted Police, 1657 (ii).
Tête du Pointe, Barracks (Ques.) 1240 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 774, 777 (i).

Hackett, Mr. E., *Prince, P. E. I.*
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amts. Bs. 92, 99 and 118, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) to place on Govt. Orders, 1221 (ii).
Cape Breton Island Ry. B. 143 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 1488 (ii).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. B. 105 (Mr. *Pope*) on prop. Res., 675 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1238 (ii).
Farm or Real Estate Banks, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Orton*) 583 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com. 1468 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1263 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) to Amt (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1115 (ii).
I. C. R. Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 615 (i).
Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup., 889 (ii).
Lobster Fishing in P.E.I. (Ques.) 31 (i).
Northern Light and winter communication with P.E.I., on M. for Cor., 849 (ii).
Northumberland Straits Tunnel Ry. Co.'s (B. 128, 1°*) 1014; in Com., 1466 (ii).
Riel, Louis, case of, Pets. from Provincial Govts. (Ques.) 634 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice, 889 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1263 (ii).

Haggart, Mr. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 43 (Mr. *Mackintosh*) in Com., 555, 612 (i).
Gananoque, Perth and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1624 (ii).
North Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 73, 1°*) 426 (i).
Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for Com. (Ques. of Order) 1316 (ii).

Haggart, Mr. J. G.—*Continued.*
Prince Albert Colonisation Co., on M. (Mr. *Edgar*) for Sel. Com., 491 (i).
Printing of Parlt., on M. to conc. in Four th Rep. of Com., 1198 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, Timber Limits *re* applications, 1143; refutation of charges, 1634 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1624 (ii).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt to Com. of Sup., 1073 (ii).

Hall, Mr. R. N., *Sherbrooke.*
Consentini, Girolamo, naturalisation (B. 37, 1°*) 93 (i).
Copyright, laws relating to, on M. (Mr. *Edgar*) for Sel. Com., 381 (i).
Disturbance in the N.W., duty of Govt. to bring down further papers (Amt) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 505; agreed to. (Y. 110, N. 63) 511 (i).
Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to M. to conc. in Sen. Amts, 1676 (ii).

Hesson, Mr. S. R., *South Perth.*
Bounty on Pig Iron B. 150 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1718 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1239 (ii).
Consolid. Inland Rev. Acts Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res. (oleomargarine) 688 (i).
Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1091 (ii).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 539 (i).
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 962; in Com. on B., 1150 (ii).
Farm or Real Estate Banks, on M. (Mr. *Orton*) for Com. on Res., 430; in Com., 433, 437, 572, 583 (i).
Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1430 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 751 (i).
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1387 (ii).
Legal services, in Com. of Sup., 1160 (ii).
Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).
Logs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1589; conc., 1727 (ii).
N.W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 994; on M. to adjn. deb., 1004; in Com., 1013 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to Amt (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to conc. in Ways and Means, 761, 765 (i).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1565 (ii).
Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1160 (ii).
Rideau Hall, additions, alterations, repairs, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 797 (i).

Hesson, Mr. S. R.—*Continued.*
Rideau Hall, gardening and grounds, amounts paid, on M. for Stmnt., 796 (i).
Riel, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt. (remarks) as to time for closing debate, 300 (i).
Sugars, conc. in Ways and Means, 777 (i).
Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 147 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 1712 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dom. Exhibition) 1091 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Interior, Dept. of) 527 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Weights and Measures and Gas, salaries) 1545 (ii).
Immigration (general vote) 1387 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1656 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 1160 (ii).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1057-1059 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 751, 761-765, 777 (i), 1579, 1727 (ii).
Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1545.

Hickey Mr. C. E., *Dundas.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) M. to adjn. deb., 911 (ii).
Druggists (B. 99, 1°*) 691 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1478 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 752 (i).
Land Grants to Militia B. 142 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res., 1456 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) respecting legislation, 551; on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 763 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues (Weights and Measures and Gas, salaries, &c.) 1547 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 752, 763 (i).

Hilliard, Mr. G., *West Peterborough.*
Trent Valley Canal, on M. for Ret., 901 (ii).
Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 949; in Com., 951 (ii).

Holton, Mr. E., *Chateauguay.*
Customs Seizures at Montreal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1684 (ii).
Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 542 (i).
——— expenditures (Ques.) 633 (i).
——— display and Colonial Exhibition (Ques.) 692 (i).
Mutual Life Association of Can. (Ques.) 1379 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Interior, Dept. of) 542 (i).

Homer, Mr. J. A. R., *New Westminster.*
Dom. Lands in B.C., settlement, on M. for Cor., 497 (i).
Shuswap and Okanagan Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 33, 1°*) 92 (i).

Hurteau, Mr. H., *L'Assomption.*
Repentigny Wharf, expenditure (Ques.) 634 (i).
Ste. Ursule, &c., and Lake Temiscamingue Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 74, 1°*) 426 (i); 3° m., 957 (ii).

Innes, Mr. J., *South Wellington.*
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 78, 1°*) 460 (i).
Ingersoll, London and Chatham Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1599 (ii).
Pensions, N.W. Rebellion, in Com of Sup., 1742 (ii).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 2°, 1528; in Com., 1558 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1598 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Pensions (N.W. Rebellion) 1742 (ii.)

Irvine, Mr. D., *Carleton, N. B.*
Consolid. Inland Rev. Acts Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res. (oleomargarine) 688 (i).
Customs Appointment at Woodstock, N. B. (Ques.) 1075 (ii).
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. for Res., 967 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 753 (i).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1264 (ii).
I. C. R., Stellarton and Pictou branch. B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 628 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice, 888 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N. B.) 1264 (ii).
Travis, Judge, in Com. of Sup., 888 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 753, (i).

Ives, Mr. W. B., *Richmond and Wolfe.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. to consdr. B., 910 (ii).
Business of House on M. to take Thursdays, 512 (i).
I. C. R., Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for 3°, 666 (i).
Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, &c., B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) in Com., 908 (ii).
Land Grants to Ry. Co.'s B. 117 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 3°, 1017 (ii).
Logs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1588 (ii).
Lumber and saw logs, free export (Ques.) 634 (i).
N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 985 (ii).
Prince Albert Colonisation Co., on M. to add names to Sel. Com. (Ques. of Order) 493 (i).
Private Bills, presentation, extension of time (M.) 66 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Globe*, 1077 (ii).
Rocky Mountain Rangers, issue of Scrip to (Ques.) 543 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1588 (ii).

Jackson, Mr. J., *South Norfolk.*
C. P. R. bonds held by Govt. (Ques.) 495 (i).
Consolid. Inland Rev. Acts Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res. (oleomargarine) 686 (i).
Debt, floating (Ques.) 1076 (ii).
Deposits in Govt. Savings Banks (Ques.) 1218 (ii).
Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 637 (i).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to conc. in Ways and Means, 758 (i).
Port Rowan life-saving service (M. for Cor.) 703; (remarks continued) 785 (i).
——— or Port Royal, harbor of refuge (M. for Ret.) 65 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1087 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 758 (i).

Jamieson, Mr. J., *North Lanark.*
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 92, 1°) 599 (i); Bs. 92, 99 and 118, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) to place on Govt. Orders, 1220; on Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) to M. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com. *re* M. Roche, 1339 (ii).
Intoxicating Liquors Act Amt. B., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Beaty*) 904 (ii).
Senate, constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1285 (ii).

Jenkins, Mr. J. T., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1149 (ii).
Health Statistics, in Com of Sup., 1094 (ii).
Northern Light, and winter communication with P.E.I. (M. for Cor.) 845 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1194 (ii).
Roche, M., of N.S., transfer of, on M. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com., 1329 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Health Statistics) 1094 (ii).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Cape Breton Island Ry. B. 143 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 1495 (ii).
Mining Law Amt. (Ques.) 844 (ii).
Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 949 (ii).
Nictaux and Atlantic Ry. (remarks) on intrdn. of B. 146, 1636 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 323-325 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. to introd., 1636 (ii).

Kilvert, Mr. F. E., *Hamilton.*
Northern and North-Western Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 65, 1°*) 393 (i).

King, Mr. G. G., *Queen's, N.B.*
Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1269 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 753 (i).
I.C. R., Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 629 (i).
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1413 (ii).
Jemseg Creek, N.B., Navigation (Ques.) 369 (i).
Logs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1590 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (general vote) 1413 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging, 1269 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 753 (i), 1590 (ii).

Kinney, Mr. J. R., *Yarmouth.*
Bank of Yarmouth (B. 69, 1°*) 393 (i).
I. C. R., Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 626 (i).
Nova Scotia Steamship Co.'s incorp. (B. 51, 1°*) 149 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. to introd., 1638; (personal explanation) 1639; in Com., 1705 (ii).
Western Counties Ry. (remarks) on intrdn. of B., 146, 1638; in Com., 1705 (ii).
Windsor Branch Ry., settlement (Ques.) 1240 (ii).
Yarmouth Steamship Co.'s incorp. (B. 91, 1°*) 599 (i).

Kirk, Mr. J. A., *Guysborough.*
Baddeck, N. S., Custom House (Ques.) 1379 (ii).
Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).
Canso and Port Hood steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 1371 (ii).
Cape Breton Island Ry. B. 143 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res. (Ques. of Order) 1491, 1494 (ii).
Caraquet Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1604 (ii).
Clergyman in Inverness Co., on personal explanation (remarks) 1541 (ii).
Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1544 (ii).
Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1454 (ii).
Dufferin Gate, Quebec, claims of H. J. Beemer (Ques.) 1661 (ii).
Fisheries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1542 (ii).
Fish Importations (M. for Ret.) 370 (i).
Flag Treaty between U.S. and Spain, on M. for Cor., 701 (i).
Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1429 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1469 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 755 (i).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1261 (ii).
I. C. R., McCann Station to Joggins Ry. Subsidy in Com. on Res., 1615 (ii).
——— Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 607, 612, 616, 622; on M. for 3°, 666 (i).
——— Stellarton and Pictou branch, O. C., Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 802 (i).
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1652 (ii).
Ingersoll, London and Chatham Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1604 (ii).

Kirk, Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
Lighthouses and Fog alarms, in Com. of Sup., 1376 (ii.)
McDonald, Angus, appointment as Census enumerator (M. for copy *) 438 (i).
Public Buildings generally, in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, Official Reps. and headings to extra copies, 630 (i).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1623 (ii).
Rys. or Repeal, telegram to Halifax *Mail* (read) 1615 1628 (ii).
Scatterie Fog-whistle Superintendent, M. for Cor., 786 (i).
Short Line Ry. in N.S., on M. for copies of Cor., 445 (i).
Short Line Ry., Montreal and Salisbury (Ques.) 1240; (M. for copy of contract) 1309 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1615 (ii).
Subsidy to N.S., readjustment (M. for Ret.) 449 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Miscellaneous) 1453, 1752 (ii).
Collection of Revenues—(Cullers' salaries, &c.) 1544; (Customs) 1454 (ii).
Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 1542 (ii).
Indians (N.B.) 1652 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses and Fog alarms) 1376 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Canso and Port Hood) 1371 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (generally) 1166; Harbors Rivers (N.S.) 1261 (ii).
Truro to Newport Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1620 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 755 (i).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A., *Frontenac. See* SPEAKER, Mr.

Kranz, Mr. H., *North Waterloo.*
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Orton*) M. to place on Govt. Orders, 1218; neg. (Y. 35, N. 134) 1223 (ii).
German representation in Senate (Ques.) 1661 (ii).

Labrosse, Mr. S., *Prescott.*
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 366 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 861; in Com., 864 (ii).
Bonds, counterfeit, Govt. (Ques.) 121 (i).
Calgary and Fort Macleod Mail Service, Tenders for (M. for Ret.*) 35 (i).
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Bs. 92, 99 and 118, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) to place on Govt. Orders, 1222 (ii).
Census of N.W.T., names, &c., of employés (M. for Stmnt.*) 66 (i).
Corinth, Post Office at (Ques.) 843; in Com. of Sup., 885 (ii).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 534 (i).
Farm or Real Estate Banks, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Orton*) 433 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Franchise Act, instructions to revising officers, on M. for copies, 53 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1504, 1672 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 752 (i).
Haldimand, issue of Writ (M.) 912; (Ques.) 1015, 1077, 1144, 1171 (ii).
——— appointment of returning officer (Ques.) 1144, 1172 (ii).
Half breed Claims Commission, 1877, Reps. of (M. for Ret.) 634 (i).
Harbor Master of Sarnia (Ques.) 692 (i).
Hay tax in the N.W.T. (Ques.) 121 (i).
Heney, John, claim of, for refund of tolls (M. for Ret.*) 392 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) to Amt (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1111 (ii).
Inspection Act Amt. (Ques.) 764.
Inspectors or Commissioners of Indian Affairs in N.W. (M. for copy of O.C.*) 438 (i).
Land Improvement Fund, amount due Ont. (Ques.) 1266.
Land Sales in N.W., 1884-85 (Ques.) 120 (i).
Military Branch and District Staff, salaries, in Com. of Sup., 1298 (ii).
Mongrain, Louison, papers in connection with trial, &c. (M. for copies*) 392 (i).
Naturalisation Act Amt. (Ques.) 709 (i).
N.W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 998 (ii).
Oleomargarine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1193 (ii).
Palmerston and Georgian Bay Ry. (remarks) on M. that Com. rise, 1627 (ii).
Peterborough Post Office site (Ques.) 843 (ii).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1556 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Bryson*) on quotation from "Parliamentary Companion," 1077, 1078 (ii).
Rideau Hall, additions, alterations, repairs, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 800 (i).
Settlers in Saugeen Peninsula, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1540 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1627 (ii).
Summary Proceedings before Justices, &c., B. 84 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 806 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Interior, Dept. of) 525 (i); (Post Office, contingencies) 885 (ii); (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 524 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Weights and Measures and Gas, salaries, &c.) 1544 (ii).
Militia (Salaries, District and Branch Staff) 1298 (ii).
Timber sales on Georgian Bay Islands (Ques.) 898 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, fees paid to Poisett and Roger (Ques.) 843 (ii).
——— payments for right of way (Ques.) 843 (ii).
Union Suspension Bridge B. 72 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) in Com., 518 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 752 (i).
Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1544.

Landry, Mr. P. A., *Kent, N.B.*
Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 43 (Mr. *Mackintosh*) in Com., 558 (i).
Easter, Adjnmt. for (remarks) 748 (i).
Moncton and Buctouche Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1597 (ii).
Returns, expense in producing (M. for Ret.) 386 (i).
Revised Statutes of Canada B. 9 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1225 (ii).
Rideau Hall, contingencies, on M. for Ret., 794 (i).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 213-223 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1597 (ii).
Timber Land and Coal Leases in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1062 (ii).

Landry, Mr. P., *Montmagny.*
Central Board of Agriculture (Ques.) 634 (i).
La Canadienne and *Alliance*, collision (Ques.) 1660 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of (Res. of regret) 59; Order read, 62; (M.) 68 (i).
——— Medical Commissioners (M. for Cor.) 814 (ii).
——— Sanitary Commission, Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 693 (i).
Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction limitation (B. 13, 1°) 41 (i).

Langelier, Mr. F., *Mégantic.*
Brigade Majors salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1302 (ii).
Citadel, drainage and water supply (Ques.) 843 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1742 (ii).
Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries, in Com. of Sup., 1758 (ii).
Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1544 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 923, 925, 928 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt., B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1511, 1670 (ii).
Fisheries, salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1542 (ii).
Fishing Bounties, claims for (M. for copies) 697 (i).
Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1429 (ii).
France and Quebec Steamship subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1370 (ii).
Govt. Buildings, Quebec, water supply (Ques.) 843 (ii).
Hamond, E., employment of by Govt. (Ques.) 1379 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1265 (ii).
Hébert, Hubert, Revising Officer of Montmagny (Ques.) 569 (i).
I. C. R., Marois, Elzéar, claim of (Ques.) 784 (i).
——— oil barrels, sale of (M. for Ret. *) 802 (i).
——— St. Charles branch, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).
Interest in B.C., B. 22 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1245 (ii).
Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 1377 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, in Com. of Sup., 1370.

Langelier, Mr. F.—*Continued.*
Manitoba Penitentary, in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).
Nataskowan River, estuary of, rent paid (Ques.) 1379 (ii).
Navigable Waters, works in, B. 130 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1270 (ii).
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1417 (ii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1623 (ii).
Quebec Harbor Improvements further Loan B. 140 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1384 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 139-149 (i).
——— Sir Alex. Campbell's Memo., amounts paid newspapers (Ques.) 67 (i).
St. Lawrence River Navigation (B. 46, 1°) 119 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1623 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues (Cullers' salaries, &c.) 1544 (ii).
Fisheries (Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries) 1758; (salaries, &c.) 1542 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (France and Que.) 1370 (ii).
Militia (Brigade Majors salaries) 1302; (draining Citadel of Que.) 1742 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 896 (ii).
Public Works: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1265 (ii).
Quarantine (general vote) 1417 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (St. Charles Branch) 1451 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (Observatories) 1377 (ii).
Wurtele, Hon. J. S., appointment as Judge (Ques.) 865, 912, 1342 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector, *Three Rivers.*
Address, on the, His Ex.'s reply (presented) 92 (i).
Advances to P.E.I. (Ans.) 1378 (ii).
Annunciation Day, remarks on adjnmt., 301; (M.) 368 (i).
Ash-Wednesday, adjmnt. for (M.) 66 (i).
Aspy Bay Fisheries, despatches, &c., Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 807 (ii).
Assiniboine River improvements (Ans.) 784 (i).
Baddeck, N.S., Custom house (Ans.) 1379 (ii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co. (Ans.) 1482 (ii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s (B. 144) prop. Res., 1455; M. for Com. on Res., 1482; in Com. 1496; M. to conc. in Res., 1515; 1°* of B., 1515; on 2°, 1630 (ii).
Bayfield Harbor repairs, on. M. for Cor., 383 (i).
Boucherville Islands, obstructions in channel (Ans.) 495 (i).
Brooklyn Breakwater, N.S., Repairs (Ans.) 265 (i).
Budget, the (Ans.) 330 (i).
Burlington Bay Canal (B. 76, 1°) 426; 2° m., 518 (i).
Business of the Session (remarks) 691 (i).
Butternut Ridge, N.B., Postmaster (Ans.) 1075 (ii).
Cab-hire, in Com. of Sup., 881 (ii).
Cabinet representation for B.C. (Ans.) 369 (ii).
C. P. R. bonds, application for (remarks) 704 (i).
——— tariffs (Ans.) 1076 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—*Continued.*
Can. Temp. Act, legislation respecting (Ans.) 912 (ii).
Canso and Port Hood steamship subventions, in Com. of Sup., 1372 (ii).
Cape Breton Island Ry. (B. 143) prop. Res., 1455, 1485; in Com., 1486; M. to conc. in Res. and 1°* of B., 1515 (ii).
Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1158 (ii).
Central Ont. Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. *White, Hastings*) in Com., 783 (i).
Claims of P.E.I., settlement of, in Com. of Sup., 1263 (ii).
Copyright, laws relating to, on M. (Mr. *Edgar*) for Sel. Com., 380, 382 (i).
Corinth Post Office (Ans.) 843 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt (seduction, &c.) B 20 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts. (objection) 1326 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals Prevention B. 11 (Mr. *Charlton*) names added to Sel. Com., 439 (ii).
Digby Pier, rebuilding of (Ans.) 31, 42 (i).
Disturbance in the N.W., confidential papers, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 368 (i).
——— duty of Govt. to bring down urther papers, on Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 498 (i).
——— report of operations and war claims (remarks) 1343 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act. Amt., on M. to introd. B., 877 (ii).
Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1269 (ii).
Dufferin Gate, Quebec, claims of H. J. Beemer (Ans) 1661 (ii).
Dunnville Dam and Bridge tolls (B. 139, 1°) 1378 (ii).
Easter, adjnmt. for (remarks) 718 (i); (M) 865 (ii).
Engineers' certificates, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 599 (i).
Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1156, 1752.
Fabre, Hector, Rep. from (Ans.) 1661 (ii).
Farm or Real Estate Banks, on M. (Mr. *Orton*) for Com. on Res., 432 (i).
Father Point deep-water pier (Ans) 633 (i).
Fishing Rights of Indians on Lakes Huron and Nipissing, Pets. &c., on M. for copies, 695 (i).
Flying column for N W., on M. for Cor., 635 (i).
Gov. Gen. and Staff's salaries, on M. for Stmnt., 795 (i).
——— travelling expenses, on M. for Ret., 792 (i).
Govt. Buildings, Quebec, water supply (Ans.) 844 (ii).
Govt. Business (M. to take in Thursdays) 512 (i); Wednesdays, 1014; M. to take in Saturday and Monday, 1592 (ii).
Graham, Mr., appointment of as Legal Agent at Halifax (Ans.) 1514 (ii).
Haldimand, issue of Writ (Ans.) 1144, 1171 (ii).
——— returning officer (Ans.) 1144 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup, 1261, 1264, 1266, 1269, 1754 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland (M.) appointing day for discussion, 1075 (ii).

Langevin, Hon Sir Hector—*Continued.*
Home Rule Res, imperfect dispatch to English press (remarks) 1381 (ii).
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1387 (ii).
Indemnity to Members, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Farrow*) (Amt.) to proceed to consdn. of Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt. for execution of Louis Riel, 121 (i).
Independence of Parlt. Act, breach of, on M. to ref. to Sel. Com. (Amt.) 1595 (ii).
Indian Administration of the N. W., on Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 730–733 (personal explanation) 745 (i).
Indian Lands, Letters Patent (B. 102, 1°) 2° m., 807; 2° and in Com., 808 (ii).
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1650 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1205 (ii).
Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, &c., B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) in Com., 908; M. to place consdn. of Sen. Amts. on Govt. Orders, 1592 (ii).
I. C. R., St. Charles branch, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 80, 1°*) 488; 2° m., 519; M. for Com., 712 (i).
Jemseg Creek, N.B., navigation (Ans.) 369 (i).
Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup., 1693 (ii).
Kaministiquia River, in Com. of Sup., 1157 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1164, 1745 (ii).
Lake Man. navigation (Ans.) 369 (i).
Lanoraie, construction of wharf at (Ans.) 1173 (ii).
Legal services in connection with Pub. Works, 1159 (ii).
Letters Patent for Indian Lands (B. 102, 1°) 692 (i).
London Infantry School, in Com. of Sup., 1753 (ii).
Lotbinière Mail Service (Ans.) 709 (i).
Macdonald, Sir John, illness of, letter from physician (read) 543 (i).
Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1754 (ii).
Metapedia to Paspebiac Ry. *See* "Baie des Chaleurs."
Montreal Armories, in Com. of Sup., 1162 (ii).
——— Board of Trade Acts Amt. B. 90 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 856 (ii).
Mounted Police, in Com of Sup., 1656, 1746; barracks, 1754 (ii).
Mount Middleton, N. B., Postmaster (Ans.) 1075 (ii).
Mud Creek Dams, raising of (Ans.) 1746 (ii).
Navigable Waters, construction of works (B. 130, 1°) 1075; 2° m, 1246 (ii).
Navigation in Man. waters (Ans.) 1217 (ii).
Nerepis Station, N. B., Postmaster (Ans.) 1075 (ii).
Northern Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Sen. Amts., 1605 (ii).
Northumberland Straits Ry. Tunnel Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com., 1466 (ii).
N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 982 (ii).
Oleomargarine, in Com. on B. 101, 1205 (ii).
Pensions, Rebellion of 1885, in Com. of Sup., 1154; (Ans.) 1198 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—*Continued.*
Peterborough Post Office site (Ans.) 843 (ii).
Photographs of Pub. Works, in Com. of Sup., 1160 (ii).
Pickering Post Office irregularities, on M. for copies of Reps., 60 (i).
Plante, Jean Baptiste, claim of, on M. for copies, 697 (i).
Port Arthur Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1157 (ii).
Port Rowan or Port Royal harbor of refuge, on M. for Ret., 65 (i).
Postmaster General's Deptl. Rep. (presented) 58 (i).
Post Office Act., 1875, Amt. (B. 77, 1°*) 437; 2° m., 519; M. to ref. back to Com., 710 (i).
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1547 (ii).
——— Savings Banks in Man. (Ans.) 62 (i).
Post Offices in Muskoka, &c., established, on M. for Ret., 43 (i).
——— in North Wellington (Ans.) 1173 (ii).
Prince Albert Colonisation Co., on M. (Mr. *Edgar*) for Sel. Com., 489 (i).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1554 (ii).
Printing of Parlt., on M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1197 (ii).
Private Bills, Reps. from Com. (Ms.) to extend time, 543 (i), 897 (ii).
Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 1697 (ii).
Public Accounts Com. meeting of (remarks) 1514 (ii).
Public Buildings, in Com of Sup., 1154, 1158, 1160, 1162, 1165, 1745.
Public Officials and outside employment, on M. for Ret., 383 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 31 (i).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1621 (ii).
Quebec Harbor improvements further Loan (B. 140) prop. Res., 1342; in Com., 1383; 1°* of B., 1385 (ii).
Queen's Birthday, prop. M. for adjnmt, 1431; (M.) 1455 (ii).
Red River improvements (Ans.) 1240 (ii).
Registered Letters, compensation for (Ans.) 1378 (ii).
Repairs, furniture, &c., public buildings, in Com of Sup., 1261 (ii).
Repentigny wharf expenditure (Ans.) 634 (i).
Representation of the N.W.T. in Parlt., joint Address agreed to, 1013 (ii).
——— (B. 115) prop. Res. (fees and expenses) 1143; conc. in, 1223. (ii).
——— English legislation (Ans.) 1514 (ii).
Return, incomplete, shareholders in Co.'s (remarks) 1168 (ii).
Returns, enquiries for (remarks) Indians of Ft. William reserve, 119 (i).
Rice, increased duty on (Ans.) 369 (i).
Rideau Hall, additions, alterations, repairs, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 797 (i).
——— contingencies, on M. for Ret., 794 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—*Continued.*
Rideau Hall, fuel and light, on M. for Ret., 795 (i).
——— gardening and grounds, amounts paid, on M. for Stmnt., 796 (i).
Rideau River floods (Ans.) 1076 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 73 (Amt.) previous Question, 77; (M.) to make Res. first Order of the day, 119; (Amt.) to proceed to consdn. of Res (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 121; Ms. to resume adjd. deb., 149, 186 (i).
——— Medical Commissioners, on M. for Cor., 844 (ii).
Rivière aux Lievres improvements (Ans.) 426 (i).
Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1270, 1745 (ii).
Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) on Order for Com., 494; in Com., 782 (i).
St. Andrews Rapids, improvements (Ans.) 495 (i).
St. Lawrence River Navigation B. 46 (Mr. *Langelier*) on M. to introd., 119 (i).
St. Lawrence River overflow (Ans.) 865 (ii).
St. Maurice, Faucher de, on Parliamentary Procedure, in Com. of Sup., 1740 (ii).
St. Patrick's Day (M. for adjnmt.) 185 (i).
St. Peter's Harbor, P.E.I. (Ans.) 1514 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1162 (ii).
Sanitary Commission, &c., Reps., &c., on M. for copies, 693 (i).
Select Standing Coms., on M. to add names, 36; (Amt.) to Amt., 37 (i).
Settlers in Saugeen Peninsula, on M. for Com of Sup, 1539 (ii).
Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1270 (ii).
Speeches in Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) limiting, 791 (i).
Squaw Island, fishing privileges, &c. (Ans.) 784 (i).
Strathlorne, N.S., Postmaster, dismissal of, on M. for Cor., 59 (i).
Subsidies (land) to Rys. B 147 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 3°, 1714 (ii).
——— (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) prop. Res., 1551; in Com. on B., 1704 (ii).
——— to Rys. (Ans.) 68; (remarks) 1514 (ii).
Sultan, steam-tug, award of Dom. Arbitrators on M. for copy, 904 (ii).
Summary Proceedings before Justices, &c., B. 84 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 807 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Charges of Management (remarks on going into Com. 519; (Asst. Financial Inspector) 520 (i).
Civil Govt. (Indian Affairs, Dept. of) 688; (Post Office Dept.) 690 (i), 883 (ii); (Privy Council Office) 522 (i), 842, 1697 (ii); (Public Works, Dept. of) 691 (i), (contingencies) 881 (ii); (Rys. and Canals, Dept. of) 691 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office, Mail Service, salaries, &c.) 1547 (ii).
Immigration (general vote) 1387 (ii).
Indians (B. C.) 1652; (grant to suppl. fund) 1 N.W.T.) 1653; (N.B.) 1651; (N.S.) 1651 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Justice, Administration of, 1698 (ii).
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Faucher de St. Maurice on Parliamentary Procedure) 1740 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1656, 1746 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Canso and Port Hood) 1372 (ii).
Pensions (Rebellion of 1885) 1154 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Kingston Penitentiary) 1745; (Ottawa) 1154. Cape Tormentine Harbor, 1158; Esquimalt Graving Dock, 1156, 1752; Port Arthur and Kaministiquia River, 1157; Roads and Bridges, 1270, 1745; Repairs, &c., 1745 (ii). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 1166; (Ont.) 1163, 1745, 1753; (Que.) 1162, 1753; (Man.) 1165, 1745; (N.B.) 1162; (N.W.T.) 1166, 1745; (N.S.) 1158; (P.E.I.) 1160. Dredging, 1269. Harbors and Rivers (B.C.) 1269; (Man.) 1269, 1754; (Mar. Provs. generally) 1264; (N.B.) 1263; (N.S.) 1261, 1755; (N.W.T.) 1269, 1754; (Ont.) 1266, 1755; (P.E.I.) 1262; (Que.) 1264, 1755. Repairs, furniture, &c. (Public Buildings) 1261. Slides and Booms, 1270. Telegraphs, 1755 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (St. Charles Branch) 1452 (ii).
Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 1755 (ii).
Thompson, Mr., M.P., decease of (remarks) 802 (i).
Timber Island, Lake Ont., sale of (Ans.) 784 (i).
Timber Sales on Georgian Bay Islands (Ans.) 898 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, on enquiry for Ret. (remarks) 1343 (ii).
Union Suspension Bridge (B. 72, 1°*) 393; 2° m., 518 (i).
War Claims Commission, N.W.T., Rep. (Ans.) 1421 (ii).
Wharf at Selkirk (Ans.) 495 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W., *East Quebec.*
Administration of the N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt to Com. of Sup., 1735 (ii).
Amnesty, general, in the N.W.T (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1257 (ii).
Batoche, papers found at, diary of Riel, minute book, &c., of insurgent Council (M. for copies*) 58 (i).
C. P. R. and North Shore Ry. correspondence (M. for copies) 60 (i).
Disturbance in the N.W., Amnesty, general (prop. Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1257 (ii).
——— Her Majesty *vs.* parties tried in connection with Rebellion, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 60 (i).
——— Scrip to Half-breeds who took part in Rebellion (Ques.) 1075 (ii).
Half-breed Claims (remarks) on presentation of Stmnt., 746 (i).
——— enumeration of, Rep. of Commission (M. for copies*) 58 (i).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1265 (ii).
Indemnity to Members, on Res. (Mr. *Farrow*) and Mr. Blake's Ques. of Order, 124 (i).
Indian Title, extinguishment of in N.W.T. (Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 809–818; neg. (Y. 64, N. 106) 841 (ii).
New Glasgow to Montcalm Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1614 (ii).
Prince Albert Colonisation Co., suggestion to add members to Select Com. and precedents, 491 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Privilege, Ques. of (personal explanation) *re* alleged omission from Official Reps., 186 (i).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 174–185 (i).
——— Petitions for commutation of Sentence (Ques.) 35; (M. for copies*) 58 (i).
——— Sir Alex. Campbell's Memo., cost of publishing (Ques.) 66; amounts paid newspapers (Ques.) 67 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1692 (ii).
Senate, constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1291 (ii).
Short Line Ry., Montreal, St. John and Halifax Subsidy (M. for copies of O. C., &c.) 65 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1614 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 1692 (ii).
Public Works Income: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1265 (ii).
Treston, Jas. and others, receipt of Pet. (Ques.) 785 (i).

Lesage, Mr. C. A., *Dorchester.*
I. C. R., Reservoir, &c., at Lévis (Ques.) 1378 (ii).
Piton, Septimus and Arless Septimus (Ques.) 544 (i).
Quebec and Lévis Ferry service (Ques.) 121 (i).
Smith, R., of Quebec, Wood purchases from (Ques.) 544 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F., *West Lambton.*
British American Bank Note Printing Co., charges against (Ques.) 62 (i).
Cape Breton Island Ry. B. 146 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) remarks and Cor. read on intrdn. of B., 1637 (ii).
Dominion Ry. Act. Amt. B. *re* compensation (Ques.) 426 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1468, 1668, 1670 (ii).
Franchise Act, instructions to Revising Officers, on M. for copies, 52 (i).
Grape Vines imported under valuation (Ques.) 370 (i).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1268 (ii).
Harbor Master of Sarnia (Ques.) 692 (i).
Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 648 (i).
Maritime Court of Ont. Jurisdiction B. 5 (Mr. *Allen*) in Com., 561 (i).
Moody, John, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 1379 (ii).
Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Sen. Amts. 1609; on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1682 (ii).
N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 993 (ii).
Point Pelee Naval Reserve (Ques.) 120 (i).
Rideau Hall, contingencies, on M. for Ret., 795 (i).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 367 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*
St. Catharines Milling Co. law costs, in Com of Sup., 1758 (ii).
St. Maurice, Faucher de, on Parliamentary Procedure, in Com. of Sup., 1741 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1087 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. to introd., 1637 (ii).
Summary Proceedings before Justices, &c., B. 84 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 806 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Faucher de St. Maurice on Parliamentary Procedure) 1741 (ii).
Miscellaneous (St. Catharines Milling Co. law costs) 1768 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1268 (ii)
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1059-1062 (ii).
Windsor, Ont., Harbor Master at (Ques.) 785 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., *King's, P. E. I.*
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1477 (ii).
Navigable Waters, works in, B. 130 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1271 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (P.E.I.) 1161. Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1262 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A., *Carleton, Ont.*
Adams, David J., schooner, seizure of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1255 (ii).
Address, on the, 1, 30; M. for Com. to draft, 30 (i).
Administration of Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1°*) 1 (i).
Albert Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1627 (ii).
Amnesty, general in the N. W. T., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1258 (ii).
Baker, I. G. & Co.'s contract (Ans.) 1076 (ii).
Boundaries of Ont., legislation respecting (Ans.) 59 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1617 (ii).
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com., 1201; on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for 3°, 1347; on Amt. (Mr. *Trow*) 1358; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1361 (ii).
——— and North Shore Ry. correspondence, on M. for copies, 60 (i).
——— bonds, release of (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com., 1019 (ii).
Cape Breton Island Ry. B. 143 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 1496 (ii).
Caraquet Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1604 (ii).
Catholics and Politics, on objection (Mr. *Mills*) to Ques. (Ans.) 1380 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1231 (ii).
Chippewa Indians, Pets. from (Ans.) 1659 (ii).
Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries, in Com. of Sup., 1757 (ii).
Cook, Mr. H., Timber Dues (Ans.) 1380; on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 1420 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—*Continued.*
Criminal Law Amt. (law of evidence) B. 141 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1465 (ii).
Disturbance in the N. W., Amnesty, general (Ans.) 61 (i); on prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1258 (ii).
——— Indians who took part in Rebellion (Ans.) 1075 (ii).
——— Rets. respecting (remarks) 34 (i).
Dom. Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 1080 (ii).
Fire-arms in N.W.T. (Ans.) 1076 (ii).
Fishing by Foreign Vessels in Can. Waters B. 136 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1423 (ii).
Flour Supply to N. W. Indians (Ans.) 43 (i).
Franchise Act Amts. (Ans.) 61 (i).
——— instructions to Revising Officers, on M. for copies, 47 (i).
Fredericton to Prince William Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1624 (ii).
French Canadians, appeals against (Ans.) 1378 (ii).
French Canadian representation for Ont. in Senate (Ans.) 1633 (ii).
Gananoque, Perth and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1624 (ii).
German representation in Senate (Ans.) 1661 (ii).
Glenannan to Wingham Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1615 (ii).
Gaol and Lunatic Asylum at Regina, in Com. of Sup., 1747 (ii).
Graham, Mr. W., appointment as legal agent at Halifax (Ans.) 1633 (ii).
Haldimand, appointment of returning officer (Ans.) 1172 (ii).
——— Writ for (Ans.) 1015, 1077 (ii).
Hereford to International Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1614 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1024; on Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) 1136; on Amt. (Mr. *Coughlin*) 1138; (Amt.) 1139 (ii).
——— dispatch of Res. (remarks) 1178; (Ans.) 1380 (ii).
Imperial Federation (remarks on M. for adjnmt) 34 (i).
Independence of Parlt. Act, breach of, on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1594 (ii).
Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 37 (i).
I. C. R., McCann Station to Joggins Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1615 (ii).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 60 (i).
Lacombe, Father, payment to, on conc., 1774 (ii).
Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1610 (ii).
Lands, Timber and Mineral, in northern Quebec (Ans.) 1173 (ii).
L'Assomption to L'Epiphanie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1615 (ii).
Letters Patent for Indian Lands (B. 102, 1°) 692 (i).
Logs, conc. in Ways and Means, 1725 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—*Continued.*
Mississagua Indians, amount due (Ans.) 1633 (ii).
Montreal and Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1616 (ii).
Mounted Police barracks, in Com. of Sup., 1754 (ii).
Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1627 (ii).
Newcastle to Douglastown Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1625 (ii).
New Glasgow to Montcalm Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1614 (ii).
Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 1324; on Amt. to M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., notice given to trans. to Govt. Orders, 1610; (M.) 1662 (ii).
N.W. Central Ry. deposit by Co. (Ans.) 1747 (ii).
Northern and Western Ry., N. B., Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1604 (ii).
N.W.T. Law Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) to M. for 3°, 1484 (ii).
O'Donoboe, Hon. Senator, Cabinet arrangements (Ans.) 59, 61 (i).
Orangeville and Clandeboye, outrages under Scott Act (Ans.) 1661 (ii).
Parry Sound Colonisation Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1614 (ii).
Perth Centre Station to Plaster Rock Island Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1624 (ii).
Police Vessels for protection of Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 1757 (ii).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1555 (ii).
Printing of Parlt. (M.) for Mess. to Sen. 37 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (personal explanation) report by Opposition press on Northern Ry. B., 1482 (ii).
——— repudiation of statements made in speech by member on Timber Limits, 1702 (ii).
Prorogation (remarks) in Ans. to Ques., 1703 (ii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1621 (ii).
Renfrew to Eganville Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1626 (ii).
Representation of the N. W. T. in Parlt. (B. 115, 1°) 866; 2° m., 1205; reply, 1209; M. for Com., 1213; in Com., 1213–1216, 1249–1254; 3° m., 1271 (ii).
Returns, on enquiries for (remarks) 65 (i).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Order being called for Res. (remarks) postponement, 62 (i).
——— Medical Commission (Ans.) 31 (i).
——— Rep. of Trial (remarks) 34 (i).
Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1755 (ii).
Roche, M., N.S., transfer of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com., 1177 (ii).
St. Andrews to Lachute Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1616 (ii).
St. Catharines Milling Co. law costs, in Com. of Sup., 1770 (ii).
St. Félix and Lake Maskinongé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1614 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—*Continued.*
Select Standing Coms. (M.) 2; M. for Sp. Com., to prepare lists, 30; Committees appointed and lists prepared (presented) 35; on M. to add names, 37 (i).
Senate, constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1275–1277 (ii).
Stewiacke Valley and Musquodoboit Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1624 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146° (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1604, 1610, 1624 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries) 1757; (Police vessels) 1757 (ii).
Indians (B C.) 1762; (Man. and N.W.T.) 1760; (Ont., Que. and Mar. Provs.) 1773 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Gaol and Lunatic Asylum at Regina) 1747; (Lacombe, Father, payment to) 1774; (St. Catharines Milling Co. law costs) 1770 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1753; (N.W.T.) 1754. Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1754. Roads and Bridges, 1755 (ii).
Ocean and River Service, 1771 (ii).
Thunder Bay Colonisation Ry. Co 's Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1613 (ii).
Truro to Newport Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1617 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1725 (ii).
Yamaska to River St. John Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1624 (ii).

Mackenzie, Hon. A., *East York.*
French Canadians, appeals against, objection taken to Ques. 1378 (ii).
N. W. T. Law Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1383 (ii).
Quebec Harbor Improvements further Loan B. 140 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1384 (ii).
Select Standing Com., on M. to add names, 37 (i)

Mackintosh, Mr. C. H., *Ottawa City.*
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 43, 1°*) 93; in Com., 613 (i).
Capital cases and the Crown (M. for Ret.*) 60 (i).
Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 646 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1411 (ii).
Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, &c., B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) in Com., 1179 (ii).
Ottawa Board of Trade incorp. Act Amt. (B. 83, 1°*) 511 (i).
Rideau Hall, additions, alterations, repairs, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 799 (i).
Rideau River Floods (Ques.) 1076 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry*, *Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 227-237 (i).
Roche, M., of N. S., transfer of, on M. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com., 1329, 1335 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (general vote) 1411 (ii).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1063–1066 (ii).

Macmaster, Mr. D., *Glengarry.*
Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 43 (Mr. *Mackintosh*) in Com., 557 (i).
Farm and Real Estate Banks, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Orton*) 584 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1480, 1668 (ii).
Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, &c., B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) in Com., 909 (ii).
Revised Statutes of Can. B. 9 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1228 (ii).

Macmillan, Mr. D., *East Middlesex.*
Continental Bank of Can. (B. 60, 1°*) 226; in Com., 473 (i).
Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1093 (ii).
Ingersoll, London and Chatham Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1600 (ii).
Insolvent Debtors Assets, distribution, provision (B. 93, 1°*) 599 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com on Res., 1600 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dom. Exhibition) 1093 (ii).
Tecumseh Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 26, 1°*) 67 (i).
West Ontario, Pacific Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 27, 1°*) 67 (i).

McCallum, Mr. L., *Monck.*
Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 43 (Mr. *Mackintosh*) in Com., 559 (i).
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 964 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1502 (ii).
Independence of Parlt., on charges made against members, 1582 (ii).
Maritime Court of Ont. Jurisdiction B. 5 (Mr. *Allen*) in Com., 561, 567, 569 (i).
Medicine Hat, Dunmore and Benton Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 16, 1°*) 48 (i).
Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 948 (ii).
N.W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 1002 (ii).
Rideau Hall, contingencies, on M. for Ret., 794 (i).
Roche, M., N.S., transfer of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com., 1176 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1086 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 861; in Com., 865 (ii).
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amts. Bs. 92, 99 and 118, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) to place on Govt. Orders, 1220 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. D.—*Continued.*
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1358, 1367; neg. (Y. 37, N. 120) 1369 (ii).
——— confirmation of Agreement, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *McLelan*) 943–945 (ii).
Carriers by Land (B. 7, 1°) 33; 2° m., 707 (i).
Consolid. Ry. Act Amt. (B. 8, 1°) 38; in Com., 858 (ii).
Court of Ry. Commissioners (B. 6, 1°) 37; 2° m., 535, 597; Order dschgd. and B. wthdn., 599 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. (seduction, &c.) B. 20 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1327 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act, 1874, Amt. (B. 29, 1°) 67; 2° neg. (Y. 42, N. 89) 1186 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1469, 1499, 1503, 1509, 1665, 1670 (ii).
High Court of Justice, Ont., Judge's salary, in Com. on Res., 973 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) 1141 (ii).
Maritime Court of Ont. Jurisdiction B. 5 (Mr. *Allen*) in Com, 563 (i).
Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 25, 1°*) 66 (i); M. for Com., 1311; (remarks) 1314; in Com., 1318; 3° m., 1325; M. to consdr. Sen. Amts., 1605; M. for conc., 1610; on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1679 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Globe* respecting connection with Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co., 1310 (ii).
Ry. Act, Consolid., 1879, Act Amt. (B. 8, 1°) 38 (i).
Stather, R., papers, *re* application for discharge, on M. for copies, 376 (i).
Summary Proceedings before Magistrates B. 84 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 716 (i).

McCraney, Mr. W., *Halton.*
Cab-hire and Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 884, 878 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 752 (i).
Gov. Gen. and Staff's Salaries (M. for Stmnt.) 795 (i).
——— travelling expenses (M. for Ret.) 792 (i).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1268 (ii).
Life-boat service and rewards, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1373 (ii).
Logs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1591 (ii).
Miall's pamphlet against Can. Temp. Act (Ques.) 121 (i); in Com. of Sup., 881 (ii).
Militia, Dept. of, contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 878 (ii).
Orangeville and Clandeboye, outrages under Scott Act (Ques.) 1661 (ii).
Rideau Hall, additions, alterations, repairs, &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 797 (i).
——— contingencies (M. for Ret.) 794 (i).
——— cost of, since Confederation (M. for Stmnt.) 801 (i).
——— fuel and light for (M. for Ret.) 795 (i).
——— gardening and grounds, amounts paid (M. for Stmnt.) 796 (i).

McCraney, Mr. W.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt. (Gov. Genl.'s Sec.'s Office, contingencies) 869; (Inland Revenue, contingencies) 881; (Militia, Dept. of) 878; (Post Office, Dept. of, contingencies) 884 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Rewards and Life-boat service) 1373 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1268 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 752 (i), 1591 (ii).

McDougald, Mr. J., *Pictou.*

I. C. R., Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 611 (i).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton.*

Coal interest in N. S. (M. for Stmnt.) 544 (i).

Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1160 (ii).

Roche, M., N.S., transfer of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com., 1175 (ii).

Subsidy to N.S., readjustment, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) to M. for Ret., 455 (i).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 1708 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1160 (ii).

Western Counties Ry., in Com. on B. 146, 1708 (ii).

McIntyre, Mr. P. A., *King's, P.E.I.*

Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1262 (ii).

Northern Light and winter communication with P.E.I., on M. for Cor., 845 (ii).

P.E.I. and Terms of Union, despatches, &c., respecting (M. for copies*) 802 (i).

Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1161 (ii).

St. Peter's Harbor, P.E.I. (Ques.) 1514 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (P.E.I.) 1161; Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1262 (ii).

Terms of Union with P.E.I. (Ques.) 692 (i).

McLelan, Hon. A. W., *Colchester.*

Advances to P.E.I. (Ans.) 1378 (ii).

Almonds, conc. in Ways and Means, 748 (i).

Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 31 (i).

Baking powder, conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i); in Com., 1584 (ii).

Barbed wire-fencing, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).

Bonds, counterfeit, Govt. (Ans.) 121 (i).

Bolts and nuts, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1584 (ii).

Bounty on Pig Iron (B. 150) prop. Res., 1661; M. for Com. on Res., 1714; in Com., 1715; Res. conc. in, and 1°*, 2°*, 3°* of B., 1746 (ii).

B.C. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).

BUDGET, the (Annual Statement) 393-412 (i).

Butter, Substitutes for (B. 149) 1°*, 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1728 (ii).

Can. and Germany Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1756 (ii).

McLelan, Hon. A. W.—*Continued.*

Can. Temp. Act, in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).

——— return of fines collected (Ans.) 1172 (ii).

C. P. R. Act Amt. (B. 131) in Com., 1200; 3° m., 1343; on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) 1352 (ii).

——— agreement, confirmation of (prop. Res.) 662 (i); M. for Com. on Res., 930; in Com. 941-945 (ii).

——— bonds held by Govt. (Ans.) 495 (i).

——— bonds, release of, prop. Res., 913, M. for Com., 1017; M to conc. in Res., 1078; in Com., 1018 (ii).

——— expenditure in B. C., in Com. of Sup., 1449, 1744 (ii).

——— Port Arthur to Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1449, 1693 (ii).

——— salaries, &c., of staff, in Com. of Sup., 1450 (ii).

——— subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1448 (ii).

Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

Cape Race Lighthouse Transfer B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 672 (i).

Carriage hardware, conc. in Ways and Means, 1719 (ii).

Cement, Portland and Roman, conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).

Cobourg, town of, relief (B. 122) prop. Res., 866; M. for Com., 957; 1°* of B., 958; 2° and in Com., 1141 (ii).

Cocoanut dessicated, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1584 (ii).

Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries, in Com. of Sup., 1758 (ii).

Cologne water, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).

Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1659 (ii).

——— Treaties, negotiations (Ans.) 844 (ii).

Consolidated Fund (Ans.) 1076 (ii).

Cordage, manila and sisal, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1584 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).

Cotton Fabrics, printed or dyed, conc. in Ways and Means, 769 (i).

Cotton wire, conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).

Crow, L. S., payment for services, in Com. of Sup., 1763 (ii).

Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1544 (ii).

Currants, dates, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 750 (i).

Customs Act Amt. (B. 148) 1°, 2° and 3°*, 1728 (ii).

Debt, public, net, gross and floating (Ans.) 31, 42, 59, 495 (i), 1076 (ii).

Debts of Ont. and Quebec (Ans.) 974 (ii).

Deposits in Govt. and P.O. Savings Banks (Ans.) 495, 634 (i), 1218 (ii).

Disturbance in the N.W., claims paid (Ans.) 42 (i).

Dom. $2 notes, counterfeit (Ans.) 865 (ii).

Earthenware, conc. in Ways and Means, 1719 (ii).

Estimates, The, for 1886-87, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 368 (i); 1885-86, 1550; suppl. for 1887, 1633 (ii).

Farm and Real Estate Banks, on M. (Mr. *Orton*) for Com. on Res., 431; in Com., 572 (i).

McLelan, Hon. A. W.—*Continued.*

Fancy Goods, conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i).
Feathers, Ostrich and Vulture, conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i).
Felt, conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).
Fisheries protection and Marine Police regulations issued, on M. for copies, 459 (i).
Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for Cor., 701 (i).
Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1435 (ii).
Foresters' deposits in Govt. Banks (Ans.) 1095 (ii).
Franchise Act, expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1698, 1747 (ii).
Fruit, dried, conc. in Ways and Means, 750; green, 751, 754 (i).
Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1543 (ii).
Gimps, cord, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 755 (i).
Gloves, Mitts, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).
Grease, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 780 (i).
Grenville Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
Hair cloth, conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).
Handkerchiefs, conc. in Ways and Means, 1722 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1268 (ii).
Hudson Bay Expedition, in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 657 (i).
Inch Arran Hotel, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1536 (ii).
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1651, 1745 (ii).
Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, &c., B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) in Com., 908 (ii).
I.C.R., McCann Station to Joggins Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1615 (ii).
——— miscellaneous works, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).
——— repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1659 (ii).
——— St. Charles Branch, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).
——— Stellarton and Pictou Branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 627 (i); in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup., 1698 (ii).
Laces, braid, fringes, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 757 (i).
Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
Land Improvement Fund, amount due Ont. (Ans.) 267 (i).
Laundry blueing, conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i).
Lead pipes and shot, conc. in Ways and Means, 757 (i).
Logs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1587; conc., 1725 (ii).
Lumber and saw logs, free export (Ans.) 634 (i).
Man. Claims Settlement (B. 123) prop. Res., 866; M. for Com. and in Com., 959; 1°* of B., 960; 2° m., 1145; 3° m., 1199 (ii).
Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
Mutual Life Association of Can. (Ans.) 1173, 1379 (ii).
Nail plate, iron or steel, conc. in Ways and Means, 1722 (ii).

McLelan, Hon. A. W.—*Continued.*

Northern Light and winter communication with P.E.I., on M. for Cor., 856 (ii).
N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act. Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 990 (ii).
Oil cloth, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1587; conc., 1719 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 758; on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) 765 (i).
Paper hangings, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 1720 (ii).
Pipes, gas and water, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 755 (i).
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1549 (ii).
Printing of Parlt., on M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1196; (Amt.) to refer back to Com., 1309 (ii).
Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 1697 (ii).
Public Accounts (presented) 31 (i).
Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
Quebec Harbor Commissioners further Loan (B. 140) prop. Res., 1342 (ii).
Returns, on enquiries for (remarks) 65 (i).
Roche, M., N.S., transfer of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com., 1178 (ii).
Rubber belting, conc. in Ways and Means, 1719 (ii).
Savings Banks, Govt. deposits in (Ans.) 495, 634 (i), 1218 (ii).
Scatterie Fog-whistle Superintendent, on M. for Cor., 787 (i).
Scythes, conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).
Spirits and strong waters, conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).
Stereotypes and electrotypes, conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).
Stellarton branch Ry. *See* "I. C. R."
Stove bolts and nuts, conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).
Straw board, conc. in Ways and Means, 1719 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1615; on M. to introd. B., 1636, 1639 (ii).
Substitutes for Butter. *See* "Oleomargarine" and "Butter."
Sugars, conc. in Ways and Means, 773 (i), 1724; in Com., 1587 (ii).
Superannuation, Civil Service, on M. for Ret., 1181, 1184 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 1452; (Grenville) 1453; (Lachine) 1452; (Murray) 1453; (Tay Canal) 1453; (Welland) 1453; (Williamsburg) 1452 (ii).
Charges of Management (remarks on order of Business) 519 (Asst. Financial Inspector) 520; (Auditor and Receiver-General, Halifax, Victoria and Winnipeg) 521 (i), conc. 1773 (i).
Civil Govt. (Auditor Gen.'s office) 689; (Finance, Dept. of, and Treasury Board) 689; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 522 (i); (Privy Council) 1697. Contingencies (Depts. generally) 886; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 868; (Privy Council Office) 870; (Finance, Dept. of) 881; (Post Office, Dept. of) 883 (ii).

McLelan, Hon. A. W.—*Continued*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Collection of Revenues (Cullers' salaries, &c.) 1544; (Customs, Polariscopic test) 1763. Rys. (I.C.R., repairs, &c.) 1659; (Post Office Mail Service, salaries, &c.) 1549 (ii).

Fisheries (Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries) 1758 (ii).

Geological Survey, 1543 (ii).

Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 1653, 1745; (N.B) 1651 (ii).

Justice, Administration of, 1698 (ii).

Legislation: Miscellaneous (Franchise Act, expenses under) 1698, 1747 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (Canada and Germany) 1756 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Can. Temp. Act) 1658; (Commercial Agencies) 1659, conc., 1773; (Forged Bond, payment for) 1763; (Hudson's Bay Expedition) 1658; (L. S. Crow, for services) 1763; (printing) 1763 (ii).

Ocean and River Service, 1771 (ii).

Penitentiaries (B.C.) 896 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 1166. Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1755; (Ont.) 1268 (ii).

Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (expenditure in B. C.) 1449, 1744; (Port Arthur to Red River) 1449, 1693; (salaries, &c., of staff) 1450; (subsidy) 1448. I. C. R. (miscellaneous works) 1451; (St. Charles branch) 1451; (Stellarton branch) 1452 (ii).

Supply (B. 145) Res. from Com. of Ways and Means, conc. in, and 1°*, 2°* and 3°* of B., 1775 (ii).

Syrups, cane-juice, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 779 (i).

Tay Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

Telegraphing and Extra Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 881 (ii).

Temporary Loans by Govt., on M. for Ret., 56 (i).

Truro to Newport Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1619 (ii).

Tubing, wrought-iron, conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).

Welland Canal, in Com of Sup., 1453 (ii).

West Indies, Trade Relations with (Ans.) 785 (i).

Western Counties Ry. (remarks) on intrdn. of B. 146, 1639 (ii).

Whips, conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).

Williamsburg Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).

Wire, iron or steel, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).

Yeast cakes, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 748 (i), 1583, 1719 (ii).

TARIFF CHANGES: (almonds) 748; (baking powder) 749 (i); 1584 (ii); (blueing) 749 (i); (bolts, nuts, &c.) 1584; (carriage hardware) 1719 (ii); (cement) 772 (i); (cocoanut, dessicated) 1584; (cologne) 770; (cotton) 769 (i); (cotton wire) 1721; (earthenware) 1719; (felt) 1721 (ii); (fancy goods) 749; (feathers) 749; (fruit, dried) 750; (fruit, green) 751; (gas pipes, iron) 755; (Geneva gin) 770; (gimps, &c.) 755; (gloves) 756; (grease) 780; (hair cloth) 756 (i); (handkerchiefs) 1722 (ii); (laces, braids, &c.) 757; (lead) 757 (i); (logs) 1587, 1725; (manila cordage, sisal) 1584; (nail plate, iron or steel) 1722 (ii); (oleomargarine) 758 (i); (paper hanging, &c.) 1720 (ii); (peaches) 755 (i); (rubber belting) 1719; (scythes) 1721; (stereotypes and electrotypes) 1721; (stove bolts and nuts) 1721; (straw board) 1719 (ii); (sugar) 773 (i), 1724 (ii); (syrups) 779; (tubing) 770; (union collar cloth paper) 1720 (ii); (wire) 770; (wire fencing) 772; (yeast) 772 (i).

Union collar cloth paper, conc. in Ways and Means, 1720 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*

Barker, P.M., amounts paid to (M. for Ret.*) 658 (i).

Cab-hire, in Com. of Sup., 871 (ii).

Can. Temp. Act, convictions under (M. for Ret.*) 912

Currants, dates, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).

Disturbance in the N.W., Services of Members of Parliament and Senators in connection with, amounts paid (M. for Ret.*) 392 (i).

Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup. 1092 (ii).

——— Lands, in Com. of Sup. 529, 538 (i), 1550 (ii).

——— Notes in circulation and gold held by Govt. (M. for Ret.*) 438 (i).

Durham to Georgian Bay Ry. (remarks) on M. that Com. rise, 1628 (ii).

Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 966 (ii).

Farm or Real Estate Banks, on M. (Mr. *Orton*) for Com. on Res., 431; in Com., 582 (i).

Fisheries, salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1542 (ii).

Fog-whistles, maintenance, in Com. of Sup., 1375 (ii).

Franchise Act Amts. (Ques.) 61 (i).

——— instructions to Revising Officers, on M. for copies (explanation) 55 (i).

——— expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1747 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1506, 1510, 1666, 1669, 1672 (ii).

Fruit, dried, conc. in Ways and Means, 750; green, 754 (i).

Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1650 (ii).

Gloves, Mitts, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) Amt. to Amt., 1104, 1108; neg. (Y. 60, N. 118) 1135 (ii).

Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 642 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 1385, 1392 (ii).

Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1653 (ii).

Interest on money secured by mortgage (B. 12, 1°) 41; 2° m., 439 (i).

I. C. R., Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 609, 616 (i).

Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup, 1698 (ii).

Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1164 (ii).

Legal services in connection with Pub. Works, in Com. of Sup., 1160 (ii).

Mortgages on Real Estate Act Amt. (B. 12, 1°) 41 (i).

Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).

Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 955 (ii).

Newspapers and Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 877, 879 (ii).

Northern and Pacific Junction Ry Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 1319; on Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1677 (ii).

Oleomargarine, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) respecting legislation, 552; on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 762 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Pipes, gas and water, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).

Post Offices in North Wellington (Ques.) 1173 (ii).

Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1555 (ii).

Printing, on M. to refer item to Public Accts. Com., 460 (i).

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1160, 1163 (ii).

Rideau Hall, contingencies, on M. for Ret., 795 (i).

Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 367 (i).

Returns, enquiry for, 570 (i).

Savings Banks and P. O. Savings Banks amount held by Govt. (M. for Ret.*) 438 (i).

Scott Act Enforcement (Ques.) 438 (i).

Sec. of State, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 1697 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1628 (ii).

Summary Proceedings before Magistrates B. 84 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 718 (i).

Superannuation, M. for Ret., 905; deb. rsmd., 1180; reply, 1183 (ii).

——— names, date, and amounts paid under list (M. for Ret.*) 58 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dom. Exhibition) 1092 (ii).

Charges of Management (Auditor and Rec. Genl., Winnipeg) 521 (i).

Civil Govt. (Finance, Dept. of, contingencies) 881; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, contingencies) 869 (ii); (Interior, Dept. of) 524; (Justice, Dept. of) 523 (i); (Militia, Dept. of, contingencies) 877, 879; (Post Office, contingencies) 885; (Privy Council Office, contingencies) 871; (Public Works, contingencies) 882 (ii); (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 524 (i), 1697 (ii).

Collection of Revenues (Dom. Lands) 1550; (Weights and Measures and Gas, salaries, &c.) 1545 (ii).

Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 1542 (ii).

Geological Survey, 1650 (ii).

Immigration (general vote) 1385 (ii).

Indians (Man. and N. W.) 1653 (ii).

Justice, Administration of, 1698 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (salaries) 1089. Miscellaneous (Franchise Act, expenses under) 1747 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Fog-whistles, &c., maintenance) 1375 (ii).

Mounted Police, 1656 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 1160; (Ont.) 1163: Telegraphing, 881 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 872, 885 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on 1° of Res., 484; on conc., 750, 754, 756, 762 (i).

Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 109 (Mr. *Costigan*) on prop. Res. and in Com, 747 (i).

Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1545 (ii).

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce.*

Animals, Contagious Diseases B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 864 (ii).

Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 585 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A.—*Continued.*

Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 963 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1501, 1505 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) to Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1114; on Amt. (Mr. *Coughlin*) 1137 (i).

Land Grants to Militia Force B. 142 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res., 1457; on M. for 2°, 1571 (ii).

Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 953 (ii).

Oleomargarine, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 767 (i).

Roche, M., N.S., transfer of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com., 1177 (ii).

Senate, constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1284 (ii).

Settlers in Saugeen Peninsula, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1538 (ii).

Sugars, conc. in Ways and Means, 776, 778 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 773, 776, 778 (ii).

Massue Mr. L. H., *Richelieu.*

Life-saving apparatus, &c. (Ques.) 783 (i).

Richelieu County, sale of Govt. properties in (Ques.) 185 (i).

Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 341 (i).

St. Gabriel Levee and Ry. Co.'s B. 116 (Mr. *Curran*) in Com., 1153 (ii).

School Savings Bank incorp. (B. 75, 1°*) 426 (i).

Mills, Hon. D., *Bothwell.*

Adams, David J., schooner, seizure of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1257 (ii).

Administration of the N.W.T. (Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1729; neg. (Y. 51, N. 71) 1740 (ii).

Boundaries of Ont., legislation respecting (Ques.) 59; (M. for Cor.*) 66 (i).

Bounty on Pig Iron B. 150 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1718 (ii).

B. C. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 43 (Mr. *Mackintosh*) in Com., 613 (i).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amts. Bs. 92, 99 and 118, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) to place on Govt. Orders, 1219 (ii).

C.P.R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for 3°, 1348; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1362 (ii).

——— bonds, release of, Res. (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com., 1021 (ii).

Cape Breton Island Ry. B. 143 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on Res, 1485; in Com., 1486, 1495, (ii).

Cape Race Lighthouse Transfer B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 672 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*

Catholics and Politics, Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) objected to, 1379 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1230 (ii).

Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries, in Com. of Sup., 1757 (ii).

Commission to Public Officers B. 110 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 2°, 958; in Com., 958 (ii).

Copyright, laws relating to, on M. (Mr. *Edgar*) for Sel. Com., 381 (i).

Criminal Law Amt. (law of evidence) B. 141 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1464; (objection) 1465 (ii).

Dominion Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 917, 925, 928, 1079, 1083, 1085 (ii).

Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 962; in Com. on B., 1146, 1150 (ii).

Farm or Real Estate Banks, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Orton*) 432, 435, 572 (i).

Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1436, 1443 (ii).

Franchise Act, 1885, Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. to introd., 1342; in Com., 1467, 1505, 1509, 1665, 1672; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1672; neg. (Y. 54, N. 92) 1673 (ii).

——— expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1699 (ii).

——— instructions to Revising Officers, on M. for copies, 55 (i).

——— working of Act, on presentation of Cor. (remarks) 1482 (ii).

Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 753 (i).

Graham, Mr. W., appointment as Legal Agent at Halifax (Ques.) 1514, 1633 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) 1136; on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1339; (Amt.) 1140; neg. (Y. 19, N. 87) 1142 (ii).

Home Rule Resolution, imperfect dispatch to English press (remarks) 1381 (ii).

Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 614 (i).

Immigrants settled in Canada, number (Ques.) 61 (i).

Indian Lands, Letters Patent B. 102 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 808; in Com., 809 (ii).

Indian Title, extinguishment of, in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 836-839 (ii).

Indemnity to Members, on Res. (Mr. *Farrow*) and Mr. *Blake's* Ques. of Order, 123 (i).

Independence of Parlt., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1582 (ii).

Ingersoll, London and Chatham Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1598 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1204 (ii).

Interest in B. C., B. 22 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1243; in Com., 1245 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*

I. C. R., Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 604, 620; on M. for 3°, 665 (i).

Interpretation Act B. 80 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for 2°, 670; in Com., 712 (i).

Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup., 889, 891 (ii).

Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1610 (ii).

Land Grants to Ry. Co.'s B. 117 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 3°, 1016 (ii).

Lands in North and West Ont. (Ques.) 1172 (ii).

——— timber and mineral, in northern Que. (Ques.) 1173 (ii).

Library of Parlt., in Com. of Sup., 1153 (ii).

Logs, conc. in Ways and Means, 1728 (ii).

Maritime Court of Ont. Jurisdiction B. 5 (Mr. *Allen*) in Com., 565, 568 (i).

Militia, Dept. of, in Com of Sup., 878 (ii).

Moncton and Buctouche Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1597 (ii).

Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i).

Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 1°, 630; on M. for 2°, 947; in Com., 952, 956 (ii).

Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Ques. of Order, 1316; in Com., 1320 (ii).

Northumberland Straits Tunnel Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com., 1467 (ii).

N. W. T. Law Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1382, 1458; on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) to M. for 3°, 1483 (ii).

Oleomargarine, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) respecting legislation, 553; on Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 758 (i); in Com. on B. 101, 1204 (ii).

Pipes, gas and water, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).

Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 2°, 1531; in Com., 1552; 1554, on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1567 (ii).

Printing of Parlt., on M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 1309 (ii).

Printing pamphlets, immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1393 (ii).

Public Lands of B.C., B. 120 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 3°, 1223 (ii).

Queen's Counsel appointments (M. for Cor.) 392 (i).

Real property in the N.W.T. B. 10 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. to introd., 41 (i); in Com., 1516 (ii).

Representation of the N.W.T. in Parlt. B. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1210; on M. for Com., 1212; in Com., 1213-1216, 1249; on M. for 3° (Amts.) 1271 (ii).

Returns, expense in producing, on M. for Ret., 389 (i).

Revised Statutes of Can. B. 9 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1227 (ii).

Mills, Hon. D.—*Continued.*

Rideau Hall, additions, alterations, repairs, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 800 (i).

Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 291-300 (i).

Roche, M., N.S., transfer of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com., 1177 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice, 889 (ii).
Charges of Management (remarks on order of Business) 520 (i).
Civil Govt. (Militia, Dept. of, contingencies) 878 (ii).
Fisheries (Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries) 1757 (ii).
Immigration (printing pamphlets) 1393 (ii).
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Franchise Act, expenses under) 1699; (Library of Parlt.) 1153 (ii).
Miscellaneous (St. Catharines Milling Co. law costs) 1770 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1656 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 896 (ii).

St. Catharines Milling Co. law costs, in Com. of Sup., 1770 (ii).

Senate, constitution of (Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. 1272-1275; (explanation) 1286; neg. (Y. 57, N. 89) 1295 (ii).

Stather, R., papers, *re* application for discharge, on M. for copies, 375 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1089 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1597, 1610 (ii).

Summary Proceedings before Magistrates B. 84 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 715, 805 (i).

Supreme Court, extra reporter, in Com. of Sup., 891 (ii).

——— of Judicature for N.W.T., in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Thompson*) 1203 (ii).

Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1071 (ii).

Travis, Judge, in Com. of Sup., 889 (ii).

Treason-Felony Trials at Regina, &c. (M. for Cor., &c.) 696 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 753, 756, 758 (i), 1728 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Address, on the, 29 (i).

Adams, David J., schooner, seizure of (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1254 (ii).

Aspy Bay Fisheries dispute (Ques.) 1076 (ii).

Bounty on Pig Iron B. 150 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1718 (ii).

Business of House, on M. to take Thursdays, 512; (remarks) 691 (i).

Butter, Substitutes for, B. 149 (Mr. *McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1728 (ii).

Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act. Amt. B. 43 (Mr. *Mackintosh*) in Com., 556 (i).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Orton*) on Amt. (Mr. *Kranz*) to place on Govt. Orders, 1218 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—*Continued.*

C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for 3°, 1354; on Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1364, 1366, 1368 (ii).

——— expenditure in B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1744 (ii).

Cape Breton Island Ry. B. 143 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on Res. 1486 (ii).

Cape Race Lighthouse Transfer B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 673 (i).

Caraquet Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1605 (ii).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. B. 105 (Mr. *Pope*) on prop. Res., 674, 677; in Com., 681 (i); on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1381 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1229; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1240; neg. (Y. 60, N. 114) 1242 (ii).

Citadel, draining of, in Com. of Sup., 1743 (ii).

Cocoanut, dessicated, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1584 (ii).

Copyright, laws relating to, on M. (Mr. *Edgar*) for Sel. Com., 380 (i).

Disturbance in the N. W., duty of Govt. to bring down papers, on Amt. (Mr. *Hall*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 511 (i).

Dom. Elections Act, 1874, Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 1186 (ii).

——— Lands in B. C., Administration B. 120 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 1°, 912 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1498; on M. for 3°, 1673 (ii).

——— Act, expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1698 (ii).

——— working of Act, on presentation of Cor. (remarks) 1482 (ii).

Fisheries, Joint Commission respecting (M. for Ret.) 392 (i).

——— protection and Marine Police regulations, &c., issued (M. for copies) 456 (i).

——— regulations, violation of by Americans (M. for Ret.*) 392 (i).

Fish importations, on M. for Ret., 370 (i).

Fishing by Foreign Vessels in Can. Waters B. 136 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 1422; in Com., 1423 (ii).

Fishery negotiations, (Ques.) 120 (i).

Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1425; (reply) 1444; neg. (Y. 46, N. 119) 1447 (ii).

Govt. business, on M. to take Wednesdays (remarks) 1014 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) to Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1131; on Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) 1136; on Amt. (Mr. *Coughlin*) 1137; on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1139; (remarks) 1143 (ii).

Indemnity to Members, on Res. (Mr. *Farrow*) and Mr. Blake's Ques. of Order, 124 (i).

Indian Title, extinguishment of in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 840 (ii).

I. C. R., claims arising out of construction, in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—*Continued.*

Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and the N.W.T. B. 147 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res., 1631 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries, Rep. of Min. to Privy Council in 1869 (M. for copy) 391 (i).

Marine Police Force of Can. (M. for Ret.) 383, 386 (i).

Militia, contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 1744 (ii).

Miramichi Mail Subsidy, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 1756 (ii).

Moncton and Buctouche Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1597 (ii).

Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 948 (ii).

Navigable Waters, works in, B. 130 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1246; in Com., 1270 (ii).

Neguac, construction of wharf at (remarks) 1640; ref. to in Com. of Sup., 1754 (ii).

Newcastle to Douglastown Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1625 (ii).

Northern Light and winter communication with P.E.I., on M. for Cor., 854 (ii).

Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for Com., 1315; in Com., 1318; on Sen. Amts., 1608; on M. to trans. Sen. Amts. to Govt. Orders, 1664 (ii).

N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on M. for Com. (Amt.) 978; (personal explanation) 1000; on M. to adjn. deb., 1003; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 59 N. 86) 1011 (ii).

——— land Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1631 (ii).

——— deposit by Co. (Ques.) 1747 (ii).

N. W. T. Law Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) to M. for 3°, 1485 (ii).

Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1552; on Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) to M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1728 (ii).

Prorogation, closing remarks, 1775 (ii).

Public Lands in B. C., B. 120 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 1202 (ii).

Quebec Harbor Improvements further Loan B. (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1384 (ii).

Representation of N.W.T. in Parlt., on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to ref. Res. to Sel. Com., 868 (ii).

Return, enquiry for, Sec. 16, I.C.R. (remarks) 1635 (ii)

Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 366 (i).

St. Maurice, Faucher de, on Parliamentary Procedure in Com. of Sup., 1741 (ii).

Shuswap and Okanagan Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Homer*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1171 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1087 (ii).

Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 147 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 1710 (ii).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1597 (ii).

Sultan, steam-tug, award of Dom. Arbitrators (M. for copy) 904 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—*Continued.*

Superannuation, Civil Service, on M. for Ret., 1182, 1184 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Charges of Management (Asst. Financial Inspector) 520 (i).

Civil Government (Militia, contingencies) 1744 (ii).

Legislation: Miscellaneous (Faucher de St. Maurice on Parliamentary Procedure) 1741; (Franchise Act, expenses) suppl., 1698 (ii).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (N.B. and P.E.I. to G.B.) 1756 (ii).

Militia (draining Citadel) 1743 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1754 (ii).

Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (B.C.) 1744. I.C.R. (Claims) 1752 (ii).

United States fishing vessels and inshore fisheries (M. for Ret.*) 392 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1584, 1586 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W., *North York.*

Ammunition, clothing, &c., in Com of Sup., 1304 (ii).

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. (B. 19, 1°*) 58 (i); 2° m., 858; consdn. of B. m., 909; on M. to adjn. deb., 911 (ii).

Brigade Majors salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1300 (ii).

B.C. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).

Cab-hire and travelling expenses, in Com. of Sup., 872 (ii).

C. P. R. expenditure in B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1744 (ii).

——— Port Arthur to Red River, in Com of Sup., 1697 (ii).

Cartridge Factory at Quebec (Ques.) 543 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 Mr. *Chapleau*). in Com., 1233; on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for 3°, 1242 (ii).

Citadel, draining of, in Com. of Sup., 1742 (ii).

Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries, in Com. of Sup., 1757 (ii).

Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. (B. 4, 1°) 31; wthdn., 858 (ii).

Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt., B. 8 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 857 (ii).

Deposits in Govt. and P. O. Savings Banks (Ques.) 634 (i).

Dom. Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 922 (ii).

Extra Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 883 (ii).

Factory legislation (Ques.) 634 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1473, 1508, 1510, 1665, 1668, 1672 (ii).

——— Act, expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1699, 1747 (ii).

——— instructions to Revising Officers, on M. for copies, 55 (i).

Food Supply to Indians in the N.W. (M. for Ret.*) 58 (i).

Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1649 (ii).

Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1387 (ii).

Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1650 (ii).

Insurance B. 111 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1385 (ii).

Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup., 887 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*

Land Claims Commission, N.W., Rep. (Ques.) 1421 (ii).

Land Grants to Militia Force B. 142 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res., 1457 (ii).

Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 895 (ii).

Maritime Court of Ont. Jurisdiction B. 5 (Mr. *Allen*) in Com., 563, 569 (i).

Military Branch and District Staff, salaries, in Com. of Sup., 1298 (i).

Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1298, 1743 (ii).

Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for Com., 1311; in Com., 1318; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1325; neg. (Y. 48, N. 90) 1326; on Sen. Amts. (objection) 1606; on conc. (Amt.) 1610; on M. to trans. to Govt. Orders, 1662; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1673; (Amt.) 1676, 1683; neg., 1683; on second Amt. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 45, N. 90) 1684 (ii).

N.W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on M. for Com. (Amt.) 1011; neg. (Y. 55, N. 82) 1012 (ii).

N.W.T. Law Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1460 (ii).

Obscene Publications (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1746 (ii).

Powder imported for Cartridges (Ques.) 898 (ii).

Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1557, 1560 (ii).

Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1621 (ii).

Ry. Act Consolid., 1879, Act Amt. (B. 4, 1°) 31 (i).

Representation of N.W.T. in Parlt., on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) for Address to Her Majesty, 867 (ii).

Representation of the N.W.T. in Parlt. B. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1211 (ii).

Returns, enquiry for, 570 (i).

——— incomplete, Shareholders in Co.'s (remarks) 1168 (ii).

Revised Statutes of Can. B. 9 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1226 (ii).

Rideau Hall, additions, alterations, repairs, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 797 (i).

Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1308 (ii).

St. Catharines Milling Co. law costs, in Com. of Sup., 1769 (ii).

Savings Banks, Govt. deposits in (Ques.) 495 (i).

Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1621 (ii).

Superannuation, Civil Service, on M. for Ret., 1184 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice, 887 (ii).

Civil Government (C. S. Board of Examiners) 841 (ii); (Interior, Dept. of) 525 (i), contingencies 881; (Militia, Dept. of, contingencies) 1743; (Post Office and Finance Depts., computing interest, &c.) 841; (Post Office, Dept. of, contingencies) 883; (Privy Council Office, contingencies) 872 (ii); (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 524 (i), 880 (ii); (Public Works, Dept. of, contingencies) 882 (ii).

Fisheries (Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries) 1758 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Geological Survey, 1649 (ii).

Immigration (general vote) 1387 (ii).

Indians (grant to suppl. fund) 1650; (Man. and N. W. T.) 1653; (N. B.) 1651 (ii).

Legislation: Miscellaneous (Franchise Act, expenses under) 1699, 1747; (Faucher de St. Maurice) 1763 (ii).

Militia (Ammunition, clothing, &c.) 1304; (Brigade Majors salaries, &c.) 1300; (draining Citadel) 1742; (permanent batteries, &c.)1771; (Royal Military College) 1308; (salaries, District and Branch Staff) 1298 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Forged Bond, payment for) 1764; (St. Catharines Milling Co. law costs) 1769 (i).

Penitentiaries (B. C.) 896; (Man.) 895 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1753 (ii).

Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (B. C.) 1744; (Port Arthur to Red River) 1697 (ii).

Temperance Colonisation Co. (remarks) 1633 (ii).

Travis, Judge, ref. to in Com. on B. 133, 1461; in Com. of Sup., 887 (ii).

War Claims Commission, N. W., Rep. (Ques.) 1421 (ii).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., *Muskoka.*

Ammunition, clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1305 (ii)

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 864 (ii).

Brigade Majors salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1300 (ii).

C. P. R. Act. Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on Amt. Mr. *McCarthy*) to M. for 3°, 1353 (ii).

Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 594 (i).

Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 529, 533 (i).

Drill instruction and drill pay, in Com. of Sup. 1306 (ii).

Farm or Real Estate Banks, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Orton*) 576 (i).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1479, 1667, 1669 (ii).

Franchise Act, expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1699 (ii).

Fishing Rights of Indians on Lakes Huron and Nipissing, Pets. &c. (M. for copies) 693 (i).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) to Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1109 (ii).

Indian administration of the N. W., on Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 741 (i).

Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1650 (ii).

Land Grants to Militia Force B. 142 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 2°, 1571 (ii).

Logs, conc. in Ways and Means, 1726 (ii).

Military Branch and District Staff, salaries, in Com. of Sup., 1295 (ii).

Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1295 (ii)

Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 948; in Com., 954 (ii).

——— works in, B. 130 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1248 (ii).

Parry Sound Colonisation Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1614 (ii).

Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1163, 1166 (ii).

Rebellion losses, claims, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1766 (ii).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E.—*Continued.*
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1614 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Interior, Dept. of) 529 (i).
Indians (B.C.) 1652; (grant to suppl. fund) 1650; (Man. and N.W.T.) 1653 (ii).
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Franchise Act, expenses under) 1699 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition, clothing, &c.) 1305; (Brigade Majors salaries, &c.) 1300; (Drill instruction and Drill pay) 1306; (salaries, Branch and District Staff) 1295 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Rebellion, losses, &c.) 1766 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 1166; (Ont.) 1163 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1726 (ii).

Orton, Mr. G. T., *Centre Wellington.*
Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 859 (ii).
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for 3°, 1345 (ii).
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 104, 1°) 710 (i).
——— legislation respecting (Ques.) 912 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1233 (ii).
Farm or Real Estate Banks (M. for Com. on Res.) 427; in Com., 432–436, 571, 577, 583; 1°* of B. 88, 585 (i).
Franchise Act, instructions to Revising Officers, on M. for copies (remarks) 54 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) to Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1113; on Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) 1142 (ii).
Interest in B. C., B. 22 (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) in Com., 1245 (ii).
Interest on Money secured by Mortgage B. 12 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 441 (i).
N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 992 (ii).
Oleomargarine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1192 (ii).
Post Office Savings Banks in Man. (Ques.) 62 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (personal explanation) paragraphs in *Globe*) 513, 601 (i).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 301–307 (i).
Roche, M., of N.S., transfer of, on M. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com. (Amt.) to substitute Order for 2° of Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 104, 1335 (ii).
Saskatchewan Land and Homestead Co.'s (B. 42, 1°*) 93 (i).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1072 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 772 (i).

Paint, Mr. N., *Richmond, N.S.*
Bounty on Pig Iron B. 150 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1719 (ii).
C.P.R., salaries, &c., of Staff, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).
Canso and Port Hood Steamship Subsidies, in Com. of Sup., 1371 (ii).
Cape Breton Island Ry. B. 143 (Sir *Hector Langevin*)

Paint, Mr. N.—*Continued.*
in Com. on Res., 1490; (remarks) on intrdn. of B., 1638 (ii).
Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries, in Com. of Sup., 1758 (ii).
Fog-whistles, &c., maintenance, in Com. of Sup., 1376 (ii).
Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) on Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1431 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, maintenance and repairs, in Com. of Sup., 1372 (ii).
Lennox Passage Bridge Co.'s (B. 81, 1°*) 487 (i).
Obstructions in Nav. Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1374 (ii).
Port Hood Harbor, closing of, on M. for Cor., 788 (i).
Port Mulgrave and East Bay Steamship Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1371 (ii).
Privilege, Ques of (personal explanation) *re* paragraph in *Globe*, 460 (i).
Rideau Hall, contingencies, on M. for Ret., 794 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. to introd., 1636, 1638 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries) 1758 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Fog-whistles, maintenance, &c.) 1376 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c. (Canso and Port Hood) 1371; (Port Mulgrave and East Bay, C.B.) 1371 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 1372; (Water and River Police) 1374; (Obstructions in Nav. Rivers) 1374 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C.P.R. (salaries, &c., of Staff) 1451 (ii).
Water and River Police, in Com. of Sup., 1374 (ii).

Paterson, Mr. W., *South Brant.*
Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 860; in Com., 864; on M. to consdr. B., 909 (ii).
Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1741 (ii).
Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1659 (ii).
Consolid. Inland Rev. Acts Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res. (malt) 684 (i).
Customs Seizures at Montreal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1688 (ii).
——— at Winnipeg (M. for Ret.*) 392 (i).
Fishing Rights of Indians on Lakes Huron and Nipissing, Pets., &c., on M. for copies, 696 (i).
Flour Supply to N.W. Indians (Ques.) 43; (M. for Reps.*) 65 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1471, 1503, 1666, 1667 (ii).
——— Act, expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).
——— instructions to Revising Officers, on M. for copies, 54 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) to Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1128; on imperfect dispatch sent to English press (remarks) 1381 (ii).
Immigration, in Com of Sup., 1389 (ii).
Indian Administration of the N.W., on Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 733–739 (i).
Indian Lands Letters Patent B. 102 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 808 (ii).

Paterson, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1654 (ii).
Ingersoll, London and Chatham Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1598 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1204 (ii).
Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1610 (ii).
Land Grants to Ry. Co.'s B. 117 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 973 (ii).
Mississagua Indians, amount due (Ques.) 1633 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on conc. in Ways and Means (Amt.) 758; on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) 767 (i); on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1188, 1195; in Com. on B. 101, 1204 (ii).
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1549 (ii).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1559 (ii).
Public Buildings generally, in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1420 (ii).
Returns, enquiry for, 570 (i).
Rideau Hall, additions, alterations, repairs, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 798 (i).
Senate, constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) to Amt. of Com. of Sup., 1277–1280 (ii).
Six Nation Indians, Minutes of Councils (M. for copies*) 58 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1598, 1610; in Com. on B., 1708 (ii).
Sugar, conc. in Ways and Means, 773, 775 (i), 1772 (ii).
Summary Proceedings before Magistrates B. 84 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 718 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Colonial and Indian Exhibition) 1741 (ii).
Charges of Management (remarks on going into Com.) 519 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office Mail Service, salaries, &c.) 1549 (ii).
Immigration (Agents, contingencies) 1393; (general vote) 1389 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 1654, 1758 (ii).
Legislation (Franchise Act, expenses under) 1752 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) 1659 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (generally) 1166 (ii).
Quarantine (general vote) 1420 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on 1° of Res., 470–480; on conc., 758, 767, 773, 775, 780 (i), 1772 (ii).

Patterson, Mr. J. C., *North Essex.*
Forbes' Trochilic Steam Engine Central Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 66, 1°*) 393 (i).
Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1613 (ii).
Maritime Court of Ont. Jurisdiction B. 5 (Mr. *Allen*) in Com., 561, 568.
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1613 (ii).

Platt, Mr. J. M., *Prince Edward, Ont.*
Barbed wire fencing, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).
C.P.R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1369 (ii).

Platt, Mr. J. M.—*Continued.*
Life-boat service, Rewards, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1373 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to Amt (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 759 (i); on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1194 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (Rewards, &c., and Life-boat service) 1373 (ii).
Timber Island, Lake Ont., sale of (Ques.) 784 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 759, 770 (i).
Whips, conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).
Wire, iron or steel, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).

Pope, Hon. J. H., *Compton.*
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 60 (i).
Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 862; in Com., 865; on Amt. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) to M. for 3°, 910 (ii).
Annapolis and Digby Ry. extension (remarks) 1743 (ii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co., (prop. Res.) 1455 (ii).
C. P. R., B. C. contracts (Ans.) 709 (i).
——— B. C. Section (Ans.) 121 (i).
——— leased lines, amounts paid by Co. as rent, &c (Ans.) 368 (i).
——— Northern Pacific Ry., agreement (Ans.) 633 (i).
——— operation of main line, cost of (Ans.) 121 (i).
Canal tolls, reduction (Ans.) 494 (i).
Cape Breton Island Ry., survey of routes (Ans.) 296 (i); prop. Res., 1455 (ii).
Caraquet Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 494 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (B. 105) prop. Res., 513; M. for Com. on Res., 673; Res. conc. in and 1° * of B., 712 (i); 3° m., 1015 (ii).
Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. 4 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 858 (ii).
Consolid. Ry. Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 857 (ii).
Dom. Ry. Act Amt., *re* ocmpensation (Ans.) 426 (i).
Edmonstone and Rivière du Loup Ry. Subsidy (Ans). 570 (i).
Elgin Station, L'Islet (Ans.) 544 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry., inspection, &c. (Ans.) 369 (i).
——— (B. 47, 1°) 119; 2° m., 515; 3° m., 602 (i).
Hebert, H., Revising Officer at Montmagny (Ans.) 570 (i).
Ingersoll, London and Chatham Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1598, 1602 (ii).
I.C.R., Buctouche and Moncton branch (Ans.) 330 (i).
——— Canso to Sydney, extension, &c. (Ans). 843 (ii).
——— claims arising out of construction, in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).
——— earnings and working expenses (Ans.) 62 (i).
——— Marois, Elzéar, claim of (Ans.) 784.
——— oil contracts (Ans.) 897 (ii).
——— Paspebiac branch (Ans.) 186 (i).

Pope, Hon. J. H.—*Continued.*
I.C.R., private and official cars built or purchased, on M. for Ret., 57 (i).
——— Stellarton and Pictou branch (B. 57, 1°) 185; 2° m. and in Com., 604, 647; 3° m., 663 (i).
——— wire fencing contract (Ans.) 544 (i).
——— wood purchases from R. Smith, 544 (i).
Interpretation Act (B. 80) 2° m., 670 (i).
Lachine Canal, crossing in Montreal (Ans.) 426 (i).
——— lots on basins (Ans.) 633 (i).
Metapediac and Cross Point Ry. Survey (Ans) 426 (i).
Moncton and Buctouche Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1596 (ii).
Oil Contracts for I.C.R. (Ans.) 897 (ii).
Piton Septimus and Arless Septimus (Ans.) 544 (i).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Subsidy (Ans.) 331 (i).
——— and Lévis Ferry Service (Ans.) 121 (i).
——— Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 783 (i).
Restigouche River, Ry. Bridge across (Ans.) 426 (i).
Richibucto and St. Louis Ry. Subsidy (Ans.) 494 (i).
Richélieu River, obstructions, on M. for copies of Pets., &c., 33 (i).
Rivière du Loup and Edmonstone Ry. Subsidy (Ans.) 331 (i).
St. John's, Q., railway wharf (Ans.) 897 (ii).
Smith, R., from Quebec, Wood purchases from (Ans.) 544 (i).
Stellarton and Pictou branch Ry. *See* "I.C.R."
Subsidies to Rys., on M. for Ret., 391 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. (B. 146) prop. Res., 1551; M. for Com. on Res., 1595; in Com., 1590-1599; M. to introd., 1636; 1°* of B., 1639 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Trent River Nav.) 1752. *Income* (miscellaneous) 1752 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (B.C.) 1774. I. C. R. (Claims) 1752 (ii).
Trent River Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).
——— Valley Canal, on M. for Ret., 903 (ii).
——— payments for right of way (Ans.) 843 (ii).
Wire fencing, from Lévis to Rivière du Loup (Ans.) 544 (i).

Pruyn, Mr. M. W., *Lennox.*
Emerson and North-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 39, 1°*) 93 (i).

Ray, Mr. W. H., *Annapolis.*
Convict Labor in Dorchester Penitentiary (Ques.) 1075 (ii).

Rinfret, Mr. C. J., *Lotbinière.*
Les Fonds, establishment of Post Office at (M. for Cor., &c.*) 802 (i).
Lotbinière Mail service (Ques.) 709 (i).

Robertson, Mr. A., *West Hastings.*
Bow River Coal Mine and Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 44, 1°*) 119 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. (burglars,) &c. (B. 28, 1°) 67 (i); 2° m., 1185 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. for Ret., 902 (ii).

Robertson, Mr. T., *Hamilton.*
Birrell, Flora, Relief (B. 129, 1° on a div.) 1014; 2°, agreed to (Y. 85, N. 33) 1172 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. (law of evidence) (B. 3, 1°) 31 (i); 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 52) 858; 3° m., 911.
——— (openings cut in the ice, &c.) (B. 2, 1°) 31; 2° m., 707 (i).
Franchise Act, instructions to Revising Officers, on M. for copies (remarks) 50 (i).
Ingersoll, London and Chatham Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1599 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1599 (ii).

Robertson, Mr. T., *Shelburne.*
American fishermen, depredations by (Ques.) 783 (i).
Liquor manufactured in Can., exports, imports and labor employed (Ms. for Stmnts.*) 912 (ii).
Sugar in Bond in Montreal (Ques.) 783 (i), 843 (ii).

Ross, Mr. A. W., *Lisgar.*
Assiniboine River improvements (Ques.) 784 (i).
Churchill and Nelson Rivers surveys (Ques.) 266 (i).
Customs Office at Yukon (Ques.) 266 (i).
Disturbance in the N. W., non-combatants, recognition of services (Ques.) 633 (i).
Half-Breeds, Claims proved before Commission (M. for Ret.*) 58 (i).
Hudson's Bay Exploration (Ques.) 266 (i).
Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret. 639 (i).
Man. and North-Western Ry. Co. of Can. (B. 70, 1°*) 393 (i).
National Parks in the N. W. T. or B. C. (Ques.) 266 (i).
Pensions to Volunteers wounded at Duck Lake (Ques.) 633 (i).
Prince Albert Volunteers, Scrip for (Ques.) 633 (i).
St. Andrews Rapids improvements (Ques.) 495 (i).
Wharf at Selkirk (Ques.) 495 (i).
Yukon River Explorations (Ques.) 266 (i).

Royal, Mr. J., *Provencher.*
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for 3°, 1346 (ii).
Disturbance in the N. W., distribution of Medals (Ques.) 1661 (ii).
Fisheries protection in Man. (Ques.) 692 (i).
Hudson's Bay Exploration (Ques.) 1378 (ii).
Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Ry. and Steamship Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 119, 1°*) 912 (ii).
Immigration from Dakota and Texas (Ques.) 1217 (ii).
Medals, distribution of (Ques.) 1661 (ii).
Navigation in Man. Waters (Ques.) 1217 (ii).
Ontario, Minnesota and Manitoba Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 49, 1°*) 149 (i).
Representation of the N.W.T. in Parlt. B. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1211; in Com., 1215, 1251 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 93-96 (ii).

Royal, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Sisters, "Faithful Companions of Jesus," incorp. (B. 32, 1°*) 92 (i).
Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Ry. and Steamship Co.'s (B. 119) 2° m., 1085 (ii).

Rykert, Mr. J. C., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Leduc, Rev. H., and Danl. Maloney, Pets. and Letters (M. for copies*) 438 (i).
Niagara Frontier Bridge Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 48, 1°*) 149 (i).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagany*) censuring Govt., 150–169 (i).

Scott, Mr. T., *Winnipeg.*
Census of Man. (Ques.) 1240 (ii).
Red River Improvements (Ques.) 1240 (ii).

Scriver, Mr. J., *Huntingdon*
Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 43 (Mr. *Mackintosh*) in Com., 556 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. to introd., 1342; in Com, 1468 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 752 (i).
Harness and saddlery, conc. in Ways and Means, 757 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 752, 754, 757, 772 (i).
Wire, iron or steel, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).

Shakespeare, Mr. N., *Victoria, B.C.*
Cabinet Representation for B.C. (Ques.) 369 (i).
C.P.R., salaries of staff, in Com of Sup., 1451 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1229; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1243 (ii).
Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1091 (ii).
Dom. Lands in B.C., settlement of (M. for Cor.) 496 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. B. 47 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for 2°, 517 (i).
Fisheries, deep-water, in B.C. (M. for Cor.) 495 (i).
Liquor License Act, 1883, Commissioners and Inspectors' emoluments, refund of fees (Ques.) 266 (i).
Rice, increase of duty (Ques.) 369 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dom. Exhibition) 1091 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (salaries of Staff, &c.,) 1451 (ii).

Shanly, Mr. W., *South Grenville.*
Alberta Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 31, 1°*) 92 (i).
Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 43 (Mr. *Mackintosh*) in Com., 556, 558 (i).
——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1617 (ii).
Carriage hardware, conc. in Ways and Means, 1720 (ii).
Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1158 (ii).
Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 593 (i).
Kaministiquia River, in Com. of Sup., 1157 (ii).
Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1612 (ii).
Nictaux and Atlantic Ry., in Com, on B. 146, 1619 (ii).
Northumberland Straits Tunnel Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com., 1467 (ii).

Shanly, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
Parry Sound Colonisation Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1614 (ii).
Port Arthur Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1157 (ii).
St. Gabriel Levee and Ry. Co.'s B. 116 (Mr. *Curran*) in Com., 1153 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1612; on M. to introd. B., 1636 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Williamsburg) 1452 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1158; (Port Arthur and Kaministiquia River) 1157 (ii).
Truro to Newport Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1619 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1720 (ii).
Williamsburg Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).

Small, Mr. J., *East Toronto.*
Calvin Co.'s incorp. (B. 53, 1°*) 149 (i).
Can. Permanent Loan and Savings Bank Co.'s (B. 93, 1°*) 644 (i).
Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 592 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1498, 1666 (ii).
Kootenay Ry. Co. of B.C. incorp. (B. 89, 1°*) 599 (i).
Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. (B. 54, 1°*) 149 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of, Franchise B., letter read from Revising Officer's clerk, denying charge in *Globe*, 1635; (remarks) 1703 (ii).
Rock Lake, Souris and Brandon Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 63, 1°*) 301 (i).
Toronto Board of Trade Acts Amt. (B. 85, 1°*) 519 (i).

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Brant.*
Baker, I. G. & Co.'s contract (Ques.) 1076 (ii).
Franchise Act, expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1747 (ii).
Independence of Parlt., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1579, 1581 (ii).
——— Act, breach of, charge against a member (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 1594 (ii).
Kah-ke-wa-quo-na-by, Chief, amounts paid to (M. for Ret.*) 57 (i).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 2°, 1524–1528; in Com., 1554, 1560, 1564 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Franchise Act, expenses under) 1747 (ii).
Travelling Expenses of Members of Govt. (M. for Ret.*) 57 (i).
Tupper, Sir Charles, Travelling Expenses (M. for Ret.*) 57 (i).
Woodruff, J. A., Amounts paid to (Ques.) 68 (i).

Speaker, Mr., (HON. GEO. A. KIRKPATRICK) *Frontenac.*
Address, The, His Ex's. reply (read) 92 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*

Antigonish Electoral Dist., Vacancy and Return of Member, 1 (i).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amts. Bs. 92, 99 and 118, on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) to place on Govt. Orders (ruling) 1220; Member requested to confine himself to question, 1221; on dividing ques. (rule read) 1222 (ii).

Cape Race Lightship and fog-whistle, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 226 (i).

Cardwell Electoral District, Vacancy and Return of Member, 1 (i).

Catholics and Politics, on objection (Mr. *Mills*) to Ques., 1379 (ii).

Criminal Law Amt. (seduction, &c.) B. 20 (Mr. *Charlton*) Sen. Amts. rep., 1326; (rule read) 1327 (ii).

Customs seizure at Montreal, settlement (remarks) on Ques., 1343 (ii).

Debates, publishing of, in Com. of Sup., 1089 (ii).

Disturbance in the N. W., confidential papers, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 368 (i).

Durham, East, Electoral District, Vacancy and Return of Member, 1 (i).

Engineers' Certificates, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 599 (i).

Estimates, The, for 1886-87, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 368 (i); suppl., 1885-86, 1550; suppl., 1886-87, 1633 (ii).

Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res. (irrelevancy of deb.) 968, 973 (ii).

French Canadians, appeals against, on objection (Mr. *Mackenzie*) to Ques., 1378 (ii).

Haldimand, issue of Writ for, irrelevancy of remarks, member called to order, 1171 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on prop. Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1139 (ii).

——— imperfect dispatch sent to English press (remarks) 1381 (ii).

House of Commons, salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1089 (ii).

Immigration, assisted and unassisted, irrelevancy of remarks, 637, 640, 641, 643 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order, deb. objected to by (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) ruled member justified in replying, 653 (i).

Indemnity to Members, on Res. (Mr. *Farrow*) and Mr. *Blake's* Ques. of Order, 122 (i).

I.C.R., Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57. (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for 3° (remarks) 665, 666, 667, 668 (i).

Internal Economy Commiss., Mess. from His Ex. (read) 60 (i).

Irrelevancy of debate, 637, 640, 641, 643 (i), 968, 973, 1002, 1009, 1171 (ii).

King's, N. B., Electoral District, vacancy and return of Member, 1 (i).

Library of Parlt., in Com. of Sup., 1153 (ii).

Librarians' joint Rep. (presented) 2 (i).

New Members (announcement) 1 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*

Members Indemnity Act Amt., on prop. B. (Mr. *Farrow*) ruled not in order, 38 (i).

——— requested to confine themselves to Ques. before Chair, 1221, 1317 (ii).

Messages from His Ex., 60, 92, 226, 368, 559 (i), 1550, 1633 (ii).

Middleton, Maj. Gen., communication from, *re* vote of thanks by Parlt., 630 (i).

Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Ques. of Order, 1316; on Sen. Amts. (remarks) 1605; (ruling) 1607 (ii).

N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com. (relevancy of debate) 1002, 1009; (remarks) on members not voting, 1011, 1013 (ii).

Notice of Motion, member anticipating (remarks) 1541 (ii).

Oleomargarine, member called to order, referring to previous deb., 1193 (ii).

Parliamentary language, members called to order (rule quoted from May) 1580, 1582, 1635, 1701, 1704

Personal explanations by members (remarks) 1198 (ii)

Prince Albert Colonisation Co., on M. to add members to Sel. Com., 492; (ruling) 494 (i).

Printing of Parlt., on M. (Mr. *Bergin*) to conc. in Fourth Rep., 1239 (ii).

Printing, printing paper, in Com. of Sup., 1090 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Charlton*) application for Timber Limits (remarks) 1515 (ii).

——— Ques. of (Mr. *Kirk*) Official Reps. and headings to extra copies, 631 (i).

Prorogation, Letter from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 1775

Riel, Louis, Execution of, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to place Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) first Order of the Day (ruling) 119 (i).

——— on Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to rsme. adjnd. deb. on Res (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 149 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) to Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to M. for Rets., 187 (i).

Rules of the House, on prop. Amt., 842 (ii).

St. John, N.B, City and County Electoral District, Return of member elect, 1 (i).

——— City Electoral District, Vacancy and Return of member, 1 (i).

Senate, salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1089 (ii).

Shuswap and Okanagan Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Homer*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., certificate from law clerk, 1171 (ii).

Speech from the Throne (reported) 1 (i).

Supply B. 145, passing of by Commons announced in Sen., 1777 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: Miscellaneous (Library of Parlt.) 1089, 1153; (printing, paper, &c.) 1090. Senate and House of Commons, 1089, (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Temperance Colonisation Co. (remarks) 1634 (ii).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., relevancy of deb., 1057; member requested to withdraw statement, 1061; unparliamentary language, 1071, 1074 (ii).
Vacancies (announcement) 1 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 860 (ii).
Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. 43 (Mr. *Mackintosh*) in Com., 559 (i).
Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 589 (i).
Disturbance in the N.W., police scouts (M. for Ret.) 738 (i).
Dom. Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 917, 922 (ii).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 538 (i).
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 969 (ii).
Farm or Real Estate Banks, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Orton*) 434 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1474, 1507, 1509, 1666, 1669 (ii).
Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 657 (i).
Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup., 1698 (ii).
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1654 (ii).
Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, &c., B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) in Com., 909 (ii).
Logs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1591; conc., 1728 (ii).
Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1657 (ii).
Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 955 (ii).
N.W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 990 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) respecting legislation, 550 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 768 (i); on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1189 (ii).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1556 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Cook*) on personal explanation, 1167 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 325–330 (i).
Settlers in Saugeen Peninsula, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1540 (ii).
Speeches in Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) limiting, 792 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Interior, Dept. of) 538 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Weights and Measures and Gas, salaries) 1545 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 1654 (ii).
Justice, Administration of, 1698 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1657 (ii).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1070–1072 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 768 (i), 1228, 1591 (ii).
Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 1545 (ii).

Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz-William, *West Halifax.*
Can. Temp. Act, Returns of Fines collected (Ques.) 1172 (ii).
Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for Cor., 701 (i).
Pictou Coal and Iron Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 64, 1°*) 368 (i).
Sugar Duties paid at Halifax and Montreal (Ques.) 898 (ii).
Sugars, conc. in Ways and Means, 774, 777, 779 (i).
Union Bank of Halifax, Capital Stock reduction (B. 52, 1°*) 149 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 774, 777, 779 (i).

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford.*
Ingersoll, London and Chatham Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1599 (ii).
Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 35, 1°*) 92 (i).
Sable and Spanish River Slide and Boom Co.'s (B. 36, 1°*) 92; Order for Com. read, 494; in Com., 782 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1599 (ii).

Taschereau, Mr. T. L., *Beauce.*
Riel, Louis, case of, Pets. from Provincial Govts. (Ques.) 634 (i).

Tassé, Mr. J., *Ottawa City.*
Catholics and Politics (Ques.) 1379 (ii).
Dom. $2 Notes, counterfeit (Ques.) 865 (ii).
French Canadians, appeals against (Ques.) 1378 (ii).
—— representation for Ont. in Sen. (Ques.) 1633 (ii).
Labelle, Rev. M., Immigration Rep. (Ques.) 1633 (ii).
Medals, distribution of (Ques.) 1661 (ii).
Prorogation, closing remarks, 1775 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 364–366 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*
Consolid. Inland Rev. Acts Amt. B. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com. on Res. (oleomargarine) 687 (i).
Cook, Mr. H., Timber Dues (Ques.) 1380; (M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com.) 1420 (ii).
Edmonton and St. Albert Land Surveys (M. for Cor., &c.*) 802 (i).
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1415 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 752 (i).
North American Tel. Co.'s incorp. (B. 86, 1°*) 543 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Oleomargarine, &c. (Res.) legislation, 547, 554; in Com. on B. 101, 687; on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 762 (i); deb. rsmd., 1187; on Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) to M. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com. *re* M. Roche, 1341 (ii).
Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Pets. from Orange Lodges respecting (Ques.) 196 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Rideau) 1453 (ii).
Immigration (general vote) 1415 (ii).
Timber, Land, and Coal, Leases in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1055–1057 (ii).
Timber Limits, &c., refutation of charges, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1583 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 753, 762.

Temple, Mr. T., *York, N. B.*
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1149 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1474 (ii).
Fredericton to Prince William Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1625 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1625 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. J. S. D., *Antigonish.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 861; in Com., 864 (ii).
Bankruptcy and Insolvency, legislation (Ans.) 59 (i).
B. C. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).
C.P.R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) in Com., 1201 (ii).
Cape Race Lighthouse Transfer B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 672 (i).
Carleton City of St. John branch Ry. B. 137 (Mr. *Hackett*) on M. to introd., 1310; on M. for 2° and in Com., 1424 (ii).
Carriers by Land B. 7 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 707 (i).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. (B. 105) M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1381 (ii).
Convict Labor in Dorchester Penitentiary (Ans.) 1075 (ii).
Court of Ry. Commissioners B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 596 (i).
Criminal Law Amt. (burglars) B. 28 (Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*) on M. for 2°, 1185 (ii).
——— (law of evidence) B. 23 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 707 (i).
——— (law of evidence) B. 3 (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*) in Com., 911 (ii).
——— (law of evidence) (B. 141, 1°*) 1385; in Com., 1464 (ii).
——— (offences against the person) (B. 125, 1°*) 1254; 2° m., 1272; in Com., 1382 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. J. S. D.—*Continued.*
Criminal Law Amt. (seduction, &c.) B. 20 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Com., 571; in Com., 705 (i).
Crown Cases reserved Act Amt. (B. 126) 1° m., 974; 2° m., 1202 (ii).
Cruelty to Animals Prevention B. 11 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 439 (i).
Disturbance in the N.W., Half-breeds, Indians, &c., committals and convictions (Ans.) 61 (i).
——— Reps. from Govt. Counsel on Trials, &c. (Ans.) 185 (i).
——— Trial of Half-breeds, Indians, &c. (Ans.) 58 (i).
Dorchester Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 892 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. B. 47 (Mr. *Pope*) on M. for 2°, 517 (i).
Factory Legislation (Ans.) 634 (i).
Fines and Forfeitures (B. 82, 1°) 488; 2° m., 671; in Com., 713 (i).
Fishing by Foreign Vessels in Can. Waters B. 136 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 1423 (ii).
Fisheries protection and Marine Police regulations issued, on M. for copies, 459 (i).
Franchise Act, Amts. (Ans.) 543 (i).
——— Electoral, Act Amt. (B. 138) M. to introd., 1342; in Com., 1467, 1504, 1507, 1510; M. to ref. back to Com., 1664; in Com., 1665 (ii).
Govt. measures (remarks) 913, 1194 (ii).
High Court of Justice, Ont., Judge's salary (Ans.) 898; (B. 125) prop. Res., 877; in Com. and 1°* of B., 973; in Com., 1204 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) to Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1125; on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1139; on Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) 1140; (Amt.) agreed to (Y. 80; N. 70) 1142 (ii).
Indemnity to Members, on Res. (Mr. *Farrow*) and Mr. *Blake's* Ques. of Order, 122 (i).
Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, &c., Act Amt. B. 15 Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for 2°, 460 (i); in Com., 1179 (ii).
Insurance (B. 111, 1°*) 842; 2° m., 957; in Com., 1385 (ii).
I. C. R., Reservoir, &c., at Lévis (Ans.) 1378 (ii).
——— Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 617, 623; on M. for 3°, 665 (i).
Interest in B. C., B. 22 (Mr. *Baker, Vic.*) M to place on Govt. Orders, 1218; 2° m., 1248; in Com., 1244 (ii).
——— on Money secured by Mortgage B. 12 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 440 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 80) in Com., 712 (i).
Judge's Salary, additional (Ont.) prop. Res., 877 (ii).
Judiciary in the N.W.T. (B. 133) Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 1223 (ii).
Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup., 886, 889–891, 1698 (ii).
——— Penitentiaries branch, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 31 (i).

Thompson, Hon. J. S. D.—*Continued.*
Keewatin, boundaries extension (B. 127, 1°) 974 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 891, 1165 (ii).
Lands in North and West Ont. (Ans.) 1172 (ii).
Law of Evidence. *See* "Criminal law."
Legal Services in connection with Revision of Statutes, in Com. of Sup., 1159 (ii).
Manitoba, increased representation in Parlt. (Ans.) 784 (i).
——— Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 893 (ii).
Maritime Court of Ont. Jurisdiction B. 5 (Mr. *Allen*) in Com., 560, 562, 565–569 (i).
Naturalisation Act Amt. (Ans.) 709 (i).
Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 948; in Com., 955 (ii).
——— works in, B. 130 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1246; in Com., 1270 (ii).
Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *Mc Carthy*) in Com., 1323; on Sen. Amts., 1606 (ii).
N.W.T. Law Amt. (B. 133) prop. Res., 1015; in Com., 1203; 1°* of B., 1223; in Com., 1382, 1459; on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) to M. for 3°, 1483 (ii).
Prince Albert Colonisation Co., on M. to add members to Sel. Com., 492 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Kirk*) Official Reps. and headings to extra copies, 631 (i).
Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1159 (ii).
Queen's Counsel, appointments, on M. for Cor., 392 (i).
Real Property in the N. W. T., transfer (B. 10) M. to introd., 40; 1°*, 41; 2° m., 668 (i); in Com., 1516; prop. Res., 1532; M. to conc. in Res., 1552 (ii).
Reformatory for Juvenile Offenders Halifax (B. 134) 1°*, 1254; in Com., 1381 (ii).
Revised Statutes of Can. (B. 9) M. to introd., 38; 1°*, 40 (i); in Com., 1224 (ii).
Riel, Louis, case of, authority to exercise mercy (Ans.) 59; Pets. from Provincial Govts. (Ans.) 634 (i).
——— Execution of, Reps, &c., in favor of mercy (Ans.) 266 (l).
——— Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 267–291 (i).
——— Medical Commission, Reps. (Ans.) 68 (i).
——— O. C. ordering execution (Ans.) 59 (i).
——— Pets. for hanging (Ans.) 266 (i).
——— recommendation to mercy by jury (Ans.) 62 (i).
——— Reps. of Drs. Valade and Lavell (Ans.) 120 (i).
——— respites granted, motive for (Ans.) 59 (i).
——— respites granted, O. C., *re* execution and letters, &c., of Medical Commission, on M. for copies, 59 (i).
——— respites granted, on M. for copies of O.C., 43 (i).
——— trial of, instructions sent to Mr. Justice Richardson, on M. for copies, &c., 59 (i).
——— trial of, on M. for copies of documents, &c., 43 (i).
Rys. or Repeal (remarks) on telegram in Halifax *Mail*, 1628 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1692 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. J. S. D.—*Continued.*
Scott Act, enforcement (Ans.) 438 (i).
Short Line Ry., Montreal and Salisbury (Ans.) 1240 (ii).
Stather, R., transfer from Dorchester Penitentiary to Kingston (Ans.) 68 (i).
——— papers, *re* application for discharge, on M. for copies, 373 (i).
Statutes, Revised (B. 9) in Com., 513 (i).
——— M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 555 (i).
——— M. to add name to Com., 599 (i).
Stipendiary Magistrate at Calgary (Ans.) 427 (i).
Stoney Mountain Penitentiary, prisoners' health (Ans.) 1173 (ii).
Summary Proceedings before Justices of the Peace (B. 84, 1°*) 519; 2° m., 671; in Com., 715, 805 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Indian Affairs, Dept. of) 689; (Justice, Dept. of) 523 (i), (contingencies) 877 (ii); (Railways and Canals, Dept. of) 691 (i).
Justice, Administration of, 886, 1698 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B. C.) 896; (Dorchester) 892; (Kingston) 891; (Man.) 893; (St. Vincent de Paul) 1692 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 1159 (ii).
Supreme Court, extra reporter, in Com. of Sup., 891 (ii).
Travis, Judge, in Com. of Sup., 886–889 (ii).
——— ref. to in Com. on B. 133, 1463 (ii).
Treason-felony Trials at Regina, &c., on M. for Cor., &c., 696 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, Fees paid to Poisett and Roger (Ans.) 843 (ii).
Windsor Branch Ry. Settlement (Ans.) 1240 (ii).
Wurtele, Hon. J. S., appointment as Judge (Ans.) 866

Townshend, Mr. C. J., *Cumberland.*
Chignecto Marine Ry. B. (Mr. *Pope*) on prop. Res., 676

Trow, Mr. J., *South Perth.*
American Fishermen, depredations by (Ques.) 783 (i).
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on M. for 3°, 1357; in Com., 1358 (ii).
——— B. C. contracts (Ques.) 709 (i).
——— Northern Pacific Ry. Agreement (Ques.) 633 (i).
——— salaries, &c., of Staff, in Com. of Sup., 1450 (ii).
Deposits in Govt. and P. Q. Savings Banks (Ques.) 634 (i).
Disturbance in the N. W., Anderson, James, Cor. *re* purchase of supplies, &c. (M. for copies) 427 (i).
——— Batoche, battle of, Rep. of Officer second in Command (Ques.) 369 (i).
——— instructions to non-combatants (M. for copies, &c.) 427 (i).
——— transport contractors (M. for Ret.) 427 (i).
Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1092 (ii).
——— Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 918, 921, 926 (ii).
——— Lands, in Com. of Sup., 541 (i).
——— Ry. Act Amt. *re* compensation (Ques.) 426 (i).
Factory Legislation (Ques.) 634 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com, 1469 (ii).

Trow, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Grape Vines imported under valuation (Ques.) 370 (i).
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1387 (ii).
Jarvis, P. R., amount paid to as returning officer under Can. Temp. Act (M. for Ret.*) 393 (i).
Kaministiquia River, in Com. of Sup., 1157 (ii).
Oleomargarine, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Bowell*) to Amt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) to M. to conc. in Ways and Means, 763 (i).
Port Arthur Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1157 (ii).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1565; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts. (Amt.) 1728 (ii).
——— of Parlt., on M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com. 1197 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, on personal explanation (Mr. *Orton*) *re* paragraph in *Globe*, 602 (i).
Prorogation, closing remarks, 1776 (ii).
Public Buildings, Ont., in Com. of Sup., 1163 (ii).
Squaw Island, Fishing Privileges, &c. (Ques.) 784 (i).
Sugar in Bond in Montreal (Ques.) 783 (i), 843 (ii).
Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 147 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 1713 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dom. Exhibition) 1092 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Interior, Dept. of) 541 (i).
Immigration (general vote) 1387 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Port Arthur Harbor and Kaministiquia River) 1157. *Income:* Buildings (Ont.) 1163 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (salaries, &c., of staff) 1450 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 763 (i).

Tupper, Mr. C. H., *Pictou.*
Columbia Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87, 1°*) 569 (i).
I. C. R., Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 604, 608, 611, 621; on M. for 3°, 664 (i).
Navigable Waters, works in, B. 130 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) in Com., 1271 (ii).
Pictou Bank (B. 50, 1°*) 149; in Com., 614 (i).
Short Line Ry. in N.S. (M. for copies of Cor.) 444 (i).
Stather, R., *re* application for discharge of, on M. for copies, 375 (i).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1073 (ii).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe.*
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of up., 1074 (ii).

Vail, Hon. W. B., *Digby.*
A, B and C Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 1309 (ii).
Adams, David J., schooner, seizure of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1255 (ii).
Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1090 (ii).
Annapolis and Digby Ry. Extension (remarks) 1746 (ii).
Bounty on Pig Iron B. 150 (Mr. *McLelan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1715 (ii).
Briar and Long Islands telegraph communication, Gisborne's Rep. (M. for copy*) 393 (i),
Brigade Majors salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1302 (ii).

Vail, Hon. W. B.—*Continued.*
Buoys and Beacons, in Com. of Sup., 1377 (ii).
Burlington Bay Canal B. 76 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 518 (i).
Canal Tolls, amount collected (Ques.) 784 (i).
Cape Breton Island Ry. B. 143 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on Res., 1486; in Com., 1488 (ii).
Cape Race Lighthouse Transfer B. 100 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com. on Res., 672 (1).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. B. (Mr. *Pope*) on prop. Res., 677 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1236; on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for 3°, 1242 (ii).
Cobourg, town of, Relief B. 122 (Mr. *McLelan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 958; in Com., 1141 (ii).
Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries, in Com. of Sup., 1758 (ii).
Contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1307 (ii).
Commissions to Public Officers B. 110 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 959 (ii).
Cordage, manila and sisal, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1584 (ii).
Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1091 (ii).
Customs Seizures at Montreal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1690 (ii).
Digby Pier, rebuilding of (Ques.) 31, 42 (i).
Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1269 (ii).
Easter, adjnmt. for (remarks) 748 (i).
Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1157 (ii).
Farm or Real Estate Banks, on M. (Mr. *Orton*) for Com. on Res., 432; in Com., 583 (i).
Fisheries protection and Marine Police regulations issued, on M. for copies, 458 (i).
Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain (M. for Cor.) 700 (i).
Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1430 (ii).
Franchise Act, expenses under, in Com. of Sup., 1747 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1469, 1504 (ii).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 752 (i).
Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 1649 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, maintenance and repairs, in Com. of Sup., 1372 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1261, 1264 (ii).
Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1095 (ii).
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1651 (ii).
I. C. R., St. Charles branch, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
——— Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com., 607, 724, 626; on M for 3°, 663 (i).
——— Stellarton branch, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
——— Westinghouse Brakes, amounts paid for applying (M. for Ret.*) 393 (i).
Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, in Com. of Sup., 1376 (ii).
Logs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1587 (ii),

Vail, Hon. W. B.—*Continued.*

Lylian, schooner, seizure of (Ques.) 912 (ii).
Marine Police Force in Can., on M. for Ret., 385 (i).
Military works in B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).
Militia, contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 878, 1744 (ii).
Montreal Armories, in Com. of Sup., 1163 (ii).
Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 949 (i).
——— works, in B. 130 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 1246 (ii).
Nictaux and Atlantic Ry., in Com. on B. 146, 1619 (ii).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1553 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Kirk*) Official Reps. and headings to extra copies, 631 (i).
Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1308 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1087 (ii).
Public Buildings at Ottawa, in Com. of Sup., 1156, 1160, 1163 (ii).
Stewiacke and Musquodoboit Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1624; (remarks) on intrdn. of B. 146, 1636 (ii).
Sugars, conc. in Ways and Means, 773, 778 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1617; on intrdn. of B., 1636, 1638; in Com., 1704, 1707 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives, care of) 1090; Criminal Statistics) 1091; (Health Statistics) 1095 (ii).
Charges of Management (Asst. Financial Inspector) 520; (Auditor and Rec. Gen., Vic.) 521 (i).
Civil Govt. (Agriculture, Dept. of) 691; (Indian Affairs, Dept. of) 689; (Interior, Dept. of) 524; (Marine, Dept. of) 691 (i), (contingencies) 886; (Militia, contingencies) 878, 1307, 1744 (ii); (Railways and Canals, Dept. of) 691; (Secretary of State, Dept of) 524 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1454 (ii).
Fisheries (Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries) 1758 (ii).
Geological Survey, 1649 (ii).
Indians (N.S.) 1651 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (salaries) 1089; Miscellaneous (Franchise Act, expenses under) 1747 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Buoys and Beacons) 1377; (Lighthouses and Fog alarms) 1376 (ii).
Militia (A, B, and C, Batteries) 1309; (Brigade Majors salaries, &c.) 1302; (Royal Military College) 1308 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 1372; (Wrecks and Casualties) 1374 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1157; (Military works, B.C.) 1752; (Public Buildings, Ottawa) 1156.
Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1160; (Ont.) 1163; (P.E.I.) 1161; (Que.) 1163. Dredging, 1269. Harbors and Rivers, 1754; (N.B.) 1264; (N.S.) 1261; (Mar. Provs. generally) 1264 (ii).
Railways—Capital. I.C.R. (St. Charles Branch) 1452; (Stellarton Branch) 1452 (ii).
Truro to Newport Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1617 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 752, 754, 773 (i), 1583 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act, 1879, Amt. B. 109 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 957 (ii).
Western Counties Ry., in Com. on B. 146, 1707 (ii).
Wrecks and Casualties, in Com. of Sup., 1374 (ii).

Valin, Mr. P. V., *Montmorency.*

Returns, expense in producing, on M. for Ret., 386 (i).
Valin, Mr., M.P., Grants of land to, in N.W., on M. for Ret., 32 (i).

Vanasse, Mr. F., *Yamaska.*

Riel, Louis, Pets. praying for clemency, &c. (Ques.) 120 (i).

Wallace, Mr. N. C., *West York, Ont.*

Dom. Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) in Com. 1081 (ii).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 536 (i).
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 961 (ii).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1469, 1506, 1509, 1511, 1670 (ii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) to Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1117 (ii).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1556–1560 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Edgar*) *re* supposed telegrams read in House, 782 (i).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 99–104 (i).
Sugars, conc. in Ways and Means, 777 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Indian Affairs, Dept. of) 689; (Interior, Dept. of) 536 (i).
Timber Land and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1071(ii.)
——— Licenses in disputed Territory (Ques.) 41 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 777 (i).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *East Durham.*

Address, The, seconded, 6 (i).
Midland Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 18, 1°*) 58 (i).

Watson, Mr. R., *Marquette.*

Ammunition, clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1302 (ii).
Assiniboine River improvements (Ques.) 784 (i).
Barbed wire fencing, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on M. for 3°, 1343; (Amt.) 1345; neg. (Y. 49, N. 116) 1357 (ii).
Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1742 (ii).
Contingencies, &c., Militia, in Com. of Sup., 1308 (ii).
Cordage, manila and sisal, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1586 (ii).
Disallowance of Ry. charters in Man. (M. for Ret.*) 802 (i).
Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1091 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 914, 917, 919, 921, 1081–1084 (ii).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 528, 534, 539, 542 (i), 1550 (ii).

Watson, Mr. R.—*Continued.*
Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1269 (ii).
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 961 (ii).
Flying Column for N.W. (M. for Cor.) 634 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1672 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1269 (ii).
Hudson Bay Expedition, in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 660 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1388 (ii).
Indian Administration of N.W., on Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 745 (i)
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1653 (ii).
Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup., 887, 890 (ii).
Lake Manitoba navigation (Ques.) 369 (i).
Land Grants to Militia Force B. 142 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) on M. for 2°, 1570; in Com., 1572 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and the N W.T. B. 147 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res., 1632; M. to conc. in Res., 1639; in Com. on B., 1710 (ii).
Man. Claims settlement B. 123 (Mr. *McLelan*) on M. to conc. in Res., 960; on M. for 2°, 1145 (ii).
Man., increased representation in Parlt. (Ques.) 784 (i).
Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 895 (ii).
Memorial of the N.W. Council (M. for copy) 703 (i).
Militia organisation in N.W.T (Ques.) 843 (ii).
Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1657 (ii).
N.W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 985; on M. to adjn. deb., 1004; in Com., 1013 (ii).
——— Land Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1632 (i).
N.W.T. Law Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1464 (ii).
Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 55, 1°*) 185 (i).
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1549 (i).
Pre-emptions in Man., reduction in price (Ques.) 369 (i).
Public Works, Man., in Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1419 (ii).
Representation of the N.W.T. in Parlt. B. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1211; in Com., 1216, 1251; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1271 (ii).
Returns, expense in producing, on M. for Ret., 390 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Colonial Exhibition) 1742; Dom. Exhibition) 1091 (ii).
Charges of Management (Auditor and Rec. Gen., Winnipeg) 521 (i).
Civil Govt. (Interior, Dept. of) 527 (i); (Militia, &c., contingencies) 1308 (ii.)
Collection of Revenues (Dom. Lands) 1550; (Post Office, Mail Service, salaries, &c.) 1549 (ii).
Immigration (general vote) 1388; (agricultural implements) 1401 (ii).

Watson, Mr. R.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 1653 (ii).
Justice, Administration of, 887 (ii).
Militia (Ammunition, clothing, &c.) 1302 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Hudson Bay Expedition) 1658 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1657 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 895 (ii).
Pensions (conc.) 1771 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man.) 1165. Dredging, 1269. Harbors and Rivers (Man.) 1269 (ii).
Quarantine (general vote) 1419 (ii).
Travis, Judge, in Com. of Sup., 887 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 772 (i), 1586 (ii).
Wire, iron or steel, &c., conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).

Weldon, Mr. C. W., *St. John, N. B., City and County.*
Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 886, 890 (ii).
Bank of N. B., Capital Stock reduction (B. 14, 1°*) 48 (i).
B. C. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).
Buoys and Beacons, in Com. of Sup., 1377 (ii).
Butternut Ridge, N. B., Postmaster (Ques.) 1075 (ii).
C.P.R., Port Arthur to Red River, in Com. of Sup., 1694 (ii).
Caraquet Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 494 (i).
Carleton City of St. John branch Ry. B 127 (Mr. *Hackett*) on M. for 2°, 1424; in Com., 1425 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1229 (ii).
Cordage, manila and sisal, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1534 (ii).
Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1742 (ii).
Criminal Law Amt. (law of evidence) B. 141 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1465 (ii).
Crown Cases Reserved Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1202 (ii).
Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1454 (ii).
Edmonstone and Rivière du Loup Ry. Subsidy (Ques.) 570 (i).
Fairfield, N.B., Postmastership (Ques.) 1661 (ii).
Fisheries, salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1542 (ii).
Fishing by Foreign Vessels in Canadian Waters B. 136 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 1423 (ii).
Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1431 (ii).
Franchise Act, instructions to Revising Officers, on M. for copies, 55 (i).
Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1468, 1498, 1509, 1666, 1671 (ii).
Fredericton to Prince William Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1625 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, N. B., in Com. of Sup., 1263 (ii.)
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1651 (ii).
Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, &c., B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) in Com., 908 (ii).
I. C. R., casualties, &c., damage and amount of claims (M. for Ret.*) 58 (i).

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—*Continued.*
I. C. R. claims arising out of construction, in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).
——— earnings and working expenses (Ques.) 62; (M. for Ret.*) 392 (i).
——— employees between Campbellton and Halifax, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 58 (i).
——— Indiantown branch, amount paid for land damages (M. for Ret.*) 392 (i).
——— oil contracts (Ques.) 897 (ii).
——— private and official cars built or purchased (M. for Ret.) 57 (i).
——— rolling stock purchased (M. for Ret.*) 58 (i).
——— rolling stock repaired at Govt. workshops, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 58 (i).
——— Stellarton branch, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
Interest in B. C., B. 22 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1245 (ii).
Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup., 890 (ii).
Land Grants to Militia B. 142 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com. on Res, 1456; on M. for 2°, 1570; in Com., 1572 (ii).
Legal Services in connection with Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1159 (ii).
Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, in Com. of Sup., 1376 (ii).
Marine Police Force in Can., on M. for Ret., 385 (i).
Maritime Court of Ont. Jurisdiction B. 5 (Mr. *Allen*) in Com., 560, 564, 567 (i).
Metapedia and Cross Point Ry. Survey (Ques.) 426 (i),
Meteorological Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 1377 (ii).
Moncton and Buctouche Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1597 (ii).
Mount Middleton, N.B., Postmaster (Ques.) 1075 (ii).
Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 946; in Com., 950 (ii).
Navigable Waters, works in, B. 130 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) M. for 2° 1246; in Com., 1270 (ii).
Nerepis Station, N.B., Postmaster (Ques.) 1075 (ii).
N.W.T. Law Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1383, 1458; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1483; neg. (Y. 42, N. 70) 1485 (ii).
Oil Contracts, I.C.R. (Ques.) 897 (ii).
Paper Hangings, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1587 (ii).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1556 (ii).
Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1155, 1159, 1162 (ii).
Queen's Birthday, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) for Adjnmt., 1431 (ii).
Ry. station buildings in St. John, N.B., cost, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 58 (i).
Real Property in the N.W.T. B. 10 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1516 (ii).
Reformatory for Juvenile Offenders, Halifax, B. 134 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1381 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—*Continued.*
Representation of the N.W.T. in Parlt. B. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1251 (ii).
Restigouche River, Ry. bridge across (Ques.) 426 (i).
Richibucto and St. Louis Ry. Subsidy (Ques.) 494 (i).
St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension Co. (M. for Ret.*) 66 (i).
Senate, Constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1294 (ii).
Stather R., papers, *re* application for discharge (Ques.) 68; (M. for copies) 371, 376 (i).
Statutes, Revised, B. 9 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 514 (i), 1224 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1086 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1597, 1625 (ii).
Summary Proceedings before Justices, &c., B. 84 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 807 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Colonial and Indian Exhibition) 1742 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1454 (ii).
Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 1542 (ii).
Indians (N.B.) 1651 (ii).
Justice, Administration of, 890 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Buoys and Beacons) 1377; (Lighthouses and Fog alarms) 1376 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 896 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Ottawa) 1155; (Que.) 1162. *Income:* Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1263; (N.S.) 1159 (ii).
Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (Port Arthur to Red River) 1694. I. C. R. (claims) 1752; (Stellarton Branch) 1452 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Observatories) 1377 (ii).
Supreme Court, extra reporter, in Com. of Sup., 891 (ii).
Travis, Judge, in Com of Sup., 890 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1584, 1585 (ii).

White, Mr. J., *East Hastings.*
Anglo-American Iron Co.'s incorp. (B. 62, 1°*) 301 (i).
Canadian Copper Co.'s (B. 61, 1°*) 301 (i).
Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 67, 1°*) 393 (i).
Cook, Mr. H., Timber Dues, on M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 1420 (ii).
Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 537 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Coughlin*) 1137 (ii).
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1651 (ii).
Interest on moneys secured by Mortgage B. 12 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 440 (i).
Legal services in connection with Fishery Award, in Com. of Sup., 1159 (ii).
Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 79, 1°*) 460 (i).
——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1627 (ii).
Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 1321 (ii).
Oleomargarine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1191 (ii).
Prince Albert Colonisation Co., on M. (Mr. *Edgar*) for Sel. Com., 489 ( ).

White, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1159 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1627 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Interior, Dept. of) 537 (i).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 1654; (N.B.) 1651 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1159 (ii).

White, Mr. P., *North Renfrew.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. to consdr. B., 909; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 910; neg. (Y. 36, N. 99) 911 (ii).
Farm or Real Estate Banks, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Orton*) 582 (i).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1266 (ii).
Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, &c., B. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*) in Com., 908 (ii).
Kingston and Pembroke Mutual Aid and Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 24, 1°*) 66 (i).
Navigable Waters protection (fisheries, &c.) B. 96 (Mr. *Foster*) on M. for 2°, 949 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Bonus to Ont. and Pacific Ry., &c., 1096 (ii).
Red River improvements (Ques.) 1240 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1266 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, on M. for Ret., 902 (ii).

White, Hon. T., *Cardwell.*
Address, on the, 27 (i).
Administration of the N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1733 (ii).
BUDGET, The. *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."
C. P. R., confirmation of Agreement, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *McLelan*) 941 (ii).
——— Homesteads in Ry. Belt (Ans.) 120, 185 (i).
——— Lands, sale of by Co. (Ans.) 543 (i).
Churchill and Nelson Rivers surveys (Ans.) 266 (i).
Colonisation Co.'s and Settlers (Ans.) 330 (i).
Disturbance in the N. W., duty of Govt. to bring down further papers, on Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 502 (i).
——— Police Scouts, on M. for Cor., 789 (i).
——— Scrip to Half-breeds who took part in Rebellion (Ans.) 1075 (ii).
——— Settlers on service and homesteads (Ans.) 426 (i).
Dominion Lands Act, 1883, Amt. (B. 94, 1°) 600 (i); in Com., 913-930, 1078, 1081-1085; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1568 (ii).
Dom. Lands in B. C. administration (B. 120, 1°) 912 (ii).
——— settlement of, on M. for Cor., 496 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 527, 530-533 (i) 1550 (ii).
Geological display and Colonial Exhibition (Ans.) 692 (i).
——— Survey, expenditure (Ans.) 633 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 524, 542 (i), 1649 (ii).

White, Hon. T.—*Continued.*
Half-breeds Claims Commission, 1877, Reps. of, on M. for Ret., 634 (i).
——— Stmnt. respecting (presented) 746 (i).
Hay tax in the N.W.T. (Ans.) 121 (i).
Homestead Entries, cancelled or abandoned in N.W., on M. for Ret., 801 (i).
Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 651 (i).
Imperial Federation (remarks on M. for adjnmt.) 34 (i).
Indian Title, extinguishment of in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 818-829 (ii).
Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 60 (i).
Justice, Administration of, in Com. of Sup., 387 (ii).
Land Claims Commission, N.W., Rep. (Ans.) 1421 (ii).
Land Grants to Militia (B. 142) M. to introd., 1420; M. for Com. on Res., 1455; in Com., 1456, 1458; 2°, m., 1568; 2° and in Com., 1572 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. Act Amt. (B. 117, 1°) 876; 2° m. and in Com., 973; 3° m., 1015 (ii).
Lands, Public, in B. C. (B. 120, 1°*) 912; in Com., 1202; 3° m, 1223 (ii).
Land Sales in N.W., 1884-85 (Ans.) 120 (i).
Licenses to cut Timber in Dom. (Amt.) to M. for Ret., 65 (i).
Man. and North-Western Ry. Co.'s land Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1630 (ii).
Man. Claims settlement B. 123 (Mr. *McLelan*) on M. for 2°, 1145 (ii).
Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 1657 (ii).
Mining Law Amt. (Ans.) 844 (ii).
National Parks in N. W. T. or B. C. (Ans.) 266 (i).
N.W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com., 995; on M. to adjn. deb., 1004 (ii).
——— Land Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1631 (ii).
N. W. T. Law Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1462 (ii).
Point Pelee Naval Reserve (Ans.) 120 (i).
Pre-emptions in Man., reduction in price (Ans.) 369 (i).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1566 (ii).
Printing Immigration pamphlets, in Com. of Sup., 1394 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Charlton*) timber limits, 1515 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Haggart*) *re* application for timber limits, 1144 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Kirk*) official Reps. and headings to extra copies, 631 (i).
Rebellion losses, claims, &c, in Com. of Sup., 1764 (ii).
Returns, expense in producing, on M. for Ret., 388 (i).
Richelieu County, sale of Govt. properties in (Ans.) 185 (i).
Riel, Louis, deputation to (Ans.) 785 (i).
——— Execution of, on Amt. (Mr. *Edgar*) to Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to M. for Rets., 190 (i).

White, Hon. T.—*Continued*
Rideau Hall, additions, alterations, repairs, &c., on M. for Stmnt., 799 (i).
Rocky Mountain Rangers, issue of Scrip (Ans.) 544 (i).
Subsidies (land) to Rys. in Man. and N.W.T. (B. 147) prop. Res., 1551; in Com., 1630; M. to conc. in Res., 1639; 1°* of B., 1640 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Interior Dept. of) 524, 801 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Dom. Lands) 1550 (ii).
Immigration (Printing Pamphlets) 1394 (ii).
Justice, Administration of, 887 (ii).
Miscellaneous (N.W. Rebellion losses, &c.) 1764 (ii).
Geological Survey, 1649 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1657 (ii).
Temperance Colonisation Co. (remarks) 1634 (ii).
Timber, Land, and Coal Leases in N.W.T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1041–1047 (ii).
Timber Licenses in disputed Territory (Ans.) 42 (ii).
Travis, Judge, in Com. of Sup., 887 (ii).
Treston, Jas., and others, receipt of Petitions (Ans.) 785 (i).
Valin, Mr., M.P., Grants of Land to in N.W., on M. for Ret., 32 (i).
Vancouver Ry. Reserves, Squatters' pre-emption Records (Ans.) 369 (i.)
Ways and Means—On 1° of Res., 460-470 (i).
Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s Land Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1633 (ii).
Yukon River Explorations (Ans.) 266 (i).

Wigle, Mr. L., *South Essex.*
Experimental Farm Stations establishment B. 124 (Mr. *Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 965 (ii).
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1654 (ii).
Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1611 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1611 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 1654 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. J. H., *East Elgin.*
Arts, Agriculture, &c., Dom. Exhibition, 1093 (ii).
B. C. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).
Can. Temp. Act., in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries, in Com. of Sup., 1758 (ii).
Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 876 (ii).
Convict *vs.* Free Labor, number employed in Dom. Penitentiaries (M. for Ret.*) 47 (i).
Fabre, Mr., salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, Ont., in Com. of Sup., 1267 (ii).
Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1094 (ii).
Immigration, assisted and unassisted (M. for Ret.) 635, 661 (i).

Wilson, Mr. J. H.—*Continued.*
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1387 (ii).
Ingersoll, London and Chatham Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1601 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 892, 1164 (ii).
Life-boat service, rewards, &c., in Com of Sup., 1373 (ii).
Manitoba Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 894 (ii).
Militia, Dept. of, contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 877, 879 (ii).
Morgan's "Register," in Com. of Sup., 880 (ii).
Photographs of Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 882 (ii).
Public Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1163 (ii).
Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1417 (ii).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1600 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dom. Exhibition) 1093; (Health Statistics) 1094 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Inland Revenue, Dept. of) 689 (i). Contingencies (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 868; (Interior, Dept. of) 881; (Militia, Dept. of) 877, 879; (Public Works) 882; (Secretary of State) 880 (ii).
Fisheries (Cod Liver Oil and Guano industries) 1758 (ii).
Immigration (general vote) 1387 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Can. Temp. Act) 1658; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1658 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Rewards, &c., and life-boat service) 1373 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 897; (Kingston) 892; (Man.) 894 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1163; Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1267 (ii).
Quarantine (general vote) 1417 (ii).

Wood, Mr. J. F., *Brockville.*
Brockville and New York Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 68, 1°*) 393 (i).
Franchise Act, instructions to Revising Officers, on M. for copies (remarks) 50 (i).
Fruit, green, conc. in Ways and Means, 753 (i).
Oleomargarine, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1190 (ii).
Riel, Louis, Execution of, on Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 136–139 (i).
Senate, constitution of, on Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1288 (ii).
Timber, Land and Coal Leases in N. W. T., on Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1074 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 753 (i).

Wood, Mr. J., *Westmoreland.*
Chignecto Marine Ry. B. (Mr. *Pope*) on prop. Res., 676, 680 (i).
Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1432 (ii).
Ways and Means—on 1° of Res., 480–484 (i).

Woodworth, Mr. D. B., *King's, N.S.*
Cab-hire and travelling expenses, in Com. of Sup., 873 (ii).
C. P. R. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*) on Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to M. for 3°, 1356 (ii).
Cape Breton Island Ry. B. 143 (Sir *Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 1489 (ii).
Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. B. (M. *Pope*) on prop. Res., 679 (i).
Customs Seizures at Montreal, on M. for Com. of Sup. 1691 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act, 1883, Amt. B. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 918, 920, 926 (ii).
Flour and Coal duties, abolition of, on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1441 (ii).
Immigration, assisted and unassisted, on M. for Ret., 643 (i).
I. C. R., McCann Station to Joggins Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1650 (ii).
—— Stellarton and Pictou branch B. 57 (Mr. *Pope*) M. for 3°, 666 (i).
Nictaux and Atlantic Ry. (remarks) on B. 146, 1617, 1638 (ii).
Northern Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Sen. Amts., 1608 (ii).

Woodworth, Mr. D. B.—*Continued.*
N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*) on M. for Com., 974-978; on M. to adjn. deb., 1005 (ii).
N. W. T. Law Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1460 (ii).
Printing and Stationery Bureau B. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) to M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1729 (ii).
Rideau Hall, contingencies, on M. for Ret., 794 (i).
Subsidies (money) to Rys. B. 146 (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. on Res., 1617; on M. to introd. B., 1638 (ii).
Subsidies (land) to Rys. B. 147 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) in Com., 1711 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Privy Council Office) contingencies, 873 (i).
Travis, Judge, ref. to in Com. on B. 133, 1462 (ii).
Truro to Newport Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 1617 (ii).

Wright, Mr. A., *Ottawa County.*
Eddy, E. B., Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. (B. 30, 1°*) 92 (i).
Rivière aux Lièvres improvements (Ques.) 426 (i).

INDEX-PART II.

SUBJECTS.

A, B AND C BATTERIES: in Com. of Sup., 1308, 1547; conc., 1771 (ii).

"ADAMS, DAVID J.," SCHOONER, SEIZURE OF: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1254 (ii).

ADDRESS, IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: Moved (Mr. *Everett*) 2; Sec. (Mr. *Ward*) 6; reply (Mr. *Blake*) 8; Ans (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 19, remarks, 30; deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 23; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 27; (Mr. *Davies*) 27; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 29; agreed to, 30; His Ex.'s reply, 92 (i).

ADJOURNMENTS:

ANNUNCIATION DAY: Remarks on adjnmt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 301; (M.) 368 (i).

ASH WEDNESDAY: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 66 (i).

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY: prop. M. for adjnmt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1431; (M.,) 1455 (ii).

ST. PATRICK'S DAY: M. for adjnmt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 185 (i).

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 886, 1747 (ii)

ADMINISTRATION OF THE N. W. T.: Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1729; deb. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 1733; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1735; (Mr. *Amyot*) 1738; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1739; neg. (Y. 51, N. 71) 1740 (ii).

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1 (*pro formâ*) (i).

Adulteration Act Amt. B. No. 108 (Mr. *Costigan*). 1°*, 747 (i); 2°* and in Com., 957; 3°*, 1015 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)

ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com of Sup., 1547 (ii).

ADVANCES TO P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 1378 (ii).

ADVERTISING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 875; in Com. on B. 132, 1552 (ii).

Agriculturists Banking and Loan Facilities. *See* "BANKING."

AGRICULTURE, IMMIGRATION, &c.:

AGRICULTURE, DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Pope*) 60 (i); in Com. of Sup., 691, 1698 (ii).

ARCHIVES, CARE OF: in Com. of Sup., 1090 (ii).

ARTS, AGRICULTURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1090 (ii).

CENSUS OF MANITOBA, N.W.T. AND KEEWATIN; Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 43 (i); (Mr. *Scott*) 1240 (ii).

CENTRAL BOARD OF AGRICULTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 634 (i).

COLONIAL AND INDIAN EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup, 1095, 1741 (ii).

—— DELAY IN TRANSMITTING EXHIBITS: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 1077 (ii).

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1091 (ii).

DOMINION EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 1091 (ii)

EXPERIMENTAL FARM STATIONS, ESTABLISHMENT. *See* B. 124.

FABRE, HECTOR, REPORT FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Coursol*) 1661 (ii).

HEALTH STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup, 1094 (ii).

IMMIGRATION AND EMIGRATION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 370 (i).

—— ASSISTED AND UNASSISTED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 635 (i).

AGRICULTURE, IMMIGRATION, &c.—*Continued.*

IMMIGRATION FROM DAKOTA AND TEXAS: Ques. (Mr. *Royal*) 1217 (ii).

—— FROM FRANCE AND WORK OF M. LABELLE: Ques. (Mr. *Coursol*) 1661 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1385, 1392 (ii).

IMMIGRANTS SETTLED IN CANADA, NUMBER OF: Ques (Mr. *Mills*) 61 (i).

LABELLE, REV. M., IMMIGRATION REPORT: Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) 1633 (ii).

MODEL FARM: in Com. of Sup., 1659 (ii).

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 1417 (ii).

WOOD, M. C., EXPLANATION (Mr. *Carling*): in Com. of Sup., 885 (ii).

ALBERT RY. CO'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1627 (ii).

Alberta Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 31 (Mr. *Shanly*). 1°*, 92; 2°*, 119 (i); wthdn., 1309 (ii).

ALMONDS: conc. in Ways and Means, 748 (i).

AMERICAN FISHERMEN, DEPREDATIONS BY: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 783 (i).

AMNESTY, GENERAL, IN THE N.W.T.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1257 (ii).

AMMUNITION, CLOTHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1302 (ii).

AMMUNITION, MANUFACTURED AT QUEBEC: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casey*) 554 (i).

ANDERSON, JAMES, COR. *re* PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES, &C., IN N.W.T.: M. for copies (Mr. *Casey*) 427 (i).

Anglo-American Iron Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. *White, Hastings*). 1°*, 301; 2°*, 368 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 907 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 97.)

Anglo-Canadian Bank of Can. incorp. B. No. 18 (Mr. *Ward*). 1°*, 58; 2°*, 102; in Com., 494; 3°*, 555. (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 64.)

Animals Contagious Diseases Act Amt. B. No. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 58(i); 2° m., 858; 2° and in Com. 864; cnsdn. of B. m., 909; Amt. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 910; neg. (Y. 36, N. 99) and 3°, 911. (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

Animals, Cruelty to, Prevention B. No. 11 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 41; 2° m., 438; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 439 (i).

ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY RY. EXTENSION: Remarks (Mr. *Vail*) 1746 (ii).

ANNUNCIATION DAY: Remarks on adjnmt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 301; (M.) 368 (i).

ANTIGONISH, ELECTORAL DIST.: Vacancy and Return of Member elect, 1 (i).

ARCHIVES, CARE OF: in Com. of Sup., 1090 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, HON. J., sums paid to: in Com. of Sup., 1159, (ii).

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1090, 1095, 1741 (ii).

ASH WEDNESDAY, ADJNMT. FOR: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 66 (i).

ASPY BAY FISHERY DISPUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1076 (ii).

ASSINIBOINE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Messrs. *Watson* and *Ross*) 784 (i).

AUDITOR AND REC. GENL.'S, HALIFAX, WINNIPEG AND VIC.: in Com. of Sup., 521 (i).

AUDITOR GENL.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 689 (i).

——— REP.: presented (Mr. *McLelan*) 31 (i).

BADDECK, N.S., CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 1379 (ii).

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 1481 (ii).

Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. No. 144 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 1455; M. for Com., 1482; in Com., 1496; M. to conc. in Res., 1515; 1°* of B., 1516; 2° m., 1628; 3°*, 1635 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 17.)

BAKING POWDER: conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i); in Com., 1584 (ii).

BAKER, I. G. & Co., CONTRACTS FOR INDIAN SUPPLIES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 438 (i).

BAKER, I. G. & Co.'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 1076 (ii).

Banking and Loan Facilities for Agriculturists B. No. 88 (Mr. *Orton*). Res. prop., 427; in Com., 432, 1°* of B., 585 (i).

BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 59 (i).

BANKS AND BANKING:

- ANGLO-CANADIAN BANK. *See* B. 16.
- BRITISH CANADIAN INCORP. ACT AMT. *See* B. 114.
- AGRICULTURAL BANKING FACILITIES. *See* B. 88.
- CONTINENTAL BANK OF CAN. *See* B. 60
- DEPOSITS IN GOVT. AND P. O. SAVINGS BANKS: M. for Stmnt.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 392; Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 495, 634 (i); (Mr. *Jackson*) 1218 (ii).
- DOM. NOTES IN CIRCULATION AND GOLD HELD BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 438 (i).
- FARM OR REAL ESTATE BANKS: M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. *Orton*) 427; in Com., 432, 436, 574 (ii).
- FORESTERS' DEPOSITS IN GOVT. BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1095 (ii).
- FREEHOLD LOAN AND SAVINGS SOCIETY. *See* B. 113.
- INTEREST IN B. C. *See* B. 22.
- INSOLVENT BANKS, INSURANCE CO.'S, &c. *See* B. 15.
- NEW BRUNSWICK BANK. *See* B. 14.
- POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Orton*) 62 (i).
- PICTOU BANK. *See* B. 50.
- SAVINGS BANKS AND P. O. SAVINGS BANKS, AMOUNT HELD BY GOVT. IN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 438 (i).
- SCHOOL SAVINGS BANK INCORP. B. *See* B. 75.
- YARMOUTH BANK. *See* B. 69.
- UNION BANK OF HALIFAX. *See* B. 52.
- UNION BANK OF LOWER CANADA. *See* B. 41.

BARKER, MR. F. E.: Returned as Member elect for St. John (N.B.) City, 1 (i).

BARKER, P. M., AMOUNTS PAID TO: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 58 (i).

BATTERIES: in Com. of Sup., 1308, 1547, 1771 (ii).

BATOCHE, BATTLE OF, REP. OF OFFICER SECOND IN COMMAND: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 369 (i).

BATOCHE, PAPERS FOUND AT, DIARY OF RIEL, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 58 (i).

BAYFIELD HARBOR REPAIRS: M. for Cor. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 383 (i).

BELL & LEWIS, HOWARD WRIGHT, AND OTHERS, MONEYS PAID TO FOR TRANSPORT, &c., IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 437 (i).

BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1626 (ii).

BILLS ASSENTED TO: 1776 (ii).

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald.*)
1°*, 1 (*pro formâ*) (i).

BILL (No. 2) To amend the Criminal Law, and to declare it a misdemeanor to leave unguarded and exposed holes cut in the ice on any navigable or frequented waters.—(Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton.*)
1°, 31; 2°, 707(i); in Com. and 3°*, 856(ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 53.)

BILL (No. 3) For the further amendment of the Law of Evidence in certain cases.—(Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton.*)
1°, 31 (i); 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 52) 853; in Com., 911; Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 59, N. 68) 911; 3° on same div. reversed, 912 (ii).

BILL (No. 4) To amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and amendments thereto.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 31 (i); 2° m., Order dschgd. and B. wthdn, 858 (ii).

BILL (No. 5) To extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.—(Mr. *Allen.*)
1°*, 37; 2° m., 149; 2°*, 437; in Com., 559 (i).

BILL (No. 6) For constituting a Court of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 37; 2° m., 585; Order dschgd. and B. wthdn., 599 (i).

BILL (No. 7) Respecting Carriers by Land.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 38; 2° m., Order dschgd. and B. wthdn., 707 (i).

BILL (No. 8) To amend the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 38; 2°*, 707 (i); in Com., 857; 3°*, 858 (ii).

BILL (No. 9) Respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°, 38; 2°* and in Com., 513; ref. to Sel. Com., 555 (i); in Com., 1224; 3°* 1229 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 4.)

BILL (No. 10) Respecting Real Property in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°, 40; 2° m., 668; 2°* and ref. to Sp. Com., 670 (i); prop. Res., 1015; in Com. on B., 1516; in Com. on Res., 1532; Res. conc. in and 3°*, 1552 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 26.)

BILL (No. 11) For the more effectual prevention of Cruelty to Animals.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°, 41; 2° m., 438; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 439 (i).

BILL (No. 12) To amend the Act relating to interest on moneys secured by mortgage on real estate.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°, 41; 2° m., 439; 2°, 441 (i).

BILL (No. 13) To limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court as respects matters of a purely local nature in the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. *Landry, Montmagny.*)
1°, 41 (i).

BILL (No. 14) To reduce the capital stock of the Bank of New Brunswick.—(Mr. *Weldon.*)
1°*, 48; 2°*, 66; in Com and 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 59.)

BILL (No. 15) Further to amend an Act respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Companies, Building Societies and Trading Corporations.—(Mr. *Edgar.*)
1°, 48; 2°, 437 (i); in Com., 907, 1179; 3°*, 1180; M. to trans. Sen. Amts. to Govt. Orders, 1592 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 46.)

BILL (No. 16) To incorporate the Medicine Hat, Dunmore and Benton Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCallum.*)
1°*, 48; 2°*, 102 (i); wthdn., 1309 (ii).

BILL (No. 17) To amend the Act respecting the North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Beaty.*)
1°*, 58; 2°*, 102 (i); M. for Com., 974; Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3 m. h., 979; neg. (Y. 59, N. 86) 1011; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 82) in Com. and 3°*, 1013 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 74.)

BILL (No. 18) To incorporate the Midland (title changed to "Anglo-Canadian") Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Ward.*)
1°*, 58; 2°*, 102; in Com., 494; 3°*, 555 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 64.)

BILL (No. 19) To amend "The Animal Contagious Diseases Act."—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 58 (i); 2° m., 858; 2° and in Com., 864; consdn. of B. m., 909; Amt. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 910; neg. (Y. 36, N. 99) and 3°, 911 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

BILL (No. 20) to punish Seduction and like offences, and to make better provision for the protection of women and girls.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 60; 2° m., 441; 2ª agreed to (Y. 114, N. 47) 444; M. for Com., 570; ref. to Sel. Com., 571; in Com. of W., 704; 3°*, 707 (i); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1326 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 52.)

BILL (No. 21) Further to amend "The Supreme and Exchequer Court Act."—(Mr. *Edgar.*)
1°, 60 (i).

BILL (No. 22) Respecting interest in the Province of British Columbia.—(Mr. *Baker, Victoria.*)
1°, 61 (i); M. to place 2° on Govt. Orders, 1218; Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) to add B. (No. 92) neg. (Y. 68, N. 88) 1218; Amt. (Mr. *Kranz*) to add B. No. 104, 1218; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) to add Bs. Nos. 92, 99 and 118, 1219; neg., Y. 22, N. 149) 1222; Amt. (Mr. *Kranz*) neg. (Y. 35, N. 134) 1223; 2° m., 1143; 2° and in Com., 1244; 3°*, 1270 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 44.)

BILL (No. 23) To further amend the Law of Evidence in criminal cases.—(Mr. *Cameron, Huron.*)
1°, 66; 2° m, 707; 2° neg. (Y. 57, N. 80) 709 (i).

BILL (No. 24) To incorporate the Kingston and Pembroke Mutual Aid and Insurance Company (Limited).—(Mr. *White, Renfrew.*)
1°*, 66; 2°*, 240 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 907 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 65.)

BILL (No. 25) Respecting the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 66; 2°*, 240 (i); M. for Com., 1311; in Com., 1318; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1325; neg. (Y. 48, N. 96) and 3°, 1326; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1605; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1640; M. to trans. Sen. Amts. to Govt. Orders, 1662; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1673; Amts. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1676, 1684; neg. (Y. 45, N. 90) 1684 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 76.)

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Tecumseh Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Macmillan, Middlesex.*)
1°*, 67; 2°*, 119; in Com. and 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 93.)

BILL (No. 27) To amend the Act to incorporate the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macmillan, Middlesex.*)
1°*, 67; 2°, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)

BILL (No. 28) To amend the Criminal Law of Canada.—(Mr. *Robertson, Hastings.*)
1°, 67 (i); 2° m., 1185; neg., 1186 (ii).

BILL (No. 29) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1884.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°, 67 (i); 2° m. and neg. (Y. 42, N. 80) 1186 (ii).

BILL (No. 30) To incorporate the E. B. Eddy Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. *Wright.*)
1°*, 92; 2°*, 119; in Com. and 3°*, 757 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 106.)

BILL (No. 31) To incorporate the Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Shanly.*)
1°*, 92; 2°*, 119 (i); wthdn., 1309 (ii).

BILL (No. 32) To incorporate a Community of Religious Ladies under the name of "The Sisters Faithful Companions of Jesus."—(Mr. *Royal.*)
1°*, 92; 2°*, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 473 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 111.)

BILL (No. 33) To incorporate the Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company.—(Mr. *Homer.*)
1°*, 92; 2°*, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 614 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1171 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 82.)

BILL (No. 34) To incorporate the Lake Superior Mineral Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dawson.*)
1°*, 92; 2°*, 119; in Com. and 3°*, 757 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 81.)

BILL (No. 35) To amend the Act to incorporate the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford.*)
1°*, 92; 2°*, 119; in Com. and 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 77.)

BILL (No. 36) To grant certain powers to the Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Company of Algoma (Limited).—(Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford.*)
1°*, 92; 2°*, 119; Order for Com. read, 494; in Com., 782; 3°*, 783 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 108.)

BILL (No. 37) To naturalise Girolamo Consentini, commonly called Baron Girolamo Consentini.—(Mr. *Hall.*)
1°*, 93; 2°*, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 473 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 112.)

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Baker, Victoria.*)
1°*, 93; 2°*, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 494 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)

BILL (No. 39) To incorporate the Emerson and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Pruyn.*)
1°*, 93; 2°*, 342 (i); wthdn., 897 (ii).

BILL (No. 40) Relating to the Canada Southern Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Baker, Victoria.*)
1°*, 93; 2°*, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 494 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 90.)

BILL (No. 41) To reduce the Capital Stock of the Union Bank of Lower Canada, and to change the corporate name thereof to the "Union Bank of Canada."—(Mr. *Bossé.*)
1°*, 93; 2°*, 119; in Com. and 3°*, 704 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)

BILL (No. 42) Respecting the Saskatchewan Land and Homestead Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Orton.*)
1°*, 93; 2°*, 119; in Com. and 3°*, 757 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 101.)

BILL (No. 43) To amend the Act incorporating the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mackintosh*)
1°*, 93; 2°*, 119; in Com., 555, 612; 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 72.)

BILL (No. 44) To incorporate the Bow River Coal Mine and Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Robertson, Hastings.*)
1°*, 119; 2°*, 265; in Com. and 3°*, 757 (i). (49 *Vic*, *c.* 87.)

BILL (No. 45) Respecting the Dominion Lands Colonisation Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Beaty.*)
1°*, 11[illegible]; 2°*, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 100.)

BILL (No. 46) To repeal the Act intituled: "An Act for facilitating the navigation of the River St. Lawrence in and near the Harbor of Quebec."—(Mr. *Langelier.*)
1°, 119 (i).

BILL (No. 47) Respecting the railway from Esquimalt to Nanaimo, in British Columbia.—(Mr. *Pope.*)
1°, 119; 2° m., 515; 2° and in Com., 517; 3° m., 602; 3°*, 604 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 15)

BILL (No. 48) To amend the Act to incorporate the Niagara Frontier Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Rykert*)
1°*, 149; 2°*, 240 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1153 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)

BILL (No. 49) To incorporate the Ontario, Minnesota and Manitoba Railway Company.—(Mr. *Royal.*)
1°*, 149; 2°*, 342 (i); wthdn., 897 (ii).

BILL (No. 50) Respecting the Pictou Bank.—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°*, 149; 2°*, 265; in Com. and 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 62.)

BILL (No. 51) To amend the Act to incorporate the Nova Scotia Steamship Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Kinney.*)
1°*, 149; 2°*, 265; in Com. and 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 96.)

BILL (No. 52) To reduce the Capital Stock of the Union Bank of Halifax.—(Mr. *Stairs.*)
1°*, 149; 2°*, 265; in Com. and 3°*, 704 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)

BILL (No. 53) To incorporate the Calvin Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 149; 2°*, 265; in Com. and 3°*, 474 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 107.)

BILL (No. 54) To incorporate the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 149; 2°*, 265; in Com. and 3°*, 494 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 86.)

BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Watson.*)
1°*, 185; 2°*, 265 (i); wthdn., 1309 (ii).

BILL (No. 56) To incorporate the Nova Scotia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dodd.*)
1°*, 185; 2°*, 342 (i).

BILL (No. 57) Respecting the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from a point at or near Stellarton to the Town of Pictou.—(Mr. *Pope*)
1°, 185; 2° and in Com., 604, 614; 3° m., 663; 3°*, 668 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

BILL (No. 58) To incorporate the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Colby.*)
1°*, 226; 2°*, 342; in Com. and 3°*, 757 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 78.)

BILL (No. 59) To incorporate the First Synod in the Dominion of Canada of the Reformed Episcopal Church, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(Mr. *Beaty.*)
1°*, 226; 2°*, 342; in Com. and 3°*, 757 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 110.)

BILL (No. 60) To incorporate the Colonial (title changed to "Continental") Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Macmillan, Middlesex.*)
1°*, 226; 2°*, 342; in Com., 473; 3°*, 473 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)

BILL (No. 61) Respecting the Canada Copper Company.—(Mr. *White, Hastings.*)
1°*, 301; 2°*, 368 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 907 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 99.)

BILL (No. 62) Respecting the Anglo-American Iron Company.—(Mr. *White Hastings.*)
1°*, 301; 2°*, 368 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 907 (ii). (49 *Vic*, *c.* 97.)

BILL (No. 63) To incorporate the Rock Lake, Souris and Brandon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 301; 2°*, 368 (i); wthdn., 1309 (ii).

BILL (No. 64) To amend the Act incorporating the Pictou Coal and Iron Company.—(Mr. *Stairs.*)
1°*, 368; 2°*, 474; in Com. and 3°*, 783 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 98.)

BILL (No. 65) Respecting the Northern and North-Western Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kilvert.*)
1°*, 393; 2°*, 474(i); in Com. and 3°*, 1281 (ii).

BILL (No. 66) To incorporate the Forbes' Trochilic Steam Engine Central Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Patterson, Essex.*)
1°*, 393; 2°*, 474 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 907 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 109.)

BILL (No. 67) Respecting the Central Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. *White, Hastings.*)
1°*, 393; 2°*, 474; in Com. and 3°*, 783 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 71.)

BILL (No. 68) To incorporate the Brockville and New York Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)
1°*, 393; 2°*, 474 (i); in Com and 3°*, 856 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 91.)

BILL (No. 69) Respecting the Bank of Yarmouth.—(Mr. *Kinney.*)
1°*, 393; 2°*, 474 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 63.)

BILL (No. 70) Respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Ross.*)
1°*, 393; 2°*, 474 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 957 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 75.)

BILL (No. 71) For the discharge of Insolvent Debtors whose Estates have been distributed rateably among their Creditors.—(Mr. *Edgar.*)
1°*, 393 (i).

BILL (No. 72) Respecting the Union Suspension Bridge.—(Sir *Hector Langevin.*)
1°*, 393; 2° and in Com., 518; 3°*, 604 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the North Canadian Pacific Railway Company (title changed to "Winnipeg and North Pacific Railway Company").—(Mr. *Haggart.*)
1°*, 426; 2°*, 494 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1153 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 84.)

BILL (No. 74) To incorporate the Ste. Ursule, Mattawan and Lake Temiscamingue Railway Company (title changed to Maskinongé and Nipissing Railway Company).—(Mr. *Hurteau.*)
1°*, 426; 2°*, 494 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 957 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 79.)

BILL (No. 75) To incorporate the School Savings Bank.—(Mr. *Massue.*)
1°*, 426; 2°*, 474 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 67.)

BILL (No. 76) Respecting the Burlington Bay Canal.—(Sir *Hector Langevin.*)
1°, 426; 2° and in Com., 518; 3°*, 604 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 77) To amend the Post Office Act, 1875—(D) *from the Senate.*—(Sir *Hector Langevin.*)
1°*, 437; 2° and in Com., 519; recom., 711; 3° on a div., 712 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 21.)

BILL (No. 78) To amend the Act to incorporate the Guelph Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Innes.*)
1°*, 460; 2°*, 614; in Com. and 3°*, 783 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 69.)

BILL (No. 79) Respecting the Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Railway Company.—(*Mr. White, Hastings.*)
1°*, 460; 2°*, 614 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1386 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 68.)

BILL (No. 80) Further to amend the Interpretation Act—(C) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°*, 488; 2° m., 519; 2°, 671; in Com., 712; 3°*, 713 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 2.)

BILL (No. 81) To incorporate the Lennox Passage Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Paint.*)
1°*, 487; 2°*, 614 (i); wthdn., 1378 (ii).

BILL (No. 82) Respecting the application of certain Fines and Forfeitures.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°, 488; 2°, 671; in Com., 713; 3° m. and Amts. (Mr. *Blake*) 711; 3° agreed to (Y. 47, N. 106) 715 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 48.)

BILL (No. 83) To amend the Act incorporating the Board of Trade of the city of Ottawa.—(Mr. *Mackintosh.*)
1°*, 511; 2°*, 614 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 907 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 57.)

BILL (No. 84) To make further provision respecting Summary Proceedings before Justices and other Magistrates—(A) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°*, 519; 2°, 671; in Com., 715 (i), 805; 3°*, 913 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 49.)

BILL (No. 85) To amend the several Acts relating to the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto—(E) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 519; 2°*, 614; in Com. and 3°*, 704 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 56.)

BILL (No. 86) To incorporate the North American Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 543; 2°*, 704 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1281 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 94.)

BILL (No. 87) To incorporate the Columbia Valley Railway Company (title changed to "The Kootenay and Athabasca Railway Company").—(Mr. *Tupper.*)
1°*, 569; 2°*, 704 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1386 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 83.)

BILL (No. 88) To provide Banking and Loan Facilities to those engaged in Agricultural pursuits.—(Mr. *Orton.*)
Res. prop., 427; in Com., 432, 1°* of B., 585 (i).

BILL (No. 89) To incorporate the Kootenay Railway Company of British Columbia.—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 599; 2°*, 704 (i); incorp. with B. 87.

BILL (No. 90) To amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Montreal Board of Trade.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°*, 599 (i); 2°, 856; in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 55.)

BILL (No. 91) To incorporate the Yarmouth Steamship Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Kinney.*)
1°*, 599; 2°*, 704 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 95.)

BILL (No. 92) Further to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878.—(Mr. *Jamieson.*)
1°, 599 (i); Ms. to place on Govt. Orders, neg. (Y. 68, N. 88) 1218; neg. (Y. 22, N. 149) 1222 (ii.)

BILL (No. 93) To provide for the distribution of the Assets of Insolvent Debtors.—(Mr. *Macmillan, Middlesex.*)
1°*, 599 (i).

BILL (No. 94) Further to amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1883.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell.*)
1°, 600; 2°*, 748 (i); in Com., 913, 1078, 1085; 3°*, 1243; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1568 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 27.)

BILL (No. 95) To incorporate the Victoria and Sault Ste. Marie Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dawson.*)
1°*, 630; 2°*, 757 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1153 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 80.)

BILL (No. 96) Respecting the protection of Navigable Waters.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 630 (ii); 2° m., 946; in Com., 951; 3°, 1015 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 97) Respecting the London and Ontario Investment Company (Limited)—(F) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Beaty.*)
1°*, 644; 2°*, 704 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1326 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 102.)

BILL (No. 98) To consolidate the borrowing powers of the Canada Permanent Loan and Savings Company, and to authorise the said Company to issue Debenture Stock—(H) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Small.*)
1°*, 644; 2°*, 704 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 104.)

BILL (No. 99) Relating to Druggists—(J) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Hickey.*)
1°*, 691 (i); Ms. to place 2° on Govt. Orders, 1219, 1222; neg. (Y. 22, N. 149) 1222 (ii).

BILL (No. 100) Respecting the transfer of the Lighthouse at Cape Race, Newfoundland, and its appurtenances, to the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop., 513; in Com., 672; 1°* of B., 673; 2° and in Com., 748 (i); 3°*, 805 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 20.)

BILL (No. 101) To amend the Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883, and the Act amending the same.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
Res. prop., 601; in Com., 681; 1°* of B., 688 (i); 2°* and in Com., 1204; 3°*, 1223 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 39.)

BILL (No. 102) To expedite the issue of Letters Patent for Indian Lands.—(Sir *Hector Langevin.*)
1°, 692; 2° m., 807; 2° and in Com., 808; 3°*, 868 (ii). (49, *Vic., c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 103) Further to amend The Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
Res. prop. and 1°* of B., 710 (i); 2° and in Com., 1086; 3°*, 1144 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 104) To amend The Canada Temperance Act, 1878.—(Mr. *Orton.*)
1°, 710 (i); M. to place 2° on Govt. Orders, 1218; neg. (Y. 35, N. 134) 1223 (ii).

BILL (No. 105) To amend the Act to provide for the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, limited.—(Mr. *Pope.*)
Res. prop., 513; M. for Com., 673; in Com., 681; conc. in and 1°* of B., 712 (i); 2°* and in Com., 957; 3° on a div., 1015; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1381 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 18.)

BILL (No. 106) To amend an Act to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into Canada.—(Mr. *Chapleau.*)
1°, 746 (i); 2° and in Com., 1229; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1240; neg. (Y. 60, N. 114) 1242; Amt. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) and 3°*, 1243 (ii).

BILL (No. 107) To amend the Act relating to the representation in the House of Commons of the Province of British Columbia.—(Mr. *Baker, Victoria.*)
1°, 746 (i).

BILL (No. 108) To amend The Adulteration Act.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°*, 747 (i); 2°* and in Com., 957; 3°*, 1015 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 41.)

BILL (No. 109) In further amendment of the Weights and Measures Act of 1879.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 747 (i); 2° and in Com. 957; 3°*, 1015 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 40.)

BILL (No. 110) Respecting Commissions to Public Officers of Canada.—(Mr. *Chapleau.*)
1°*, 781 (i); 2° and in Com., 958; 3°*, 1015 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 111) Respecting Insurance—(G) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°*, 842; 2°, 957; in Com. and 3°*, 1385 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 45.)

BILL (No. 112) To consolidate the borrowing powers of the Western Canada Loan and Savings Company, and to authorise the said Company to issue Debenture Stock—(M) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Beaty.*)
1°*, 805; 2°*, 856; in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii.) (49 *Vic., c.* 105.)

BILL (No. 113) To consolidate the borrowing powers of the Freehold Loan and Savings Company, and to authorise the said Company to issue Debenture Stock—(L) *from the Senate.*—(*Mr. Beaty.*)
1°*, 805; 2°*, 856; in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 103.)

BILL (No. 114) To amend the Act incorporating the British Canadian Bank.—(Mr. *Dawson.*)
1°*, 865; 2°*, 907; in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 115) Respecting the representation of the North-West Territories in the Parliament of Canada.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald.*)
1°, 866; Res. prop., 1143; Res. conc. in and ref. to Com. on B., 1223; 2° m., 1205; 2°* and in Com., 1213; in Com., 1249; 3° m., Amts. (Messrs. *Mills* and *Watson*) and 3°*, 1271 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 116) To incorporate The St. Gabriel Levee and Railway Company.—(Mr. *Curran.*)
1°* and 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 1153 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 85.)

BILL (No. 117) To amend an Act to authorise the granting of subsidies in land to certain Railway Companies.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell.*)
1°, 876; 2°* and in Com., 973; M. for 3°, 1015; 3°*, 1017 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 12.)

BILL (No. 118) To amend the Acts respecting the Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors.—(Mr. *Beaty.*)
Res. prop., 903; in Com. and 1°* of B., 904; M. to place 2° on Govt. Orders, 1219; neg. (Y. 22, N. 149) 1222 (ii).

BILL (No. 119) To amend the Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company.—(Mr. *Royal.*)
1°, 912; 2°, 1085; in Com. and 3°*, 1386 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 73.)

BILL (No. 120) To make further provision respecting the administration of the Public Lands of Canada in British Columbia.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell.*)
1°, 912; 2°* and in Com., 1202; 3°, 1223 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 28.)

BILL (No. 121) To regulate the employment of children and young persons and women in the Workshops, Mills and Factories of the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. *Bergin.*)
1°*, 946 (ii.)

BILL (No. 122) For the relief of the Corporation of the Town of Cobourg.—(Mr. *McLelan.*)
Res. prop., 866; M. for Com., 957; in Com. and 1°* of B., 958; 2°* and in Com., 1144; 3°*, 1199 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)

BILL (No. 123) To explain the Act 48 and 49 Victoria, Chapter 50, intituled: "An Act for the final settlement of the Claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion."—(Mr. *McLelan.*)
Res. prop., 866; in Com., 959; 1°* of B., 960; 2° m., 1145; 2°* and in Com., 1146; 3°, 1199. (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)

BILL (No. 124) Respecting Experimental Farm Stations.—(Mr. *Carling.*)
Res. prop., 866; M. for Com., 960; in Com. and 1°* of B., 973; 2°* and in Com., 1146, 1204; 3°*, 1204 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

BILL (No. 125) To amend the Law relating to the salaries of certain Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature for Ontario.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
Res. prop., 877; in Com. and 1°* of B., 973; 2°* and in Com., 1201; 3°*, 1223 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 6.)

BILL (No. 126) To amend the Law respecting Crown Cases reserved.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°, 974; 2° and in Com., 1202; 3°*, 1223 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 47.)

BILL (No. 127) To extend the boundaries of the District of Keewatin, and to amend the Law respecting such District.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°, 974; wthdn., 1485 (ii).

BILL (No. 128) To incorporate the Northumberland Straits Tunnel Company—(K) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Hackett.*)
1°*, 1014; 2°*, 1085; in Com., 1465; 3°*, 1467 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 92.)

BILL (No. 129) For the relief of Flora Birrell—(I) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton.*)
1° on a div., 1014; 2° agreed to (Y. 85, N. 33) 1172; in Com. and 3° on a div., 1326 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 113.)

BILL (No. 130) Respecting certain Works constructed in or over Navigable Waters.—(Sir *Hector Langevin.*)
1°, 1075; 2° m., 1246; 2°*, 1249; in Com., 1270; 3°*, 1271 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 35.)

BILL (No. 131) Further to amend the Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. *McLelan.*)
Res. prop. (confirmation of agreement) 622 (i); M. for Com., 930; in Com., 941; Res. prop. (release of bonds) 913; 1°* of B., 1078; 2°* and in Com., 1199; 3° m., 1343; Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) 1345; neg. (Y. 49, N. 116) 1357; Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) neg. on a div., 1357; Amt. (Mr. *Trow*) 1357; recom., 1358; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1358; neg. (Y. 37, N. 120) 1369; Amt. (Mr. *Platt*) and 3°*, 1369 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 9).

BILL (No. 132) Respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. *Chapleau.*)
M. to introd. and 1°* of B., 1217; 2° m., 1517; 2°*, 1532; in Com., 1552; 3°*, 1568; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1728 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 22.)

BILL (No. 133) Further to amend the Law respecting the North-West Territories.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
Res. prop., 1015; M. for Com., 1202; in Com., 1203; conc. in and 1°* of B., 1223; 2°* and in Com., 1382; in Com., 1458; 3° m. Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) 1483; neg. (Y. 42, N. 70) and 3°*, 1485 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 134) To amend "An Act respecting a Reformatory for certain Juvenile Offenders in the County of Halifax, in the Province of Nova Scotia"—(O) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°*, 1254; 2°*, 1272; in Com., 1381; 3°*, 1381 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 54.)

BILL (No. 135) To amend "An Act respecting Offences against the Person"—(N) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°*, 1254; 2°, 1272; in Com. and 3°*, 1382 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

BILL (No. 136) Further to amend the Act respecting Fishing by Foreign Vessels.—(Mr. *Foster.*)
1°, 1310; 2° m., 1421; 2° and in Com., 1423; 3°*, 1455; M. to conc. in Senate Amts., 1703 (ii).

BILL (No. 137) Respecting the Carleton City of Saint John Branch Railway.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°, 1310; 2° and in Com., 1424; 3°*, 1455 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 138) To amend the Act respecting the Electoral Franchise and the Dominion Elections Act, 1874.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
M. to introd. and 1°* of B., 1342; 2°* and in Com., 1467; in Com., 1498, 1665; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) 1672; neg. (Y. 54, N. 92) and 3°*, 1673 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 139) Respecting Tolls over the Dunnville Dam and Bridge connecting works constructed over the Grand River.—(Sir *Hector Langevin.*)
1°, 1378; 2°* and in Com., 1467; 3°*, 1482 (ii). (49 *Vic*, *c.* 30.)

BILL (No. 140) Respecting the improvement of the harbor of Quebec.—(Mr. *McLelan.*)
Res. prop., 1342; in Com., 1383; 1°* of B., 1385; 2°* and in Com., 1467; 3°*, 1482 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 19.)

BILL (No. 141) To amend the Law of Evidence in certain cases—(P) *from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°*, 1385; 2°* and in Com., 1464; 3°*, 1485 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 50.).

BILL (No. 142) To make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-West.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell.*)

M. to introd. B., 1420; Res. in Com., 1455; 1°* of B., 1458; 2° m., 1568; 2°* and in Com., 1572; 3°*, 1573 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 29.)

BILL (No. 143) to authorise the construction of a railway from the Straits of Canso, as a public work.—Sir *Hector Langevin.*)

Res. prop., 1455; M. for Com., 1485; in Com., 1486; Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 1515; 2°* and in Com., 1628; 3°*, 1635 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 14).

BILL (No. 144) Respecting certain Subsidies for a railway from Metapediac, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Paspebiac.—(Sir *Hector Langevin.*)

Res. prop., 1455; M. for Com., 1482; in Com., 1496; M. to conc. in Res., 1515; 1°* of B., 1516; 2° m., 1628; 3°*, 1635 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 17.)

BILL (No. 145) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the years ending respectively the 30th June, 1886, and the 30th June, 1887; and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *McLelan.*)

Res. in Com., conc. in, 1°, 2° and 3°* of B., 1775 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 146) to authorise the granting of the subsidies therein mentioned for and in aid of the construction of certain railways.—(Mr. *Pope.*)

Res. prop., 1551; M. for Com., 1595; in Com., 1596, 1610; Res. conc. in, 1635; 1° of B., 1636; 2° and in Com., 1704; 3°*, 1709 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 10.)

BILL (No. 147) To authorise the grant of certain subsidies in land for the construction of the Railways therein mentioned.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell.*)

Res. prop., 1551; in Com., 1630; Res. conc. in, 1639; 1°* of B., 1640; 2° and in Com., 1709; 3°*, 1714 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 11.)

BILL (No 148) Further to amend the Acts relating to Duties of Customs and the importation or exportation of goods into or from Canada.—(Mr. *McLelan.*)

1°*, 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1728 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 37.)

BILL (No. 149) To prohibit the manufacture and sale of substitutes for Butter (title amended by adding word "certain" before "substitutes for Butter.")—(Mr. *McLelan.*)

1°*, 2° in Com. and 3°*, 1728 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 150) Respecting the Bounty on Pig Iron manufactured in Canada from Canadian Ore.—(Mr. *McLelan.*)

Res. prop., 1661; M. for Com., 1714; in Com., 1715; Res. conc. in, 1°, 2°, in Com. and 3°, on a div., 1746 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 38.)

Birrell, Flora, Relief B. No. 129 (I) from the Sen. (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*). 1° on a div., 1014; 2° agreed to (Y. 85, N. 33) 1172; in Com. on a div. and 3° on a div., 1326 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 113.)

BOLTS AND NUTS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1584 (ii).

BONDS, COUNTERFEIT, GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 121 (i).

BOND, FORGED, PAYMENT FOR: in Com. of Sup., 1764 (ii).

BOOKS PURCHASED FOR DEPARTMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 882 (ii).

BOUCHERVILLE ISLANDS, OBSTRUCTIONS IN CHANNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Benoit*) 495 (i).

Boundaries of Keewatin. *See* "KEEWATIN."

BOUNDARIES OF ONT. AND IMPERIAL LEGISLATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Mills*) 66 (i).

—— LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 59 (i).

—— WEST AND NORTH, EXPENSES INCURRED BY DOM. SINCE 1870: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 438 (i).

Bounty on Pig Iron B. No. 150 (Mr. *McLelan*). Res. prop., 1661; M. for Com., 1714; in Com., 1715; Res. conc. in, 1°, 2°, in Com. and 3° on a div., 1746 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 38.)

Bow River Coal Mine and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 44 (Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*). 1°*, 119; 2°*, 265; in Com. and 3°*, 757 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 87.)

BOXES, WRITING DESKS, &C.: conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i).

BLACK ROD, GENTLEMAN USHER: Messages from His Ex. summoning Commons to Senate, 1 (i), 1776 (ii).

BLUEING: conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i).

BRANCH AND DISTRICT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 1295 (ii).

BRANT MEMORIAL: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).

BRIAR AND LONG ISLANDS TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION, GISBORNE'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Vail*) 393 (i).

BRIGADE MAJORS SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1300 (ii).

BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE PRINTING CO., CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 62 (i).

British Canadian Bank incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 114 (Mr. *Dawson*). 1°*, 865; 2°*, 907; in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 61.)

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

CABINET REPRESENTATION FOR B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 369 (i).

C. P. R., B. C. CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 709 (i).

—— B. C. SECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 121 (i).

CHINESE IMMIGRANTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gordon*) 382 (i).

COLUMBIA VALLEY RY. CO. *See* B. 87.

DOM. LANDS IN B. C., SETTLEMENT OF: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 496 (i).

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS VANCOUVER ISLAND, RE-ADJUSTMENT IN REPRESENTATION. *See* B. 107.

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY. *See* B. 47.

—— INSPECTION, &C., OF RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 369 (i).

INTEREST, RATE OF, IN B. C. *See* B. 22.

KOOTENAY RY. CO. OF B. C. *See* B. 89.

NATIONAL PARKS IN THE N. W. T. OR B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 266 (i).

PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).

SHUSWAP AND OKANAGAN RY. CO. *See* B. 33.

VANCOUVER RY. RESERVES, SQUATTERS PRE-EMPTION RECORDS: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 369 (i).

YUKON RIVER EXPLORATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 266 (i).

[*See* also "PUBLIC WORKS."]

Brockville and New York Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 68 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1°*, 393; 2°*, 474 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 856 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 91.)

BROKOVSKI, E., COMPLAINTS AGAINST: M. for copy* (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 438 (i).

BROOKLYN BREAKWATER, N.S., REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 265 (i).

BUCTOUCHE AND MONCTON BRANCH OF I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 330 (i).

BUDGET, THE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 330; Annual Stmnt. (Mr. *McLelan*) 393 (i). [For deb. *see* "WAYS AND MEANS."

BUOYS AND BEACONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (ii).

Burglary, &c. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW AMT."

Burlington Bay Canal B. No. 76 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°, 426; 2° and in Com., 518; 3°*, 604 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to take in Thursday, 512 (i). *See* "GOVT. BUSINESS."

——— Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 1746 (ii).

BUSINESS OF THE SESSION: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell* and Sir *Hector Langevin*) 691 (i).

BUTTERNUT RIDGE, N.B., POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 1075 (ii).

Butter, Substitutes for, B. No. 149 (Mr. *McLelan*). 1°*, 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1728 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 42.)

BUTTER SUBSTITUTE. *See* "OLEOMARGARINE."

CAB-HIRE AND TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 870, 878, 881 (ii).

CABINET REPRESENTATION FOR B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 369 (i).

CALGARY AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS FOR: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 35 (i).

Calvin Co.'s incorp. B. No. 53 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 149; 2°*, 265; in Com. and 3°*, 474 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 107.)

CAMPBELL, SIR ALEX., MEMO. of, *re* RIEL, COST OF PUBLISHING: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 66, 67 (i).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 43 (Mr. *Mackintosh*). 1°*, 93; 2°*, 119; in Com., 555, 612; 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 72.)

CANADA ATLANTIC RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1617 (ii).

——— AND ANTWERP STEAMSHIP SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (ii).

——— AND GERMANY MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1756 (ii).

Canada Copper Co.'s B. No. 61 (Mr. *White, Hastings*). 1°*, 301; 2°*, 368 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 907 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 99.)

Canada Permanent Loan and Savings Co. consolid. B. No. 98 (H) from the Sen. (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 644; 2°*, 704 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic.* 104.)

Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. No. 40 (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*). 1°*, 93; 2°*, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 494 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 90.)

Canada Temperance Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 104 (Mr. *Orton*). 1°, 710 (i); M. to place 2° on Govt. Orders, 1218; neg. (Y. 35, N. 134) 1223 (ii).

——— AMOUNT PAID to P. R. JARVIS AS RETURNING OFFICER UNDER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Trow*) 393 (i).

——— CONVICTIONS UNDER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 912 (ii).

Canada Temp. Act further amt. B. No. 92 (Mr. *Jamieson*). 1°, 599 (i); Ms. to place on Govt. Orders, neg. (Y. 68, N. 88) 1218; neg. (Y. 22, N. 149) 1222 (ii).

——— LEGISLATON RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Orton*) 912 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) to Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) to M. for Sel. Com. *re* Matthew Roche, 1339 (ii).

——— PUTTING IN FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).

——— RETURN OF FINES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Stairs*) 1172 (ii).

C.P.R. Co.'s further Act Amt. B. No. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*). Res. prop. (confirmation of agreement) 622 (i); M. for Com., 930; in Com., 941; Res. prop. (release of bonds) 913; 1°* of B., 1078; 2°* and in Com., 1199; 3° m., 1343; Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) 1345; neg. (Y. 49, N. 116) 1357 Amt (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) neg. on a div., 1357; Amt. (Mr. *Trow*) 1357; recom., 1358; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1358; neg. (Y. 37, N. 120) 1369; Amt. (Mr. *Platt*) and 3°*, 1369 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 9.)

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY:

AND NORTH SHORE RY. COR.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 60 (i).
BONDS, APPLICATION FOR: Remarks (Mr. *Gault*) 704 (i).
BONDS HELD BY GOVT: Ques. (Mr. *Jackson*) 495 (i).
BONDS, RELEASE OF: prop. Res. 913 (ii).
B.C. CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 709 (i).
B C. SECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 121 (i).
CONFIRMATION OF AGREEMENT: M. for Com. on Res., 930 (ii); in Com., 941-945 (ii).
EXPENDITURE IN B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1448, 1774 (ii)
GRAVENHURST TO CALLANDER, AGREEMENTS LEASING LINE: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 391 (i).
HOMESTEADS IN RY. BELT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 120, 185 (i).
LANDS, SALE OF BY CO.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 543 (i).
LEASED LINES, AMOUNTS PAID BY CO. AS RENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Glen*) 368 (i).
NORTHERN PACIFIC RY. AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 633 (i).
OPERATION OF MAIN LINE, COST OF: Ques. Mr. *Charlton*) 121 (i).
PORT ARTHUR TO RED RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1449, 1693 (ii).
SALARIES, &C., OF STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (ii).
SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (ii).
TARIFFS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1076 (ii).

CANALS:

BURLINGTON BAY. *See* B. 76.
CARILLON: in Com. of Sup., 1745 (ii).
CORNWALL: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
GALOPS CANAL ENLARGEMENT, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
GRENVILLE: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
LACHINE, CROSSING IN MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 426 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
——— LOTS ON BASINS: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 633 (i).
MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1771 (ii).
MURRAY: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1659 (ii).
TAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
TOLLS, AMOUNT COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 784 (i).
——— REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 494 (i).
TRENT RIVER NAV.: in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).
——— VALLEY CANAL, FEES PAID TO POISETT AND ROGER: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 843 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cook*) 898; Enquiry for Ret., 1343 (ii).
——— PAYMENTS FOR RIGHT OF WAY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 843 (ii).
WELLAND: in Com., of Sup., 1453 (ii).
WILLIAMSBURG: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).

CANSO AND PORT HOOD, &c., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com of Sup., 1371 (ii).

Cape Breton Island Ry. B. No. 143 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 1455; M. for Com., 1485; in Com., 1486; Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 1515; 2°* and in Com., 1628; 3°*, 1635 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 14.)

CAPE BRETON, SURVEY OF RAILWAY ROUTES: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 266 (i).

CAPE RACE LIGHTSHIP AND STEAM FOG-WHISTLE: Mess. from His Ex., 226 (i).

CAPE RACE LIGHTHOUSE, TRANSFER OF: prop. Res. (Mr. *Foster*) 512 (i).

Cape Race, Nfld., Lighthouse Transfer B. No. 100 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop., 513; in Com., 672; 1°* of B., 673; 2° and in Com., 748 (i); 3°*, 805 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 20.)

CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOR: in Com. of Sup., 1158 (ii).

CAPITAL CASES AND THE CROWN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 60 (i).

CAP ROUGE AND ST. LAWRENCE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551 (ii).

CARAQUET RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 494 (i).

CARAQUET RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1604 (ii).

CARDWELL, ELECTORAL DIST.: Vacancy and Return of Member elect, 1 (i).

CARILLON CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1745 (ii).

Carleton City of St. John Branch Ry. B. No. 137 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 1310; 2° and in Com., 1424; 3°*, 1455 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 16.)

CARTRIDGE FACTORY AT QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 543 (i).

CARRIAGE HARDWARE: conc. in Ways and Means, 1719 (ii).

Carriers by Land B. No. 7 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 38; 2° m., Order dschgd. and B. wthdn., 707 (i).

CATHOLICS AND POLITICS: Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) 1379 (ii).

CAVALRY AND INFANTRY SCHOOLS: In Com. of Sup., 1547 (ii). *See* "MILITIA."

CEMENT, PORTLAND AND ROMAN: conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).

CENSUS OF N. W. T., NAMES OF EMPLOYEES: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 66 (i).

CENSUS OF MAN., N. W. T. AND KEEWATIN: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 43 (i).

CENSUS OF MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1240 (ii).

CENTRAL BOARD OF AGRICULTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 634 (i).

Central Ont. Ry. Co.'s B. No. 67 (Mr. *White, Hastings*). 1°*, 393; 2°*, 474; in Com. and 3°*, 783 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 71.)

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 520 (i); conc., 1773 (ii).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s Subsidy Act Amt. B. No. 105 (Mr. *Pope*). Res. prop., 513; M. for Com., 673; in Com., 681; conc. in and 1°* of B., 712 (i); 2°* and in Com., 957; 3° on a div., 1015; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1381 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 18.)

CHINESE IMMIGRANTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gordon*) 382 (i).

Chinese Immigration Restriction B. No. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*). 1°, 746 (i); 2° and in Com., 1229; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1240; neg. (Y. 69, N. 114) 1242; Amt. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) and 3°*, 1243 (ii).

CHINESE, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 68 (i).

CHIPPEWA INDIANS, PETS. FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 1659 (ii).

CHURCHILL AND NELSON RIVERS SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 266 (i).

CITADEL, QUEBEC, DRAINAGE AND WATER SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 343 (ii).

CITADEL, QUEBEC, DRAINING OF: in Com. of Sup., 1742 (ii).

CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 522, 688 (i), 868, 877, 1343, 1649, 1697 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE BOARD OF EXAMINERS: in Com. of Sup., 841 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 905; Deb. resumed (Mr. *McMullen*) 1181; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1182; (Mr. *Bowell*) 1183; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1184; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1184; neg., 1185 (ii).

CLAIMS OF P. E. I., SETTLEMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 1263 (ii).

CLAIMS RECOGNISED BY GOVT. IN N. W. T., AMOUNTS PAID: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).

CLEANING OFFICES: in Com. of Sup., 885 (ii).

COAL INTERESTS IN N. S.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 544 (i).

COAL LEASES. *See* "TIMBER."

COBOURG, RELIEF OF TOWN, *re* CONSTRUCTION OF HARBOR: prop. Res. (Mr. *McLelan*) 866 (ii).

Cobourg, Town of, Relief B. No. 122 (Mr. *Mc Lelan*). Res. prop., 866; M. for Com., 957; in Com. and 1°* of B., 958; 2°* and in Com., 1144; 3°*, 1199 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 33.)

COCOANUT, DESSICATED: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1584 (ii).

COD LIVER OIL AND GUANO INDUSTRIES: in Com. of Sup., 1757 (ii).

COLOGNE WATER, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).

COLLECTION OF REVENUES, in Com. of Sup., 1454, 1543, 1659, 1763 (ii).

Colonial Bank. *See* "CONTINENTAL."

COLONIAL EXHIBITION, DELAY IN TRANSMITTING EXHIBITS: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 1077 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 1095, 1741 (ii).

COLONISATION CO.'S AND SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *Farrow*) 330 (i).

COLONISATION CO.'S LETTERS PATENT INCORPORATING: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 65 (i).

Columbia Valley Ry. Co.'s B. *See* "KOOTENAY AND ATHABASCA."

COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 1659; conc., 1773

COMMERCIAL TREATIES, NEGOTIATIONS FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 844 (ii).

Commissions to Public Officers B. No. 110 (Mr. *Chapleau*). 1°*, 781 (i); 2° and in Com., 958; 3°*, 1015 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 5.)

COMMITTEES:

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.: M. for Com. to supervise, 30 (i).

SELECT STANDING: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2; M. for Com. to prepare lists, 33; lists presented, 35; Standing Orders conc. in, 36; Amt. (Mr. *Coursol*) to add names, 36; Amt. to Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin* to add names, 37 (i).

COMMONS SUMMONED TO SEN.: 1 (i), 1776 (ii).

COMPANIES:

ALBERTA RY. CO. *See* B. 31.

ANGLO-AMERICAN IRON CO. *See* B. 62.

BOW RIVER COAL MINE AND TRANSPORTATION CO. *See* B. 44.

BROCKVILLE AND NEW YORK BRIDGE CO. *See* B. 68.

CALVIN CO. *See* B. 53.

CANADA ATLANTIC RY. CO. *See* B. 43.

—— COPPER CO. *See* B. 61.

—— PERMANENT LOAN AND SAVINGS CO. *See* B. 98.

—— SOUTHERN BRIDGE CO. *See* B. 40.

CENTRAL ONTARIO RY. CO. *See* B. 67.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RY. CO. *See* B. 105.

DOMINION LANDS COLONISATION CO. *See* B. 45.

EDDY MANUFACTURING CO. *See* B. 30.

EMERSON AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO. *See* B. 39.

FORBES' TROCHILIC STEAM ENGINE CENTRAL CO. *See* B. 66.

FREEHOLD LOAN AND SAVINGS CO. *See* B. 113.

GUELPH JUNCTION RY. CO. *See* B. 78.

KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE MUTUAL AID, &C., CO. *See* B. 24.

KOOTENAY AND ATHABASCA RY. CO. *See* Bs. 87 and 89.

LAKE NIPISSING AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO. *See* B. 35.

LAKE SUPERIOR MINERAL RY. CO. *See* B. 34.

LENNOX PASSAGE BRIDGE CO. *See* B. 81.

LONDON AND ONTARIO INVESTMENT CO. *See* B. 97.

MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO. *See* B. 70.

MASKINONGÉ AND NIPISSING RY. CO. *See* B. 74.

MEDICINE HAT, DUNMORE AND BENTON RY. CO. *See* B. 16.

—— RY. AND COAL CO. *See* B. 54.

MUTUAL LIFE ASSOCIATION OF CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 1379 (ii).

—— RESERVE FUND LIFE ASSOCIATION CERTIFICATES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1173 (ii).

NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. CO. *See* B. 79.

NORTH CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. CO. *See* B. 73.

NIAGARA FRONTIER BRIDGE CO. *See* B. 48.

—— GRAND ISLAND BRIDGE CO. *See* B. 38.

NORTH AMERICAN TELEGRAPH CO. *See* B. 86.

NORTHERN AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO. *See* B. 65.

—— PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO. *See* B. 25.

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS TUNNEL CO. *See* B. 128.

NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY CO. *See* B. 17.

NOVA SCOTIA AND WESTERN RY. CO. *See* B. 56.

—— STEAMSHIP CO. *See* B. 51.

ONTARIO, MINNESOTA AND MAN. RY. CO. *See* B. 49.

PICTOU COAL AND IRON CO. *See* B. 64.

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE AND LAKE OF THE WOODS, &C., CO. *See* B. 55.

PRINCE ALBERT COLONISATION CO.: M. (Mr. *Edgar*) for Sel. Com. to enquire into charge against members, 489 (i).

RETURN, INCOMPLETE, SHAREHOLDERS IN CO'S.: remarks (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1168 (ii).

ROCK LAKE, SOURIS AND BRANDON RY. CO. *See* B. 63.

SABLE AND SPANISH BOOM CO., &C. *See* B. 36.

ST. GABRIEL AND LEVEE RY. CO. *See* B. 116.

ST. LAWRENCE AND ATLANTIC JUNCTION RY. CO. *See* B. 58.

SASKATCHEWAN LAND AND HOMESTEAD CO. *See* B. 42.

SUSHWAP AND OKANAGAN RY. CO. *See* B. 33.

TECUMSEH INSURANCE CO. OF CANADA. *See* B. 26.

VICTORIA AND SAULT STE. MARIE JUNCTION RY. CO. *See* B. 95.

WESTERN CANADA LOAN AND SAVINGS CO. *See* B. 112.

WEST ONTARIO PACIFIC RY CO. *See* B. 27.

WINNIPEG AND HUDSON'S BAY RY. AND STEAMSHIP CO. *See* B. 119.

WINNIPEG AND NORTH PACIFIC RY. CO. *See* B. 73.

YARMOUTH STEAMSHIP CO. *See* B. 91.

Consentini Girolamo, Naturalisation B. No. 37 (Mr. *Hall*). 1°*, 93; 2°*, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 473 (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 112.)

CONSOLID. FUND: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1076 (ii).

—— RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 35 (i).

Consolid. Inland Rev. Acts Amt. B. No. 101 (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 601; in Com., 681; 1°* of B., 688 (i); 2°* and in Com., 1204; 3°*, 1223 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.*, 39)

Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. No. 4 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 31; 2° m., Order dschgd. and B. wthdn., 858 (ii).

Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. No. 8 (Mr. *Mc Carthy*). 1°, 33; 2°*, 707 (i); in Com., 857; 3°*, 858 (ii).

Contagious Diseases. *See* "ANIMALS."

CONTINGENCIES, &C., MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 1307 (ii).

—— DEPTL.: in Com., of Sup., 868, 877 (ii).

Continental Bank of Can. incorp. B. No. 60 (Mr. *Macmillan, Middlesex*). 1°*, 226; 2°*, 342; in Com., 473; 3°*, 473 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 65.)

CONVICT LABOR IN DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. *Ray*) 1075 (ii).

—— *vs.* FREE LABOR, NUMBER EMPLOYED IN DOM. PENITENTIARIES: M. for Ret* (Mr. *Wilson*) 47 (i).

COOK, MR. H., TIMBER DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1380 (ii).

—— M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1420 (ii).

COPYRIGHT, LAWS RELATING TO: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Edgar*) 377 (i).

CORDAGE, MANILA AND SISAL: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1584 (ii).

CORINTH AND EGREMONT POST OFFICES: in Com. of Sup., 885 (ii).

—— —— POST OFFICE AT: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 843 (ii).

CORNWALL CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).

COTTON FABRICS, PRINTED OR DYED: conc. in Ways and Means, 769 (i).

—— WIRE: conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).

COUNTERFEIT DOM. $2 NOTES: Ques (Mr. *Tassé*) 865 (ii).

Court of Ry. Commissioners, B. No. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 37; 2° m., 585; Order dschgd. and B. wthdn., 599 (i).

Criminal Law Amt. (burglary, &c.) B. No. 28 (Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*). 1°, 67 (i); 2° m, 1185; neg., 1186 (ii).

Criminal Law Amt. (law of evidence) B. No. 3 (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°, 31 (i); 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 52) 858; in Com., 911; Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 59, N. 68) 911; 3° on same div. reversed, 912 (ii).

Criminal Law Amt. (law of evidence) B. No. 23 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 65; 2° m, 707; 2° neg. (Y. 57. N. 80) 709 (i).

Criminal Law Amt. (law of evidence) B. No. 141 (P) from the Sen. (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°*, 1385; 2°* and in Com., 1464; 3°*, 1435 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 50.)

Criminal Law Amt. (offences against the person) Act Amt. B. No. 135 (N) from the Sen. (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 1310; 2° m., 1421; 2° and in Com., 1423; 3°*, 1455; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1703 (ii).

Criminal Law Amt. (seduction, &c.) B. No. 20 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 60; 2° m., 441; 2° agreed to (Y. 114, N. 47) 444; M. for Com., 570; ref. to Sel. Com., 571; in Com. of W., 704; 3°*, 707 (i); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1326 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 52.)

Criminal Law Amt. (unguarded holes in the ice) B. No. 2 (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°, 31; 2°, 707; in Com. and 3°*, 856 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 53.)

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1091 (ii).

Crown Cases Reserved Law Amt. B. No. 126 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 974; 2° and in Com., 1202; 3°*, 1223 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 47.)

CROW, L. S., PAYMENT FOR SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1763 (ii).

Cruelty to Animals Prevention B. No. 11 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 41; 2° m., 438; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 439 (i).

Customs Acts further Amt. B. No. 148 (Mr. *McLelan*). 1°*, 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1728 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 37.)

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE:

- BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE PRINTING CO., CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 62 (i).
- CUSTOMS APPOINTMENT AT WOODSTOCK, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Irvine*) 1075 (ii).
- —— in Com. of Sup., 690, 874, 1454, 1763 (ii).
- —— OFFICE AT YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 266 (i).
- —— SEIZURES AT MONTREAL: Remarks (Mr. *Holton*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1684 (ii).
- —— SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 1343; in Com. of Sup., 1369 (ii).
- —— AT WINNIPEG: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 392 (i).
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, STMNT. OF: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 35 (i); Value of: Ques. 1240 (ii).
- FLOUR AND COAL DUTIES, ABOLITION OF: Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1425; (Reply) 1444; neg. (Y. 46, N. 119) 1447 (ii).
- GRAPE VINES IMPORTED UNDER VALUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 370 (i).
- LUMBER AND SAW LOGS, FREE EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. *Ives*) 634 (i).
- REVENUE FRAUDS BY MONTREAL FIRMS: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 709 (i).
- RICE, INCREASE OF DUTY: Ques. (*Shakespeare*) 369 (i).
- SUGAR DUTIES PAID AT HALIFAX AND MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Stairs*) 898 (ii).
- SUGAR IN BOND IN MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 783 (i), 843 (ii).

DAKOTA AND TEXAS, IMMIGRATION FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Royal*) 1217 (ii).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.: M. for Sel. Com., 30; M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com. (Mr. *Desjardins*) 66 (i).

—— PUBLISHING: in Com. of Sup., 1089 (ii).

—— HEADINGS TO EXTRA COPIES: Remarks (Mr. *Kirk*) 630 (i).

DEBT, FLOATING: Ques. (Mr. *Jackson*) 1076 (ii).

DEBT OF THE DOM.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 31 (i).

DEBT, PUBLIC, NET AND GROSS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 42, 59, 495 (i), 1076 (ii).

DEBTS OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 974 (ii).

DEPARTMENTS, GENERALLY, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 868, 877 (ii).

DEPOSITS IN GOVT. AND P. O. SAVINGS BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 634 (i); Ques. (Mr. *Jackson*) 1218 (ii).

DIGBY PIER, RE-BUILDING OF AND REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 31, 42 (i).

DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. RY. CO.'S CHARTERS: M. dropped (Mr. *Blake*) 383 (i); M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Watson*) 802 (i).

DISTURBANCE IN THE N. W. T.:

- AMNESTY TO PARTIES WHO TOOK PART IN REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 61 (i).
- —— GENERAL: prop. Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1257 (ii).
- ANDERSON, JAMES, COR. *re* PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Casey*) 427 (i),
- BATOCHE, BATTLE OF, REP. OF OFFICER SECOND IN COMMAND: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 369 (i).
- BELL & LEWIS, HOWARD WRIGHT, AND OTHERS, MONEYS PAID TO, FOR TRANSPORT, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 437 (i).
- CLAIMS COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 42 (i).
- CLAIMS PAID: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 42 (i).
- CLAIMS RECOGNISED BY GOVT. AND AMOUNTS PAID: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).
- CONFIDENTIAL PAPERS: Mess. from His Ex. presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 368 (i).
- DUTY OF THE GOVT. TO BRING DOWN FURTHER PAPERS: Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 497 (i).
- FOOD, MATERIAL, MEDICAL SUPPLIES AND COMFORTS, FORAGE, &C., PURCHASE OF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).
- HALF-BREEDS, INDIANS, &C., COMMITTALS AND CONVICTIONS: Ques (Mr. *Blake*) 61 (i).
- HER MAJESTY *vs.* PARTIES TRIED IN CONNECTION WITH REBELLION, &C.: M. for Rets.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 60 (i).
- HORSES PURCHASED, AND FROM WHOM, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).
- INDIANS WHO TOOK PART IN REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1075 (ii).
- INSTRUCTIONS TO NON-COMBATANTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Casey*) 427 (i).
- LAURIE AND STRANGE, MAJ. GENERALS, STATUS IN ACTIVE FORCE: Ques (Mr. *Casey*) 119 (i).
- LOSSES, CLAIMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1764 (ii).
- MEDALS, DISTRIBUTION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Royal*) 1661 (ii).
- MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL STAFF, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).
- MIDDLETON, MAJ. GENERAL, NAMES, &C, OF STAFF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 437.
- MILITARY CLAIMS COMMISSION, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).
- NON-COMBATANTS, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: Ques. (Messrs. *Ross* and *Cameron, Middlesex*) 633 (i).
- OFFICERS, &C., WHO VOLUNTEERED FOR SERVICE, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).
- PENSIONS TO VOLUNTEERS WOUNDED AT DUCK LAKE: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 633 (i).
- POLICE SCOUTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 788 (i).
- PRINCE ALBERT VOLUNTEERS, SCRIP FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 633 (i).
- PURCHASING AGENTS, NAMES, &C: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 437 (i).
- REPS. OF GOVT. COUNSEL ON TRIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 185 (i).
- REPORT ON REBELLION PRESENTED TO HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1640 (ii).
- RETS. RESPECTING: (Mr. *Blake* and others) 34 (i).
- RIEL, LOUIS. *See* general heading.
- SCRIP TO HALF-BREEDS WHO TOOK PART IN REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1075 (ii).
- SEIZURES BY MOUNTED POLICE OR EXPEDITIONARY FORCE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).

DISTURBANCE IN THE N. W. T.—*Continued.*

SERVICES OF M.P.'S AND SENATORS IN CONNECTION WITH, AMOUNTS PAID: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 392 (i).

SETTLERS ON SERVICE AND HOMESTEADS: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 426 (i).

STAFF PAYMASTERS, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).

TRANSPORT AND SUPPLY OFFICERS, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 437 (i).

TRANSPORTATION CONTRACTORS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casey*) 427 (i).

TRANSPORT SERVICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 61 (i).

TRIAL OF HALF-BREEDS, INDIANS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 58 (i).

WAR CLAIMS AND OPERATIONS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1343 (ii).

DIVISIONS:

ADMINISTRATION OF THE N. W. T.: Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Ways and Means, 1729-1733; neg. (Y. 51, N. 71) 1740 (ii).

ANIMALS, CONTAGIOUS, DISEASES B. 19 (Mr. *Mulock*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) to recom., 910; neg. (Y. 36, N. 99) 911 (ii).

BIRRELL, FLORA, RELIEF B. 109 (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*): 2° agreed to (Y. 85, N. 33) 1172 (ii).

C. P. R. ACT AMT. BILL B. 131 (Mr. *McLelan*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to recom., 1345; neg. (Y. 49, N. 116) 1357; Amt. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1367; neg. (Y. 37, N. 120) 1369 (ii).

CHINESE IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION ACT AMT. B. 106 (Mr. *Chapleau*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to recom., 1240; neg. (Y. 60, N. 114) 1242 (ii).

COAL AND FLOUR DUTIES, ABOLITION OF: Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1425-1428; neg. (Y. 46, N. 119) 1447 (ii).

CRIMINAL LAW AMT. (LAW OF EVIDENCE) B. 3 (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*): 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 52) 858; Amt. (Mr. *Desjardins*) on M. for 3°, 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 59, N. 68) 912 (ii).

CRIMINAL LAW AMT. (LAW OF EVIDENCE) B. 23 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*): M. for 2°, 707; neg. (Y. 57, N. 80) 709 (ii).

CRIMINAL LAW AMT. (SEDUCTION, &c.) B. 20 (Mr. *Charlton*): 2° agreed to (Y. 114, N. 47) 444 (i).

DISTURBANCE IN THE N. W.: Res. (Mr. *Blake*) duty of Govt. to bring down further papers, 407; Amt. (Mr. *Hall*) 506; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 510; neg. (Y. 62, N. 111 510; Amt. (Mr. *Hall*) agreed to (Y. 110, N. 63) 511; main M., as amended, agreed to, on same div., 511 (i).

DOMINION ELECTION AMT. B. 29 (Mr. *McCarthy*): 2° agreed)to (Y. 52, N. 89) 1186 (ii).

EXTINGUISHMENT OF THE INDIAN TITLE IN THE N. W.: Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 809-819; neg. (Y. 64, N. 106) 841 (ii).

FINES AND FORFEITURES B. 82 (Mr. *Thompson*): on M. for 3° Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) to recon., neg. (Y. 47, N. 106) 714 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT AMT. B. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) to recom., 1672; neg. (Y. 54, N. 92) 1673 (ii).

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1096; Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 1097; Amt. to Amt (Mr. *McMullen*) 1108; neg. (Y. 60, N. 118) 1135; Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) agreed to (Y. 117, N. 61) 1135; Amt. (Mr. *Coughlin*) neg. (Y. 22, N. 142) 1138; Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) neg. (Y. 69, N. 87) 1142; Amt (Mr. *Thompson*) agreed to (Y. 80, N. 70) 1142; main M., as amended, agreed to (Y. 140, N. 6) 1143 (ii).

INDEMNITY OF MEMBERS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Farrow*) Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to proceed to consdn. of Res. (Mr. *Landry Montmagny*) respecting execution of Riel, 121; agreed to (Y. 105, N. 61) 124 (i). *See.*

INDIAN ADMINISTRATION IN THE N. W.: Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 718-730; neg. (Y. 65, N. 114) 746 (i).

INTEREST IN B. C., B. 22 (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*): on M. to place 2° on Govt. Orders, Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) to add B. 92, neg. (Y. 68, N. 88) 1218; Amt. (Mr. *Kranz*) to add B. 104, 1218; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) to add Bs. 92, 99 and 118, 1219; neg. (Y. 22, N. 149) 1222; Amt. (Mr. *Kranz*) neg. (Y. 35, N. 134) 1223 (ii).

DIVISIONS—*Continued.*

NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*): Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to recom., 1325; neg (Y. 48, N. 90) 1326 (ii).

NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S. B. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*): on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) neg. (Y. 45, N. 90) 1684 (ii).

NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.'S B. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*): on M. for Com., (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3° m. h., 979; neg. (Y. 59, N. 86) 1011; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to recom. to Sel. Stndg. Com. on Rys., &c., neg. (Y. 55, N. 82) 1012 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES LAW AMT. B. 133 (Mr. *Thompson*): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) to recom., 1483; neg. (Y. 42, N. 70) 1485 (ii).

PRINCE ALBERT COLONISATION CO.: on prop. Res (Mr. *Edgar*) charging members with using their position to influence Govt. in granting lands, Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 489; agreed to on a div., main M., as amended, agreed to (Y. 150, N. 1) 491 (i).

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE: Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1647; neg. (Y. 36, N. 70) 1648 (ii).

RIEL, LOUIS, EXECUTION OF: on M. (Mr. *Amyot*) for Rets., Amt. to proceed to consdn. of Res. censuring Govt., 186; agreed to (Y. 116, N. 75) 194 (i).

——— OF: on Res. (Mr. *Landry*, Montmagny) censuring Govt. 68; Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) previous question, 77; agreed to (Y. 126, N. 73) 368 (i); Res. neg. (Y. 52, N. 146) 368 (i).

ROCHE, MATTHEW, OF LINGAN, N.S.: Res. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com. to enquire into conduct of certain M.P.'s, 1173; Amt. (Mr. *Orton*) to substitute 2° of B. 104, 1335; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) to resume adjd. deb. on Mr. *Taylor's* Res (oleomargarine) 1337; Amts. neg. and main motion neg. (Y. 51, N. 89) 1341 (ii).

SENATE, CONSTITUTION OF: Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1272-1275; neg. (Y. 57, N. 89) 1295 (ii).

STELLARTON AND PICTOU BRANCH RY., I.C.R., EXTENSION B. 57: on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Vail*) to recom., 664; neg. (Y. 51, N. 107) 668 (i).

SUBSIDY (MONEY) TO N.S. RE-ADJUSTMENT: on prop. M. (Mr. *Kirk*) Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*, Inverness) 455; neg. (Y. 16, N. 82) 456 (i).

TIMBER LAND AND COAL LEASES IN N.W.T. (INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT., BREACH OF): Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1030-1041; neg. (Y. 43, N. 99) 1074 (ii).

DODD, MURRAY, M.P.: Res. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com. to enquire into charges against, 1173 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act, 1884, Amt. B. No. 29 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 67; 2° m. and neg. (Y. 42, N. 89) 1186 (ii).

DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT.: Remarks (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on M. to introd., 877 (ii).

DOM. EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 1091 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act further Amt. B. No. 94 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1°, 600; 2°*, 748 (i); in Com., 913, 1078, 1085; 3°*, 1243; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1568 (ii). (49 *Vic., c. 21.*)

Dom. Lands Colonisation Co.'s B. No. 45 (Mr. *Beaty*). 1°*, 119; 2°*, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 100.)

DOM. LANDS:

DEBATE, IN COM. OF SUP., 527-542 (i).

GRAZING LAND AND GRAZING LAND LEASES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 392 (i).

HOMESTEAD AND PRE-EMPTION ENTRIES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Glen*) 393 (i).

DOMINION LANDS—*Continued.*
IN COM. OF SUP., 1550 (ii).
PRE-EMPTION ENTRIES, &C., AMOUNTS OWING AND UNPAID: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Glen*) 393 (i).
—— IN MAN., REDUCTION IN PRICE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 369 (i).
SETTLEMENT OF IN B. C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 496 (i).
[*See* also "C. P. R.," "INDIANS," "LANDS," &c.]
DOM. NOTES IN CIRCULATION AND GOLD HELD BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 438 (i).
DOM. RY. ACT AMT., *re* COMPENSATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 426 (i).
DOM. $2 NOTES, COUNTERFEIT: Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) 865 (ii).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONVICT LABOR: Ques. (Mr. *Ray*) 1075 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 892 (ii).
DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1269 (ii).
DRILL INSTRUCTION AND DRILL PAY: in Com. of Sup., 1306 (ii).
Druggists B. No. 99 (J) from the Sen. (Mr. *Hickey*). 1°*, 691 (i); Ms. to place 2° on Govt. Orders, 1219, 1222; neg. (Y. 22, N. 149) 1222 (ii).
DUCK, GEO., DOM. LAND AGENT AT PRINCE ALBERT, REP. OF: M. for copies* (Mr. *Edgar*) 58 (i).
DUFFERIN GATE, QUEBEC, CLAIMS OF H. J. BEEMER: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 1661 (ii).
Dunnville Dam and Bridge Tolls B. No. 139 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°, 1378, 2°* and in Com., 1467; 3°*, 1482 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 30.)
DURHAM, EAST, ELECTORAL DIST.: Vacancy and Return of Member elect, 1 (i).
DURHAM TO GEORGIAN BAY RY.: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. that Com. rise, 1628 (ii).
EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES, &c., I.C.R.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 392 (i).
EARTHENWARE: conc. in Ways and Means, 1719, (ii).
EASTER, ADJMNT. FOR: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 747 (i).
Eddy, E. B., Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. No. 30 (Mr. *Wright*). 1°*, 92; 2°*, 119; in Com. and 3°*, 757 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 106.)
EDMONSTONE AND RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 570 (i).
EDMONTON AND ST. ALBERT LAND SURVEYS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 802 (i).
ELGIN STATION, L'ISLET: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 544 (i).
Emerson and North Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 39 (Mr. *Pruyn*). 1°*, 93; 2°*, 342 (i); wthdn., 897 (ii).
ENGINEERS' CERTIFICATES; Mess. from His Ex. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 599 (i).
ENTOMOLOGIST, FRENCH, APPOINTMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Landry*, *Montmagny*) 634 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. B. No. 47 (Mr. *Pope*). 1°, 119; 2° m., 515; 2° and in Com., 517; 3° m, 602; 3°*, 604 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)
ESQUIMALT AND NAINAIMO RY., INSPECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 369 (i).
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, in Com. of Sup., 1156, 1752 (ii).
ESTIMATES, THE, FOR 1886-87: Mess. from His Ex., presented (Mr. *McLelan*) 368 (i); suppl. for 1885-86, 1550; suppl. for 1887, 1633 (ii).
EVERETT, MR. C.: introduced as Member elect for St. John, N. B., City and County, 1 (i).
EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 1543 (ii).
EXPENSE IN PRODUCING RETURNS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Valin*) 386 (i).
EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF GOVT. IN ENGLAND: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville*, *Brant*) 57 (i).
Experimental Farm Stations B. No. 124 (Mr. *Carling*). Res. prop., 866; M. for Com., 960; in Com. and 1°* of B., 973; 2°* and in Com., 1146, 1204; 3°*, 1204 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)
EXPERIMENTAL FARM STATIONS ESTABLISHMENT: Deb. on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. *Carling*) 960; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 960; (Messrs. *Wallace* [*York*] and *Watson*) 961; (Messrs. *Mills* and *Hesson*) 962; Messrs. *McNeill* and *Charlton*) 963; (Messrs. *McCallum* and *Ferguson*, *Welland*) 964; (Mr. *Wigle*) 965; (Messrs. *McMullen* and *Cochrane*) 966; (Mr. *Irvine*) 967; (Mr. *Farrow*) 968; (Mr. *Sproule*) 969; (Mr. *Bain*, *Wentworth*) 971 (ii).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup, 1659 (ii).
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, VALUE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1240 (ii).
—— STATEMENT OF: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 35 (i).
EXTRA CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 880, 883 (ii).
FABRE, HECTOR, REP. FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Desjardins*) 1661 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
Factories Regulation B. No. 121 (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°*, 946 (ii).
FACTORY LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 634 (i).
FAIRFIELD, N.B., POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 1661 (ii).
FANCY GOODS: conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i).
Farm or Real Estate Banks B. No. 88 (Mr. *Orton*). Res. and M. for Com., 427; in Com., 432, 571, 577, 1°* of B. 585 (i).
FARM STATIONS. *See* EXPERIMENTAL.
FATHER POINT, DEEP WATER-PIER: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 633 (i).
FEATHERS, OSTRICH AND VULTURE: conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i).
FELT: conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).
FINANCIAL INSPECTOR, ASST.: in Com. of Sup., 520 (i).
FINANCE, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 689 (i); contingencies, 681 (ii).
FINANCE:
AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP.: presented (Mr. *McLelan*) 31 (i).
BONDS, COUNTERFEIT, GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 121 (i).
C.P.R. BONDS, HELD BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Jackson*) 495 (i).
CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 35 (i); Ques., 1076 (ii).

FINANCE—*Continued.*

DEBT, FLOATING: Ques. (Mr. *Jackson*) 1076 (ii).
DEBT OF THE DOM.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 31 (i).
DEBT, PUBLIC, NET AND GROSS, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 42, 59, 495 (i), 1076 (ii).
DEBTS OF ONT. AND QUE.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 974 (ii).
DOM. $2 NOTES, COUNTERFEIT: Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) 865 (ii).
LAND IMPROVEMENT FUND, AMOUNT DUE ONT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 266 (i).
LOANS, TEMPORARY, BY GOVT.: on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Blake*) 57 (i).
PRINTING ACCTS. AND PUB. ACCTS. COM.: M. to refer items (Mr. *Charlton*) 383 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: presented (Mr. *McLelan*) 31 (i).
TEMPORARY LOANS BY GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 56 (i).

Fines and Forfeitures application B. No .82 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 488; 2°, 671; in Com., 713; 3° m. and Amts. (Mr. *Blake*) 714; 3° agreed to (Y. 47, N. 106) 715 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 48.)

FIRE-ARMS IN THE N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1076 (ii).

FISHERIES:

AMERICAN FISHERMEN, DEPREDATIONS BY: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 783 (i).
ASPY BAY, FISHERIES, DESPATCHES, &c.: Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 807 (ii).
——— DISPUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1076 (ii).
DEEP-WATER FISHERIES, IN B. C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 495 (i).
FISHERIES in Com. of Sup, 691 (i), 1698, 1757 (ii).
——— JOINT COMMISSION RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 392 (i).
FISHERY NEGOTIATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 120 (i).
FISH IMPORTATIONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kirk*) 370 (i).
FISHING BOUNTIES, CLAIMS FOR: M. for copies (Mr. *Langelier*) 697 (i).
——— IN MANITOBA: Ques. (Mr. *Royal*) 692 (i).
——— IN MUSKOKA DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 1076 (ii).
——— LICENSE FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 1076 (ii).
——— REGULATIONS, VIOLATION OF, BY AMERICANS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 392 (i).
——— RIGHTS OF INDIANS ON LAKES HURON AND NIPISSING, PETS., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *O'Brien*) 693 (i).
FISHERIES PROTECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 494 (i).
——— AND MARINE POLICE REGULATIONS ISSUED: M. for copies (Mr. *Mitchell*) 458 (i).
LEGAL SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH FISHERY AWARD AND REVISION OF STATUTES: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (ii).
LOBSTER FISHING IN P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 31 (i).
"LYLIAN," SCHOONER, SEIZURE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 912 (ii).
MARINE AND FISHERIES, REP. OF MIN. TO PRIVY COUNCIL IN 1869: M. for copy (Mr. *Mitchell*) 391 (i).
SQUAW ISLAND, FISHING PRIVILEGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 784 (i).
UNITED STATES FISHING VESSELS AND INSHORE FISHERIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 392 (i).
WHITE FISH FRY AT FISH HATCHERIES: M for Ret. (Mr. *Gordon*) 788 (i).

Fishing by Foreign Vessels Act further Amt. B. No. 136 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°*, 1254; 2°, 1272; in Com. and 3°*, 1382 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 51.)

FLAG TREATY BETWEEN U. S. AND SPAIN: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Vail*) 700 (i).

FLOUR AND COAL DUTIES, ABOLITION OF: Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1425; Deb. (Mr. *Burpee*) 1428; (Messrs. *Kirk* and *Langelier*) 1429; (Messrs. *Fisher, Vail* and *Hesson*) 1430; (Mr. *Weldon*) 1431; (Messrs. *Wood* [*Westmoreland*] and *Casey*) 1432; (Mr. *McLelan*) 1435; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1437; (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 1438; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1440; (Messrs. *Gault* and *Woodworth*) 1441; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1444; (Mr. *Everett*) 1446; neg. (Y. 46, N. 119) 1447 (ii).

FLOUR SUPPLY TO INDIANS OF THE N.W.: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 43, 65 (i).

FLYING COLUMN FOR THE N.W.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Watson*) 634 (i).

FRANCE AND QUEBEC STEAMSHIP SUBVENTION: in Com of Sup., 1370 (ii).

FRANCHISE ACT AMTS.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 61; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 543 (i).
——— EXPENSES UNDER: in Com of Sup., 1699 (ii).
——— INSTRUCTIONS TO REVISING OFFICERS: M. for copies (Mr. *Casey*) 43; Deb. (Mr. *Chapleau*) 46; (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 47; (Mr. *Cook*) 51; (Messrs. *Dundas* and *Lister*) 52; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 53; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 54; (Messrs. *Mills, Weldon* and *Mulock*) 55; (Mr. *Casey*) 56 (i).
——— O.C., &c., RESPECTING PUTTING IN FORCE OF ACT, &c.: Instructions to Revising Officers &c., M. for copies* (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 58 (i).
——— PRINTING FOR DISTRIBUTION: Remarks (Mr. *Dawson*) 1746 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1698, 1747 (ii).
——— ELECTORAL ACT, WORKING OF: Cor. presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 1482 (ii).

Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. No. 138 (Mr. *Thompson*). M. to introd. and 1°* of B., 1342; 2°* and in Com., 1467; in Com., 1498, 1665; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) 1672; neg. (Y. 54, N. 92) and 3°*, 1673 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 3.) *See* "DOMINION."

FREDERICTON TO PRINCE WILLIAM RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1624 (ii).

Freehold Loan and Savings Co.'s B. No. 113 (L) from the Sen. (Mr. *Beaty*). 1°*, 805; 2°*, 855; in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 103.)

FRENCH CANADIANS, APPEALS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) 1378 (ii).

FRENCH CANADIAN REPRESENTATION FOR ONTARIO IN SEN.: Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) 1633 (ii).

FRUIT, DRIED AND GREEN: conc. in Ways and Means, 750–755 (i).

FOG-WHISTLES, &c., MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1375 (ii).

FOOD, MATERIAL, MEDICAL SUPPLIES, &c., PURCHASED IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).

FOOD SUPPLY TO INDIANS IN THE N.W.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 58 (i).

Forbes' Trochilic Steam Engine Central Co. of Can. incorp. B. No. 66 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1°*, 393; 2°*, 474 (i); in Com and 3°*, 907 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 109.)

FORESTERS' DEPOSITS IN GOVT. BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1095 (ii).

FOSTER, HON. G. E.: returned as Member elect for King's, N.B., 1 (i).

GANANOQUE, PERTH AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1624 (ii).

GAS, WATER AND SOIL PIPES: conc. in Ways and Means, 755 (i).
GEOLOGICAL DISPLAY AND COLONIAL EXHIBITION: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 692 (i).
——— SURVEY EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 633 (i).
——— SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 524, 542 (i),1543, 1649 (ii).
GEORGIAN BAY ISLAND, TIMBER SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 898 (ii).
GERMAN REPRESENTATION IN THE SEN.: Ques. (Mr. *Kranz*) 1661 (ii).
GILLIS, TRIAL OF FOR MURDER, REP. OF JUDGE: M. for copy* (Mr. *Davies*) 802 (i).
GIMPS, CORDS, BRAIDS, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 755 (i).
GISBORNE, MR., REP. *re* TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION IN DIGBY CO.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Vail*) 393 (i).
GLENANNAN TO WINGHAM RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1015 (ii).
GLOVES AND MITTS: conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).
GAOL AND LUNATIC ASYLUM AT REGINA: in Com. of Sup., 1747 (ii).
GOVT. BUILDINGS, QUEBEC, WATER SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 844 (ii).
GOVT. BUSINESS: M. to take in Wednesdays (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1014 (ii).
——— M. to take in Saturdays and Mondays, 1592 (ii).
——— M. to take in Thursdays, 512 (i).
GOVT. DEPOSITS IN SAVINGS BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 495 (i).
GOVT. MEASURES, FURTHER: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1703 (ii).
——— MENTIONED IN SPEECH FROM THRONE: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 1198 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Blake* and others) 913 (ii).
GOVT. SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: M. for Stmnt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 392 (i).
GOVT. STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 1372 (ii).
GOVERNOR GENL'S AND STAFF'S SALARIES: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McCraney*) 795 (ii).
——— SEC.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 522, 868 (ii).
——— SPEECH FROM THE THRONE PROROGUING PARLT., 1777 (ii).
——— TRAVELLING EXPENSES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McCraney*) 792 (i).
GRAHAM, MR., APPOINTMENT AS LEGAL AGENT AT HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1514, 1633 (ii).
GRAPE VINES IMPORTED UNDER VALUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 370 (i).
GRAZING LANDS. *See* "DOM. LANDS."
GRAZING LEASES. *See* "TIMBER."
GREASE: conc. in Ways and Means, 780 (i).
GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt B. No. 78 (Mr. *Innes*). 1°*, 460; 2°*, 614; in Com. and 3°*, 783 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 69.)
HAIR-CLOTH: conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).
HALDIMAND, ISSUE OF WRIT FOR AND RETURNING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1144, 1172 (ii).
HALDIMAND, ISSUE OF WRIT FOR: M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 912, 1015, 1077, 1144, 1171 (ii).
HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS COMMISSION, 1877, REPS. OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 634 (i).
——— CLAIMS PROVED BEFORE COMMISSION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Ross*) 58 (i).
——— CLAIMS, STMNT. RESPECTING: presented (Mr. *White*, Cardwell) 746 (i).
——— ENUMERATION OF, REP. OF COMMISSION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 58 (i).
——— PRISONERS IN THE N.W.T.: M. for copies of O. C.* (Mr. *Desaulniers, Maskinongé*) 60 (i).
HAMOND, EUGÈNE, EMPLOYMENT OF BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1379 (ii).
HANDKERCHIEFS: conc. in Ways and Means, 1722 (ii).
HARBORS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1261, 1754 (ii).
HARBOR MASTER AT SARNIA: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 692 (i).
HARDWARE AND RY. SUPPLIES PURCHASED IN HALIFAX: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 58 (i).
HARNESS AND SADDLERY: conc. in Ways and Means, 756 (i).
HAY TAX IN THE N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 121 (i).
HEALTH STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (ii).
HEBERT, HUBERT, REVISING OFFICER AT MONTMAGNY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 569 (i).
HENEY, JOHN, CLAIM OF FOR REFUND OF TOLLS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 392 (i).
——— REFUND TO: conc. in Com. of Sup., 1774 (ii).
HENSLEY, MR. JUSTICE, REP. OF, *re* TRIAL OF GILLIS FOR MURDER: M. for copy* (Mr. *Davies*) 802 (i).
HEREFORD TO INTERNATIONAL RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1614 (ii).
HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE, ONT., JUDGE'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 898 (ii). *See B.* 125.
HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1023; Res. wthdn., 1030; M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) appointing day for discussion, 1075; prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) 1096; Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 1096; Deb. (Mr. *Casey*) 1097; (Mr. *Curran*) 1101; Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) to Amt. 1104; (Mr. *Burns*) 1108; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 1109; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1111; (Mr. *Orton*) 1113 (ii); (Mr. *McNeill*) 1114; (Mr. *Hackett*) 1115; (Messrs. *Allen* and *Wallace, York*) 1117; (Mr. *Thompson*) 1125; (Mr. *Blake*) 1119; (Mr. *Coursol*) 1127; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1128; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1131; (Mr. *Costigan*) 1132; Amt. to Amt. neg. (Y. 60, N. 118); Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) agreed to (Y. 117, N. 61) 1135; Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) to send Res. to Mr. Gladstone, 1136; Amt. (Mr. *Coughlin*) to send Res. to Mr. Parnell, neg. (Y. 22, N. 142) 1138; Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to transmit Res. to Speaker of English H. of C., 1139; withdn, 1140; Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) to add name of Mr. Parnell, 1140; neg. (Y. 69, N. 87) 1141; Amt. (Mr. *Thompson*) to transmit Res. to High Com. for Can. agreed to (Y. 80, N. 70) 1142; main M. (Mr. *Blake*) as amended, agreed to (Y. 140, N. 6) 1143 (ii).

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND, DISPATCH OF RES.: Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1178; Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 1380; remarks (Mr. *Mills*) 1381 (ii).

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, CANCELLED OR ABANDONED IN THE N.W.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 801 (i).

HORSES PURCHASED IN N.W.T., AND FROM WHOM: M. for Ret. * (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).

HOMESTEADS AND PRE-EMPTIONS. *See* "DOMINION LANDS."

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ANTIGONISH, ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Vacancy and Return of Member elect, 1 (i).

CARDWELL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Vacancy and Return of Member elect, 1 (i).

"DEBATES" COMMITTEE. *See* general heading, 30 (i).

DURHAM ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Vacancy and Return of Member elect, 1 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT AMTS.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 61; (Mr. *Blake*) 543 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT AMT. *See* B. 138.

FRANCHISE ACT, EXPENSES UNDER: in Com. of Sup., 1698, 1750 (ii).

——— INSTRUCTIONS TO REVISING OFFICERS: M. for copies (Mr. *Casey*) 43; remarks, 56 (i).

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS ACT AMT.: prop. B., 38; prop. Res., 121 (i).

KING'S, N.B., ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Vacancy and Return of Member elect, 1 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: Librarian's Rep. presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

IN COM. OF SUP., 1089 (ii).

MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 1 (i).

MESS. FROM HIS EX SUMMONING THE COMMONS TO SENATE, 1 (i) 1776 (ii).

NEW MEMBERS: Announcement (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

PROROGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Colby*) 1703; Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) further Govt. Measures, 1703 (ii).

ST. JOHN, N.B., CITY AND COUNTY ELECTORAL DISTICT: Return of Member elect, 1 (i).

ST. JOHN, N.B., CITY ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Vacancy and return of Member elect, 1 (i).

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. *See* general heading "COMMITTEES."

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, 1 (i).

THOMPSON, MR., M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 802 (i).

VACANCIES: Announcement (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

VOTERS' LISTS, PRINTING OF, CONTRACTS, &c.: M. for Stmnts. (Mr. *Casey*) 448 (i).

HUDSON BAY EXPLORATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 266 (i); (Mr. *Dawson*) 865; (Mr. *Royal*) 1378 (ii).

——— EXPEDITION: in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).

Ice, unguarded openings, &c. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW AMT."

IMMIGRATION, ASSISTED AND UNASSISTED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 635; Deb. (Mr. *Jackson*) 637; (Mr. *Ross*) 639; (Mr. *Carling*) 640; (Mr. *McMullen*) 642; (Messrs. *Woodworth* and *Beaty*) 643; (Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds*) 644; (Mr. *Mills*) 644; (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 646; (Mr. *Lister*) 648; (Mr. *Foster*) 649; (Mr. *Charlton*) 651; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 654; (Mr. *Casey*) 656; (Messrs. *McLelan* and *Sproule*) 657; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 658; (Mr. *Dawson*) 659; (Messrs. *Allen* and *Watson*) 660 (i).

IMMIGRATION AND EMIGRATION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 370 (i).

——— FROM DAKOTA AND TEXAS: Ques. (Mr. *Royal*) 1217 (ii).

——— FROM FRANCE, WORK OF M. LABELLE: Ques. (Mr. *Desjardins*) 1661 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 1385 (ii).

IMMIGRANTS SETTLED IN CANADA, NUMBER OF: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 61 (i).

IMPERIAL FEDERATION: remarks on adjnmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright* and others) 33 (i).

IMPERIAL TITLES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Edgar*) 698 (i).

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, VALUE OF: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1240 (ii).

INCH ARRAN HOTEL: Remarks (Mr. *Davies*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1533 (ii).

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Farrow*) 121 (i).

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT, BREACH OF, CHARGE AGAINST A MEMBER: M. (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) to ref. to Sel. Com., 1594 (ii).

——— REFUTATION OF CHARGES: (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1580 (ii).

INDIANS AND HALF-BREEDS:

CHIPPEWA INDIANS, PETS. FROM: Ques. (Mr *Cook*) 1659 (ii).

FLOUR SUPPLY TO N. W. INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 43 (i); (M. for Reps.*) 65 (i).

HALF-BREEDS CLAIMS COMMISSION, 1877, REPS. OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 634 (i).

——— CLAIMS PROVED BEFORE COMMISSION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Ross*) 58 (i).

——— STMNT. RESPECTING: presented (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 746 (i).

——— ENUMERATION OF, REP. OF COMMISSION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 58 (i).

——— PRISONERS IN THE N.W.T.: M. for copies of O.C. (Mr. *Desaulniers, Maskinongé*) 60 (i).

INDIAN ADMINISTRATION OF THE N.W.: Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 718-730; neg. (Y. 65, N. 114) 746 (i).

INDIAN AFFAIRS, DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 37

——— DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 688 (i).

INDIANS OF THE N.W., FOOD SUPPLY TO: M for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 58 (i).

INDIANS WHO TOOK PART IN REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1075 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 1650, 1745, 1758, 1773 (ii).

INSPECTORS OR COMMISSIONERS OF INDIAN AFFAIRS IN N. W.: M. for copy of O.C.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 438 (i).

KAH-KE-WA-QUO-NA-BY, CHIEF, AMOUNTS PAID TO: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 57 (i).

LETTERS PATENT FOR INDIAN LANDS. *See* B. 102.

MISSISSAGUA INDIANS, AMOUNT DUE THEM: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1633 (ii).

ROBINSON TREATY, INDIANS UNDER: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Dawson*) 62 (i).

SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).

SCRIP TO HALF-BREEDS WHO TOOK PART IN REBELLION: Ques (Mr. *Laurier*) 1075 (ii).

SIX NATION INDIANS, MINUTES OF COUNCIL: M. for copies* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 58 (i).

VOTERS, APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION: M. for copies (Mr. *Casey*) 449 (i).

INDIAN ADMINISTRATION OF THE N.W.: Res. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 718; Deb. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 730; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 733; (Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds*) 739; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 741; Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 742; (Mr. *Watson*) 745; remarks (Mr. *Fairbanks*) 742; (Mr. *Charlton*) 745; (neg. Y. 65, N. 114) 746 (i).

Indian Lands, Letters Patent B. No. 102 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°, 692 (i); 2°m., 807; 2° and in Com., 808; 3°*, 868 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 7.)

INDIAN TITLE, EXTINGUISHMENT OF IN N.W.T.: Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 809; Deb. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 818; (Mr. *Davies*) 829; (Mr. *Mills*) 836; (Mr. *Dawson*) 839; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 840; neg. (Y. 64, N. 106) 841 (ii).

INDIANTOWN BRANCH, I.C.R., AMOUNT PAID FOR LAND DAMAGES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 392 (i).

INGERSOLL, LONDON AND CHATHAM RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com. ,1598 (ii).

Inland Rev. Acts Amt. *See* "CONSOLIDATED."

INLAND REVENUE:

ADULTERATION ACT AMT. *See* B. 108.
—— OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 1547 (ii).
CONSOLID. INLAND REV. ACTS AMT. *See* B. 101.
CULLERS, TIMBER: in Com. of Sup., 1544 (ii).
DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 31 (i).
DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i), 881, 1543 (ii).
EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 1543 (ii).
HENRY, JOHN, REFUND TO: on conc., 1774 (ii).
INSPECTION ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 784 (i).
NEW EDINBURGH AND GATINEAU FERRY: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1172 (ii).
PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1544 (ii).
SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 1547 (ii).

Insolvent Debtors Assets Distribution B. No. 93 (Mr. *Macmillan, Middlesex*). 1°*, 599 (i).

Insolvent Debtors Discharge B. No. 71 (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°*, 393 (i).

Insolvent Banks, Ins. Co.'s, Loan Co.'s, &c., Act Amt. B. No. 15 (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°, 48; 2°, 437; in Com., 907, 1179; 3°*, 1180; M. to transfer Sen. Amts. to Govt. Orders, 1592 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 46.)

INSPECTION ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 784 (i).

INSPECTORS OR COMMISSIONERS OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, &C., IN N. W.: M. for copy of O. C.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 438 (i).

INSTRUCTIONS TO NON-COMBATANTS IN THE N. W. T.: M. for copies (Mr. *Casey*) 427 (i).

Insurance B. No. 11 (G) from the Sen. (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°*, 842; 2°, 957; in Com. and 3°*, 1385 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 45.)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:

BUCTOUCHE AND MONCTON BRANCH: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 330 (i).
CASUALTIES, &C., DAMAGES AND AMOUNT OF CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 58 (i).
CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).
DALHOUSIE BRANCH: M. (Mr. *Davies*) to refer expenditure to Public Accts. Com., 227 (i).
EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 62 (i); M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 392 (ii).
ELGIN STATION, L'ISLET: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 544 (i).
EMPLOYEES BETWEEN CAMPBELLTON AND HALIFAX, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 58 (i).
EXTENSION FROM STRAIT OF CANSO TO SYDNEY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 843 (i).
HARDWARE AND RY. SUPPLIES PURCHASED IN HALIFAX: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 58 (i).
INDIANTOWN BRANCH, AMOUNT PAID FOR LAND DAMAGES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 392 (i).
REPAIRS, &C., in Com. of Sup, 1659 (ii).
RESERVOIR, &C., AT LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. *Lesage*) 1378 (ii).
ROLLING STOCK PURCHASED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 58 (i).
ROLLING STOCK REPAIRED AT GOVERNMENT WORKSHOPS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 58 (i).
ST. CHARLES BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).
STELLARTON AND PICTOU BRANCH, O. C.s PETS., &C.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Kirk*) 802 (ii).
STELLARTON BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii). *See* B. 57.
MAROIS, ELZÉAR, CLAIM OF: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 784 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Continued.*

McCANN STATION TO JOGGINS RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1616 (ii).
MISCELLANEOUS WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).
OIL BARRELS, SALE OF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 802 (i).
OIL CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 897 (ii).
PASPEBIAC BRANCH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 186 (i).
PRIVATE AND OFFICIAL CARS BUILT OR PURCHASED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon*) 57 (i).
WESTINGHOUSE BRAKES, AMOUNTS PAID FOR APPLYING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Vail*) 393 (i).
WIRE FENCING CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Gaudet*) 544 (i).
WOOD PURCHASES FROM R. SMITH, OF QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Lesage*) 544 (i).

I.C.R. extension (Stellarton to Pictou) B. No. 57 (Mr. *Pope*). 1°, 185; 2° and in Com., 604, 614; 3° m., 663; 3°*, 668 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 13.)

Interest in B.C. B. No. 22 (Mr. *Baker, Vic.*) 1°, 61 (i); M. to place 2° on Govt. Orders, 1218; Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) to add B. No. 92, neg. (Y. 68, N. 88) 1218; Amt. (Mr. *Kranz*) to add B. No. 104, 1218; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) to add Bs. Nos. 92, 99 and 118, 1219; neg. (Y. 22, N. 149) 1222; Amt. (Mr. *Kranz*) neg. (Y. 35, N. 134) 1223; 2° m., 1243; 2° and in Com., 1244; 3°*, 1270 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 44.)

Interest on Moneys, &c., Act Amt. B. No. 12 (Mr. *McMullen*). 1°, 41; 2° m., 439; 2°, 441 (i).

INTERIOR:

COLONISATION CO.'S AND SETTLERS: Ques (Mr. *Farrow*) 330 (i).
—— LETTERS PATENT INCORP.: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 65 (i).
DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 524-543 (i), 881 (ii).
DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 60 (i).
DOMINION LANDS ACT, 1883, AMT. *See* B. 94.
—— IN B.C., ADMINISTRATION. *See* B. 120.
GEOLOGICAL DISPLAY AND COLONIAL EXHIBITION: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 692 (i).
—— SURVEY EXPENDITURES: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 633 (i).
GRAZING LAND AND GRAZING LAND LEASES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 392 (i).
LAND GRANTS TO RYS. *See* Bs. 117 and 147.
LICENSES TO CUT TIMBER IN DOM.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 65 (i).
MINING LAW AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fairbank*) 844; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 844 (ii).
PRINCE ALBERT COLONISATION CO., EXCHANGE OF LAND: M. for O.C.* (Mr. *Edgar*) 58 (i).
STEPHENSON, RUFUS, INSPECTOR OF COLONISATION CO.'S, REP. OF: M. for copy* (Mr. *Edgar*) 58 (i).
[*See* also "DOM. LANDS," "HALF-BREEDS," "INDIANS," &C.]

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex. presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 60 (i).

Interpretation Act Amt, B. No. 80 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°*, 488; 2° m, 519; 2°, 671; in Com., 712; 3°*, 713 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 2.)

Intoxicating Liquors Traffic Act Amt. B. No. 118 (Mr. *Beaty*). Res. prop., 903; in Com. and 1°* of B., 904; M. to place 2° on Govt. Orders, 1219; neg. (Y. 22, N. 149) 1222 (ii).

IRELAND. *See* "HOME RULE."

IRON SAND OR GLOBULES, &C.: conc. in Ways and Means, 780 (i).

JARVIS, P. R., AMOUNT PAID TO AS RETURNING OFFICER UNDER CAN. TEMP. ACT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Trow*) 393 (i).

JEMSEG CREEK, N.B., NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *King*) 369 (i).
JOINT STOCK CO.'S, PRINTING BLUE-BOOK: Ques. (Mr. *Bernier*) 186 (i).
JONES, CHIEF, AMOUNTS PAID TO: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 57 (i).
JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF:
BATOCHE, PAPERS FOUND AT, DIARY OF RIEL, MINUTE BOOK, &c., OF INSURGENT COUNCIL: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 58 (i).
CAPITAL CASES AND THE CROWN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 60 (i).
CONVICT *vs.* FREE LABOR, NUMBER EMPLOYED IN DOMINION PENITENTIARIES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 47 (i).
CONVICT LABOR IN DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. *Ray*) 1075 (ii).
——— DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 522 (i), 877 (ii).
——— DEPTL. REP., PENITENTIARIES BRANCH: presented (Mr. *Thompson*) 31 (i).
HENSLEY, MR. JUSTICE, REP. OF, *re* TRIAL OF GILLIS FOR MURDER: M. for copy (Mr. *Davies*) 802 (i).
HER MAJESTY *vs.* PARTIES TRIED IN CONNECTION WITH REBELLION: &c., &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Laurier*) 60 (i).
HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE (ONT.) JUDGE'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 898 (ii).
IN COM. OF SUP.: 886, 1698 (ii).
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).
MONGRAIN, LOUISON, PAPERS IN CONNECTION WITH TRIAL, &c.: M for copies (Mr. *Landerkin*) 392 (i).
QUEEN'S COUNSEL APPOINTMENTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mills*) 392 (i).
REPS. FROM GOVT. COUNSEL ON TRIALS IN N. W., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 185 (i).
STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATE AT CALGARY: Ques. (Mr. *Burpee*) 427 (i).
STONY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, PRISONERS' HEALTH: Ques. (Mr. *Desjardins*) 1172 (i).
SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Barker*) 802 (i).
TREASON-FELONY TRIALS AT REGINA, &c.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Mills*) 696 (i).
TRIAL OF HALF-BREEDS, INDIANS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 59 (i).
[*See* also "RIEL, LOUIS."]
KAH-KE-WA-QUO-NA-BY, CHIEF, AMOUNTS PAID TO: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 57 (i).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup, 1157 (ii).
Keewatin, Boundaries extension Law Amt. B. No. 127 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 974; wthdn., 1485 (ii).
KEEWATIN, MAN. AND N. W. T., POPULATION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 370 (i).
KING'S, N.B., ELECTORAL DIST.: Vacancy and Return of Member elect, 1 (i).
Kingston and Pembroke Mutual Aid and Ins. Co. incorp. B. No. 24 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*). 1°*, 66; 2°*, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 907. (49 *Vic., c.* 65.)
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 891, 1164, 1745 (ii).
Kootenay and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 87 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°*, 569; 2°*, 704 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1386 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 83.)
Kootenay Ry. Co. of B. C. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 599; 2°*, 704 (i); incorp. with B. 87.
LABELLE, REV. M., IMMIGRATION REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) 1633 (ii).
LACES, BRAIDS &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 757 (i).
LACHINE CANAL, CROSSING IN MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 426 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
——— LOTS ON BASINS: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 633 (i).
LACOMBE, FATHER, PAYMENT TO: conc., 1774 (ii).
LAKE ERIE, ESSEX AND DETROIT RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1610 (ii).
LAKE MAN. NAVIGATION: Ques (Mr. *Watson*) 369 (i).
Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 35 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*). 1°*, 92; 2°*, 119; in Com. and 3 *, 614 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 77.)
Lake Superior Mineral Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 34 (Mr. *Dawson*). 1°*, 92; 2°*, 119; in Com. and 3°*, 757 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 81.)
L'ASSOMPTION TO L'EPHIPHANIE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1615 (ii).
Law of Evidence. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW AMT."
LAND CLAIMS COMMISSION, N.W., Rep.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1421 (ii).
Land Grants to the Militia Force B. No. 142 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). M. to introd. B., 1420; Res. in Com., 1455; 1°* of B., 1458; 2° m, 1568; 2°* and in Com., 1572; 3°*, 1573 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 29.)
Land Grants to Rys. *See* "SUBSIDIES."
LAND IMPROVEMENT FUND, AMOUNT DUE ONT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 266 (i).
LANDS IN NORTH AND WEST ONT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1172 (ii).
LAND LEASES. *See* "TIMBER."
LAND SALES IN N. W., 1884-85: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 120 (i).
LAND SUBSIDIES. *See* "SUBSIDIES."
LANDS, TIMBER AND MINERAL IN NORTHERN QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1173 (ii).
Land Transfer in N. W. T. regulation B. No. 10 (Mr. *Thompson*. 1°, 40; 2° m., 668; 2° and ref. to Sp. Com., 670; prop. Res., 1015; in Com. on R., 1516; in Com on Res., 1532; Res. conc. in and 3°*, 1552. (49 *Vic., c.* 26)
LANORAIE, WHARF, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bernier*) 1173 (ii).
LAUNDRY BLUEING: conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i).
LAURIE, MAJ. GEN., AND GEN. STRANGE, POSITION IN THE MILITIA FORCE DURING REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 68 (i).
LEAD PIPE AND LEAD SHOT: conc. in Ways and Means, 757 (i).
"LA CANADIENNE" AND "ALLIANCE," COLLISION: Ques. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 1660 (ii).
LEDUC, REV. H., AND DANIEL MALONEY, PETS. AND LETTERS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Rykert*) 438 (i).
LEGAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 1154, 1159 (ii).
LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 1089, 1153 (ii).
Lennox Passage Bridge incorp. B. No. 81 (Mr. *Paint*). 1°*, 487; 2°*, 614 (i); wthdn., 1378 (ii).
LES FONDS, POST OFFICE AT: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Rinfret*) 802 (i).
Letters Patent. *See* "INDIAN LANDS."
LIBRARY: in Com. of Sup., 1089, 1153 (ii).
LICENSES TO CUT TIMBER IN DOM.: M. for Rets. (Mr. *Charlton*) 65 (i).

LIFE-BOAT SERVICE AND REWARDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1372 (ii).

LIFE-SAVING APPARATUS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 783 (i).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1375 (ii).

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, COMMISSIONERS AND INSPECTORS EMOLUMENTS, AND REFUND OF FEES: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 266 (i).

——— COSTS INCURRED BY DOM.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 438 (i).

——— MANUFACTURED IN CANADA, EXPORTS AND IMPOTS AND LABOR EMPLOYED, Ms. for Stmnts.* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 912 (ii).

Loan Co.'s. *See* "INSOLVENT BANKS."

LOANS, TEMPORARY BY GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 56 (i).

LOBSTER FISHING IN P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 31 (i).

LOGS, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1587; conc., 1725.

London and Ontario Investment Co.'s B. No. 97 (F) from the Sen. (Mr. *Beaty*). 1°*, 644; 2°*, 704 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1326 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 102.)

LONDON INFANTRY SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 1753 (ii).

LONG SAULT AND LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551 (ii).

LOTBINIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 709 (i).

LUMBER AND SAW LOGS, FREE EXPORT: Ques. (Mr. *Ives*) 634 (i).

"LYLIAN," SCHOONER, SEIZURE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 912 (ii).

MACDONALD HUGH, AND PILOTAGE COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 68 (i).

MACDONALD, SIR JOHN, ILLNESS OF: Letter from Physician read, 543 (i).

MCDONALD, ANGUS, APPOINTMENT AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR: M. for copy* (Mr. *Kirk*) 438 (i).

MCDOUGALL, HECTOR F., M.P.: Res. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com. to enquire into charges against, 1173 (ii).

MAILS, CARRIAGE OF, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 495 (i).

MAIL SUBSIDIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1370, 1756 (ii).

MANITOBA:

- ASSINIBOINE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 784 (i).
- CHURCHILL AND NELSON RIVERS SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 266 (i).
- DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. RY. CO.'S CHARTERS: M. dropped (Mr. *Blake*) 383 (i); M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Watson*) 802 (i).
- EMERSON AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO. *See* B. 39.
- KEEWATIN, MAN. AND N.W.T., POPULATION: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 370 (i).
- LAKE MANITOBA NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 369 (i).
- CLAIMS SETTLEMENT. *See* B. 123.
- INCREASED REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 784 (i).
- NAVIGATION IN MAN. WATERS: Ques. (Mr. *Royal*) 1217 (ii).
- PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 893 (ii).
- PRE-EMPTIONS IN MAN., REDUCTION IN PRICE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 369 (i).
- RED RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1240 (ii).
- SETTLERS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 42 (i).
- STONEY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, PRISONERS' HEALTH: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1172 (ii).
- WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY RY. STEAMSHIP CO. *See* B. 119.
- WINNIPEG AND NORTH PACIFIC RY. *See* B. 72.

[*See* also "N.W.T.," "INDIANS," &c.]

Man. and North-Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 70 (Mr. *Ross*). 1°*, 393; 2°*, 474 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 957 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 75.)

MAN. AND NORTH WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 1551; in Com., 1630 (ii).

Man. Claims Settlement Act Amt. B. No. 123 Mr. *McLelan*). Res. prop. 866; in Com., 959; 1°* of B., 960; 2° m., 1145; 2°* and in Com., 1146; 3°, 1199. (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)

MARINE:

- BUOYS AND BEACONS: in Com. of Sup., 691 (i), 886, 1377 (ii).
- CAPE RACE LIGHTHOUSE, TRANSFER. *See* B. 100.
- GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1372. (ii).
- HARBOR MASTER OF SARNIA: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 692 (i).
- HUDSON BAY EXPLORATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 266 (i), 865, 1378 (ii).
- LIFE-SAVING APPARATUS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 783 (i).
- MACDONALD, HUGH, AND PILOTAGE COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 68 (i).
- MARINE, DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 31 (i).
- MARINE POLICE FORCE OF CAN.; M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 383, 386 (i).
- NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION. *See* B. 96.
- "NORTHERN LIGHT," AND WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P. E. I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Jenkins*) 845 (ii).
- PENETANGUISHENE LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 1515 (ii).
- STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT, 1882, Amt. *See* B. 103.
- "SULTAN," STEAM-TUG, AWARD OF DOMINION ARBITRATORS: M. for copy (Mr. *Mitchell*) 904 (ii).

[*See* also "FISHERIES."]

MARINE AND FISHERIES, REP. OF MIN. TO PRIVY COUNCIL IN 1869: M. for copy (Mr. *Mitchell*) 301 (i).

Maritime Court of Ont. Jurisdiction B. No. 5 (Mr. *Allen*). 1°*, 37; 2° m., 149; 2°*, 437; in Com., 559 (i).

MAROIS, ELZÉAR, CLAIM OF: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 784 (i).

Maskinongé and Nipissing Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 74 (Mr. *Hurteau*). 1°*, 426; 2°*, 494 (i); in Com. and 3°, 957 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 79.)

MEDALS, DISTRIBUTION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Royal*) 1661 (ii).

MEDALS FOR VOLUNTEERS WHO SERVED IN THE N. W. T.: M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 458 (i).

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL STAFF IN N. W. T, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).

Medicine Hat, Dunmore and Benton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 16 (Mr. *McCallum*). 1°*, 48; 2°*, 102 (i); wthdn., 1309 (i).

Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 149; 2°*, 265; in Com. and 3°*, 494 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 86.)

MEMBERS INTRODUCED: 1 (i).

MEMORIAL OF THE N. W. COUNCIL: M. for copy (Mr. *Watson*) 703 (i).

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:

- CAPE RACE LIGHTSHIP AND STEAM FOG-WHISTLE: presented (Mr. *Foster*) 226 (i).
- DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST, CONFIDENTIAL PAPERS: presented (Sir *Hector L. Langevin*) 368 (i).
- ENGINEERS CERTIFICATES: presented (Sir *Hector L. Langevin*) 599 (i).
- ESTIMATES, THE, FOR 1886-87: presented (Mr. *McLelan*) 368 (i); 1885-86, 1550; suppl. for 1887, 1633 (ii).
- INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 60 (i).

METAPEDIAC AND CROSS POINT RY. SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 426 (i).

METAPEDIAC AND PASPEBIAC RY. *See* "BAIE DES CHALEURS."
METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORIES: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (ii).
MIALL'S PAMPHLET AGAINST CAN. TEMP. ACT: Ques. (Mr. *McCraney*) 121 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 881 (ii).
MIDDLETON, MAJ. GENL., NAMES, &c., OF STAFF IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 437 (i).
Midland Bank. *See* "ANGLO CANADIAN."
MILITIA:
A, B AND C BATTERIES: in Com. of Sup., 1309, 1547; conc., 1771 (ii).
AMMUNITION, CLOTHING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1302 (ii).
——— MANUFACTURED AT QUEBEC: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casey*) 554 (i).
BATTERIES, CAVALRY SCHOOLS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1547 (ii).
BRIGADE MAJORS SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1300 (ii).
CITADEL, QUE., DRAINING OF: in Com. of Sup., 1742 (ii).
CONTINGENCIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 523 (i), 877-880, 1295, 1307, 1743 (ii).
DRILL INSTRUCTION AND DRILL PAY: in Com. of Sup., 1306 (ii).
LAND GRANTS TO MILITIA. *See* B. 142.
LAURIE, MAJ. GEN., AND GENERAL STRANGE, POSITION IN MILITIA FORCE DURING REBELLION: Ques (Mr. *Casey*) 68 (i).
LONDON INFANTRY SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 1753 (ii).
MEDALS, DISTRIBUTION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) 1661 (ii).
MEDALS FOR VOLUNTEERS WHO SERVED IN N.W.: M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. *Amyot*) 438 (i).
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL STAFF, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).
MILITARY BRANCH AND DISTRICT STAFF, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1295 (ii).
——— CLAIMS COMMISSION, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).
——— OPERATIONS IN N.W., Rep.: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 1075 (ii).
——— PROPERTIES: in Com. of Sup., 1309, 1771 (ii).
——— WORKS IN B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE, DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 57 (i).
——— REBELLION REP: presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1455 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1295 (ii).
——— REGIMENTS VISIT TO GREAT BRITAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 709.
NON-COMBATANTS, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 633 (i).
OFFICERS, &c., WHO VOLUNTEERED FOR SERVICE, NAMES, &c.: M for Ret.,* 438 (i).
ORGANISATIONS IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 843 (ii).
PENSIONS, N.W. REBELLION: in Com. of Sup., 1742; conc., 1771 (ii).
PENSIONS TO VOLUNTEERS WHO SERVED IN THE N.W: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1198 (ii).
POWDER IMPORTED FOR CARTRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 898 (ii).
REBELLION, LOSSES, CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1767 (ii).
RETURN, IMPERFECT, *re* SEIZURES BY EXPEDITIONARY FORCE IN N.W., 1380 (ii).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 1308 (ii).
[*See* also "DISTURBANCE."]
MINING LAW AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulback*) 844 (ii).
MIRAMICHI MAIL SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Com. of Sup., 1756 (ii).
MISSISSAGUA INDIANS, AMOUNT DUE: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1633 (ii).
Model Farm. *See* "EXPERIMENTAL."
MONCTON AND BUCTOUCHE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1596 (ii).
MONGRAIN, LOUISON, PAPERS IN CONNECTION WITH TRIAL, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 392 (i).
MONTREAL AND WESTERN RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1616 (ii).
Montreal Board of Trade Acts Amt. B. No. 90 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 599 (i); 2°, 856; in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 55.)
MOODY, JOHN, EMPLOYMENT OF BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1379 (ii).
MORGAN'S "ANNUAL REGISTER": in Com. of Sup., 880, 1740 (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 1754 (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).
MOUNT MIDDLETON, N.B., POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 1075 (ii).
MUD CREEK DAMS, RAISING OF: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1746 (ii).
MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
MUTUAL LIFE ASSOCIATION OF CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 1379 (ii).
MUTUAL RESERVE FUND LIFE ASSOCIATION CERTIFICATES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1173 (ii).
NAIL PLATE, IRON OR STEEL: conc. in Ways and Means, 1722 (ii).
Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. No. 79 (Mr. *White, Hastings*). 1°*, 460; 2°, 614 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1386 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 68.)
NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1627 (ii).
NATASKOWAN RIVER, ESTUARY OF, RENT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1379 (ii).
NATIONAL PARKS IN THE N.W.T. OR B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 266 (i).
NATURALISATION ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 709 (i).
Navigable Waters Protection (fisheries, &c.) B. No. 96 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 630 (i); 2° m., 946; in Com., 951; 3°, 1015 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 36.)
Navigable Waters, works in, B. No. 130 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°, 1075; 2° m., 1246; 2°*, 1249; in Com., 1270; 3°*, 1271 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 35.)
NAVIGATION IN MAN. WATERS: Ques. (Mr. *Royal*) 1217 (ii).
Navigation. *See* "ST. LAWRENCE."
NEGUAC, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF AT: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1640, 1754 (ii).
NEREPIS STATION, N.B., POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 1075 (ii).
New Brunswick Bank Capital Stock Reduction B. No. 14 (Mr. *Weldon*). 1°*, 48; 2°*, 66; in Com. and 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 59.)
NEW BRUNSWICK:
ALBERT RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1627 (ii).
BANK OF N.B., CAPITAL STOCK REDUCTION B. *See* B. 14.
BUCTOUCHE AND MONCTON BRANCH: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 330 (i).
BUTTERNUT RIDGE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 1075 (ii).
CARAQUET RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 494 (i); Res. in Com., 1604 (ii).
EDMONSTONE AND RIVIÈRE DU LOUP RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 570 (i).
FAIRFIELD POSTMASTERSHIP: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 1661 (ii).
FREDERICTON TO PRINCE WILLIAM RY. SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1624 (ii).
HEREFORD TO INTERNATIONAL RY. SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1614 (ii).
INDIANTOWN BRANCH, AMOUNT PAID FOR LAND DAMAGES: M for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 392 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Continued.*

JEMSEG CREEK NAVIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *King*) 369 (i).
KING'S ELECTORAL DIST.: Vacancy and Return of Member, 1 (i).
METAPEDIA AND CROSS POINT RY. SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 426 (i).
MOUNT MIDDLETON POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 1075 (ii).
NEREPIS STATION POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 1075 (ii).
NEWCASTLE TO DOUGLASTOWN RY. SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1625 (ii).
NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1604.
PASPEBIAC BRANCH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 186 (i).
PERTH CENTRE STATION TO PLASTER ROCK ISLAND RY. SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1624 (ii).
RY. STATION BUILDING IN ST. JOHN, COST, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 58 (i).
RESTIGOUCHE RIVER, RY. BRIDGE ACROSS: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 426 (i).
RICHIBUCTO AND ST. LOUIS RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 494 (i).
ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND RY. EXTENSION Co.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 66 (i).
ST. JOHN, N.B., CITY AND COUNTY ELECTORAL DIST.: Return of Member elect., 1 (i).
ST. JOHN, N.B., CITY, ELECTORAL DIST.: Vacancy and Return of Member, 1 (i).
STATHER, R., PAPERS, *re* APPLICATION FOR DISCHARGE: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 68; (M. for copies) 371, 376 (i).

NEWCASTLE TO DOUGLASTOWN RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1625 (ii).

NEW EDINBURGH AND GATINEAU FERRY: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1172 (ii).

NEW GLASGOW TO MONTCALM RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1614 (ii).

NEW MEMBERS: 1 (i).

NEWSPAPERS AND TRAVELLING EXPENSES, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 877 (ii).

Niagara Frontier Bridge Co.'s Act Amt.. No. 48 (Mr. *Rykert*). 1°*, 149; 2°*, 240 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1153 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*). 1°*, 93; 2°*, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 494 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)

NIOTAUX AND ATLANTIC RY.: Remarks (Mr. *Blake* and others) on intrdn. of B. 146, 1636 (ii).

——— SUBSIDY: in Com. (remarks) (Mr. *Woodworth*) 1617 (ii).

NON-COMBATANTS IN N. W. T., RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: Ques. (Messrs. *Ross* and *Cameron, Middlesex*) 633 (i).

North American Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. No. 86 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°*, 543; 2°*, 704 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1281 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 94.)

North Canadian Pacific. *See* "WINNIPEG AND HUDSON BAY."

Northern and North-Western Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 65 (Mr. *Kilvert*). 1°*, 393; 2°*, 474 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1281 (ii).

Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 25 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°*, 66; 2°*, 240 (i); M. for Com., 1311; in Com., 1318; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1325; neg. (Y. 48, N. 90) and 3°, 1326; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1605; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1640; M. to transfer Sen. Amts. to Govt. Orders, 1662; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1673; Amts. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1676–1684; neg. (Y. 45, N. 90) 1684 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 76.)

NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY., N. B., Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1604 (ii.

"NORTHERN LIGHT" AND WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P. E. I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Jenkins*) 845 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:

ADMINISTRATION OF THE N. W. T.: Res. (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1729; neg. (Y. 51, N. 71) 1740 (ii).
AGENTS, PURCHASING, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 437 (i).
ALBERTA RY. Co. *See* B. 31.
AMNESTY, GENERAL: prop. Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1257 (ii).
BAKER, I. G. & Co., CONTRACTS FOR INDIAN AND MOUNTED POLICE SUPPLIES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 488 (i).
——— CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 1076 (ii).
BELL & LEWIS, HOWARD WRIGHT, J. STEWART AND MR. SINCLAIR, MONEYS PAID TO FOR TRANSPORT, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 437 (i).
BOW RIVER COAL MINE AND TRANSPORTATION Co. *See* B. 44.
CENSUS OF N. W. T., NAMES &c., OF EMPLOYEES: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 66 (i).
CLAIMS RECOGNISED BY GOVT. AND AMOUNTS PAID: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).
DUCK, GEO., DOM. LAND AGENT AT PRINCE ALBERT, REP. OF: M. for copy* (Mr. *Edgar*) 58 (i).
EDMONTON AND ST. ALBERT LAND SURVEYS: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 802 (i).
FIRE-ARMS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1076 (ii).
FLYING COLUMN: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Watson*) 634 (i).
HALF-BREED PRISONERS: M. for copies O. C.* (Mr. *Desaulniers, Maskinongé*) 60 (i).
HAY TAX: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 121 (i).
HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, CANCELLED OR ABANDONED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 801 (i).
HOMESTEADS IN RY. BELT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 120, 185 (i).
INDIAN TITLE, EXTINGUISHMENT OF: Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Laurier*) 809–818; neg. (Y. 64, N. 106) 841 (ii).
JUDICIARY IN THE N.W.T. *See* B. 133.
KEEWATIN, BOUNDARIES OF, EXTENSION. *See* B. 127.
LAW AMT. *See* B. 133.
LEDUC, REV. H., AND DANIEL MALONEY, PETS. AND LETTERS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Rykert*) 438 (i)
MEDICINE HAT, DUNMORE AND BENTON RY. Co. *See* B. 16.
MEDICINE HAT RY. AND COAL Co. *See* B. 54.
MEMORIAL OF THE N.W. COUNCIL: M. for copy (Mr. *Watson*) 703 (i).
MILITIA ORGANISATION: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 843 (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE SUPPLIES, CONTRACTS BY I. G. BAKER & Co: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 488 (i).
NORTH CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. Co. *See* B. 73.
N.W. CENTRAL RY. Co. *See* B. 17.
PENSION TO VOLUNTEERS WOUNDED AT DUCK LAKE: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 633 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT COLONISATION Co.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Edgar*) 489; agreed to (Y. 150, N. 1) 491 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT VOLUNTEERS, SCRIP FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 633 (i).
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE AND LAKE OF THE WOODS RY. AND NAVIGATION Co. *See* B. 55.
REAL PROPERTY IN THE N.W.T. *See* B. 10.
REPRESENTATION OF THE N.W.T. IN PARLT. *See* B. 115.
——— ENGLISH LEGISLATION. Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1514 (ii).
RETURN, IMPERFECT, *re* SEIZURES BY EXPEDITIONARY FORCE: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) 1380 (ii).
RETURNS *re* EXPENSES IN N.W.T.: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 66 (i).
ROCK LAKE, SOURIS AND BRANDON RY. Co. *See* B. 63.
ROCKY MOUNTAIN RANGERS, ISSUE OF SCRIP TO: Ques. (Mr. *Ives*) 543 (i).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND AND HOMESTEAD Co. *See* B. 42.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Continued.*

SEIZURES BY MOUNTED POLICE OR EXPEDITIONARY FORCE: M for Ret. (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).

SISTERS "FAITHFUL COMPANIONS OF JESUS." *See* B. 32.

TEMPERANCE COLONISATION CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 1633 (ii).

TIMBER, LAND AND COAL LEASES: Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1036-1041; neg. (Y. 43, N. 99) 1074 (ii).

TRAVIS, JUDGE: Reference to, in Com. of Sup., 887; in Com. on B. 133, 1461 (ii)

VALIN, MR., M P., GRANTS OF LAND TO: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 31 (i).

Northumberland Straits Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 128 (K) from the Sen. (Mr. *Hackett*). 1°*, 1014; 2°*, 1085; in Com., 1465; 3°*, 1467 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 92.)

North-West Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 17 (Mr. *Beaty*). 1°*, 58; 2°*, 102 (i); M. for Com., 974; Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3 m. h., 979; neg. (Y. 59, N. 86) 1011; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) neg. (Y. 55, N. 82), in Com. and 3°*, 1013 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 74.)

NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.'S B.: on M. for Com. (Mr. *Woodworth*) 974; Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 978; Deb. (Mr. *Blake*) 979; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 983; (Mr. *Watson*) 985; (Mr. *Ives*) 985; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 988; (Messrs. *McLelan* and *Sproule*) 990; (Mr. *Charlton*) 991; (Mr. *Orton*) 992; (Mr. *Lister*) 993; (Messrs. *Hesson* and *Fairbank*) 994; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 995; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 998; (Mr. *Bowell*) 999; (Mr. *McCallum*) 1002; on M. to adjn. Deb. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1003; (Messrs. *White* [*Cardwell*], *Blake, Watson* and *Hesson*) 1004; (Mr. *Woodworth*) 1005; Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) neg. (Y. 59, N. 86) 1011 (ii).

NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., DEPOSIT BY CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1747 (ii).

NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY CO.'S LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 1551; in Com., 1631 (ii).

North-West Ter. Law Amt. B. No. 133 (Mr. *Thompson*). Res. prop., 1015; M. for Com., 1202; in Com., 1203; conc. in and 3°* of B, 1223; 2°* and in Com., 1382; in Com., 1458; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) 1483; neg. (Y. 42, N. 70) and 3°*, 1485 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 25.)

NOTICE OF MOTION, MEMBER ANTICIPATING: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1541 (ii).

Nova Scotia and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp B. No. 56 (Mr. *Dodd*). 1°*, 185; 2°*, 342 (ii.)

Nova Scotia Steamship Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 51 (Mr. *Kinney*). 1°*, 149; 2°*, 265; in Com. and 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 96.)

NOVA SCOTIA:

ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY RY. EXTENSION: Remarks, 1746 (ii).

ANTIGONISH ELECTORAL DIST: Vacancy and Return of Member, 1 (i).

BADDECK CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 1379 (ii).

BANK OF YARMOUTH. *See* B. 69.

BRIAR AND LONG ISLAND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION, GISBORNE'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Vail*) 393 (i).

BROOKLYN BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 265 (i).

CANSO AND LOUISBURG RY.: M. to conc. in Res. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1515 (ii).

CAPE BRETON ISLAND RY. *See* B. 143.

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RY. *See* B. 105.

COAL INTEREST IN N.S.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 544 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Continued.*

DIGBY PIER, REBUILDING OF: Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 31, 42 (i).

GRAHAM, MR. W., APPOINTMENT AS LEGAL AGENT AT HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1514, 1633 (ii).

HARDWARE AND RY. SUPPLIES, PURCHASED IN HALIFAX: M. for Ret* (Mr. *Forbes*) 58 (i).

MCDONALD, ANGUS, APPOINTMENT AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR: M. for copy* (Mr. *Kirk*) 438 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA AND WESTERN RY. *See* B. 56

—— STEAMSHIP CO. *See* B. 51.

PICTOU BANK. *See* B. 50.

PICTOU COAL AND IRON CO. *See* B. 64.

PORT HASTINGS WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 60 (i).

PORT HOOD HARBOR, PROTECTION TO: M for Cor.* (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 60; closing of, 787 (i).

REFORMATORY FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS, HALIFAX. *See* B. 134.

ROCHE, M., OF LINGAN, N.S., TRANSFER OF: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel Com to enquire into charges against certain members, 1173; reply, 1176; neg (Y. 51, N. 89) 1341 (ii).

SCATTERIE FOG-WHISTLE SUPERINTENDENT: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 786 (i).

SHORT LINE RY., MONTREAL AND SALISBURY: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 1210; (M. for copy of contract) 1309 (ii).

SHORT LINE RY.; M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Tupper*) 444 (i).

STELLARTON AND PICTOU BRANCH RY., O.C.'s, PETS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Kirk*) 802 (i).

STELLARTON AND PICTOU BRANCH RY. *See* B. 57.

STEWIACKE VALLEY AND MUSQUODOBOIT RY. SUBSIDY: Res in Com., 1624 (ii).

STRAIT OF CANSO TO SYDNEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 843 (ii).

STRATHLORNE, N.S, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 59 (i).

SUBSIDY TO N S., READJUSTMENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kirk*) 449 (i).

SURVEY OF RAILWAY ROUTES IN CAPE BRETON: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell, Vic.*) 266 (i)

TRURO TO NEWPORT RY. SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1617 (ii).

UNION BANK OF HALIFAX. *See* B 52.

WINDSOR BRANCH RY. SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr *Kinney*) 1240 (ii).

YARMOUTH STEAMSHIP CO. *See* B. 91.

Oaths of Office. *See* "ADMINISTRATION."

OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1746 (ii).

OBSERVATORIES: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (ii).

OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1374 (ii).

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1372; conc., 1771 (ii).

O'CONNOR, D., SUMS PAID TO: in Com. of Sup., 1154, 1160 (ii).

O'DONOHOE, HON. SENATOR, CABINET ARRANGEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 58, 61 (i).

—— AND CIRCULAR TO CATHOLICS: Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) 1379 (ii).

Offences against the Person. *See* "CRIMINAL LAW."

OFFICERS &C., WHO VOLUNTEERED FOR SERVICE IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).

OIL CLOTHS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1587; conc, 1719 (ii).

OIL CONTRACTS, I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 897 (ii).

OIL BARRELS, &c., I.C.R, SALE OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Langelier*) 802 (i).

OLEOMARGARINE, &c.: Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) respecting legislation, 547-553 (i); Deb. resumed (Mr. *Taylor*) 1187, 1195; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1188; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1190

(Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds*) 1190; (Messrs. *Blake, White* [*Hastings*] and *Guillet*) 1191; (Messrs. *Orton, Bain* [*Wentworth*] and *Bowell*) 1192; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1193; (Messrs. *Cochrane, Jenkins, Fairbank* and *Platt*) 1194 (ii).

—— in Com. on Ways and Means, 758-769 (i).

—— in Com. on B. 101 (Inland Rev. Act Amt.) 1204 (ii).

—— Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) to Amt. to M. (Mr. *Blake*) for Sel. Com. *re* Matthew Roche, 1337 (ii).

Ont., Minnesota and Man. Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 49 (Mr. *Royal*). 1°*, 149; 2°*, 342 (i); wthdn., 897 (ii).

ONTARIO:

APPOINTMENT OF RETURNING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1144, 1172 (ii).

BARKER, P. M., AMOUNTS PAID TO: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 58 (i).

BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Res. in Com. (Mr. *Bowell*) 1626 (ii).

BOUNDARIES OF ONT., LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 59, 66 (i).

—— WEST AND NORTH, EXPENSES INCURRED BY DOM. SINCE 1870: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 438 (i).

BROCKVILLE AND NEW YORK BRIDGE CO. *See* B. 68.

BURLINGTON BAY CANAL. *See* B. 76.

CANADA ATLANTIC RY. CO. *See* B. 43.

CANADA ATLANTIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1617 (ii).

CANADA SOUTHERN BRIDGE CO. *See* B. 40.

CARDWELL ELECTORAL DIST.: Vacancy and return of Member, 1 (i).

CENTRAL ONTARIO RY. CO. *See* B. 67.

COBOURG, TOWN OF, RELIEF B. *See* B. 122.

COOK, MR. H., TIMBER DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1380; M. to ref. to Pub. Accts. Com., 1420 (ii).

DUNNVILLE DAM AND BRIDGE TOLLS. *See* B. 139.

DURHAM, EAST, ELECTORAL DIST.: Vacancy and Return of Member, 1 (i).

FRENCH CANADIAN REPRESENTATION FOR ONT. IN SENATE: Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) 1633 (ii).

GANANOQUE, PERTH AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1624 (ii).

GRAVENHURST TO CALLANDER, LEASE OF LINE: M. for copies of agreements, &c. (Mr. *Edgar*) 391 (i).

GUELPH JUNCTION RY. CO. *See* B. 78.

HALDIMAND, ISSUE OF WRIT: M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 912; Ques., 1015, 1077, 1144, 1171 (ii).

HARBOR MASTER OF SARNIA: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 692 (i).

INGERSOLL, LONDON AND CHATHAM RY. SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1598 (ii).

JARVIS, P. R., AMOUNT PAID AS RETURNING OFFICER UNDER CAN. TEMP. ACT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Trow*) 393 (i).

JUDGE'S SALARY, ADDITIONAL (ONT.); Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 897 (ii). *See* B. 125.

KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE MUTUAL AID AND INSURANCE CO. *See* B. 24.

LAKE NIPISSING AND JAMES BAY RY. CO. *See* B. 35.

LAKE SUPERIOR MINERAL RY. CO. *See* B. 34.

LANDS IN NORTH AND WEST ONT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1172 (ii).

MARITIME COURT OF ONT. JURISDICTION. *See* B. 5.

MIDLAND BANK OF CANADA. *See* B. 18.

MOODY, JOHN, EMPLOYMENT OF BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1379.

MUD CREEK DAMS, RAISING OF: Ques (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1746.

NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUE. RY. CO. *See* B. 79.

—— SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1627 (ii).

NIAGARA AND GRAND ISLAND BRIDGE CO. *See* B. 38.

NIAGARA FRONTIER BRIDGE CO. *See* B. 48.

NORTHERN AND NORTH-WESTERN JUNCTION RY CO. *See* B. 65.

NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO. *See* B. 25.

NORTHERN PACIFIC RY. AGREEMENT: Ques (Mr. *Trow*) 633 (i).

PALMERSTON AND GEORGIAN BAY RY.: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) on M. that Com. rise, 1627 (ii).

ONTARIO—*Continued.*

PARRY SOUND COLONISATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1614 (ii).

POINT PELEE NAVAL RESERVE: Ques (Mr. *Lister*) 120 (i).

PORT ROWAN OR PORT ROYAL HARBOR OF REFUGE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jackson*) 65 (i).

PORT ROWAN LIFE-SAVING SERVICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Jackson*) 703; remarks continued, 785 (i).

RENFREW TO EGANVILLE RY. SUBSIDY: in Com on Res., 1626 (ii).

RIDEAU RIVER FLOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 1076 (ii).

ROPER, S.C.D., EMPLOYMENT OF BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 570 (i).

SABLE AND SPANISH SLIDE AND BOOM CO. *See* B 36.

TÊTE DU POINTE BARRACKS: Ques. (Mr. *Gunn*) 1240 (ii).

TIMBER ISLAND, LAKE ONT., SALE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 784; (Mr. *Fisher*) 784 (i).

TIMBER LICENSES IN DISPUTED TER.: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace, York*) 41 (i)

TIMBER SALES ON GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 898 (ii).

TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE ACTS AMT. *See* B. 85.

THUNDER BAY COLONISATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1613 (i).

VICTORIA AND SAULT STE. MARIE JUNCTION RY. CO. *See* B. 95.

WEST ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. CO. *See* B. 27.

WINDSOR, ONT., HARBOR MASTER AT: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 785 (i).

WOODRUFF, J. A., AMOUNTS PAID TO: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*, Brant) 68 (i).

ORANGEVILLE AND CLANDEBOYE, OUTRAGES UNDER SCOTT ACT: Ques. (Mr. *McCraney*) 1661 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE:

ORDER:

CATHOLICS AND POLITICS: Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) containing a statement of facts, of which the House has no knowledge, objected to by Mr. *Mills* as being out of order. Rule read by Mr. *Speaker* respecting Questions, and decided that same should not be asked unless Govt. choose to answer it, 1380 (ii).

CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT MONTREAL: Member, in asking a Ques., not in order to discuss the subject (Mr. *Speaker*) 1343 (ii).

EXPERIMENTAL FARM STATIONS: Reference to National Policy or other foreign subject in discussing B. not in order, 968, 973 (ii).

FRENCH CANADIANS, APPEALS AGAINST: Letter published in Winnipeg *Siftings* and alleged to have been written by Sir *John A. Macdonald*. Objection taken to Ques. by Mr. Mackenzie, 1378 (ii).

HALDIMAND, WRIT FOR: Member declared out of order (Mr. *Speaker*) in making personal remarks respecting Premier not issuing writ under Speaker's warrant, 1171 (ii).

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: on Mr. *Speaker's* ruling respecting Can. Temp. Amts. Bs., vote on above subject cited by Mr. *McCarthy* as a parallel case. Objection taken by Mr. *Blake*, and sustained by Mr. *Speaker*, 1220 (ii).

IMMIGRATION AND EMIGRATION: Members requested to confine themselves to subject before the House (Mr. *Speaker*) 637, 640, 643. Objection (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) taken to latitude of debate; Ruled (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) that member having been attacked has the right of reply, 653 (i).

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT.: Charge against a Member, Member requested to withdraw Stmnt (Mr. *Speaker*) 1061 (ii).

IRRELEVANCY OF DEBATE: 637, 640, 643, 667, 668 (i), 968, 973, 1002, 1009, 1171, 1221, 1317 (ii).

MEMBERS INDEMNITY ACT AMT.: M. to introduce B. declared out of order (Mr. *Speaker*), it creating a charge on the Public Treasury should originate by Res. in Com. with consent of the Crown, 38 (i).

NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.: Reference to or reading letters respecting charge made by Mr. *Woodworth* against Mr. *Beaty*, ruled out of order, 1009 (ii).

NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.: Reference to parties who tendered for building the road objected to by Mr. *Haggart*; reference in order, 1316 (ii).

OLEOMARGARINE: Reference to a previous deb. not in order, 1193 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—*Continued.*

ORDER—*Continued.*

OPENING OF DEBATE: Objection taken by Mr. White (Cardwell), to Member re-opening deb. on a question of Privilege; Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) irregular to make speech on such an occasion, some other opportunity, such as Supply, in order, 1575 (ii)

PARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: Member called to order. Rule quoted from "May," 1580; 1582, 1635, 1701, 1704 (ii).

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT: Fourth Rep. of Com, conc. in objected to by Mr. Blake, notice not having been given. Ruled (Mr *Speaker*) notice must be given, unless Rep. is adopted by unanimous consent of House, 1239 (ii)

RIEL, LOUIS, EXECUTION OF: on Mr. Amyot's prop M. for Ret. respecting non-commutation and Sir *Hector Langevin's* Amt. that the 17th Order be called, Mr. *Edgar* moved an Amt. adding to original motion. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) not in order and "Bourinot" quoted to sustain same, 187 (i).

——— Execution of: On Res. (Mr. *Furrow*) respecting Indemnity to Members, Sir *Hector Langevin* moved an Amt. that the 35th Order be called. Objection (Mr. *Blake*) Govt. pressing on deb., House not being in possession of materials to discuss subject; Amt. ruled in Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 122 (i)

RULES OF THE HOUSE: M. to alter Rule 31. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that notice must be given, 842 (ii).

TIMBER LANDS AND COAL LEASES IN N.W.T.: Member not referring to subject under discussion, called to order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1057 (ii).

PRIVILEGE:

BOGUS TELEGRAMS READ IN HOUSE AND DISTRIBUTION OF SPEECH OF AN HON. MEMBER: personal Explanation and denial (Mr. *Edgar*) 781 (i)

CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.: Personal explanation (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) *re* report of remarks in Opposition press and Mr. *Mc Carthy's* position in Northern Ry. Co., 1482 (ii)

COLONISATION LANDS, APPLICATION FOR: Remarks (Mr. *Gault*) 1198; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1199, 1421 (ii).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) *re* alleged omission, 186 (i); remarks (Mr. *Kirk*) on headings to extra copies, 631; (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) on paragraph in Ottawa *Free Press* indirectly charging him with dishonorable conduct, 693 (i).

DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W.T.: Personal explanation (Mr. *Amyot*) article in Toronto *Mail* reflecting on his character as a soldier, 331 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT AMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Small*) on paragraph in *Globe*, *re* revising officer's clerk, letter read, 1635; remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) 1701 (ii).

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: Explanation (Mr. *Bergin*) of vote on Res., 1311 (ii).

——— Personal explanation (Mr. *Coughlin*) on paragraph in Ottawa *Free Press*, *re* Vote, 1168 (ii).

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT: Personal explanation (Messrs. *Paint* and *Cameron, Inverness*) on paragraph in *Globe* insinuating their obtaining a charter for personal profit, 460 (i).

INTERNATIONAL RY CO.: Personal explanation (Mr. *Ives*) and denial of paragraph in *Globe* charging him with being a director of the Co., 1077 (ii).

PRINCE ALBERT COLONISATION CO.: Attention of House called to M. on Order Paper insinuating certain charges (Mr. *Bowell*) 488 (i).

PONTIAC AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY.: Personal explanation (Mr. *Bryson*) and denial of charge made by an hon. member, 1077 (ii).

REFLECTION ON A CLERGYMAN IN INVERNESS CO: Explanation (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 1541; in the N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Ferguson, Leeds*) 1592 (ii).

RETURN, COMPILATION OF AND HANDLING: Personal explanation (Mr. *Blake*) respecting remarks made by the Minister of Interior, 842 (ii).

RIEL, LOUIS, EXECUTION OF: Explanation (Mr. *Curran*) *re* paragraph in *Evening Journal* reflecting on Mgr. Taché, 301 (i).

——— SANITY OF: Personal explanation (Mr. *Chapleau*) Rep. of speech in London *Advertiser*, 393 (i).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—*Continued.*

PRIVILEGE—*Continued.*

NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.: Personal explanation (Mr. *McCarthy*) and denial of statement in *Globe*, 1310 (ii).

ONTARIO AND PACIFIC RY BONUS: Personal explanation (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) and denial of statement made by member in the House, 1096 (ii).

SLANDERING MEMBERS OF PARLT: Remarks (Mr. *Orton*) on paragraph in *Globe*, 513; (personal explanation) 601 (i).

TIMBER LAND AND COAL LEASES: Personal explanation (Mr *Costigan*) and denial of statement made by member, 1634; Personal explanation (Mr. *Haggart*) and denial of statements made by member in the House, 1096, 1143, 1634; Personal explanation (Mr *Charlton*) *re* application of Mr. *McCarthy*, M. P, 1514 (ii); Personal explanation (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in repudiation of statement made by member, 1702 (i).

TIMBER LIMITS: Statement made in House by Members reflecting on others: Remarks (Mr. *Cook*) 1167; personal explanation (Mr. *Dickinson*) on paragraph in *Globe*, 1168 (ii).

PROCEDURE:

CAN. TEMP. ACT, 1878: AMT. (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) to place Bs. 92, 99 and 118, on Govt. Orders. B. 92 having been negatived, it was contended by the mover that the placing of same in conjunction with Bs. 99 and 108 was not inconsistent with vote. Objection having been taken, Mr. *Speaker* ruled that B. 92 could not be added to Govt. Orders, 1220; questions can be divided, rule read, 1221 (ii).

CRIMINAL LAW AMT. (SEDUCTION) B.: Amts. made by the Sen. reported by Mr. *Speaker*, 1326; Sir *Hector Langevin* suggested that Amts. remain before House for consdn, 1326; 2° of Amts. moved; rule 23 respecting Amts. made by Sen. read and practice quoted from Bourinot's "Parliamentary Procedure" (Mr. *Speaker*) 1327 (ii).

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: Despatch sent to English press. Attention of House called by Mr. *Mills* to a telegram in the London *Times* calculated to be misleading. Attested copy of Res. passed by House sent to High Commissioner by Mr. *Speaker*, 1381 (ii).

——— Communicating a Res. passed by House of Commons, Mr. *Speaker* has no power or authority to transmit same to Prime Minister of England, except as a private communication, 1139 (ii).

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS: Res. objected to by Mr. *Blake*, as same should have originated in Com and assent of Crown obtained. Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that Res. being an abstract one and barren of result, within the power of House to adopt same, but B. could not be founded upon it, 122 (i).

PRINCE ALBERT COLONISATION CO.: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to add members to Sel. Com. on Privileges and Elections, precedent quoted, 492; objection (Mr. *Ives*) 493; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) out of order, as such motions require notice, 494 (i).

NORTHERN AND PACIFC JUNCTION RY: Amts. made by Sen. reported by Mr. *Speaker*, reading of same objected to and reference to a Com. suggested by Mr. *Blake*, 1605; right of Sen. to pass Amts. involving money expenditure questioned by Mr. *Mulock*; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that the B. being a private one and the Amt. one affecting the interests of the Crown in the contract, in order for House to confirm same, 1607 (ii).

STELLARTON AND PICTOU BRANCH RY.: 3° objected to by Sir *Richard Cartwright*, clause 3 of B. authorising the grant of public money should have originated by Res. in Com., 665; suggestion (Mr. *Speaker*) and clause modified, 666 (i).

RIEL, LOUIS, EXECUTION OF: Objection by Mr. *Blake* to Sir *Hector Langevin's* M. to place Res. censuring Govt. first on Order Paper; objection sustained (Mr. *Speaker*) unanimous consent of House being required, 119 (i).

OTTAWA, ADDITIONAL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1154 (ii).

Ottawa City Board of Trade Act Amt. B. No. 83 (Mr. *Mackintosh*). 1°*, 511; 2°*, 614 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 907 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 57.)

PALMERSTON AND GEORGIAN BAY RY.: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) on M. that Com. rise, 1627 (ii).
PAPER HANGINGS, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1587; conc., 1720 (ii).
"PARISIAN" S.S., SMALL POX AND QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 1417 (ii).
PARLIAMENT, 5th, FOURTH SESSION, 1886, 49 VICTORIA: Opening and Speech from the Throne, 1 (i); Bills assented to, 1776; Prorogation, 1778 (ii). *See* "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
PARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: Members called to order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1580, 1635 (ii).
PARRY SOUND COLONISATION RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1614 (ii).
PENETANGUISHENE LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 1515 (ii).
PENITENTIARIES; in Com. of Sup., 891-897, 1692 (ii).
PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1153, 1742; conc., 1771 (ii).
PENSIONS TO VOLUNTEERS WOUNDED AT DUCK LAKE: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 633 (i); (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1198 (ii).
PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS BY MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1198 (ii).
PERTH CENTRE STATION TO PLASTER ROCK ISLAND RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1624 (ii).
PETERBOROUGH POST OFFICE SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 843 (ii).
PHILOSOPHICAL INSTRUMENTS, GLOBES, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 781 (i).
PHOTOGRAPHS OF PUBLIC WORKS, &c., CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 882 (ii).
PICKERING POST OFFICE IRREGULARITIES: M. for copies of Reps. (Mr. *Edgar*) 60 (i).
Pictou Bank B. 50 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°*, 149; 2°*, 265; in Com. and 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 62.)
Pictou Coal and Iron Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 64 (Mr. *Stairs*). 1°*, 368; 2°*, 474; in Com. and 3°*, 783 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 98.)
PIG IRON. *See* "BOUNTY."
PIPES, GAS AND WATER, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 755 (i).
PITON, SEPTIMUS AND ARLESS SEPTIMUS: Ques. (Mr. *Lesage*) 544 (i).
PLANTE, JEAN BAPTISTE, CLAIM OF: M. for copy (Mr. *Amyot*) 696 (i).
POINT PELEE, NAVAL RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 120 (i).
POLICE VESSELS FOR PROTECTION OF FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 1757 (ii).
POLITICS AND CATHOLICS: Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) 1379 (ii).
Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Ry. and Navgn. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 55 (Mr. *Watson*). 1°*, 185; 2°*, 265 (i); wthdn., 1309 (ii).
PORT ARTHUR HARBOR: in Com. of Sup., 1157 (ii).
——— TO RED RIVER, C.P.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (ii).
PORT HASTINGS WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 60 (i).
PORT HOOD HARBOR, PROTECTION: Ms. for Cor.* (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 60; closing of, 787 (i).
PORTLAND AND ROMAN CEMENT: conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).
PORT MULGRAVE AND EAST BAY, C.B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (ii).
PORT ROWAN OR PORT ROYAL HARBOR OF REFUGE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jackson*) 65 (i).
Post Office Act, 1875, Amt. B. No. 77 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°*, 437; 2° and in Com., 519; recom., 711; 3° on a div., 712 (i). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 21.)
POST OFFICE:
BUTTERNUT RIDGE, N.B., POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Burpee*) 1075 (ii).
CALGARY AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS FOR: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 35 (i).
CORINTH, POST OFFICE AT: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 843; in Com. of Sup., 885 (ii).
IN COM. OF SUP.: 690 (i), 883, 1547 (ii).
INTEREST, COMPUTING: in Com. of Sup., 841 (ii).
LES FONDS, ESTABLISHMENT OF POST OFFICE AT: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Rinfret*) 802 (i).
LOTBINIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 709 (i).
MOUNT MIDDLETON, N.B., POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Burpee*) 1075 (ii).
NEREPIS STATION, N.B., POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Burpee*) 1075 (ii).
PICKERING POST OFFICE IRREGULARITIES: M. for copies of Reps. (Mr. *Edgar*) 60 (i).
POST OFFICE ACT, 1875, AMT. *See* B. 77.
POSTMASTER GENERAL'S DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 58 (i).
POST OFFICES IN MUSKOKA, &c., ESTABLISHED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cook*) 43 (i).
——— IN NORTH WELLINGTON: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1173 (ii).
REGISTERED LETTERS, COMPENSATION FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Everett*) 1378 (ii).
SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: M. for Stmnt.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 392 (i).
——— IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Orton*) 62 (i).
POWDER IMPORTED FOR CARTRIDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 898 (ii).
PRE-EMPTIONS. *See* "DOM. LANDS."
PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1544 (ii).
PRINCE ALBERT COLONISATION CO.: charges against Hon. Mr. Bowell and Mr. White (Hastings); M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Edgar*) 489 (i).
——— EXCHANGE OF LAND: M. for O.C.* (Mr. *Edgar*) 58; *See* also "DUCK" and "STEPHENSON."
——— VOLUNTEERS, SCRIP FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 633 (i).
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
ADVANCES TO P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 1378 (ii).
CLAIMS SETTLEMENT: in Com. of Sup, 1263 (ii).
NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS TUNNEL CO. *See* B. 128.
P. E. I. AND TERMS OF UNION, DESPATCHES, &c., RESPECTING: M. for copies* (Mr. *McIntyre*) 802 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (ii).
ST. PETER'S HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 1514 (ii).
TERMS OF UNION WITH P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 692 (i).
PRINTING ACCTS. AND PUBLIC ACCTS. COM.: M. to refer items (Mr. *Charlton*) 383 (i).
Printing and Stationery B. No. 132 (Mr. *Chapleau*). M. to introd. and 1°* of B., 1217; 2° m., 1517; 2°*, 1532; in Com., 1552; 3°*, 1568; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1728 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, *c.* 22.)
PRINTING IMMIGRATION PAMPHLETS: in Com. of Sup., 1393 (ii).

PRINTING: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to refer item to Public Accts. Com., 460 (i).

PRINTING OF PARLT.: M. for Mess. to Sen. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 37 (i); Ms. (Mr. *Bergin*) to conc. in fourth Rep. of Com., 1195, 1239, 1309 (ii).

PRINTING PAMPHLETS IN QUEBEC OFFICES: Ques. (Mr. *Auger*) 865 (ii).

PRINTING, PAPER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1090 (ii).

PRIVATE BILLS, EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION: Ms. (Mr. *Ives*) 66; (Mr. *Beaty*) 47; (Mr. *Dawson*) 393.

PRIVATE BILLS, REPS. FROM COM.: Ms. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to extend time, 543 (i), 897 (ii).

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup, 522 (i), 842, 869, 1697 (ii).

PROROGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Colby*) 1703; letter from Gov. Gen.'s Secretary, 1775; closing remarks, 1775 (ii).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.: Explanation (Mr. *Davies*) of non-attendance, 1144 (ii).

——— MEETING OF: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1514 (ii).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: presented (Mr. *McLelan*) 31 (i).

Public Lands in B. C., Administration B. No. 120 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1°, 912; 2°* and in Com., 1202; 3°, 1223 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 28.)

PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casey*) 383 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS:

ASSINIBOINE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 784 (i).

BAYFIELD HARBOR REPAIRS: M. for Cor. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 383 (i).

CITADEL DRAINAGE AND WATER SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 843 (ii).

FATHER POINT, DEEP-WATER PIER: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 633 (i).

GOVT. BUILDINGS, QUEBEC, WATER SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 843; in Com. of Sup., 1154, 1261, 1745, 1752 (ii).

LANORAIE, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF AT: Ques. (Mr. *Auger*) 1173 (ii).

LEGAL SERVICE, IN CONNECTION WITH PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (ii).

RED RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques (Mr. *Scott*) 1240 (ii).

REPENTIGNY WHARF EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Hurteau*) 634 (i).

RICHELIEU RIVER, OBSTRUCTIONS IN: M. for copies of Pets., &c. (Mr. *Bechard*) 33 (i).

RIDEAU HALL, ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS, REPAIRS, &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McCraney*) 797 (i); (Mr. *Blake*) 801 (i).

——— CONTINGENCIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McCraney*) 794 (i).

——— COST OF, SINCE CONFEDERATION: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McCraney*) 801 (i).

——— FUEL AND LIGHT FOR: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McCraney*) 795 (i).

——— GARDENING AND GROUNDS, AMOUNT PAID: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McCraney*) 796 (i).

RIVIÈRE AUX LIÈVRES, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Wright*) 426 (i).

ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 495 (i).

ST. JOHN'S, Q, RY. WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 897 (ii).

SLIDES AND BOOMS, AMOUNTS OWING ON ACCOUNT OF: Ms. for Rets.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1195 (ii).

STANSTEAD, SHEFFORD AND CHAMBLY RY. CO.'S WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 1096 (ii).

UNION SUSPENSION BRIDGE. *See* B. 72.

WHARF AT SELKIRK: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 495 (i).

PURCHASING AGENTS IN N.W.T., NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 437 (i).

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 1417 (ii).

QUARANTINE REGULATIONS AND STEAMSHIP "PARISIAN:" Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1669 (ii).

QUEBEC:

BAIE DES CHALEURS RY. CO *See* B. 144.

——— Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 1481 (ii).

BOUCHERVILLE ISLANDS, OBSTRUCTIONS IN CHANNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Benoît*) 495 (i).

C. P. R. AND NORTH SHORE RY. CORRESPONDENCE: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 60 (i).

CARTRIDGE FACTORY AT QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 543 (i).

DUFFERIN GATE, QUEBEC, CLAIMS OF H. J. BEEMER: Ques., 1661 (ii)

ELGIN STATION, L'ISLET: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 544 (i).

HAMOND, EUGÈNE, EMPLOYMENT OF BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 1379 (ii).

HEBERT, HUBERT, REVISING OFFICER OF MONTMAGNY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 569 (i).

I. C. R., RESERVOIR, &c., AT LÉVIS: Ques (Mr. *Lesage*) 1378 (ii).

LANDS, TIMBER AND MINERAL, IN NORTHERN QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1173 (ii).

L'ASSOMPTION TO L'EPIPHANIE RY SUBSIDY: Res. in Com, 1615 (ii).

METAPEDIAC TO PASPEBIAC RY. SUBSIDY. *See* "BAIE DES CHALEURS."

MONTREAL AND WESTERN RY. SUBSIDY: Res. in Com. (Mr. *Chapleau*) 1616 (ii).

MONTREAL BOARD OF TRADE INCORP. ACTS AMT. *See* B. 90.

MUD CREEK DAMS, RAISING OF: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1746 (ii).

NATASKOWAN RIVER, ESTUARY OF, RENT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 1379 (ii).

NEW GLASGOW TO MONTCALM RY. SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1614 (ii).

PETERBOROUGH POST OFFICE SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 843 (ii).

PITON, SEPTIMUS AND ARLESS SEPTIMUS: Ques. (Mr. *Lesage*) 544 (i).

PLANTE, JEAN BAPTISTE, CLAIM OF: M. for copy (Mr. *Amyot*) 696 (i).

PRINTING PAMPHLETS IN QUEBEC OFFICES: Ques. (Mr. *Auger*) 865 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 31; in Com. of Sup., 691 (i), 881 (ii).

QUARANTINE REGULATIONS AND S. S. "PARISIAN": Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1659 (ii).

QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1621 (ii).

QUEBEC AND LAKE ST JOHN RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 331 (i).

QUEBEC AND LÉVIS FERRY SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lesage*) 121 (i).

QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 783 (i).

QUEBEC HARBOR COMMISSIONERS' LOAN *See* B. 140.

RICHELIEU COUNTY, SALE OF GOVT. PROPERTIES IN: Ques. (Mr. *Massue*) 185 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP AND EDMONSTONE RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 331.

ST. ANDREWS TO LACHUTE RY. SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1616 (ii).

ST. EUSTACHE TO ST. PLACIDE RY. SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1624 (ii).

ST. FÉLIX AND LAKE MASKINONGÉ RY. SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1614 (ii).

ST. GABRIEL AND LEVEE RY. CO. *See* B. 116.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER NAVIGATION. *See* B. 46.

——— OVERFLOW: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 865 (ii).

SHORT LINE RY., MONTREAL, ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX, SUBSIDY: M. for copies of O.C., &c. (Mr. *Laurier*) 65 (i).

SMITH, R., of QUEBEC, WOOD PURCHASES FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Lesage*) 544 (i).

WIRE FENCING, FROM LÉVIS TO RIVIÈRE DU LOUP: Ques. (Mr. *Gaudet*) 544 (i).

WURTELE, HON. J. S., APPOINTMENT AS JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*). 865, 912, 1342 (ii).

YAMASKA TO RIVER ST. JOHN RY. SUBSIDY: Res. in Com., 1624 (ii).

Quebec Harbor Improvements further Loan B. No. 140 (Mr. *McLelan*). Res prop., 1342; in Com., 1383; 1°* of B., 1385; 2°* and in Com., 1467; 3°*, 1482 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 19.)

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY: prop. M. for adjnmt., 1431; (M.) 1455 (ii).
QUEEN'S COUNSEL APPOINTMENTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Mills*) 392 (ii).
QUEEN *vs.* RIEL, PRINTING BLUE-BOOK: Ques. (Mr. *Bernier*) 186 (i).
Railway Act, 1879. *See* "CONSOLIDATED."
RAILWAYS AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 691 (i), 1448 (ii).
Railway Commissioners. *See* "COURT."
RAILWAYS. *See* respective headings.
RAILWAYS OR REPEAL, TELEGRAM TO HALIFAX "MAIL": read (Mr. *Kirk*) 1615, 1628 (ii).
RAILWAY STATION BUILDING IN ST. JOHN, N.B., COST, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 58 (i).
RAILWAY SUBSIDIES. *See* "SUBSIDIES."
REBELLION. *See* "DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W."
RED RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1240 (ii).
Reformatory for Juvenile Offenders, Halifax, Act Amt. B. No. 134 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°*, 1254; 2°*, 1272; in Com. and 3°*, 1381 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 54.)
Reformed Episcopal Church (First Synod) incorp. B. No. 59 (Mr. *Beaty*). 1°*, 226; 2°*, 342; in Com. and 3°*, 757 (i) (49 *Vic., c.* 110.)
REGISTERED LETTERS, COMPENSATION FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Everett*) 1378 (ii).
RENFREW TO EGANVILLE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1626 (ii).
REPAIRS, FURNITURE, &c., PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1261 (ii).
REPORTS PRESENTED:
AGRICULTURE (Mr. *Pope*) 60 (i).
AUDITOR GENERAL (Mr. *McLelan*) 31 (i).
INDIAN AFFAIRS (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 37 (i).
INLAND REVENUE (Mr. *Costigan*) 31 (i).
INTERIOR (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 60 (i)
JUSTICE, PENITENTIARIES BRANCH (Mr. *Thompson*) 31 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
MARINE (Mr. *Foster*) 31 (i).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 57 (i).
POSTMASTER GENERAL (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 58 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Mr. *McLelan*) 31 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 31 (i).
REBELLION, N.W.T. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1455 (ii).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS (Mr. *Bowell*) 31 (i).
Representation of B. C. in the H. of C. Act Amt. B. No. 107 (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*). 1°, 746 (i).
Representation of the N.W.T. in Parlt. B. No. 115 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 866; Res. prop., 1143; Res. conc. in and ref. to Com. on B., 1223; 2° m., 1205; 2°* and in Com., 1213; in Com., 1249; 3° m., Amts. (Messrs. *Mills* and *Watson*) and 3°*, 1271 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 24).
REPRESENTATION OF THE N.W.T. IN PARLT., ENGLISH LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1514 (ii).
——— RETURNING OFFICERS, &c., FEES: prop. Res. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1143 (ii).
——— Joint Address agreed to, 1013 (ii).
RESTIGOUCHE RIVER, RY. BRIDGE ACROSS: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 426 (i).
RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c., MOTIONS FOR:
AGENTS, PURCHASING, PERSONS EMPLOYED AND PAYMENT*; Mr. *Casey*, 437 (i).
AMMUNITION MANUFACTURED AT QUEBEC; Mr. *Casey*, 554 (i).
ANDERSON, JAS., COR. WITH; Mr. *Trow*, 427 (i).
APPOINTMENT OF QUEEN'S COUNSEL; Mr. *Mills*, 392 (i).
ASSISTED IMMIGRATION; Mr. *Wilson*, 635 (i).
BAKER I. G. & CO., CONTRACTS FOR MOUNTED POLICE AND INDIAN SUPPLIES*; Mr. *Cameron, Huron*, 438 (i).
BANKS CIRCULATION AND GOLD HELD BY GOVT.*; Mr. *McMullen*, 438 (i).
BANNON, J., CLAIM OF ESTATE AGAINST I. C. R.; Mr. *Mitchell*, 905 (i).
BARKER, P. M., AMOUNTS PAID AS RETURNING OFFICER UNDER CAN. TEMP. ACT*; Mr. *McMullen*, 57 (i).
BAYFIELD HARBOR, REPAIRS; Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 383 (i).
B. C. DEEP WATER FISHERIES; Mr. *Shakespeare*, 495 (i).
B. C. LANDS SETTLEMENT; Mr. *Shakespeare*, 496 (i).
BEATTIE, MR., REVISING OFFICER FOR WEST ELGIN, COR.; Mr. *Casey*, 449 (i).
BELL & LEWIS, SUMS PAID FOR TRANSPORT*; Mr. *Casey*, 437 (i).
BOUNDARIES OF ONT., WEST AND NORTH*; Mr. *Cameron, Huron*, 438 (i).
BOUNDARIES OF ONT., WEST AND NORTH-WEST, IMPERIAL LEGISLATION*; Mr. *Mills*, 66 (i).
BRIER AND LONG ISLANDS TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION*; Mr. *Vail*, 393 (i).
BROKOVSKI, E., COMPLAINTS AGAINST*; Mr *Cameron, Middlesex*, 438 (i)
CALGARY AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE*; Mr. *Landerkin*, 35 (i).
CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY. *See* general heading.
CAN. TEMP. ACT, AMOUNT PAID RETURNING OFFICER IN CO. OF DUFFERIN*; Mr. *McMullen*, 57; in Co. of Perth*; Mr. *Trow*, 393 (i).
CAN. TEMP. ACT, CONVICTIONS, &c., UNDER*; Mr. *McMullen*, 912 (ii).
CAPITAL CASES AND THE CROWN*; Mr. *Mackintosh*, 60 (i).
CARTRIDGE FACTORY, QUEBEC, AMMUNITION; Mr. *Casey*, 554 (i).
CASUALTIES ON I.C.R.*; Mr. *Weldon*, 57 (i).
CENSUS OF THE N.W.T., PERSONS EMPLOYED*; Mr. *Landerkin*, 66 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION INTO CAN.; Mr. *Gordon*, 382.
CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATIONS*; Mr. *McMullen*, 57 (i), 905, 1180 (ii).
CLAIMS FOR FISHING BOUNTIES; Mr. *Langelier*, 697 (i).
CLAIM OF JEAN BAPTISTE PLANTE; Mr. *Amyot*, 696 (i).
CLAIMS, SECTION 16, I.C.R.; Mr. *Mitchell*, 905 (ii).
COAL INTERESTS OF N.S.*; Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*, 544 (i).
COMMISSIONERS OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, N.W.*; Mr. *Landerkin*, 438 (i).
CONSOLID. FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE*; Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 35 (i).
CONTINGENCIES, RIDEAU HALL; Mr. *McCraney*, 794 (i).
CONTRACTORS FOR TRANSPORT DURING REBELLION; Mr. *Casey*, 427 (i).
CONVICT *vs.* FREE LABOR*; Mr. *Wilson*, 47 (i).
COWAN, D. L., MURDER OF BY MONGRAIN*; Mr. *Landerkin*, 392 (i).
CUSTOMS. *See* general heading.
DEEP WATER FISHERIES OF B. C.; Mr. *Shakespeare*, 495 (i).
DEPOSITS IN GOVT. BANKS*; Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 392 (i).
DISALLOWANCE OF RY. CHARTERS IN MAN.*; Mr. *Watson*, 802 (i).
DISTURBANCE IN THE N. W. *See* general heading.
DOM. ARBITRATORS, REP. *re* STEAM-TUG "SULTAN"; Mr. *Mitchell*, 904 (ii).
——— *re* SECTION 16, I. C. R; Mr. *Mitchell*, 905 (ii).
DOMINION LANDS. *See* general heading
DOM. NOTES IN CIRCULATION*; Mr. *McMullen*, 438 (i)
DUCK, GEO., DOM LANDS AGENT, REP. OF*; Mr. *Edgar*, 58 (i)
EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES, I. C. R.*; Mr. *Weldon*, 392 (i).
EDMONTON, SURVEYS OF LAND*; Mr. *Taylor*, 802 (i)
EMPLOYMENT OF MEN ON I. C. R.*; Mr. *Weldon*, 58 (i).
EXPORTS AND IMPORTS*; Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 35 (i).
FENIAN RAID, 1870, IMPERIAL TITLES CONFERRED ON OFFICERS; Mr. *Edgar*, 698 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c., MOTIONS FOR—*Continued.*

FISHERIES COMMISSION, COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN CAN. AND U.S. THROUGH LORD LORNE; Mr. *Mitchell*, 392 (i).
FISHERY REGULATIONS, VIOLATION OF BY AMERICANS*; Mr. *Mitchell*, 392 (i).
FISH HATCHERIES, WHITE FISH FRY, PICKEREL AND BASS; Mr. *Gordon*, 788 (i).
FISHING BOUNTY CLAIMS; Mr. *Langelier*, 697 (i).
FISHING RIGHTS OF INDIANS ON LAKES HURON AND NIPISSING; Mr. *O'Brien*, 693 (i).
FISHING UNDER WASHINGTON TREATY*; Mr. *Mitchell*, 392 (i).
FISH IMPORTATIONS FROM U.S. AND NFLD.; Mr. *Kirk*, 370 (i).
FLAG TREATY BETWEEN U.S. AND SPAIN; Mr. *Vail*, 700 (i).
FLOUR SUPPLIED INDIANS, INSPECTION*; Mr. *Paterson, Brant*, 65 (i).
FLYING COLUMN FOR THE N.W.; Mr. *Watson*, 634 (i).
FOOD, MATERIAL, MEDICAL SUPPLIES, &c.*; Mr. *Casey*, 438 (i).
FOOD SUPPLY TO INDIANS OF N.W.T.*; Mr. *Mulock*, 57 (i).
FRANCHISE ACT, PRINTING VOTERS' LISTS; Mr. *Casey*, 448 (i).
FRANCHISE ACT, PUTTING IN FORCE*; Mr. *Cameron, Huron*, 58 (i).
FRANCHISE ACT, REVISING OFFICERS' INSTRUCTIONS; Mr. *Casey*, 43, 48 (i).
FUEL, LIGHT, &c., RIDEAU HALL; Mr. *McCraney*, 795 (i).
FURNITURE AND FITTINGS FOR STATION BUILDING, ST. JOHN, N.B.* Mr. *Weldon*, 58 (i).
GARDENING AND GROUNDS, RIDEAU HALL; Mr. *McCraney*, 796 (i).
GILLIS, A., TRIAL OF, FOR MURDER, JUDGE'S REP.*; Mr. *Davies*, 802 (i).
GISBORNE, F. N., REP. OF, *re* TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION*; Mr. *Vail*, 393 (i).
GOLD HELD BY GOVT.*; Mr. *McMullen*, 438 (i).
GOVERNOR GEN.'S TRAVELLING EXPENSES; Mr. *McCraney*, 793 (i).
——— AND STAFF'S SALARIES; Mr. *McCraney*, 795 (i).
GOVT. SAVINGS BANKS, AMOUNTS HELD BY GOVT.*; Mr. *McMullen*, 438 (i).
GOVT. SAVINGS BANKS, DEPOSITS IN*; Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 392 (i).
GRAVENHURST TO CALLANDER RY.; Mr. *Edgar*, 391 (i).
GRAZING LAND LEASES, ACRES*; Mr. *Charlton*, 392 (i).
HALF-BREEDS. *See* general heading "Indians."
HAMILTON AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. AND C.P.R.; Mr. *Edgar*, 391 (i).
HARDWARE SUPPLIES PURCHASED IN HALIFAX*; Mr. *Forbes*, 57 (i).
HENRY, JOHN, REFUND OF TOLLS*; Mr. *Landerkin*, 392 (i).
HENSLEY, MR. JUSTICE, REP. ON TRIAL OF GILLIS FOR MURDER; Mr. *Davies*, 802 (i).
HOMESTEAD ENTRIES AND PRE-EMPTIONS CANCELLED*; Mr. *Glen*, 393 (i).
HOMESTEAD ENTRIES CANCELLED OR ABANDONED; Mr. *Cameron, Huron*, 801 (i).
HORSES PURCHASED AND SOLD DURING N. W. EXPEDITION*; Mr. *Casey*, 438 (i).
HORSES, &c., SEIZED BY EXPEDITIONARY FORCE*; Mr. *Casey*, 438 (i).
INLAND REVENUES, SLIDES AND BOOMS ARREARAGES*; Mr. *Casgrain*, 1195 (ii).
IMMIGRATION, ASSISTED AND UNASSISTED; Mr. *Wilson*, 635 (i).
IMPERIAL LEGISLATION *re* BOUNDARIES OF ONT.*; Mr. *Mills*, 66 (i).
IMPERIAL TITLES CONFERRED ON OFFICERS AFTER FENIAN RAID AND RED RIVER REBELLION; Mr. *Edgar*, 698 (i).
IMPORTATION OF FISH FROM U. S. AND NFLD; Mr. *Kirk*, 370 (i).
IMPORTS AND EXPORTS*; Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 35 (i).
INDIANS. *See* general heading.
INDIAN SUPPLIES, I. G. BAKER & CO.'S CONTRACT*; Mr. *Cameron, Huron*, 432 (i).
INDIANTOWN BRANCH, I.C.R., AMOUNTS PAID FOR LAND DAMAGES*; Mr. *Weldon*, 392 (i).
INDIAN VOTERS UNDER FRANCHISE ACT, APPLICATIONS FOR REGISTRATION; Mr. *Casey*, 449 (i).
INSPECTORS OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, N.W.*; Mr *Landerkin*, 438 (i).
INTERCOLONIAL RY. *See* general heading.
JAMIESON, J. C., COR., *re* PRINCE ALBERT COLONISATION CO.; Mr. *Edgar*, 65 (i).
JARVIS, P. R., AMOUNTS PAID AS RETURNING OFFICER UNDER CAN. TEMP. ACT*; Mr. *Trow*, 393 (i).
JONES, CHIEF, AMOUNTS PAID TO*; Mr. *Somerville, Brant*, 57 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c., MOTIONS FOR—*Continued.*

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY SUPREME COURT OF CAN.*; Mr. *Baker*, 802 (i).
KAH-KE-WA-QUO-NA-BE, AMOUNTS PAID TO*; Mr. *Somerville, Brant*, 57 (i).
LAKES HURON AND NIPISSING, FISHING RIGHTS OF INDIANS; Mr. *O'Brien*, 693 (i).
LAND DAMAGES, I.C.R., AMOUNTS PAID*; Mr. *Weldon*, 392 (i).
LAND GRANT BOUNTY TO POLICE SCOUTS; Mr. *Sproule*, 788 (i).
LANDS IN B.C. OPEN FOR SETTLEMENT; Mr. *Shakespeare*, 496 (i).
LEDUC, REV. H., PET. AND LETTERS*; Mr. *Rykert*, 438 (i); Mr. *Taylor*, 802 (ii).
LES FONDS POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT*; Mr. *Rinfret*, 802 (i).
LICENSES OR PERMITS TO CUT TIMBER IN DOM.; Mr. *Charlton*, 65 (i).
LIFE-SAVING SERVICE AT PORT ROWAN; Mr. *Jackson*, 703, 785 (i).
LIQUORS IMPORTED AND DUTIES COLLECTED*; Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*, 912 (ii).
LIQUOR LICENSE ACTS, LAW COSTS*; Mr. *Cameron, Huron*, 438 (i).
LIQUOR MANUFACTURED, EXPORTED AND VALUE*; Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*, 912 (ii).
LOANS, TEMPORARY, BY GOVT.; Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 56 (i).
LORD LORNE AND FISHERIES COMMISSION; Mr. *Mitchell*, 392 (i).
MACHAR, J. M., REP. *re* HALF-BREEDS; Mr. *Landerkin*, 634 (i).
MALONEY, DANL., PETS. AND LETTERS*; Mr. *Rykert*, 438; Mr. *Taylor*, 802 (i).
MARINE AND FISHERIES REP. OF 1869; Mr. *Mitchell*, 391 (i).
MARINE POLICE FORCE OF CAN.; Mr. *Mitchell*, 383 (i).
MCDONALD, ANGUS, APPOINTMENT AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR*; Mr. *Kirk*, 438 (i).
MCLEOD, ISAAC, POSTMASTER AT STRATHLORNE; Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*, 59 (i).
MEDALS TO VOLUNTEERS, COR.*; Mr. *Amyot*, 438 (i).
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL STAFF, APPOINTMENTS*; Mr. *Casey*, 438 (i).
MEMBERS OF PARLT. AND THE REBELLION, SERVICES*; Mr. *McMullen*, 392 (i).
MIDDLETON, MAJ. GEN., OFFICERS COMPOSING STAFF*; Mr. *Casey*, 437 (i).
MILITARY CLAIMS COMMISSION, COMPOSITION OF*; Mr. *Casey*, 438 (i).
MILITIA. *See* general heading.
MONGRAIN, LOISON, TRIAL OF AND COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE*; Mr. *Landerkin*, 392 (i).
MOUNTED POLICE SUPPLIES, I. G BAKER & CO.'S CONTRACT*; Mr. *Cameron, Huron*, 438 (i).
MUIRHEAD, WM., CLAIM OF ESTATE AGAINST I.C.R.; Mr. *Mitchell*, 905 (ii).
MUSKOKA, POST OFFICES IN; Mr. *Cook*, 43 (i).
NIPISSING DISTRICT, POST OFFICE IN; Mr. *Cook*, 43 (i).
NON-COMBATANTS, INSTRUCTIONS TO; Mr. *Casey*, 427; officers as Supply and Transport*, 437 (i).
NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. AND C. P. R.; Mr. *Edgar*, 391 (i).
"NORTHERN LIGHT," DISCONTINUANCE OF TRIPS; Mr. *Jenkins*, 845 (ii).
NORTHERN RY. CO. OF CAN. AND C. P. R.; Mr. *Edgar*, 391 (i).
N. S. COAL INTERESTS; Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*, 544 (i).
N. W. FLYING COLUMN; Mr. *Watson*, 634 (i).
OFFICIALS, DEPTL., AND OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT; Mr. *Casey*, 383 (i).
OIL BARRELS, EMPTY, SALE OF; Mr. *Langelier*, 802 (i).
ONT., WEST AND NORTH-WEST, ENGLISH LEGISLATION*; Mr. *Mills*, 66 (i).
ONT., WESTERN AND NORTHERN BOUNDARIES*; Mr. *Cameron, Huron*, 438 (i).
PARRY SOUND POST OFFICES; Mr. *Cook*, 43 (i).
PAYMASTERS, STAFF, APPOINTMENTS*; Mr. *Casey*, 438 (i).
PAYMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF REBELLION*; Mr. *Casey*, 438 (i).
PENITENTIARIES, DOM., CONVICT LABOR*; Mr. *Wilson*, 47 (i).
PERMITS TO CUT TIMBER IN DOM.; Mr. *Charlton*, 65 (i).
PICKERING POST OFFICE IRREGULARITIES; Mr. *Edgar*, 60 (i).
PINAULT, LOUIS AND MICHEL, CLAIMS FOR FISHING BOUNTY; Mr. *Langelier*, 697 (i).
PLANTE, JEAN BAPTISTE, CLAIM; Mr. *Amyot*, 696 (i).
POLICE SCOUTS IN THE N.W. DURING REBELLION; Mr. *Sproule*, 788 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c., MOTIONS FOR—*Continued.*

PORT HASTINGS WHARF, REPAIRS*; Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*, 60 (i).
PORT HOOD HARBOR, PROTECTION*; Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*, 60, 787 (i).
PORT ROWAN LIFE-SAVING SERVICE; Mr. *Jackson*, 703, 785 (i).
PORT ROWAN OR PORT ROYAL HARBOR OF REFUGE; Mr. *Jackson*, 65 (i).
POST OFFICE AT LES FONDS, ESTABLISHMENT; Mr. *Rinfret*, 802 (i).
POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS, AMOUNTS HELD BY GOVT.*; Mr. *McMullen*, 438 (i).
POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS, DEPOSITS IN*; Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 392 (i).
PRE-EMPTION AND HOMESTEAD ENTRIES CANCELLED*; Mr. *Glen*, 393 (i).
PRE-EMPTION ENTRIES, AMOUNTS OWING*; Mr. *Glen*, 393 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT COLONISATION CO., EXCHANGE OF LAND*; Mr. *Edgar*, 58 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT COLONISATION CO., LETTERS PATENT, &C; Mr. *Edgar*, 65 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS. *See* general heading.
QUEBEC CARTRIDGE FACTORY, AMMUNITION; Mr. *Casey*, 554 (i).
QUEEN'S COUNSEL, APPOINTMENTS; Mr. *Mills*, 392 (i).
REBELLION. *See* general heading "Disturbance."
RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE, CONSOLID. FUND*; Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 35 (i).
RED RIVER REBELLION, 1870, IMPERIAL TITLES CONFERRED ON OFFICES; Mr. *Edgar*, 698 (1).
REFUND OF TOLLS TO JOHN HENEY*; Mr. *Landerkin*, 392 (i).
RETURNS, EXPENSE IN BRINGING DOWN; Mr. *Valin*, 386 (i).
REVISING OFFICERS' INSTRUCTIONS; Mr. *Casey*, 43, 48; Mr. *Cameron, Huron*, 58 (i).
RICHELIEU RIVER OBSTRUCTIONS; Mr. *Béchard*, 33 (i).
RIDEAU HALL, ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS, &c.; Mr. *McCraney*, 797 (i).
RIDEAU HALL, CONTINGENCIES; Mr. *McCraney*, 794 (i).
RIDEAU HALL, COST, PURCHASE, RENT, &c.; Mr. *McCraney*, 801 (i).
RIDEAU HALL, FUEL, LIGHT, &c.; Mr. *McCraney*, 795 (i).
RIDEAU HALL, GARDENING AND GROUNDS; Mr. *McCraney*, 796 (i).
RIEL, LOUIS. *See* general heading.
ROBINSON TREATY, INDIANS UNDER; Mr. *Dawson*, 62, 64 (i).
ROLLING STOCK PURCHASED FOR I.C.R*; Mr. *Weldon*, 57 (i).
ROLLING STOCK REPAIRED AT GOVT. WORKSHOPS*; Mr. *Weldon*, 58 (i).
RYAN, MATTHEW, REP. *re* HALF-BREEDS; Mr. *Landerkin*, 634 (i).
RY. CHARTERS IN MAN. DISALLOWED*; Mr. *Watson*, 802 (i).
RY. SUPPLIES PURCHASED IN HALIFAX*; Mr. *Forbes*, 57 (1).
SCATTERIE FOG-WHISTLE, SUPERINTENDENT; Mr. *Kirk*, 786 (i).
SCOTT ACT, CONVICTIONS, &C., UNDER*; Mr. *McMullen*, 912 (ii).
SEIZURES AT WINNIPEG, CUSTOMS*; Mr. *Paterson, Brant*, 392 (i).
SEIZURE OF HORSES, BY EXPEDITIONARY FORCE*; Mr. *Casey*, 438 (i).
SENATORS AND THE REBELLION, SERVICES; Mr. *McMullen*, 392 (i).
SETTLEMENT OF LANDS IN B.C.; Mr. *Shakespeare*, 496 (1).
SHORT LINE RY., IN N.S., COR. BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND N.S.; Mr. *Tupper*, 444.
SHORT LINE RY., MONTREAL TO ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX, SUBSIDY*; Mr. *Laurier*, 65 (i).
SIX NATION INDIANS, MINUTES OF COUNCIL; Mr. *Paterson, Brant*, 58 (i).
SLIDES AND BOOMS, BALANCES OWING*; Mr. *Casgrain*, 1195 (ii).
SPAIN AND U.S., FLAG TREATY; Mr. *Vail*, 700 (i).
STAFF PAYMASTERS, APPOINTMENTS*; Mr. *Casey*, 438 (i).
ST. ALBERT, SURVEY OF LAND*; Mr. *Taylor*, 802 (i).
STATHER, R, DISCHARGE OF, AND JUDGMENTS; Mr. *Weldon*, 371.
STATION BUILDING, ST. JOHN, N.B., COST, &C.*; Mr. *Weldon*, 58 (i).
STELLARTON AND PICTOU RY, PETS., &C.*; Mr. *Kirk*, 802 (i).
STEPHENSEN, RUFUS, INSPECTOR OF COLONISATION CO.'S., REP.*; Mr. *Edgar*, 58 (i).
STEWART, J., AND SINCLAIR, SUMS PAID FOR TRANSPORT*; Mr. *Casey*, 437 (i).
ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND RY. EXTENSION CO., EXPENDITURE; Mr. *Landerkin*, 66.
STORES PURCHASED AND TAKEN INTO STOCK FOR I.C.R.; Mr. *Weldon*, 57 (i).
STRATHLORNE, N.S., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL; Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*, 59 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c., MOTIONS FOR—*Continued.*

SUBSIDY (MONEY) TO N.S., READJUSTMENT; Mr. *Kirk*, 449 (i).
SUBSIDIES TO RYS. UNDER 47 VIC., C. 8; Mr. *Charlton*, 391 (i)
"SULTAN" STEAM-TUG, AWARD OF DOM. ARBITRATORS; Mr. *Mitchell*, 904 (ii).
SUPERANNUATION IN THE C. S.; Mr. *McMullen*, 57 (i), 905, 1180 (ii).
SUPREME COURT OF CAN., JUDGMENTS RENDERED*; Mr. *Barker*, 802 (i).
SWEETNAM, INSPECTOR, REP. CONCERNING PICKERING P.O.; Mr. *Edgar*, 60 (i).
TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION IN DIGBY CO., N.S.*; Mr. *Vail*, 393 (i).
TEMPORARY LOANS BY GOVT.; Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 56 (i).
TERMS OF UNION, P.E.I. AND DOM.*; Mr. *McIntyre*, 802 (i).
TIMBER LICENSES OR PERMITS TO CUT IN DOM.; Mr. *Charlton*, 65 (i).
TRANSPORT CONTRACTORS; Mr *Casey*, 427 (i).
TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &C, OF MEMBERS OF GOVT.*; Mr. *Somerville, Brant*, 57 (i).
TRAVELLING EXPENSES OF GOV. GEN.; Mr. *McCraney*, 792 (i).
TRENTON COLONISATION CO., COR. WITH DEPT.; Mr. *Edgar*, 65 (i).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL, COST OF CONSTRUCTION; Mr. *Cook*, 898 (ii).
TUPPER, SIR CHARLES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES*; Mr. *Somerville, Brant*, 57 (i).
UNITED STATES AND SPAIN, FLAG TREATY; Mr. *Vail*, 700 (i).
UNITED STATES FISHERMEN, ALLEGED INTERFERENCE WITH*; Mr. *Mitchell*, 392 (i).
UNITED STATES FISHING VESSELS FREQUENTING CAN DURING WASHINGTON TREATY*; Mr. *Mitchell*, 392 (i)
VALIN, MR., M.P., GRANTS OF LAND TO IN N.W.T.; Mr. *Casgrain*, 31 (i).
VOLUNTEERS, OFFICERS AND MEDICAL STAFF*; Mr. *Casey*, 438 (i).
VOTERS, INDIAN, APPLICATIONS FOR REGISTRATION; Mr. *Casey*, 449 (i).
VOTERS LISTS, ARRANGEMENTS FOR PRINTING; Mr. *Casey*, 448 (i).
WASHINGTON TREATY, U. S. VESSELS FISHING UNDER*; Mr. *Mitchell*, 392 (i).
WESTINGHOUSE BRAKES ON I. C. R.*; Mr. *Vail*, 393 (i).
WHITEFISH FRY AT FISH HATCHERIES; Mr. *Gordon*, 789 (i).
WHITE, JOHN, LETTERS, &C., *re* PRINCE ALBERT COLONISATION CO; Mr. *Edgar*, 65 (i).
WILKINSON, W., CLAIM AGAINST I. C. R.; Mr. *Mitchell*, 905 (ii).
WINNIPEG, CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT*; Mr. *Paterson, Brant*, 392 (i).
WRIGHT, HOWARD, SUMS PAID FOR TRANSPORT*; Mr. *Casey*, 437 (i).

RETURNS, ENQUIRIES FOR, *re* N. W. (Mr. *Blake*) 65, 66 (i).
——— INDIANS AT FORT WILLIAM RESERVE (Mr. *Blake*) 119 (i).
——— (Messrs. *Mulock, Paterson* [*Brant*] and *McMullen*) 570 (i).
——— SECTION 16, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1635 (ii).
——— EXPENSE IN PRODUCING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Valin*) 386 (i).
——— IMPERFECT, *re* SEIZURES BY EXPEDITIONARY FORCE IN N.W.: Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) 1380 (ii).
——— INCOMPLETE, SHAREHOLDERS IN Co.'s: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 1168 (ii).
REVENUE FRAUDS BY MONTREAL FIRMS: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 709 (1).
RICE, INCREASE OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 369 (i).
RICHIBUCTO AND ST. LOUIS RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 494 (i).
RICHELIEU COUNTY, SALE OF GOVT. PROPERTIES IN: Ques. (Mr. *Massue*) 185 (i).
RICHELIEU RIVER OBSTRUCTIONS: M. for copies of Pets., &c. (Mr. *Béchard*) 33 (i).
RIDEAU CANAL, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
RIDEAU HALL, ADDITITONS, ALTERATIONS, REPAIRS, &C.: M. for Stmnt., 797 (i).
——— CONTINGENCIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McCraney*) 794 (i).

RIDEAU HALL, COST OF, SINCE CONFEDERATION: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McCraney*) 801 (i).
——— FUEL AND LIGHT FOR: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McCraney*) 795 (i).
——— GARDENING AND GROUNDS, AMOUNTS PAID: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McCraney*) 796 (i).
RIDEAU RIVER FLOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 1076 (ii).
RIEL, LOUIS, CASE OF, AUTHORITY TO EXERCISE MERCY (Mr. *Amyot*) 59; PETS. FROM PROVINCIAL GOVTS.: Ques. (Mr. *Taschereau*) 634 (i).
——— COMMUNICATIONS FROM QUEBEC GOVT. *re* EXECUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 426 (i).
——— DEPUTATION TO: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 785 (i).
——— EXECUTION OF: Res. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) censuring Govt., 59; order called, 62; (M.) 68; Amt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) previous Ques,, 73; Deb. (Mr. *Amyot*) 77; (Mr. *Royal*) 93; (Mr. *Gigault*) 96; (Mr. *Wallace, York*) 99; (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 104; Mr. *Curran*) 125: (Mr. *Coursol*) 134; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 136; (Mr. *Langelier*) 139; (Mr. *Rykert*) 150; (Mr. *Béchard*) 169; (Mr. *Laurier*) 174; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 195; (Mr. *Desjardins*) 206; (Mr. *Laundry, Kent*) 213; (Mr. *Guay*) 223; (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 227; (Mr. *Blake*) 237; (Mr. *Thompson*) 267; (Mr. *Mills*) 291; (Mr. *Orton*) 301; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 307; (Mr. *Costigan*) 309; (Mr. *Casey*) 315; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 323; Mr. *Sproule*) 325; (Mr. *Girouard*) 332; Mr. *Desaulniers, Maskinongé*) 338; (Mr. *Massue*) 341; (Mr. *Burns*) 341; (Mr. *Chapleau*) 342; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 358; (Mr. *Tassé*) 364; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 366; (Mr. *Labrosse*) 366; (Messrs. *McMullen, Lister, Cameron* [*Middlesex*] and *Landry, Montmagny*) 367 (i).
——— EXECUTION OF: M. to make Res. Order of the Day (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 119 (i).
——— MEDICAL COMMISSION: Ques. and M. for Ret. (Mr. *Coursol*) 31; Commission, Reps., Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 68; M. for Cor. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 844 (ii).
——— O.C. ORDERING EXECUTION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 59 (i).
——— PETS. FOR COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 35; M. for copies*, 58 (i).
——— PETS. FOR HANGING: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 266 (i).
——— PETS. FROM ORANGE LODGES RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 196 (i).
——— PETS. PRAYING FOR CLEMENCY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 120 (i).
——— RECOMMENDATION TO MERCY BY JURY: Ques. (Mr. *Desaulniers, Maskinongé*) 62 (i).
——— REPS. OF DRS. VALADE AND LAVELL: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 120 (i).
——— REPS., &C., IN FAVOR OF MERCY: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 266 (i).
——— REP. OF TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 34 (i).
——— RESPITES GRANTED, O.C. *re* EXECUTION AND LETTERS, &C., MEDICAL COMMISSION: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 59 (i).
RIEL, LOUIS, RESPITES GRANTED: M. for copies of O.C. (Mr. *Amyot*) 43; MOTIVES FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 59 (i).
——— SANITARY COMMISSION, REPS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 693 (i).
——— TRIAL OF, DOCUMENTS RESPECTING: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 43 (i).
——— TRIAL OF, INSTRUCTIONS SENT TO MR. JUSTICE RICHARDSON: M. for copy, &c. (Mr. *Amyot*) 59 (i).
——— TRIAL OF, SHORTHAND NOTES, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 57 (i).
RIVIÈRE AUX LIÈVRES: Ques. (Mr. *Wright*) 426 (i).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP AND EDMONSTON RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 331 (i).
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 1270, 1743, 1755 (ii).
ROBINSON TREATY, INDIANS UNDER: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Dawson*) 62 (i).
ROCHE, MATTHEW, OF LINGAN, N.S., TRANSFER OF: Res. prop. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Blake*) 1173; further consideration of prop. Res., 1325 (ii).
Rock Lake, Souris and Brandon Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 63 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 301; 2°*, 368 (i); wthdn., 1309 (ii).
ROCKY MOUNTAIN RANGERS, ISSUE OF SCRIP TO: Ques. (Mr. *Ives*) 543 (i).
ROPER, S. C. D., EMPLOYMENT OF BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 570 (i).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 1303 (ii).
RUBBER BELTING: conc. in Ways and Means, 1719 (ii).
RULES OF THE HOUSE: prop. Amt. (Mr. *Dawson*) 842 (ii).
ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 495 (i).
——— TO LACHUTE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1616 (ii).
ST. CATHARINES MILLING CO., LAW COSTS: in Com. of Sup. 1768 (ii).
ST. CHARLES BRANCH, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).
ST. EUSTACHE TO ST. PLACIDE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1624 (ii).
ST. FELIX TO LAKE MASKINONGÉ RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1614 (ii).
St. Gabriel Levee and Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 116 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°* and 2°*, 876; in Com. and 3°*, 1153 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 85.)
ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND EXTENSION RY. CO.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 66 (i).
ST. JOHN, N.B., CITY AND COUNTY ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Return of Member elect, 1 (i).
ST. JOHN, N.B., CITY ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Vacancy and Return of Member elect, 1 (i).
ST. JOHN, N.B, RY. STATION BUILDING IN, COST, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 58 (i).
ST. JOHN'S, QUE., RY. WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 897 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Atlantic Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 58 (Mr. *Colby*). 1°*, 226; 2°*, 342; in Com. and 3°*, 757 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 78.)

St. Lawrence River Navgn. Repeal B. No. 46 (Mr. *Langelier*). 1°, 119 (i).

St. Lawrence River, overflow: Ques. (Mr *Curran*) 865 (ii).

St. Maurice Faucherde, on Parliamentary Procedure: in Com. of Sup., 1740, 1763 (ii).

St. Patrick's Day, adjnmt. for: M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 185 (i).

St. Peter's Harbor, P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 1514 (ii).

Ste. Ursule, &c., Ry. *See* "Maskinongé and Nipissing."

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 1692 (ii).

Sable and Spanish Boom and Slide Co. of Algoma B. No. 36 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*). 1°*, 92; 2°*, 119; order for Com. read, 494; in Com., 782; 3°*, 783 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 108.)

Salaries, &c., of Staff of C. P. R.: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (ii).

Saskatchewan Land and Homestead Co.'s B. No. 42 (Mr. *Orton*). 1°*, 93; 2°*, 119; in Com. and 3°*, 757 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 101.)

Savings Banks and P. O. Savings Banks, amount held by Govt. in: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 438; Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 495, 634 (i).

Saw Logs and Lumber, Free Export: Ques. (Mr. *Ives*) 634 (i). *See* "Logs."

Scatterie Fog-Whistle Superintendent: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Kirk*) 786 (i).

School Savings Bank incorp. B. No. 75 (Mr. *Massue*). 1°*, 426; 2°*, 474 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 67.)

Scientific Institutions: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (ii).

Scientific Treatise in Deptl. Report: in Com. of Sup., 883 (ii).

Scott Act Enforcement: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 438 (i).

——— outrages in Orangeville and Clandeboye: Ques. (Mr. *McCraney*) 1661 (ii).

Scrip to Half-breeds who took part in Rebellion: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1075 (ii).

Scythes: conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).

Sea Fisheries Protection: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 494 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE:

Can. Temp. Act, Convictions under: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 912 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).

——— Legislation Respecting: Ques. (Mr. *Orton*) 912 (ii).

——— Return of Fines Collected: Ques. (Mr. *Stairs*) 1172 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. *See* B. 106.

Chinese, Legislation respecting: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 62 (i).

C. C. Board of Examiners: in Com. of Sup., 841 (ii).

Claims (land) Commission, N.W., Rep.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1421.

Commissions to Public Officers. *See* B. 110.

Copyright, Laws relating to: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Edgar*) 377, 382 (i).

Factory Legislation: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 634 (i).

Franchise Act, Working of: Cor. presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 1482.

——— in Com. of Sup., 524 (i); 880, 1697 (ii).

Joint Stock Co.'s, Printing Blue-book: Ques. (Mr. *Bernier*) 186 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Continued.*

Liquor License Act, 1883, Commissioners and Inspectors' Emoluments: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 266 (i).

——— Costs incurred by Dom.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 438 (i).

——— — Refund of Fees: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 266 (ii).

Liquor Manufactured in Can., Exports, Imports and Labor Employed: Ms. for Stmnts.* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 912.

Naturalisation Act Amt.: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 709 (i).

Newspaper Subscriptions and Cab-hire: in Com. of Sup., 880 (ii).

Orangeville and Clandeboye, Outrages under Scott Act: Ques. (Mr. *McCraney*) 1661 (i).

Queen *vs.* Riel, Printing Blue-book: Ques. (Mr. *Bernier*) 186 (i).

Printing and Stationery Bureau. *See* B. 132.

Returns, Expense in Producing: on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landry, Kent*) 386 (i).

Scott Act Enforcement: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 438 (i).

Sec. of State, Dept. of: in Com. of Sup., 524 (i), 1679; contingencies, 880 (ii).

Seduction, &c. *See* "Criminal Law Amt."

Seizures, Customs, at Winnipeg: M. for Ret.* (Mr. (*Paterson, Brant*) 392 (i). *See* "Customs."

Seizures by Mounted Police or Expeditionary Force in N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).

Settlers in Man. and N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 42 (i).

Settlers in Saugeen Peninsula: Remarks (Mr. *Allen* and others) 1533 (ii).

Settlers on Service in N. W. and Homesteads: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 426 (i).

Select Standing Committees. *See* "Committees."

Selkirk, Wharf at: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 495 (i).

SENATE, Constitution of: Res (Mr. *Mills*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1272; (explanation) 1286; Deb. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1275; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1277; (Mr. *Foster*) 1280; (Mr. *Davies*) 1281; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1284; (Mr. *Jamieson*) 1285; (Mr. *Casey*) 1286; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1288; (Mr. *Fisher*) 1289; (Messrs. *Amyot* and *Laurier*) 1291; (Messrs. *Fairbank* and *Armstrong*) 1292; (Messrs. *Weldon* and *Dupont*) 1294; neg. (Y. 57, N. 89) 1295 (ii).

Senate, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1089 (ii).

Services of M.P.'s, &c., in Connection with Rebellion, amounts paid: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 392 (i).

Short Line, Montreal and Salisbury: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 1240; M. for copy of contract, 1309 (ii).

——— Montreal, St. John, and Halifax, Subsidy: M. for copies of O.C., &c.* (Mr. *Laurier*) 65 (i).

——— in N.S.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Tupper*) 444 (i).

Shuswap and Okanagan Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 33 (Mr. *Homer*). 1°*, 92; 2°*, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 614 (i); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1171 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 82.)

Sisters Faithful Companions of Jesus incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. *Royal*). 1°*, 92; 2°*, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 473. (49 *Vic., c.* 111.)

Six Nation Indians, Minutes of Council: M. for copies* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 58 (i).

Slides and Booms, amounts owing on account of: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1195 (ii).

Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 1270, 1547 (ii).

SMITH, R., OF QUEBEC, WOOD PURCHASES FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Lesage*) 544 (i).

SMITH, SENATOR FRANK, AND CIRCULAR TO CATHOLICS: Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) 1379 (ii).

SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE: Opening of Parlt., 1 (i); Prorogation, 1777 (ii).

SPEECHES IN PARLT.: Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) limiting, 789 (i).

SPIRITS AND STRONG WATERS: conc. in Ways and Means, 769 (i).

SQUAW ISLAND, FISHING PRIVILEGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 784 (i).

STAFF PAYMASTERS, NAMES, &c., IN N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 438 (i).

STAMPS, COST OF OBTAINING: in Com. of Sup., 1543 (ii).

STANSTEAD, SHEFFORD AND CHAMBLY RY. CO.'S WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Béchard*) 1096 (ii).

STATHER, R., TRANSFER FROM DORCHESTER PEN. TO KINGSTON: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 68; (M. for Ret.) 371 (i).

Statutes of Can., Revised, B. No. 9 (Mr. *Thompson.*) 1°, 38; 2°* and in Com., 513; ref. to Sel. Com., 555 (i); in Com., 1224; 3°*, 1229 (ii). (49 *Vic*, c. 4.)

STATUTES, REVISED: M. to add name to Com. (Mr. *Thompson*) 599 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act further Amt. B. No. 103 (Mr. *Foster*). Res. prop. and 1°* of B., 710 (i); 2° and in Com., 1086; 3°*, 1144 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, c. 34.)

STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS, &c: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (ii).

Stellarton Branch Ry. *See* "I.C.R."

STEPHENSON, RUFUS, INSPECTOR OF COLONISATION CO.'S, REP. OF: M. for copy* (Mr. *Edgar*) 53 (i).

STEREOTYPES AND ELECTROTYPES: conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii).

STEWIACKE AND MUSQUODOBOIT RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1624; remarks (Mr. *Vail*) on intrdn. of B., 1636 (ii).

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATE AT CALGARY: Ques. (Mr. *Burpee*) 427 (i).

STONEY MOUNTAIN PENITENTIARY, PRISONERS' HEALTH: Ques. (Mr. *Desjardins*) 1174 (ii).

STOVE BOLTS AND NUTS: conc. in Ways and Means, 1721 (ii)

Straits of Canso Ry. *See* "CAPE BRETON."

STRATHLORNE, N.S., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF: M. for Cor. &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 59 (i).

STRAW BOARD: conc. in Ways and Means, 1719 (ii).

Subsidies (land) to Rys. authorisation B. No. 147 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). Res. prop., 1551; in Com., 1630; Res. conc. in, 1639; 1°* of B., 1640; 2° and in Com., 1709; 3°*, 1714 (ii). (49 *Vic*, c. 11.)

Subsidies (land) to certain Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 117 (Mr. *White, Cardwell.*). 1°, 876; 2°* and in Com., 973; M. for 3°, 1015; 3°*, 1017 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, c. 12.)

Subsidies (money) to Rys. Authorisation B. No. 146 (Mr. *Pope*). Res. prop., 1551; M. for Com., 1595; in Com., 1596, 1610; Res. conc. in, 1635; 1° of B., 1636; 2° and in Com., 1704; 3°*, 1709 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, c. 10).

SUBSIDIES TO RYS.: M. for Rets. (Mr. *Charlton*) 391; Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 68 (i); Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 1514 (ii).

SUBSIDY TO N.S., READJUSTMENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Kirk*) 449; Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 451; neg. (Y. 16, N. 82) 456 (i).

Substitutes for Butter. *See* "OLEOMARGARINE."

SUGARS: conc. in Ways and Means, 773, 1587, 1722 (ii).

SUGAR DUTIES PAID AT HALIFAX AND MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Stairs*) 898 (ii).

SUGAR IN BOND IN MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 783 (i), 843 (ii).

"SULTAN," STEAM TUG, AWARD OF DOM. ARBITRATORS: M. for copy (Mr. *Mitchell*) 904 (ii).

Summary Proceedings before Justices, &c., B. No. 84 (A) from the Sen. (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°*, 519; 2°, 671; in Com., 715 (i), 805; 3°*, 913 (ii). (49 *Vic.*, c. 49.)

SUPERANNUATION, NAMES, DATE AND AMOUNT PAID UNDER LIST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 58 (i).

—— *See* "CIVIL SERVICE."

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. OR REMARKS TO MS. for Com.: (Amt) Indian Administration in the N.W. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 718 (i); (Amt.) Extinguishment of the Indian Title and Half-breed grievances (Mr. *Laurier*) 809; (Amt.) Home Rule for Ireland (Mr. *Blake*) 1022; (Amt) Timber and Coal Licenses, &c., in the N.W. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1030; (Remarks) Seizure of schooner *David J. Adams* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1254; (Amt.) N. W. Disturbance, General Amnesty (Mr. *Laurier*) 1257; (Amt.) Constitution of the Senate (Mr. *Mills*) 1272; (Remarks) Customs Seizures at Montreal (Mr. *Gault*) 1369, (Mr. *Holton*) 1684; (Amt.) Flour and Coal Duties (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1425; (Remarks) Inch Arran Hotel (Mr. *Davies*) 1533; (Remarks) Settlers in Saugeen Peninsula (Mr. *Allen*) 1538; (Remarks) Reports on N. W. Rebellion (Mr. *Casey*) 1640; (Amt.) Public Expenditure (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1646; (Amt.) Administration of the N. W. (Mr. *Mills*) 1729 (ii).

MESS. from His Ex., transmitting Estimates for 1886-87, 368 (i); Mess. from His Ex. transmitting Suppl. Estimates for 1885-86, 1550; Mess. from His Ex., transmitting Suppl. Estimates for 1886-87, 1633 (ii).

RES. (Mr. *McLelan*) for Com., 30; in Com., 519, 748 (i), 841, 1075, 1089, 1153, 1261, 1295, 1370, 1385, 1448, 1541, 1649, 1692, 1740 (ii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice:

General Vote, 886 (ii).

Gaol and Lunatic Asylum at Regina, 1717 (ii).

Adulteration of Food. *See* "Collection of Revenues."

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:

Colonial and Indian Exhibition, 1095; suppl., 1741 (ii).

Criminal Statistics, 1091 (ii).

Dominion Exhibition, 1091 (ii).

General Vote, 1090 (ii).

Health Statistics, 1094 (ii).

Model Farm, 1659 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Canals. See "Railways and Canals."
Charges of Management:
Assistant Financial Inspector, 520 (i).
Auditors and Receivers General: Halifax, Victoria and Winnipeg, 521 (i).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, Dept. of, 691 (i); suppl., 1698; contingencies, 870, 885 (ii).
Auditor General's Office, 689 (i).
Civil Service Board of Examiners, 841.
Contingencies, Departmental:
Depts. generally, 868, 877 (ii).
Post Office and Finance Depts., 841 (ii).
Travelling expenses and cab-hire, 870, 878 (ii).
Customs, Dept. of, 690 (i); contingencies, 870, 874.
Finance, Dept of, and Treasury Board, 689 (i); contingencies, 870 (ii).
Fisheries, Dept. of, 691 (i); suppl., 1698 (ii).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 522 (i), 898; contingencies, 868 (ii).
Indian Affairs, Dept. of, 688 (i).
Inland Revenue, Dept. of, 689 (i); contingencies, 881 (ii).
Interior, Dept. of, 524 (ii); contingencies, 870, 881 (ii); (Geological Survey Branch) 1343, 1649 (ii).
Justice, Dept. of, 523 (i); suppl., 1698; contingencies, 879, 877 (ii).
Marine, Dept of, 691 (i); contingencies, 881, 886.
Militia and Defence, Dept. of, 523 (i); contingencies, 870, 877 (ii).
Postmaster General's Dept., 690 (i); contingencies, 883 (ii).
Privy Council Office, 522 (i), 842; suppl., 1697; contingencies, 870 (ii).
Public Works, Dept. of, 691 (i); contingencies, 870, 881 (ii).
Railways and Canals, Dept. of, 691 (i).
Secretary of State, Dept. of, 524 (i); suppl., 1697; contingencies, 870, 880 (ii).
Collection of Revenues:
Adulteration of Food, 1547 (ii).
Culling Timber, 1544 (ii).
Customs, 1454; suppl. (polariscopic test) 1763 (ii).
Dominion Lands, 1550 (ii).
Excise, 1543 (ii).
Post Office, 1547 (ii).
Preventive Service, 1544 (ii).
Public Works—Repairs and Working Expenses: Slide and Boom Dues, collection, 1547 (ii).
Railways—Repairs and Working Expenses: Intercolonial, 1659 (ii).
Stamps, cost of obtaining, 1543 (ii).
Weights and Measures and Gas, 1544 (ii).
Canals—Repairs and Working Expenses, 1659; conc., 1771 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Culling Timber. See "Collection of Revenues."
Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Lands. See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."
Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."
Fisheries:
Cod Liver Oil, &c., encouragement of production, 1757 (ii).
General Vote, 1541 (ii).
Police Vessels for Protection, 1757 (ii).
Geological Survey:
General Vote, 1543, 1649 (ii).
Government Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."
Immigration:
Contingencies, Canadian Agencies, 1392.
General Vote, 1385 (ii).
Indians:
British Columbia, 1652; suppl., 1762 (ii).
Manitoba and North-West, 1653; suppl., 1745 (ii).
New Brunswick, 1651 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 1651 (ii).
Ont., Que. and Maritime Provs., grant to Supplement Fund, 1650; suppl., 1758 (ii).
Justice, Administration of. See "Administration."
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Contingencies, 1089 (ii).
Salaries, per Clerk's estimate, 1089; Sergeant-at-arms estimate, 1089 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, salary, 1090 (ii).
Faucher de St. Maurice, Parliamentary Procedure, 1740, 1763 (ii).
Franchise Act, expenses under, 1698; suppl., 1747 (ii).
Library of Parliament, salaries, &c., 1153 (ii).
Morgan's "Annual Register," 1740 (ii).
Printing, miscellaneous, 1763 (ii).
Printing, paper and bookbinding, 1090 (ii).
Senate:
Salaries and contingencies, 1089 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Buoys and Beacons, below Montreal, maintenance, 1377 (ii).
Lighthouse and Fog Alarms, completion, &c., 1376 (ii).
Lights, Fog whistles, Buoys and Beacons, maintenance, &c., 1375 (ii).
Salaries, &c., Lighthouse keeper, 1375 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Canada and Antwerp, 1371 (ii).
Canada and Germany, 1756 (ii).
Canso and Port Hood, 1371 (ii).
France and Quebec, 1370 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Conventions—Continued.
Liverpool or London and St. John, N.B., or Halifax, N.S., 1371 (ii).
N.B. and P.E.I. to Great Britain and continental ports, 1756 (ii).
Militia :
A, B and C Batteries, Schools, &c., pay and maintenance, 1308, 1547; conc., 1771 (ii).
Ammunition, clothing, &c., 1302 (ii).
Cavalry and Infantry Schools, pay and maintenance, 1308, 1547; conc., 1771 (ii).
Clothing, 1302 (ii).
Citadel, Quebec, drainage, 1742 (ii).
Contingencies, 1307; suppl., 1743; conc., 1771.
Dominion Artillery Association, 1307 (ii).
Dominion Rifle Association, 1307 (ii).
Drill Instruction and pay, &c., 1306 (ii).
Military Branch and Dist. Staff, salaries, 1295 (ii).
Military Properties, construction and repairs, 1309; conc., 1771 (ii).
Miscellaneous :
Canada Temp. Act, putting in force, 1658 (ii).
Commercial Agencies, 1659 (ii).
Crow, L. J., payment for services, 1763 (ii).
Expenses of Govt. in N.W.T., 1657 (ii).
Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies, 1658 (ii).
Forged Bond, payment for, 1763 (ii).
Hudson Bay Expedition, 1658 (ii).
Lacombe, Father, payment to, 1774 (ii).
Model Farm, 1659 (ii).
Printing, Miscellaneous, 1763 (ii).
Rebellion, payments on account of, 1764 (ii).
St. Catharines Milling Co., law costs, 1768 (ii).
North West Mounted Police :
General Vote, 1656; suppl., 1745 (ii).
Ocean and River Service :
Allan Mail Contract, termination of, 1771 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, maintenance, &c., 1372 (ii).
Obstructions in Nav. Waters, removal, 1374 (ii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 1372 (ii).
Winter Mail Service, P. E. I., 1375 (ii).
Wrecks and Casualties, investigation into, 1374.
Observatories. See "Scientific Institutions."
Penitentiaries :
British Columbia, 896 (ii).
Dorchester, 893 (ii).
Kingston, 891 (ii).
Manitoba, 893 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 1692 (ii).
Pensions :
Veterans of 1812, 1153 (ii).
N. W. Rebellion, on account of, 1154; suppl., 1742; conc., 1770 (ii).
Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Public Works—Capital :*
Public Buildings:
Ottawa, additional public building, 1154 (ii).
Public Works:
Cape Tormentine Harbor, 1158 (ii).
Esquimalt Graving Dock, 1156; suppl., 1752 (ii).
Port Arthur Harbor, 1157 (ii).
Military Works in B. C., 1752 (ii).
Public Works—Income :
Dredging, 1269 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers:
British Columbia, 1269 (ii).
Manitoba, 1269 (ii).
Maritime Provinces—Repairs and Improvements generally, 1264 (ii).
New Brunswick, 1263 (ii).
N.W.T. (North Saskatchewan River) 1269 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 1261; suppl., 1754 (ii).
Ontario, 1266; suppl., 1755 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 1262 (ii).
Quebec, 1264; suppl., 1755 (ii).
Public Buildings:
Buildings, generally, 1166 (ii).
British Columbia, 1166 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, 1164; suppl., 1745 (ii).
Manitoba, 1165; suppl., 1745, 1752 (ii).
New Brunswick, 1162 (ii).
North-West Territories, 1166; suppl., 1745, 1754 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 1158 (ii).
Ontario, 1163; suppl., 1745, 1753 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 1160 (ii).
Quebec, 1162; suppl., 1753 (ii).
Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c., 1261; suppl., 1745 (ii).
Telegraphs, 1755 (ii).
Roads and Bridges, 1270; suppl., 1745, 1755 (ii).
Slides and Booms, 1270 (ii).
Quarantine :
Cattle Quarantine, Quebec, 1417 (ii).
General Vote, 1417 (ii).
Railways and Canals—Capital :*
Canadian Pacific Railway:
Expenditure in B.C., 1448; suppl., 1744 (ii).
Port Arthur to Red River, 1449, 1693 (ii).
Salaries and Expenses of Staff, 1450 (ii).
Subsidy, 1448 (ii).
Intercolonial Railway:
Claims arising out of construction, 1752 (ii).
Miscellaneous Works, 1451 (ii).
St. Charles Branch, 1451 (ii).
Stellarton and Pictou Extension, 1452 (ii).
Canals:
Carillon, 1745 (ii).
Cornwall, 1452 (ii).

* For Repairs and Working expenses, *see* "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—*Continued.*
COMMITTEE—*Continued.*
Railways and Canals—Capital*—Continued.
Canals—*Continued.*
Galops Canal, enlargement, 1453 (ii).
Grenville, 1453 (ii).
Lachine, 1452 (ii).
Murray, 1453 (ii).
Tay, 1453 (ii).
Trent River Nav. and Locks, 1752 (ii).
Welland, 1453 (ii).
Williamsburg, 1452 (ii).
Railways and Canals—Income:
Canals:
Miscellaneous, 1453, 1752 (ii).
Rideau Canal and Gananoque River, 1453 (ii).
Welland Canal, 1453 (ii).
Scientific Institutions:
Meteorological Service, 1377 (ii).
Observations, Toronto, Kingston and Montreal, 1377.
Statistics. See "Arts," &c.
Steamship Subventions. See "Mail Subsidies."
Weights and Measures and Gas. See "Collection of Revenues."
CONCURRENCE:
A, B, and C Batteries, Infantry Schools, &c., 1771 (ii).
Ocean and River Service, 1771 (ii).
Pensions on account of Rebellion in N. W., 1770 (ii).
Lacombe, Father, payment to, 1774 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs—Canals, 1771 (ii).
Military Properties, Contingencies, &c., 1771 (ii)
Supply B. No. 145 (Mr. *McLelan*). Res in Com., conc. in, 1°*, 2°* and 3°* of B., 1775 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 1.)
Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. No. 13 (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*). 1°, 41 (i).
Supreme and Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. No. 21 (Mr. *Edgar*). 1°, 60 (i).
SUPREME COURT, EXTRA REPORTER: in Com. of Sup., 890 (ii).
SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Barker*) 802 (i).
Supreme Court of Judicature, Ont., Law Amt. B. No. 125 (Mr. *Thompson*). Res. prop., 877; in Com. and 1°* of B., 973; 2°* and in Com., 1201; 3°*, 1223 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 6.)
SURVEY OF RAILWAY ROUTES IN C. B.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell, Vic.*) 266 (i).
TARIFF, THE. *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."
TAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
Tecumseh Ins. Co. of Can. incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. *Macmillan, Middlesex*). 1°*, 67; 2°*, 119; in Com. and 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 93.)
TELEGRAPHING AND EXTRA CLERKS, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 881, 1755 (ii).
TELEGRAPHS: in Com. of Sup., 1755 (ii).
TEMPERANCE COLONISATION CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 1633 (ii).
TEMPORARY LOANS BY GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 56 (i).
TERMS OF UNION WITH P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 692; suppl. Ans. (Mr. *Chapleau*) 710 (i).
TÊTE DU POINTE BARRACKS: Ques. (Mr. *Gunn*) 1240 (ii).
THOMPSON, HON. J. S. D.: returned as Member elect for Antigonish, 1 (i).
THOMPSON, MR., M. P. (Haldimand) DECEASE OF: Remarks (Messrs. *Blake* and *Langevin*) 802 (i).
THUNDER BAY COLONISATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1613 (ii).
TIMBER ISLAND, LAKE ONT., SALE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 784 (i).
TIMBER, LAND AND COAL LEASES IN N. W. T.: Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1030; Deb. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 1041; (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 1047; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1055; (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 1057; (Mr. *Hesson*) 1057; (Mr. *Lister*) 1059; (Messrs. *Foster* and *Landry, Kent*) 1062; (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 1063; (Mr. *Desjardins*) 1066; (Mr. *Cook*) 1067; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1070; (Mr. *Dawson*) 1072; (Mr. *Orton*) 1072; (Sir *Richard Cartwright* and Messrs. *Tupper* and *Haggart*) 1073; (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 1074; neg. (Y. 43; N. 99) 1074 (ii).
TIMBER LICENSES IN DISPUTED TERRITORY: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace, York*) 41 (i).
TIMBER LIMITS IN THE N. W., APPLICATIONS FOR: Remarks (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1574 (ii).
TIMBER LIMITS: Refutation of charges. *See* "ORDER," &c.
TIMBER SALES ON GEORGIAN BAY ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 898 (ii).
Toronto Board of Trade Acts Amt. B. No. 85 (E) from the Sen. (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 519; 2°*, 614; in Com. and 3°*, 704 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 56.)
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETS.: presented (Mr. *Bowell*) 31
TRANSPORT AND SUPPLY OFFICERS IN N.W.T., NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 437 (i).
TRANSPORTATION CONTRACTORS IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casey*) 427 (i).
TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 872, 885, 877 (ii).
—— OF MEMBERS OF GOVT., &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 57 (i).
TRAVIS, JUDGE: in Com. of Sup, 886 (ii).
—— Referred to in Com. on B. 133, 1461 (ii).
TREASON-FELONY TRIALS AT REGINA, &C.: M. for Cor., &c., (Mr. *Mills*) 696 (i).
TREATIES:
COMMERCIAL TREATIES, NEGOTIATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 844 (ii).
FLAG TREATY BETWEEN U.S. AND SPAIN: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Vail*) 709 (i).
TREATY OF 1818—CO-OPERATION OF NEWFOUNDLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 494 (i).
WASHINGTON TREATY, U.S VESSELS FISHING UNDER. M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 392 (i).
WEST INDIES, TRADE RELATIONS WITH: Ques. (Mr. *Coursol*) 785 (i).
TRENT RIVER NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 1752 (ii).

*For Repairs and Working Expenses, *see* "Collection of Revenues."

TRENT VALLEY CANAL, FEES PAID TO POISETTE AND ROGER: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 843 (ii).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cook*) 898 (ii).

——— Enquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Cook*) 1343 (ii).

——— PAYMENT FOR RIGHT OF WAY: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 848 (ii).

TRESTON, JAMES AND OTHERS, RECEIPT, OF PET.: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 785 (i).

TRURO TO NEWPORT RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res., 1551; in Com., 1617 (ii).

TUBING, WROUGHT IRON: conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).

TUPPER, SIR CHARLES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 57 (i).

Union Bank of Halifax Capital Stock Reduction B. No. 52 (Mr. *Stairs*). 1°*, 149; 2°*, 265; in Com. and 3°*, 704 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 60.)

Union Bank of Lower Canada Capital Stock Reduction B. No. 41 (Mr. *Bossé*). 1°*, 93; 2°*, 119; in Com. and 3°*, 704 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 58.)

UNION COLLAR CLOTH PAPER: conc. in Ways and Means, 1720 (ii).

Union Suspension Bridge B. No. 72 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°*, 393; 2° and in Com, 518; 3°*, 604 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 31.)

UNITED STATES FISHING VESSELS AND INSHORE FISHERIES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 392 (i).

VACANCIES: Announcement (Mr. *Speaker*) 1; Members introduced, 1.

VALIN, MR., M.P., GRANTS OF LAND TO IN N.W.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 31 (i).

VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. RESERVES SQUATTERS PRE-EMPTION RECORDS: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 369 (i).

VETERANS OF 1812: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (ii).

Victoria and Sault St. Marie Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 95 (Mr. *Dawson*). 1°* 630; 2°*, 757 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1153 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 80.)

VOLUNTEERS WHO SERVED IN THE N.W.T., PENSIONS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1198 (ii).

VOTERS' LISTS, PRINTING OF, CONTRACTS, &c.: M. for Stmnts. (Mr. *Casey*) 448 (i).

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION, N.W., REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1421 (ii).

WARD, MR. H. A.: Returned as Member elect for East Durham, 1 (i).

WATER AND RIVER POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 1374 (ii).

WAYS AND MEANS: Res. for Com. (Mr. *McLelan*) 30; on M. for Com., the BUDGET SPEECH, 393; Reply (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 412; prop. Res. in Com., 426; deb. on 1° of Res. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 460; Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 470; (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*) 480; (Mr. *McMullen*) 484; (Mr. *McLelan*) 486 (i); M. for Com., 1573; Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) timber limits, 1574 (ii).

WAYS AND MEANS—*Continued.*

TARIFF CHANGES: (almonds) 748 (i); (baking powder) 749 (i), 1584 (ii); (bolts, nuts, &c.) 1584 (ii); (blueing) 749 (i); (carriage hardware) 1719 (ii); (cement) 772 (i); (cocoanut, desiccated) 1584 (ii); (cologne) 770 (i); (cordage, manila and sisal) 1584 (ii); (cotton) 769 (i); (cotton wire) 1721; (earthenware) 1719 (ii); (fancy goods) 749; (feathers) 749 (i); (felt) 1721 (ii); (fruit, dried) 750; (fruit, green) 750; (gas pipes, iron) 755; (Geneva gin) 769; (gimps) 755; (gloves and mitts) 756; (grease) 780; (haircloth) 756 (i); (handkerchiefs) 1722 (ii); (harness) 756; (iron sand, putty) 780; (laces, braid, &c.) 757; (lead) 757 (i); (logs) 1587, 1725 (ii); (nail plate, iron or steel) 1722; (oil cloth) 1719 (ii); (oleomargarine) 758 (i); (paper hangings) 1587, 1720, (ii); (peaches) 755; (philosophical instruments, globes) 781 (i); (rubber belting) 1719; (scythes) 1721; (stereotypes and electrotypes) 1721; (stoves, bolts and nuts) 1721; (straw board) 1719 (ii); (sugar) 773 (i), 1724 (ii); (syrups) 779; (tubing) 770 (i); (union collar cloth paper) 1720 (ii); (whips) 700; (wire) 770; (wire fencing) 772; (writing desks) 749; (yeast cakes) 772 (i).

Weights and Measures Act further Amt. B. No. 109 (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1°* of B., 747 (i); 2° and in Com., 957; 3°*, 1015 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 4.)

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AND GAS: in Com. of Sup., 1544 (ii).

WEST INDIES, TRADE RELATIONS WITH: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 785 (i).

WESTINGHOUSE BRAKE, AMOUNT PAID FOR APPLYING TO I. C. R.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Vail*) 393 (i).

Western Canada Loan and Savings Co. B. No. 112 (M.) from the Sen. (Mr. *Beaty*). 1°*, 805; 2°*, 856; in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 105.)

WESTERN COUNTIES RY.: Remarks (Mr. *Blake* and others) on intrdn. of B. 146, 1636 (ii).

West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 27 (Mr. *Macmillan, Middlesex*). 1°*, 67; 2°, 240; in Com. and 3°*, 614 (i). (49 *Vic., c.* 70.)

WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

WHARF AT SELKIRK: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 495 (i).

WHITE FISH FRY AT FISH HATCHERIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gordon*) 788 (i).

WHITE, HON. THOS.: Returned as Member elect for Cardwell, 1 (i).

WHIPS: conc. in Ways and Means, 770 (i).

WINDSOR BRANCH RY. SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Kinney*) 1240 (ii).

WINDSOR, ONT., HARBOR MASTER AT: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 785

Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Ry. and Steamship Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 119 (Mr. *Royal*). 1°, 912; 2°, 1085; in Com. and 3°*, 1386 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 73.)

Winnipeg and North Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp, B. No. 71 (Mr. *Haggart*). 1°*, 426; 2°*, 494 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1153 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 84.)

WINNIPEG DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 1165 (ii).

WINTER MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1375 (ii).

WIRE FENCING, &c: conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).

WIRE FENCING FROM LÉVIS TO RIVIÈRE DU LOUP: Ques. (Mr. *Gaudet*) 544 (i).

WIRE, IRON OR STEEL, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 770–772 (i).

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RY. CO.'S LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 1552; in Com., 1632 (ii).

WOOD M. C., EXPLANATION, Mr. CARLING: in Com. of Sup., 885 (ii).

WOODRUFF, J. A., AMOUNTS PAID TO: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 68 (i).

WRECKS AND CASUALTIES: in Com. of Sup., 1374 (ii).

WRITING DESKS: conc. in Ways and Means, 749 (i).

WURTELE, HON. J. S. C., APPOINTMENT OF, AS JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 865, 912, 1342 (ii).

YAMASKA TO RIVER ST. JOHN RY.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 1551; in Com., 1624 (ii).

Yarmouth Bank B. No. 69 (Mr. *Kinney*). 1°*, 393; 2°*, 474 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 63.)

Yarmouth Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. No. 91 (Mr. *Kinney*). 1°*, 599; 2°*, 704 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1085 (ii). (49 *Vic., c.* 95.)

YEAST CAKES, &c.: conc. in Ways and Means, 772 (i).

YUKON RIVER EXPLORATIONS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 266 (i).